

Strongly-Consistent Distributed Discrete-event Systems

Peter Donovan, Erling Jellum, Byeonggil Jun, Hokeun Kim, Edward A. Lee,
Shaokai Lin, Marten Lohstroh, Anirudh Rengarajan

Abstract—Discrete-event (DE) systems are concurrent programs where components communicate via tagged events, where tags are drawn from a totally ordered set. Reactors are an emerging model of computation based on DE and realized in the open-source coordination language Lingua Franca. Distributed DE (DDE) systems are DE systems where the components (reactors) communicate over networks. The prior art has required that for DDE systems with cycles, each cycle must contain at least one logical delay, where the tag of events is incremented. Such delays, however, are not required by the elegant fixed-point semantics of DE. The only requirement is that the program be constructive, meaning it is free of causality cycles. This paper gives a way to coordinate the execution of DDE systems that can execute any constructive program, even one with zero-delay cycles. It provides a formal model that exposes exactly the information that must be shared across networks for such execution to be possible. Furthermore, it describes a concrete implementation that is an extension of the coordination mechanisms in Lingua Franca.

Index Terms—Discrete-event systems, synchronous-reactive programs, distributed systems, deterministic concurrency.

I. INTRODUCTION

Consistency is a measure of agreement about facts across different parts of a system. But in order to arrive at any meaningful interpretation of the term “agreement,” we need to make assumptions about time. In discrete event systems, it is typically assumed that all parts of the system have access to a shared logical clock, and that events are tagged with a reading from that clock. If the system is distributed, communication channels are used to distribute the logical clock and relay tagged events across different parts of the system. This is an effective way of accomplishing *strong consistency* – a situation where each part of the system is able to make decisions based on information that all parts of the system agree on.

Discrete-Event (DE) systems, and their distributed variant (DDE), have been used for decades for modeling and simulation, including circuit and network simulation, where time itself is modeled just like the rest of the system. More recently, the (D)DE model has been adopted as a foundation upon which to build deterministic concurrent software, where it takes the form of Reactors [1], Logical Execution Time (LET) [2], or the Sparse Synchronous model [3]. For these kinds of applications, which interact directly with the physical world, time cannot always be treated as a purely abstract, logical concept. In these systems, both a logical *and* a physical timeline are at play.

Considering the passage of logical time in conjunction with the passage of physical time exposes that the communication required to achieve consistency has a cost: it takes physical time. If decisions are held up by physical

communication delays in the system, this makes the system less available, meaning that physical interactions are handled less quickly. The tolerance for inconsistency and unavailability in a system is very application-dependent and can vary across different parts of a system. The CAL theorem [4] shows us that consistency/availability trade-offs can be navigated by inserting logical delays across communication channels, effectively manipulating the tags of events. If a subsystem is required to be strongly consistent, no logical delays can be inserted because it has to allow for logically instantaneous communication. Yet, if a strongly consistent subsystem has its distributed components organized such that there exists a zero-delay cycle (ZDC) between those components, this poses a significant coordination challenge. For this reason, most DDE frameworks reject programs that have such ZDCs.

In this paper, we present a generalized DDE framework for the real-time coordination of distributed DEs capable of handling ZDCs between nodes. We formalize the coordination algorithms required to ensure that data-determinism is preserved for all “valid” programs. We extend Lingua Franca (LF), a recent coordination language [5] with a DE semantics and “preliminary” support for distributed computing [6]. We show how the coordination algorithm can preserve deterministic timed semantics for distributed execution of all valid LF programs. A “valid” LF program is one that has a constructive procedure that terminates at each tag in a finite number of steps. LF has a constructive semantics [7] and hence rejects programs with causality cycles.

Our coordination strategy can handle ZDCs at the node level as long as there are no causality cycles. This enables elegant programming of *strongly consistent* distributed real-time systems. In practice today, ZDCs are avoided by refactoring the model, requiring the ad-hoc introduction of logical delays. This changes the model’s semantics and might introduce errors if the program depends on the logical simultaneity of certain events. Our extension makes these contortions unnecessary.

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows. Section II discusses related work. Section III gives simple examples that illustrate why it is attractive to support ZDCs. Section IV explains the time and tag model of Lingua Franca. Section V derives the information needed to ensure that events are handled in tag order. Section VI describes the policy for allowing nodes to safely advance to a tag and process events with that tag. Section VII gives implementation details for a simple realization of the policy. Section VIII evaluates the implementation, showing that it has negligible impact on performance. Finally, Section IX draws conclusions.

II. RELATED WORK

A DE model of computation (MoC), for our purposes here, is defined to be a concurrent system where components react to tagged events in a tag order, where the tags are drawn from a totally-ordered set [8], usually representing time. Similar timed models form the foundation of Simulink [9], which is widely used in industry for building embedded software. The DE MoC has a rigorous formal semantics that ensures data-determinism under well-defined assumptions [10]–[14]. The DE MoC holds particular promise for real-time embedded software because of its integration of a model of time. Lee and Zheng [15] showed that the DE MoC can be interpreted as a generalization of synchronous/reactive (SR) semantics (see also Edwards and Hui [3]). The “ticks” of an SR semantics become quantified by tags or timestamps, and each component reacts to tagged inputs logically simultaneously, producing outputs with the same tag as the inputs. Under this interpretation, a DE model inherits the elegant fixed-point semantics of an SR model.

DDE systems for *simulation* have a rich history [16]–[20]. A nice survey is given by Jafer, *et al.* [21]. Although most of this work is quite old, research continues, motivated by network simulation and digital twins, for example [22], [23]. However, the DDE systems are rarely used for *implementing* distributed real-time systems. This is largely due to the challenges in preserving data-determinism when nodes are communicating over possibly unreliable networks.

III. MOTIVATING EXAMPLES

Fig. 1 shows the (automatically generated) diagram for a Lingua Franca (LF) program realizing a feedback control system interacting with a physical plant. The program consists of three reactor instances, named *p*, *c*, and *pl*, that send each other tagged messages via named ports. Reactor *p* is an instance of a reactor class `PhysicalPlant`, which contains a timer and two reactions. Reactions are represented in diagrams by the dark gray chevrons; they consist of arbitrary code in a target language, which currently can be either C, C++, Python, Rust, or TypeScript. Although the LF source code is textual, for the purposes of this paper, it is unnecessary to show this code. The automatically generated diagrams are sufficient to convey all the required information.

In reactor *p*, the timer has an offset of 0 (meaning that it starts when the program starts) and a period of 100ms. Reaction 1 is triggered by that timer and consists of arbitrary code in the target language. Reaction 2 is triggered by an input on the control port, which will be a tagged message.

Reaction 1 in *p* could, for example, consist of C code that polls a sensor to produce sensor data on the output port named `sensor`. Reaction 2 could, for example, consist of C code that drives an actuator. Alternatively, these two reactions could interact with an external simulator or perform simulation themselves. Here, the step size of such a simulation is fixed at 100ms, but it is easy in LF to vary the step size.

In *p*, if the timer event and the control input have the same tag (they are logically simultaneous), then reaction 1 will always be invoked before reaction 2, a key feature of LF that helps preserve determinism. The order is defined by

the lexical ordering of the reaction definitions in the source code and is reflected by their numbering in the diagram. These reactions belong to the same reactor, and therefore have access to common state variables and/or the same physical plant.

Reactor *c* is an instance of `Controller`, which contains two reactions. Reaction 1 is triggered by an input on its sensor port and (potentially) produces outputs on its control and `request_for_planning` ports. If it produces such outputs, those outputs are *logically simultaneous* with the inputs. They have the same tag. A control output, therefore, will feed back logically instantaneously to the physical plant.

Notice that the ordering of reactions in the physical plant is important. If reactions 1 and 2 were reversed, then we would have a causality loop, which is flagged by the LF tools as shown in Fig. 2. The causality loop arises because, with this reversal, reaction 1 depends on the output produced by reaction 2, but reaction 1 is required to be executed before reaction 2 at any tag where both are triggered.

The logically instantaneous feedback of Fig. 1 is a common pattern in control systems and is repeated in the diagram in the interaction between the `Controller` and the `Planner`. If the physical plant is simulated, e.g., using Simulink, the design would normally include an integrator in the physical plant simulation. An integrator has the property that the output does not instantaneously depend on the input, and hence, it breaks the potential causality loop.

The pattern of Fig. 1 is not realizable in most DDE frameworks because there are ZDCs between the components. However, experiences in related systems suggest that it is possible to improve usability by accepting programs that intuitively should have a well-defined behavior, even if a conservative analysis of their component-level topology would indicate that they have a cyclic causal dependency [7]. Our generalization in this paper applies this insight to a DDE-like model of computation by enabling the execution of programs with ZDCs.

A more interesting example is given in Fig. 3, where two `Platform` instances each contain a physical plant interaction and a controller. But now, we wish for the controller to make decisions based on a consensus across the platforms. Such applications are often called multi-agent systems, and the pattern is common in robotics and vehicle control. In this pattern, each `Controller` receives both a local update from its own physical plant interface and an update from one or more remote platforms. In reaction 1, the `Controller` calculates a consensus with confidence that the other platform will calculate a similar consensus based on consistent information.

Notice the highly symmetric nature of Fig. 3, where either platform can update common information at any time, and both platforms can calculate a control signal with confidence that the other platform calculates its control signal based on the same information. The CAL Theorem of Lee, *et al.* [24] shows that this *strong consistency* comes at a price in availability that depends on the network latency (CAL stands for consistency, availability, and latency). In this example, availability refers to the time it takes for the `Controller` to reach the consensus state at which it can confidently issue a control signal. It is obvious in this case that time will depend on how long




Fig. 1: Control systems often have multiple coupled feedback loops that are usefully modeled as having zero delay.




Fig. 2: A causality loop is a cyclic dependency between logically simultaneous reactions.




Fig. 3: Distributed controllers whose control signal is based on a consensus.

it takes for these platforms to communicate. Moreover, Lee, *et al.* show that putting logical delays on the connections between these platforms introduces a measured amount of *inconsistency*, which can reduce this amount of time, thereby improving availability. However, introducing logical delays must be done very carefully to not change the semantics of the program. In the case of Fig. 3, if a logical delay is added to the connection from p2 to p1, then at each multiple of 100ms, the control output of each Controller will be based on different information. Without such a delay, even with simultaneous local and remote updates, both controllers have the same information and can, therefore, take consistent actions. With the delay, to ensure consistent actions, the same delay would have to be put on the connection from p1 to p2 and also on the internal connections from sensor to local_update. This process is error-prone and unnecessary if ZDCs are supported.

By extending the DDE execution framework to allow ZDCs, we enable the full gamut of design choices ranging from strong consistency (which requires ZDCs) to maximum availability (which can be achieved using LET, at the price of inconsistency). Note that consistency is defined with respect to logical time. This guarantee of strong consistency holds even in a granular notion of time, as we describe in the following section. Moreover, such a notion of time is fundamentally the right one for Lingua Franca because the deterministic semantics of Lingua Franca programs makes no reference to

any notion of time that is even more granular.

IV. TIME AND TAGS

We make a sharp distinction between the logical and the physical timelines of a distributed computation, as proposed by Lohstroh *et al.* [25]. We adopt the superdense model of time used by LF [5] for logical time. Other models of time accomplish the same goals [26], [27], but we do not believe it would materially change our proposed DDE framework.

In LF, logical time is modeled with tags. A tag g is a pair $(t, m) \in \mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{M}$, where $t \in \mathbb{T}$ is a 64-bit signed integer obtained from the system clock, typically representing the number of nanoseconds that have elapsed since 00:00:00 UTC on 1 January 1970. The least and greatest numbers are reserved to represent NEVER and FOREVER, respectively, which are treated as infinities when performing arithmetic on time values. The *microstep* $m \in \mathbb{M}$ is an unsigned 32-bit integer that allows a variable (such as an event at a port) to proceed through a sequence of values without time elapsing. Given two tags $g_1 = (t_1, m_1)$ and $g_2 = (t_2, m_2)$, $g_1 < g_2$ if and only if either $t_1 < t_2$ or $t_1 = t_2$ and $m_1 < m_2$. So, the set of tags forms a totally ordered set.

A port (input or output) may or may not have an event at any given tag g . If it does not have an event, it is said to be *absent* at that tag. It can have at most one event at any g . If two ports have events at the same tag, then these events are

logically simultaneous. Output events produced by a reaction that is triggered by an input event are logically simultaneous with that input event (there is no microstep increment, as one finds in some DE languages, such as VHDL).

A. Delays

The *after* keyword in Lingua Franca specifies a time value associated with a connection. A message that travels over the connection has a tag $g_s = (t_s, m_s)$ at the sending end and a tag $g_r = (t_r, m_r)$ at the receiving end. If there is no *after* on the connection, these two events are logically simultaneous. An *after* delay is specified with $d \in \mathbb{T}$. If $d \geq 0$, then it specifies a tag increment across the connection; the events are no longer logically simultaneous. If $d = 0$, then the connection introduces a single microstep increment. Since a specified *after* delay always satisfies $d \geq 0$, we can model the lack of an *after* delay with any $d < 0$. Formally, then, the tag at the receiving end is given by a function D defined by,

$$D(g_s, d) = D((t_s, m_s), d) = (t_r, m_r) = \begin{cases} (t_s, m_s), & \text{if } d < 0 \\ (t_s, m_s + 1), & \text{if } d = 0 \\ (t_s + d, 0), & \text{if } d > 0 \\ \text{FOREVER_TAG} & \text{if } t_s \geq \text{FOREVER} - d \\ \text{FOREVER_TAG} & \text{if } d = \text{FOREVER} \end{cases} \quad (1)$$

Notice that when an *after* delay with $d > 0$ is given, the microstep at the receiving end is reset to zero. We will not defend that choice here, but rather just accept it as the behavior exhibited by Lingua Franca. In the last two conditions, FOREVER_TAG is the largest representable tag. The last condition means we can model the lack of connection with $d = \text{FOREVER}$. The second to last condition models the situation where the time value overflows.

Consider a network of reactors. Let D_{ij} be the *least* after delay over all connections from reactor j to i . If there are no connections from j to i , let $D_{ij} = \text{FOREVER}$, the largest possible time. If $i = j$, let $D_{ij} = \text{NEVER}$, the least (and negative) time.


If at a tag g_j , j sends a message to i , then the tag g_i at the receiving end is at least as large as $D(g_j, D_{ij})$. Equivalently,

$$g_i \geq g_j + D((0, 0), D_{ij}),$$

where the addition of tags is element-wise. We call $D((0, 0), D_{ij})$ the **minimum tag increment** from j to i .

So far, we are only talking about direct connections between reactors. A message from one reactor, however, can trigger many other messages downstream, even an infinite number if there are cycles. We will be interested in the minimum possible tag increments along paths that may pass through several intermediate reactors.


Let \mathcal{D}_{ij} denote the **minimum tag increment** along any *path* from node j to node i . This tag increment is calculated using the D function as above, applied in the order in which connections appear along the path. For example, consider a program in Fig. 4a. The connection from A to B has an *after* delay of 0 (implying a one microstep delay), and the



(a) An example where \mathcal{D}_{CA} is $(10\text{ms}, 0)$.



(b) An example where \mathcal{D}_{CA} is $(10\text{ms}, 1)$.



(c) An example with a path including a logical action.

Fig. 4: Example LF programs with *after* delays.

connection from B to C has an *after* delay of 10ms. Hence, the minimum tag increment from A to C is

$$\mathcal{D}_{CA} = D(D((0, 0), 0), 10000000) = (10000000, 0).$$

We start with A at a tag $(0, 0)$ and evaluate the D function, first along the connection from A to B , and then along the connection from B to C .

Note that the D function is neither commutative nor associative, so when finding the total delay of a path consisting of several connections, it is necessary to apply the function in the order of the connections. For example, the example in Fig. 4b yields a minimum tag increment of

$$\mathcal{D}_{CA} = D(D((0, 0), 10000000), 0) = (10000000, 1).$$

If both delays were 0, then we would get $\mathcal{D}_{CA} = (0, 2)$.

Note that in both cases Fig. 4a and Fig. 4b, there is no path from C to A , so $\mathcal{D}_{AC} = \text{FOREVER_TAG}$. Moreover, there is no path from A to itself, so we define $\mathcal{D}_{AA} = \text{FOREVER_TAG}$.

The minimum tag increment is conservative. It does not take into account causality interfaces [28]. Causality interfaces are algebraic models that express how each output port depends on each input port. If an input at a tag g can cause an output at the tag g , then there is a **direct feedthrough** path from that input port to that output port. If an input at a tag g cannot cause an output before the tag $g + d$, then d represents a **minimum delay** from that input port to that output port.

Hence, for example, the program in Fig. 4c, $\mathcal{D}_{CA} = (0, 0)$ even though it is not possible for an output from A to trigger an input to C at the same tag. The white triangle in D represents a *logical action*, used in Lingua Franca for one reaction to schedule the invocation of another reaction at a later tag. In this example, reaction 2 schedules a later invocation of reaction 1, so the resulting output will never be logically simultaneous with the input. If we were using causality interfaces, we would capture this fact. Our conservative definition ignores this fact and assumes that there might be direct feedthrough from the input to D to its output.

Name	Description	Direction
ABS_{ij}	Absent	j to i via RTI
LTC_i	Latest Tag Complete	i to RTI
MSG_{ij}	Message	j to i via RTI
NES_i	Neighbor structure	i to RTI
NET_i	Next Event Tag	i to RTI
$PTAG_i$	Provisional Tag Advance Grant	RTI to i
TAG_i	Tag Advance Grant	RTI to i

TABLE I: Types of messages and signals exchanged between nodes and the RTI.

It turns out that this conservative definition is almost sufficient to get correct coordination, as we will see below. It is sufficient to determine the tag to which a node may commit (explained in Section VI), but additional information is used to prevent premature blocking on unknown input port statuses (explained in Section VII). In this example, the output from D that is the result of an input has a minimum tag increment of $D((0, 0), \text{min_delay})$, where min_delay is the minimum delay parameter of the logical action. The default minimum delay is 0, resulting in a minimum tag increment of $(0, 1)$. If we were to use such information, then we would get

$$\mathcal{D}_{CA} = \min((10000000, 1), D((0, 0), \text{min_delay})).$$

This is greater than or equal to our more conservative result $\mathcal{D}_{CA} = (0, 0)$. That result is “more conservative” because we use \mathcal{D}_{CA} to determine the earliest possible tags of future messages received by C that are caused by events at A , and the error here results in an earlier estimate rather than a later estimate. A later estimate could result in C seeing events out of the tag order, which would violate the semantics of LF.

V. CENTRALIZED COORDINATION

Prior to this work, Lingua Franca has provided two preliminary DDE execution frameworks that handle coordination to ensure that components see events in the tag order [6]. The more conservative coordinator, called the “centralized coordinator,” is based loosely on the High-Level Architecture (HLA) [29]. A second coordinator, called the “decentralized coordinator,” is based on PTIDES [30] (using techniques similar to those in Google Spanner [31]). In this paper, we extend the centralized coordinator to support ZDCs (as long as they are constructive). Although our centralized coordinator is implemented as a single centralized process, there is no fundamental reason that its functionality could not be distributed among the other components, yielding a more decentralized realization of the same semantics. This paper, in fact, clarifies exactly what information needs to be shared across a distributed system in order to make such coordination possible.

A. Message and Signal Types

Message and signal types needed for coordinating the distributed execution are summarized in Table I. There are two types of entities in the coordination, nodes and the Run-Time Infrastructure (RTI). A node (also called a federate) is a top-level reactor that is part of a distributed execution (also

known as a federation). The RTI is a central coordinator that has a direct communication link with every node. We use the term “message” for application-level messages that go from one node to another. We use the term “signal” for control messages exchanged with the RTI.

Most of these messages and signals carry a tag as part of the payload. Let $G(M_i)$ denote the tag carried by the message or signal M_i . For example, $G(LTC_i)$ is the tag on an LTC_i signal, which tells the RTI that node i has completed processing tag $G(LTC_i)$. This means that the RTI has seen all messages from i destined to arrive at any other node with tags less than or equal to $G(LTC_i)$ plus the after delay of the connection between the nodes.

When the RTI receives a message MSG_{ij} from node j , it will forward that message to node i . That message has two tags associated with it, a **source tag** g_j , the tag at source node j , and g_i , the **destination tag** at node i . The destination tag g_i is the source tag g_j adjusted by any after delay on the connection from j to i . I.e., $g_i = D(g_j, d)$, where d is the after delay on the connection from j to i , and D is the function defined in equation (1). Only the destination tag is carried as a payload along with the message, so $g_i = G(MSG_{ij})$. A message MSG_{ij} can occur only if there is a connection from an output port of node j to an input port of node i .

An ABS_{ij} is similar to MSG_{ij} except that it conveys to node i that it will never in the future receive a message from j with a tag less than or equal to $G(ABS_{ij})$. ABS signals are used only when there are ZDCs, as we will see below.

A NET_i signal from node i is a promise that, as of the time at which it sends this signal to the RTI, it will not produce any further messages to other nodes with tags less than $G(NET_i)$, except in response to receiving a message from another node j with a tag $G(MSG_{ij}) < G(NET_i)$.

A TAG_i signal is sent from the RTI to node i when it is safe for node i to assume it has received all MSG_{ij} and ABS_{ij} with tags less than or equal to $G(TAG_i)$. This informs node i that it can proceed to process all such messages. A $PTAG_i$ signal is sent from the RTI to node i when it is safe for node i to assume it has received all MSG_{ij} and ABS_{ij} with tags *strictly less than* $G(PTAG_i)$. This informs node i that it can safely advance its local tag to $G(PTAG_i)$ (it will not later see messages with earlier tags), but it is not yet safe to assume it has seen messages with tags *equal* to $G(PTAG_i)$. $PTAG$ signals, like ABS signals, are used only when there are ZDCs. In Section VII introduces a strategy that partially executes logical tags at a node upon receiving a $PTAG$ signal.

In the following section, we introduce a coordination algorithm specifying how the RTI should send TAG and $PTAG$ signals in response to LTC and NET signals and MSG and ABS messages.

B. Topology Information

At the start of execution, each node informs the RTI of the connection topology. Each node is identified by a unique ID and must know the IDs of its upstream and downstream nodes.

Recall that D_{ij} is the minimum delay on connections from an output port of node j to an input port of i . If there is no

connection from j to i , then D_{ij} is FOREVER. If there are connections, but no connection from j to i has an after delay, then D_{ij} is NEVER. Similarly, each node can be considered to be connected to itself with no after delay, so D_{ii} is NEVER.

Each node i sends to the RTI a NES_i signal that lists the IDs of the nodes that are upstream and downstream of it, and for each upstream node j , the minimum delay D_{ij} from j to i . This will be the sum total of the information that the RTI has about the connection topology. For distributed programs that support dynamic topologies, this information will need to be updated at runtime.

C. Assumptions

First, a node j can only produce an output in response to:

- A. An input MSG or ABS from the network.
- B. An event on its event queue.
- C. A physical action.

We call these the **causes** for messages MSG_{ij} from j to i .

A *physical action* is a Lingua Franca concept [5]. It is a mechanism that enables injection into an executing program of tagged events that are triggered by some external event, such as sensor data delivered via an interrupt. The timestamp in the tag of the resulting event is determined by the local physical clock at the node where the event is injected. When such physical actions are present, a node cannot process tagged events with timestamps greater than its local physical clock because, if it did, then a physical action may inject an event that is in the past relative to events that have been processed. As a consequence, logical time (the timestamps of events being processed) is always behind physical time; we can say, “logical time chases physical time.” As a consequence, because of the definition of NET, if node i has a physical action, it never sends NET_i with $g(NET_i) \geq T$, where T its physical time.

In addition, we need to make the following **assumption** about the execution: All messages and signals from each node i to RTI and from the RTI to i are delivered reliably and in order. (This can be realized using TCP.)

D. Earliest Future Incoming Message Tag

When the RTI receives a NET_i from i , it must decide whether to grant a TAG_i , a $PTAG_i$, or neither. To do this, it needs a lower bound B_i on the tags of messages that i may receive in the future. We call B_i the **earliest (future) incoming message tag (EIMT)** for node i .

If the EIMT $B_i > G(NET_i)$, then the RTI can grant a TAG_i with $G(TAG_i) = G(NET_i)$. If $B_i = G(NET_i)$, then the RTI can grant a $PTAG_i$ with $G(PTAG_i) = G(NET_i)$, although it may choose not to grant the $PTAG_i$ if i is not in part of a ZDC (see Section VI below). If $B_i < G(NET_i)$, then the RTI must grant neither. To determine B_i , the RTI needs to use the information it has about the *other* nodes that may send messages to i . Specifically, for each node j , it needs to find a lower bound on the tags of any message that j may send to i . In this section, we explain how to find this lower bound.

Consider a message MSG_{ij} sent from node j to node i . Recall that D_{ij} is the minimum after delay over all connections

from j to i . Then the tag g_i of the message at the receiving node will satisfy

$$g_i = G(MSG_{ij}) \geq D(g_j, D_{ij}),$$

where g_j is the tag at the sending node.

Note that the tags $G(MSG_{ij})$ on a sequence of messages from j to i may not be monotonically increasing. It is possible for node j to have more than one connection to node i (on different ports), and these connections may have arbitrary after delays. Hence, the RTI may see a MSG_{ij} with destination tag g_i and later see a similar message with an earlier destination tag.

For each node i , the RTI maintains a variable N_i that is the tag of the most recently received NET_i signal from i . If no NET_i has been received, then N_i is the start tag of the execution, a pessimistic guess for the earliest tag at which i might produce a message.

Once the RTI sees a message MSG_{ij} , then it knows that i will need to execute at the tag $G(MSG_{ij})$ even if it has not yet received a NET_i with $G(NET_i) = G(MSG_{ij})$. Thus, the RTI updates N_i to $G(MSG_{ij})$ if $G(MSG_{ij})$ is earlier than N_i . Only when the RTI receives an LTC_i with a tag greater than or equal to $G(MSG_{ij})$ can it be sure that node i has finished processing the message and produced any outgoing messages in response to it.

For each node i , the RTI also maintains a sorted queue Q_i of tags $G(MSG_{ij})$ of messages destined to i . Intuitively, Q_i is a sorted record of all messages that are in flight to i but have not yet been processed by i , as far as the RTI knows. When it receives an LTC_i , it pops off Q_i all tags less than or equal to $G(LTC_i)$ and discards them because it now knows that i has processed all those messages. Consequently, the RTI has also seen all messages MSG_{ki} from i to any other node k with *source* tag equal or less than $G(NET_i)$. Let $H(Q_i)$ be the head of Q_i (the least tag on the queue) or FOREVER if Q_i is empty. The necessity of the queue is explained in Section VI-D.

Define E_i to be a lower bound on the *source* tag of any future messages (messages not yet seen by the RTI) that node i may produce. If the RTI can calculate E_i for each node i , then it can also calculate the EIMT B_i , a lower bound on the tags of messages that node i may receive in the future. This will be

$$B_i = \min_{j \in U_i} D(E_j, D_{ij}), \quad (2)$$

where $U(i)$ is the set of nodes immediately upstream of i , and D is the delay function given in Section IV-A. As explained above, the RTI can use this to decide how to respond (or whether to respond) to a NET_i signal.

Future messages produced by a node i can only have one of two causes: they result from either an event originating within node i or a message sent to i from some other node. Hence, we can express E_j from Eq. 2 in terms of B_j , i.e., the EIMT of an upstream node j , and other information the RTI has:

$$E_j = \min(N_j, H(Q_j), B_j). \quad (3)$$

Hence, the EIMT of node i can be given by

$$B_i = \min_{j \in U_i} D(\min(N_j, H(Q_j), B_j), D_{ij}). \quad (4)$$

The RTI will never in the future see a message MSG_{ij} destined for i with a tag $G(\text{MSG}_{ij}) < B_i$.

To understand why this is a lower bound, consider each term of (3), N_j , $H(Q_j)$, and B_j :

(a) Recall that N_j is the tag of the most recently received NET_j from j , meaning that j may produce a message at N_j . No matter the RTI has seen such a message or not, it must assume such a message is possible. Notice, however, that there is no assurance that NET_j signals have monotonically increasing tags. In fact, the RTI may have seen a signal with a tag $G(\text{NET}_j) = \text{FOREVER}$ (or a large value equal to the timeout tag), indicating that j does not have any internal events that could result in a message. But j may subsequently (after having sent FOREVER) receive a message that causes it to produce a message to i with an earlier tag. In that case, however, the tag of that message will already be accounted for in B_j (or Q_j if the RTI has seen that message). B_j is the tag of the earliest possible incoming message to j , as far as the RTI knows, and it will not be updated until the RTI is sure that all messages with tags earlier than B_j have been delivered to j and j has acknowledged receiving it with a LTC_j .

(b) Q_j contains the tags of messages that might be in flight to j , each of which could cause j to produce a message in response.

(c) By the definition of B_j , j will not receive a message with a tag earlier than B_j , so if such a message triggers a message to i , that message cannot have a *source* tag less than B_j .

This accounts for all the possible causes of future messages from j . The validity of this conclusion depends on the fact that the channel from j to the RTI has reliable in-order delivery of messages and signals. Specifically, a message MSG_{ij} from j with a source tag g_j will always be preceded by a NET_j with $G(\text{NET}_j) = g_j$, and no other NET_j signal will arrive in between. The $H(Q_j)$ accounts for the possibility that the most recent NET_j corresponds to a *future* message, one that the RTI has not yet seen, but the RTI is aware of a message in flight towards j . The final term accounts for the possibility that the RTI has not yet seen relevant messages destined towards j , but those messages have to originate at upstream nodes.

Note that equation (4) is circular. If there is a path upstream from i back to itself, then B_i depends on itself. Fortunately, this does not create a problem, as we will see.

E. Two-Node Case

Consider a system with just two nodes, $i, j \in \{0, 1\}$. Then, using the definitions in Section IV-A, equation (4) reduces to

$$\begin{aligned} B_0 &= D(\min(N_1, H(Q_1), B_1), D_{01}) \\ B_1 &= D(\min(N_0, H(Q_0), B_0), D_{10}) \end{aligned}$$

This is the situation when 1 and 2 are not part of a ZDC. Combining these, we see that the EIMT for node 0 is

$$B_0 = D(\min(N_1, H(Q_1), D(\min(N_0, H(Q_0), B_0), D_{10})), D_{01}). \quad (5)$$

Notice that B_0 appears on both sides. The D function is monotonic, so we can exchange \min and D to get

$$\begin{aligned} B_0 &= \min(D(N_1, D_{01}), \\ &\quad D(H(Q_1), D_{01}), \\ &\quad D(D(N_0, D_{10}), D_{01}), \\ &\quad D(D(H(Q_0), D_{10}), D_{01}), \\ &\quad D(D(B_0, D_{10}), D_{01})). \end{aligned}$$

If either $D_{10} \geq 0$ or $D_{01} \geq 0$, then the last of these cases cannot be the minimum. That is, it cannot be that $B_0 = D(D(B_0, D_{10}), D_{01})$. Hence, if either $D_{10} \geq 0$ or $D_{01} \geq 0$, then,

$$\begin{aligned} B_0 &= \min(D(N_1, D_{01}), \\ &\quad D(H(Q_1), D_{01}), \\ &\quad D(D(N_0, D_{10}), D_{01}), \\ &\quad D(D(H(Q_0), D_{10}), D_{01})). \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

This is the situation where either there is no cycle between nodes 0 and 1 (one of D_{01} or D_{10} is FOREVER), or there is a cycle but with a logical delay.

In the case that there is a ZDC, D_{01} and D_{10} are both negative and

$$B_0 = \min(N_1, H(Q_1), N_0, H(Q_0), B_0). \quad (7)$$

Let $X = \min(N_1, H(Q_1), N_0, H(Q_0))$. Then it is clear that any $B_0 \leq X$ satisfies (7). However, this conclusion is unnecessarily weak, and if we take causality into account, we can instead make the stronger conclusion that $B_0 = X$. This is because, based on the causes listed in Section V-C, the appearance of B_0 in the minimization would have to correspond to a case when the cause of some event e at a tag B_0 is e itself. Lingua Franca forbids causality loops, and hence such a case is impossible and should not be considered. Hence, (6) is a general solution, applicable for any delays D_{01} and D_{10} .

F. N-Node Case

Equation (6) can be generalized to an arbitrary set N of nodes using the path delay \mathcal{D}_{ij} defined in Section IV-A. For all $i \in N$, the EIMT is

$$B_i = \min_{j \in N}(N_j + \mathcal{D}_{ij}, H(Q_j) + \mathcal{D}_{ij}). \quad (8)$$

Equivalently,

$$B_i = \min_{j \in N}(\min(N_j, H(Q_j)) + \mathcal{D}_{ij}). \quad (9)$$

Equation (9) suggests an algorithm. For each node i and each node j that is upstream of i along at least one path with no repetitions of nodes, we can calculate \mathcal{D}_{ij} , which is the shortest path, using Dijkstra's algorithm. This calculation needs to be done only once if the topology does not change during runtime, and recalculated only when the topology changes. Then, when the RTI receives a NET_i signal, it can grant a TAG_i with $G(\text{TAG}_i) = G(\text{NET}_i)$ if $B_i > G(\text{NET}_i)$. If $B_i = G(\text{NET}_i)$, then there may be a ZDC, and the RTI can only grant a PTAG_i with $G(\text{PTAG}_i) = G(\text{NET}_i)$. If

$B_i < G(\text{NET}_i)$, then it cannot grant anything. The decision of whether to grant a TAG_i or PTAG_i should be revisited whenever a NET_j is received from any upstream node j .

VI. TAG ADVANCE GRANTS

When a node becomes idle (and at startup), having processed all the events at a particular tag g , it enters a state where it wishes to advance its tag to some $g' > g$. If it has no events on its event queue, then g' is either $(\text{TIMEOUT}, 0)$, where TIMEOUT is the logical stop time, or FOREVER_TAG , if no logical stop time is specified. The node sends a NET_i signal to the RTI with $G(\text{NET}_i) = g'$. If the node has upstream nodes, it then waits for a response from the RTI. The response will come in the form of a TAG_i or PTAG_i with a tag greater than g and no greater than g' . If node i has no upstream nodes, then it does not wait, and instead acts as if it has already received a TAG_i with $G(\text{TAG}_i) = g'$.

Recall that a TAG_i signal from the RTI is a guarantee to node i that it has seen all network input messages with tags less than or equal to $G(\text{TAG}_i)$, and thus can safely advance its logical tag to TAG_i . Also, recall that a PTAG_i signal from the RTI is a guarantee to node i that it has seen all network input messages with tags less than $G(\text{PTAG}_i)$.

Notice that the difference between these is subtle but important. In the case of a TAG_i , the node can assume that any input port that has not received a message with a tag $G(\text{TAG}_i)$ is **absent** at the tag $G(\text{TAG}_i)$.

In the case of a PTAG_i signal, however, it cannot make any such assumption. The state of each input port is **unknown** at a tag $G(\text{PTAG}_i)$ unless it has already received a message for that port with that tag (or a greater tag). As the node executes reactions at a tag $G(\text{PTAG}_i)$, it must block any reaction that depends on an unknown input port until that port becomes **known** (to have a message or to be absent). There are several ways that an unknown port may become known:

- 1) The port receives a message MSG_{ij} with a tag $G(\text{MSG}_{ij}) \geq G(\text{PTAG}_i)$. If greater, then the port becomes known to be absent.
- 2) The port receives an ABS_{ij} message with $G(\text{ABS}_{ij}) \geq G(\text{PTAG}_i)$. At this point, the port is known to be absent.
- 3) The node receives a TAG_i signal from the RTI with $G(\text{TAG}_i) \geq G(\text{PTAG}_i)$.
- 4) The node can infer from the interconnection topology that the RTI would not have granted it the PTAG_i without having forwarded all possible messages destined for the port with $G(\text{MSG}_{ij}) \leq G(\text{PTAG}_i)$.

The last of these is the most subtle and deserves some attention. First, we need to examine the policy that the RTI uses to send TAG and PTAG signals.

A. Policy for Granting Tag Advances

Let C_i be the tag of the most recent LTC_i signal that the RTI has seen from node i , or NEVER_TAG if there has been no such signal. When node i is ready to make progress, it will send a NET_i signal to the RTI with $G(\text{NET}_i) > C_i$. When the RTI receives such a NET_i from node i , it can do one of three things:

- 1) It can respond with a TAG_i .
- 2) It can respond with a PTAG_i .
- 3) It can do nothing and wait for more information. This will block progress at node i .

To determine which of these to do, it should use the algorithm of Section V-F to calculate B_i , the earliest (future) incoming message tag (EIMT). If the system is behaving correctly, then it should always be true that $B_i > C_i$; otherwise an error has occurred. Assuming such an error does not occur, there are several possible outcomes:

- 1) If $B_i > G(\text{NET}_i)$, then the RTI can issue a TAG_i with $G(\text{TAG}_i) = G(\text{NET}_i)$.
- 2) If $B_i = G(\text{NET}_i)$, then the RTI has two choices:
 - a. The RTI does nothing, waiting for further information.
 - b. The RTI issues a PTAG_i with $G(\text{PTAG}_i) = G(\text{NET}_i)$.
- 3) If $B_i < G(\text{NET}_i)$, the RTI *must* do nothing and wait for further information.

There are two relatively simple strategies that an RTI design could follow, but both of them have serious disadvantages. First, it could always choose option 2a above. However, this will result in a large number of ABS messages becoming necessary. Every time a node i completes execution at some tag g , before sending its LTC_i signal, it will need to send ABS_{ji} messages to each downstream node j on every output port where it did not actually produce a MSG_{ji} . This will clog the network with absent messages. Second, it could always choose option 2b above. However, this will result in an inability to support ZDCs .

B. Coordination Strategy

There are two questions to resolve. First, faced with $B_i = G(\text{NET}_i)$ (condition 2 above), should the RTI choose 2a or 2b? Second, when the RTI chooses either 2a or 3 (it waits), then when does the RTI finally respond to NET_i ?

For the first question, our strategy is to minimize the use of PTAG and ABS ; using them only when not using them would result in a deadlock. Hence, when $B_i = G(\text{NET}_i)$, it becomes important which node(s) upstream of i are the ones that may send messages with tags B_i . If any one of those nodes is in a ZDC with i , then the RTI will choose 2b and issue a PTAG_i . Otherwise, it will choose 2a. It is safe to choose 2a because if all upstream nodes j that may produce a message MSG_{ij} with $G(\text{MSG}_{ij}) = B_i = G(\text{NET}_i)$ are not in a ZDC with i , then they will be able to progress to the tag B_i without waiting for i to progress to the tag B_i , and, hence, not causing a deadlock.

The second question is when the RTI finally responds to a NET_i when it has chosen to wait. Once the RTI receives an LTC_j with $G(\text{LTC}_j) \geq \text{NET}_i$ from each j that is upstream of i , then the RTI can issue a TAG_i with $\text{TAG}_i = \text{NET}_i$ (or a possibly even larger tag, the minimum of all the $g(\text{LTC}_j)$). Hence, upon receipt of any LTC_j , the RTI reevaluates whether to send a TAG_i or PTAG_i to any downstream node i . Next, whenever the RTI chooses to send a PTAG_j to any node j that is upstream of i , it should check if there is a pending NET_i that it has not responded to. If $G(\text{PTAG}_j) \geq g(\text{NET}_i)$, then it may be possible to send a TAG_i or PTAG_i . Specifically, if for every upstream j , the RTI has either a received LTC_j with




Fig. 7: A simple program with a ZDC. TPO is marked orange.

in a federated LF program. We begin with two constraints on the execution order of reactions when handling messages [5]. If multiple reactions are triggered at the same logical time:

- 1) reactions in the same reactor must be executed in the order in which they are defined.
- 2) if there is a zero-delay connection from a reaction $r1$ of one reactor to a reaction $r2$ of another reactor, $r1$ must complete its execution before $r2$ is triggered.

In LF, an acyclic precedence graph called the reaction graph is generated to capture the constraints of the order of execution of reactions. To avoid traversing the graph at runtime, we use a topological sort algorithm and assign levels to each reaction based on the topological depth [32]. This level is the same as the top level defined in [33] and provides a simple scheduling policy where a reaction is triggered only after reactions with lower levels have been completed.

When a node is in a ZDC, there are two challenges to meeting the rules for executing reactions. First, a node must wait for network input ports' statuses to become known before executing a reaction that depends on the input ports. Let us consider a simple federated LF program with a ZDC depicted in Figure 7. After starting the program, A will receive $PTAG_A$ where $G(PTAG_A)$ is equal to the start tag. It will then execute reaction 1, which does not depend on the input port, allowing it to produce an output. Next, A needs to block its execution until the input port's status becomes known. The status becomes known after B sends either MSG_{AB} or ABS_{AB} . Section VII-A explains how we tackle this challenge efficiently using a new concept that we call Max Level Allowed to Advance (MLAA).

Second, preserving the dependency between reactions from different nodes is challenging. In LF, each node is decomposed into a single program and compiled individually. Thus, we will lose some dependencies between nodes. For example, in Figure 7, once the two programs have been separated, A does not know there is a dependency between A and B . In Section VII-B, we will show that the lost information can lead to a significant problem (deadlock) and will introduce a Total Port Ordering (TPO) level to solve the problem.

A. Max Level Allowed to Advance

When a federation is decomposed into separate nodes, special-purposed reactors called network receivers and network senders are generated for each network input and output port. The diagram in Fig. 8 shows the network receiver and sender generated for the node A in Fig. 7. When a MSG_{AB} arrives at input port $A.in$, the network input reaction of the port (reaction 2 of the network receiver) is triggered. The reaction that depends on $A.in$ (reaction 2 of A) is triggered by the




Fig. 8: A separate program for the node A in Figure 7. The levels of reactions are marked blue.

network input reaction. The network sender sends MSG_{BA} to the RTI using its reaction 2 if reaction 1 of A produces an output or sends ABS_{BA} using its reaction 3 if the reaction does not produce an output.

At each tag, a node executes triggered reactions in order of their level, possibly executing reactions in parallel on multiple cores when they have the same level. When there is a reaction $r1$ that depends on an input port for which the status is unknown, the node must block before executing the reaction until the port status becomes known. Additionally, every reaction with a level higher than $r1$ must also be blocked because if $r1$ is triggered after executing those reactions, it will have violated the level order execution. Note that a port can be unknown only if its connection is a part of a ZDC. This is because if there weren't a ZDC, we would have simply waited for the port's upstream federate to advance to a sufficiently late tag to make the port known at the current tag.

To do the blocking, each node calculates an MLAA to know what reactions can be executed. The MLAA is the minimum level of an unknown port's network input reaction, and it acts like a barrier that prevents advancing to the next level until the port's status becomes known. At runtime, a node can execute a reaction only if its level is less than the MLAA. Assume that there is a node i that has n network input ports that are part of a ZDC, and that the levels of the dedicated network input reactions for the ports are l_1, l_2, \dots, l_n . Also assume that every port status is unknown when advancing the current tag to tag g . Then node i will initialize the MLAA to $\min_{\forall k \in \{1..n\}} l_k$ when it advances its tag to g ; this is the lowest level of the network input reactions. When the status of l_m 's port becomes known, the node recalculates MLAA, this time ignoring l_m , i.e., $\min_{\forall k \in \{1..n\} \setminus \{m\}} l_k$. If every port becomes known, MLAA is set to ∞ so that the node can execute every triggered reactions and advance to the next tag.

Note that this strategy is approximate and can result in some unnecessary blocking of reactions that do not depend on unknown input ports just because their level equals or exceeds the level of a blocked network input reaction. A less restrictive solution could be constructed by using, at runtime, a full representation of the reaction graph rather than its abstraction using levels. We show here, however, that this elaboration is not necessary to achieve deadlock-free execution of any network program that is free of causality loops. The additional complexity could improve performance, but TPO ensures that it will not affect correctness.




Fig. 9: A separate program for the node A in Figure 7. Levels (blue) are assigned to reactions with respect to TPO (orange).

B. Total Port Ordering

The level-based abstraction of the reaction graph is an over-approximation in the sense that it implies an ordering relation in the execution of reactions within a given tag that is a superset of the ordering relation implied by the reaction graph. This is why, in the presence of individually compiled nodes, it is non-obvious that the independently computed level assignments for the different nodes will be composed in such a way that the resulting global ordering relation is cycle-free or, equivalently, deadlock-free.

We will show the program can be deadlocked if the nodes assign levels independently (without respecting to globally-defined dependency). The blue numbers in Fig. 8 illustrate the levels assigned for reactions. The minimum level is 1. The level of reaction 2 in the network receiver is 2 because reaction 1 is defined before the network input reaction. Reaction 2 in A 's level is 3 because it depends on the level 2 reaction.

At the start tag, the level of unknown port $A.in$'s network input reaction is 2, so the node initializes MLAA to 2. Thus, the node blocks its execution after processing level 1 reactions and waits until port $A.in$'s status becomes known. However, $A.in$'s status cannot become known, and the program deadlocks. $A.in$ depends on the reaction in B in Fig. 7, and the node B can execute its reaction after it receives MSG_{BA} or ABS_{BA} from reaction 2 or reaction 3 in the network sender of A . The reactions are also blocked by MLAA, and MLAA is updated if A receives network input from B . This means that A and B are waiting for each other, resulting in a deadlock.

Total port ordering (TPO) solves this by fully specifying a globally agreed-upon ordering that must be respected at the boundaries between nodes. TPO is computed before the individual nodes are compiled and then respected by each individual node so that deadlock freedom can be ensured without any one federate requiring global knowledge of the other nodes and their internals.

To compute TPO, we first compute the ordering that comes from a global level-based topological sort of the reactions on the basis of the reaction graph. Then, we define the TPO to be the subset of that ordering that only relates the ports of federates with each other. The orange numbers in Fig. 7 denote the computed TPO for that example.

For each node, there exists at least one valid level assignment (namely, the level assignment that the node had in the global level-based sort) that is consistent with the TPO; this guarantees that when it is separately compiled, that node will be able to find some level assignment for itself that is also valid (although it may be slightly different). The restriction of the




Fig. 10: Lags measured under the LAN setup with an average network round trip time of 0.417 ms.

TPO to a node's ports fully characterizes the node's externally observable blocking behavior; this guarantees that, since the global sort was cycle-free (equivalently, deadlock-free), the composition of the nodes with their individually re-computed level assignments will be deadlock-free as well. This aligns with the statement mentioned in Section VII-A that using the level-based abstraction of dependency graph with total port ordering does not affect correctness.

Fig. 9 shows how A computes levels of reactions with respect to assigned TPO. With TPO, A knows that the input port $A.in$ depends on the output port $A.out$. Thus, the levels of the reactions related to $A.in$ becomes higher than the reactions related to $A.out$, resulting in resolving the deadlock by allowing the network sender to send MSG_{BA} or ABS_{BA} .

VIII. EVALUATION

In this section, we estimate the possible performance impact of our proposed approach to handling ZDCs. Specifically, we evaluate our approach in comparison with the conventional approach of inserting microstep delays using LF. As a benchmark, we take the simple federated example with a ZDC shown in Fig. 7 and the almost same example with a microstep delay put on the feedback path from $A.out$ to $B.in$.

We run experiments under two types of network conditions. In one setup, we connect the RTI and federates over the same local area network (LAN). In another setup, we connect the federates to the RTI via a Wi-Fi gateway. In the LAN setup, the network round trip time measured as a network ping is 0.483 ms on average, while the round trip time measured for the Wi-Fi is 8.681 ms on average. We note that the actual network round trip time varied over time, especially with the Wi-Fi setup, due to the dynamic network environments, which we can also see in real-world wireless network environments.

For the two network conditions, LAN and Wi-Fi, we measure the lag, which we define as the time difference between the physical time and the logical time of the final reaction of the cycle, reaction 2 of Reactor A. We run the experiments while varying the period of the timer in Reactor A. While running the experiments with shorter timer periods, we noticed the lag starts getting accumulated to the point that the federated program cannot guarantee the intended timing behavior. In this




Fig. 11: Lags measured under the Wi-Fi setup with an average network round trip time of 8.681 ms.

section, we call the timer period when the program starts to break down in terms of timing behavior, a *breakdown period*.

Fig. 10 and Fig. 11 illustrate the measured lags of the Lingua Franca programs in Fig. 7 (our approach, marked purple) and the same program with a microstep delay on the feedback path from A.out to B.in (marked green) under LAN setup and Wi-Fi setup, respectively. For each timer period (on the x-axis), we set the duration of the experiment so that Reactor A sends 500 messages in total. For example, when the timer period is 1 msec, we run the experiment for 500 msec; for the timer period of 2 msec, the experiment runs for 1,000 msec, and so on. We divided the duration of each experiment into 10 intervals and measured the average lag for each interval, as we observed that the lag can change over time, even in each run of experiments. We also ran 10 runs for the same experiment and averaged the lags for each interval.

In the LAN setup shown in Fig. 10, the breakdown period is 2 ms for the proposed approach and 1 ms for the microstep-based approach. In the Wi-Fi setup shown in Fig. 10, the breakdown period is around 15 ms for both approaches. In terms of the lag, our approach had a similar breakdown period, and until we reached the breakdown period, both approaches showed similar average lags. Thus, we can conclude that the proposed zero delay cycle handling does not incur any significant overhead in terms of the lag of the reactions.

IX. CONCLUSIONS

Most distributed discrete-event frameworks prohibit zero-delay cycles. We show that this prohibition is not necessary and give example program patterns where it is more convenient for the programmer to specify the desired functionality with ZDCs than to work around the prohibition. We derived the information needed to coordinate the execution of distributed components in zero-delay cycles and give an implementation that extends the open-source Lingua Franca coordination language. Our experimental evaluation suggests that the performance cost of removing this prohibition is modest.

REFERENCES

[1] M. Lohstroh *et al.*, “Reactors: A deterministic model for composable reactive systems,” in *Model-Based Design of Cyber Physical Systems (CyPhy)*, 2019.

[2] R. Ernst, S. Kuntz, S. Quinton, and M. Simons, “The logical execution time paradigm: New perspectives for multicore systems (Dagstuhl seminar 18092),” *Dagstuhl Reports*, vol. 8, pp. 122–149, 2018.

[3] S. A. Edwards and J. Hui, “The sparse synchronous model,” in *Forum on Specification and Design Languages (FDL)*, 2020.

[4] E. A. Lee, S. Bateni, S. Lin, M. Lohstroh, and C. Menard, “Quantifying and generalizing the CAP theorem,” 2021.

[5] M. Lohstroh, C. Menard, S. Bateni, and E. A. Lee, “Toward a Lingua Franca for deterministic concurrent systems,” *ACM Trans. on Embedded Computing Systems (TECS)*, vol. 20, no. 4, p. Article 36, 2021.

[6] S. Bateni *et al.*, “Risk and mitigation of nondeterminism in distributed cyber-physical systems,” in *ACM-IEEE International Conference on Formal Methods and Models for System Design*, 2023, pp. 1–11.

[7] G. Berry, *The Constructive Semantics of Pure Esterel*, 1999. [Online]. Available: <http://www-sop.inria.fr/meije/esterel/doc/main-papers.html>

[8] E. A. Lee and A. Sangiovanni-Vincentelli, “A framework for comparing models of computation,” *IEEE Transactions on Computer-Aided Design of Circuits and Systems*, vol. 17, no. 12, pp. 1217–1229, 1998.

[9] S. T. Karris, *Introduction to Simulink with engineering applications*. Orchard Publications, 2006.

[10] F. Baccelli, G. Cohen, G. J. Olsder, and J.-P. Quadrat, *Synchronization and linearity*. Wiley New York, 1992, vol. 1.

[11] E. A. Lee, “Modeling concurrent real-time processes using discrete events,” *Annals of Software Engineering*, vol. 7, pp. 25–45, 1999.

[12] H. Naundorf, “Strictly causal functions have a unique fixed point,” *Theoretical Computer Science*, vol. 238, no. 1-2, pp. 483–488, 2000.

[13] A. Cataldo, E. A. Lee, X. Liu, E. Matsikoudis, and H. Zheng, “A constructive fixed-point theorem and the feedback semantics of timed systems,” in *Workshop on Discrete Event Systems (WODES)*, 2006.

[14] E. Matsikoudis and E. A. Lee, “An axiomatization of the theory of generalized ultrametric semilattices of linear signals,” in *International Symposium on Fundamentals of Computation Theory (FCT)*, vol. LNCS 8070. Springer, 2013, pp. 248–258.

[15] E. A. Lee and H. Zheng, “Leveraging synchronous language principles for heterogeneous modeling and design of embedded systems,” in *Proc. of Int’l Conf. on Embedded Software (EMSOFT)*, 2007, pp. 114–123.

[16] R. E. Bryant, “Simulation of packet communication architecture computer systems,” MIT, Tech. Rep., November 1977.

[17] J. Misra, “Distributed discrete event simulation,” *ACM Computing Surveys*, vol. 18, no. 1, pp. 39–65, 1986.

[18] D. Jefferson, “Virtual time,” *ACM Trans. Programming Languages and Systems*, vol. 7, no. 3, pp. 404–425, 1985.

[19] R. Fujimoto, *Parallel and Distributed Simulation Systems*. Hoboken, NJ, USA: John Wiley and Sons, 2000.

[20] G. Chen and B. K. Szymanski, “Searching for parallelism in discrete event simulation,” in *Summer Computer Simulation Conference*, 2002.

[21] S. Jafer, Q. Liu, and G. Wainer, “Synchronization methods in parallel and distributed discrete-event simulation,” *Simulation Modelling Practice and Theory*, vol. 30, pp. 54–73, 2013.

[22] K. Gao *et al.*, “DONS: Fast and affordable discrete event network simulation with automatic parallelization,” in *Proceedings of the ACM SIGCOMM 2023 Conference*, 2023, pp. 167–181.

[23] W. Hofmann, S. Lang, P. Reichardt, and T. Reggelin, “A brief introduction to deploy amazon web services for online discrete-event simulation,” *Procedia Computer Science*, vol. 200, 2022.

[24] E. A. Lee *et al.*, “Consistency vs. availability in distributed cyber-physical systems,” *ACM Transactions on Embedded Computing Systems (TECS)*, vol. 22, no. 5s, pp. 1–24, 2023.

[25] M. Lohstroh, E. A. Lee, S. Edwards, and D. Broman, “Logical time for reactive software,” in *Workshop on Time-Centric Reactive Software (TCRS)*, in *CPS-IoT Week*. ACM, 2023.

[26] A. Benveniste, T. Bourke, B. Caillaud, and M. Pouzet, “The fundamentals of hybrid systems modelers,” *Journal of Computer and System Sciences*, vol. 78, no. 3, pp. 877–910, 2012.

[27] F. Cremona, M. Lohstroh, D. Broman, E. A. Lee, M. Masin, and S. Tripakis, “Hybrid co-simulation: it’s about time,” *Software and Systems Modeling*, vol. 18, pp. 1655–1679, 2017.

[28] Y. Zhou and E. A. Lee, “Causality interfaces for actor networks,” *ACM Transactions on Embedded Computing Systems (TECS)*, vol. 7, no. 3, pp. 1–35, 2008.

[29] F. Kuhl, R. Weatherly, and J. Dahmann, *Creating Computer Simulation Systems: An Introduction to the High Level Architecture*. Prentice Hall PTR, 1999.

[30] Y. Zhao, E. A. Lee, and J. Liu, “A programming model for time-synchronized distributed real-time systems,” in *Real-Time and Embedded Technology and Applications Symposium (RTAS)*. IEEE, 2007, pp. 259 – 268.

- [31] J. C. Corbett *et al.*, “Spanner: Google’s globally distributed database,” *ACM Transactions on Computer Systems (TOCS)*, vol. 31, no. 3, pp. 1–22, 2013.
- [32] C. Menard *et al.*, “High-performance deterministic concurrency using lingua franca,” *ACM Transactions on Architecture and Code Optimization*, vol. 20, pp. 1–29, 12 2023.
- [33] Y.-K. Kwok and I. Ahmad, “Static scheduling algorithms for allocating directed task graphs to multiprocessors,” *ACM Computing Surveys*, vol. 31, pp. 406–471, 12 1999.