

A FRAMEWORK FOR PREDICTING RUNTIME SAVINGS FROM DISCRETE-EVENT SIMULATION MODEL SIMPLIFICATION OPERATIONS

Mohd Shoaib^a, Navonil Mustafee^b, Varun Ramamohan^a

^aDepartment of Mechanical Engineering, IIT Delhi, Hauz Khas, New Delhi, 110016, India

^bCentre for Simulation, Analytics and Modelling, University of Exeter, Rennes Drive, Exeter, EX4 4ST, United Kingdom

Abstract

Abstraction or substitution and aggregation are the most widely used simulation model simplification operations. Abstraction involves replacing subsystems within a discrete-event simulation (DES) with one or more quantities - typically random variables - representing the lengths of stay in the subsystem(s) in question to create a 'simplified' system comprising only of subsystems of interest to the analysis at hand. Aggregation involves replacing more than one subsystem of the original 'parent' simulation with a single subsystem. However, the model simplification process itself can be expensive, in terms of the computational runtime and effort required to collect the data required to estimate the distributions of the length of stay variables, the distribution-fitting process, and testing and validation of the simplified model. Moreover, the savings in simulation runtime that the simplification process yields is *a priori* unknown to the modeller. In this context, a method that predicts the runtime savings (RS) from DES model simplification operations before their execution - at the conceptualisation stage of the simplified model development process - may help judge whether its development is indeed worth undertaking. In this paper, we present a queueing-theoretic framework for the prediction of RS from model simplification operations. Our framework is applicable for DES models comprising $M/M/$, $M/G/$ and $G/G/$ subsystems. The performance of the RS prediction framework is demonstrated using multiple computational experiments. Our proposed framework contributes to the literature around DES model complexity and more broadly to DES runtime prediction.

Keywords: Model simplification, discrete-event simulation, abstraction or substitution, aggregation or condensation, runtime prediction

1. Introduction

A discrete event simulation (DES) model designed for large and complex systems may be *simplified* for a more focused performance analysis involving a subset of the system. For example, a detailed hospital simulation model, that covers all its operations, is not needed to analyse the performance of a specific department within the hospital. In such cases, a simplified version of the simulation model can be developed. This approach can significantly reduce the computational effort needed for the analysis, making it both more efficient and focused.

The practice of developing simplified simulation models is termed model simplification, and it is used as a strategy to reduce model complexity and improve computational per-

formance (Rank et al., 2016; van der Zee, 2017). It presents several notable advantages, including a rapid model development cycle, ease of understanding and validation, as well as reduced data requirements, among other benefits (Robinson, 2023; Lidberg et al., 2021). Multiple studies in the literature have reported significant improvements in model computational performance after simplification. For instance, Fatma et al. (2020) achieved approximately 80% reduction in computational runtime with simplified models.

Typically, aggregation, deletion and abstraction or substitution approaches are employed to simplify simulation models (van der Zee, 2017). These strategies aim at reducing model elements, components, or subsystems in different ways, without altering the overall behaviour of the model. The aggregation approach involves combining multiple processes, pathways, or components together into a single and unified corresponding entity (Lidberg et al., 2021). The deletion technique, also termed omission, is concerned with the removal of non-relevant components from the detailed model. The abstraction model simplification approach is based on the strategy of replacing specific subsystems within the full-featured ‘parent’ model with simpler or less complex subsystem models. Subsystem replacement can be done using constant-valued delays or random variables in place of the subsystem being abstracted out. These delays could represent cycle times of different machines (Brooks and Tobias, 2000) or lengths of stay in the subsystem (Fatma et al., 2020). In this paper, we are interested in the broadly applicable model simplification operations abstraction (substitution) and aggregation. More specifically, we are interested in the application of these model simplification operations to DESs of complex queueing systems which comprise $M/M/n$, $M/G/n$, or $G/G/n$ subsystems or workstations.

The abstraction operation can be illustrated using a simple 2-stage tandem queueing system depicted in Figure 1. The top half of Figure 1 shows the parent model composed of two subsystems, subsystem-1 and subsystem-2 in series, whereas the bottom half of the figure depicts the simplified version. Considering that we are interested in the following: a) the performance analysis of subsystem-1; b) the overall length of stay (LOS) in the system, and c) reducing the computational runtime of the model, without changing the overall stochastic behaviour of the model. This could be accomplished by constructing a simplified model, shown in the bottom half of 1, wherein subsystem-2 is abstracted out using a random variable representing the LOS in the subsystem. Such a simplified model retains the stochastic character of the system and improves the computational costs associated with model execution. Moreover, it is worth mentioning that the terms ‘abstraction’ and ‘substitution’ are often used synonymously in the literature, but in this paper we will use the term ‘abstraction’.

Similarly, the aggregation operation is depicted in Figure 2, wherein the queueing system in the top half is a tandem queueing system with three subsystems. The dashed box around the second and third subsystems indicates that these subsystems will be subject to an aggregation operation. The queueing system in the bottom half is the simplified model, wherein the second and third subsystems in the parent model are replaced by a single subsystem with characteristics pertaining to the systems subject to the simplification operation - for example, the LOS of the second subsystem in the simplified model will be the same as that of an entity in the aggregated subsystems in the parent model.

The question of whether computational runtime savings (RS) can be predicted during the model conceptualisation phase has not, in our knowledge, been addressed in the literature. Additionally, the existing literature does not in our knowledge address the mechanisms and determinants of RS gained from DES model simplification operations. In this work, we develop RS prediction models for DESs composed of $M/M/$, $M/G/$ and $G/G/$ systems,




Figure 1: Top: a two-stage tandem queuing system (parent model). Bottom: A simplified version model of the parent model developed by substituting the second subsystem with a random variable representing the length of stay in the second subsystem.




Figure 2: Top: a three-stage tandem queuing system (parent model). Bottom: a simplified version of the parent model developed by aggregating the second and third subsystems into a single subsystem.

implying that our proposed methodology can be applied to predict RS at the conceptualisation stage for a large subset of commonly developed DES models. Our predictive models can be used to estimate the expected RS before an abstraction or aggregation operation is performed. This allows for informed decision-making regarding whether to proceed with the simplification process at all. Further, we have tested the performance of the RS prediction framework through a set of computational experiments across systems with varying complexities, including a real-world case study. We provide a more detailed description of the research contributions of this study in the following section on related work.

The remainder of the paper is organised as follows. Section 2 provides an overview of the relevant literature and the research contributions of this study. In Section 3, we present the determinants of and mechanism underlying the RS achieved with model simplification, which is followed by a description of the proposed RS prediction framework. The numerical experiments conducted to develop the models within the framework and the deployment of the framework are described in Section 4. Section 5 presents the simulation experiments conducted for assessing the performance of the RS prediction framework. We conclude in Section 6 with a summary of the study and its potential impact, a discussion of its limitations and avenues for future research.

2. Relevant Literature

Literature analysis highlights that model simplification in simulation modelling has been in use for about 30 years. The importance of creating simple models was emphasised in the

work of [Brooks and Tobias \(2000\)](#) where authors argued that complex models including too many details often lead to project failure.

[Huber and Dangelmaier \(2009\)](#) define model simplification as the process of reducing complexity to decrease the runtime and computing resources needed to execute a simulation model. It must be noted that there is a wide variation in the understanding of model complexity. Some authors link complexity to the computing power and execution time required to run the model ([Huber and Dangelmaier, 2009](#); [Schruben and Yücesan, 1993](#)). In contrast, others propose that it is the number of components, connections, and computations in a model measure of its complexity ([Brooks and Tobias, 2000](#)). Despite the divergence, a general consensus exists that model simplification reduces complexity and leads to more computationally efficient models. Thus, it could be argued that model simplification is undertaken to reduce a simulation model's complexity and computational costs associated with model execution. For example, [Fatma et al. \(2020\)](#) created a simplified healthcare facility network model to reduce the computational time needed to execute the detailed model. Similarly, a DES model of a wafer fabrication facility was simplified by [Hung and Leachman \(1999\)](#) to improve the model runtime performance. The simplified model achieved approximately 20% reduction in execution time in comparison to the detailed model.

Large-scale and complex simulation models, as encountered in the fields of semiconductor manufacturing and healthcare among others, are computationally expensive to run ([Adan et al., 2014](#); [Fatma et al., 2020](#)). Moreover, as the number of replications required to reduce the output variance and improve overall output reliability increases, the computational overheads increase considerably. In such cases scenario analysis and optimisation in particular become challenging to execute. To overcome the computational requirements, modellers may resort to model simplification via different strategies. Among these strategies abstraction and aggregation have become the most adopted approaches ([Rank et al., 2016](#); [Pegden et al., 1995](#); [Lidberg et al., 2021](#)).

Abstraction, substitution, or model condensation [Piplani and Puaah \(2004\)](#), entails substituting non-essential elements from a comprehensive or detailed model. A prevalent convention in the literature is substituting particular components or elements with constant delays ([Hung and Leachman, 1999](#); [Johnson et al., 2005](#)) or with random variables representing delays in the substituted components ([Etman et al., 2011](#); [Fatma et al., 2020](#)). Aggregation for model simplification is a technique where multiple process flows, components, elements, or machines are combined to form a single unified compound process or machine ([Lidberg et al., 2021](#)). The primary objective of aggregation is to simplify models by combining flows and machines to facilitate faster model execution and experimentation. Several simulation elements, for instance, can be represented by a single unified element, and a single random variable can represent processing time. Deletion refers to reducing the model by deleting/removing the non-essential components from a model.

Studies Reporting Model Simplification Endeavours. Our literature review revealed several examples of simulation model simplification using abstraction approach. These include replacement of non-bottleneck workstations ([Rose, 1998, 1999, 2007](#); [Hung and Leachman, 1999](#)), tool-sets ([Stogniy and Scholl, 2019, 2020](#)), and subsystems not central to the analysis at hand ([Fatma et al., 2020](#); [Pehrsson et al., 2015](#); [Völker and Gmilkowsky, 2003](#)). In terms of application areas, it can be observed that the literature is replete with instances from manufacturing sector, and specifically semiconductor fabrication ([Rose, 1998, 1999](#); [Roy et al., 2020](#); [Stogniy and Scholl, 2019, 2020](#)). A probable explanation for this could be found in the fact that these systems are inherently complex and often require rapid decision-making necessitating what-if scenario analysis. Given the complexity of the sys-

tem and time scales in decision-making, experimentation with a detailed model becomes challenging due to higher associated computational costs; hence, model simplification is performed. Model simplification in semiconductor manufacturing system analysis could be found in the work of [Rose \(1998, 1999, 2007\)](#). In [Rose \(1998\)](#), the authors developed a simplified simulation model to analyse the behaviour of a wafer production plant. In their approach, the author included only the bottleneck machine in its full-featured format while replacing the other machines with a combined delay (random variable) corresponding to all the abstracted machines. The author utilised the simplified model to examine work-in-process levels following a catastrophic bottleneck failure. In a follow-up study ([Rose, 1999](#)), the authors performed a statistical analysis of the lot interarrival time for the bottleneck workstation using the simplified model. To accomplish the task they determined the most suitable probability distribution to accurately represent the interarrival time data, and then used it to model the arrivals at the bottleneck machine. The use of the simplified model was further extended to a subsequent study ([Rose, 2007](#)). For this, the authors introduced inventory-dependent distributions for sampling the delays as opposed to the fixed distributions employed in the previous research. [Hung and Leachman \(1999\)](#) demonstrated that simplified models maintain the accuracy of the detailed models while significantly reducing the computer execution time. In their experiment, the authors substituted underused or low-utilisation workstations with fixed and random delays, representing the durations of lot wait and processing times. The authors reported the behaviour of mean error under different scenarios and gained a reduction of up to 90% in the model execution time. In healthcare settings, [Fatma et al. \(2020\)](#) developed simplified simulation models of a network of primary care institutions. The authors focused solely on the components pertinent to their research and substituted the non-essential components/subsystems with random variables representing the duration of patient stays (which includes both wait time and service time) at each subsystem. The authors also performed aggregation of servers at a workstation by combining multiple servers into one while maintaining overall workstation occupancy. The authors reported a maximum reduction of 80% in model runtime.

It is evident from the above discussion that reduction in computational runtime is an important reason for simplifying DES models. However, the extent of RS achieved remains unavailable to modellers until a model has been simplified and then executed. Without prior knowledge of the expected RS, it becomes difficult to make informed decisions regarding the extent and necessity of model simplification. Notably, our review did not identify any studies that attempted to *a priori* predict the RS that may be achieved via abstraction or aggregation - that is, at the conceptualisation stage of developing the simplified model. Therefore, our primary research contribution involves addressing this gap, building upon preliminary research on the development and application of an RS prediction approach ([Shoaib et al., 2023](#)). [Shoaib et al. \(2023\)](#) develop an approach for predicting RS from abstraction simplification operations conducted for DESs comprised of $M/M/n$ subsystems and provide a brief demonstration of its application for DESs of simple queueing systems. This study extends the work in [Shoaib et al. \(2023\)](#) in the following ways: (a) first, we consider DESs comprising $M/G/n$ and $G/G/n$ subsystems in addition to $M/M/n$ subsystems, which are much more widely encountered; (b) we also show how our proposed RS prediction framework can be applied for aggregation (in addition to abstraction) simplification operations; (c) we provide a formal description of how the RS predictive framework can be deployed for abstraction and aggregation operations; and (d) provide a much more comprehensive set of computational experiments to validate the predictive framework, including its application to a DES of a real-world system.

DES Runtime Prediction: Brief Overview. As will be described in the subsequent section, our proposed RS predictive framework involves models that first predict the number of instructions executed by the processor per arrival to the subsystem being abstracted out as a function of its occupancy, and then predicts RS as a function of the reduction in instructions achieved by the simplification operation. The number of instructions per arrival associated with a subsystem is closely linked to its simulation runtime (per arrival). Therefore, even though our study does not directly attempt to predict subsystem simulation runtime, our proposed framework contributes to the field of simulation runtime analysis and prediction.

Generating (accurate) simulation runtime predictions in a practical setting is a nontrivial task, in part because simulation runtime depends, in addition to model complexity, to a large extent on the computational resources available and the state of the computer system on which it is being executed (e.g., the number of other tasks running). In our knowledge, it appears that the majority of previous work on DES performance prediction appears to have been done for parallel and distributed asynchronous and synchronous DESs, where the goal is to predict the speed-up, or bounds on speed-up achieved through various simulation protocols (Cheng and Sin, 1990). The methodologies adopted include linear programming based event scheduling across multiple CPUs (Kunz et al., 2011), graph-theoretic critical path methods that examine event graphs (Lim et al., 1999), and communication models that also consider computation granularity (Xu and Chung, 2004). Trace-based analyses to perform synchronisation of parallel simulations by reconstructing event dependencies have been done (Bagrodia and Takai, 2000), including trace-based performance analysers that explicitly take hardware characteristics into account (Juhász et al., 2003). However, in our search of this area of the literature, we could not find another study that attempted to directly predict asynchronous DES runtime by via a queueing-theoretic approach such as ours that predicts the number of instructions as a function of server occupancy. This also thus forms a contribution of our study.

3. Runtime Savings Prediction Methodology

We start by determining the mechanism underpinning RS in model simplification operations. Our investigation of the mechanism by which RS are generated provided the key insights that led to the development of the RS prediction methodology. We must mention here that much of our proposed methodology was derived by examining outputs from DESs developed and executed on the open-source Python library *salabim* for DES (van der Ham, 2018). A similar exercise may need to be carried out for other platforms. The Python code used in the development and validation of the RS models is available on our [GitHub](#) page. Additional details are provided in [Appendix B.4](#).

3.1. Runtime Savings Mechanism Associated with Model Simplification Operations

We first introduce the terminology used in the development of the RS prediction methodology.

- The ‘event list’ refers to the sequential record of all future events scheduled to be executed.
- The ‘simulation trace’, on the other hand, is a log of events that have already occurred, organised chronologically. The trace is often found as one of the default metadata outputs in many simulation packages, including *salabim*.

- The ‘generator’ is a class that when instantiated generates simulation entities or objects (e.g., jobs, patients) that undergo some form of processing in a DES model.
- The term ‘instruction’ denotes a command or message relayed by the simulation engine to execute events recorded on the event list. A specific set of instructions is associated with the execution of each event: for example, to generate a simulation entity, the instruction executed by the engine will be ‘*create entity*’. Similarly, the instruction to enter a queue would be ‘*enter queue*’.
- For the purposes of this paper, we also define a ‘subsystem’ as a combination of a queue and one or several servers within a DES model. This definition is based on the understanding that the majority of DES models are composed of one or many such subsystems.

We now describe the process of selection of independent variables for the RS prediction models. A DES progresses through a sequence of events that occur sequentially over time. A set of instructions is executed by the simulation engine to process these events; and as the number of events grows or the size of event list increases, the number of instructions executed by the processor also increases. This in turn affects the model computational runtime. Thus, the simulation runtime may be considered as a function of the total number of instructions executed by the processor. The total number of instructions processed depends on the following three factors:

1. Number of subsystems within the model.
2. Occupancy levels of the servers within these subsystems.
3. Simulation run length.

For a constant simulation run length, computational runtime depends on the number of subsystems in the model and the individual subsystem server occupancy levels. With regard to the number of subsystems, consider a scenario wherein a subsystem is added to an existing DES model. The simulation engine will execute additional instructions associated with the events of the newly added subsystem; consequently, a larger set of instructions will need to be executed, in turn increasing the simulation runtime.

With respect to server occupancy, consider a case where a server is idle. When an entity arrives to the system it will then enter into service immediately. Associated with this event, the simulation engine executes a certain minimum number of instructions to, for example, generate the entity, deliver service and when the service is finished, leave the system. This scenario is more likely to occur when server occupancy is low. When an arriving entity finds a server busy - which is more likely at high server occupancy levels - it will have to join the queue, wait for its turn, and when the server becomes available leave the queue for service. Therefore, as server occupancy changes, the average number of instructions for each arrival varies accordingly; consequently, we selected server occupancy value as the determinant of the average number of instructions per arriving entity when the number of subsystems is fixed.

To establish a relationship between server occupancy and the number of instructions, we constructed two simple simulation models: a) a two-stage tandem queueing system with both $M/M/1$ or $M/G/1$ or $G/G/1$ queueing systems (similar to that in Figure 4a), as applicable, and b) a simplified version of this model (Figure 4b), with the second stage

abstracted out in lieu of a random variable capturing the LOS in the subsystem. Both simulation models were executed under identical conditions, and their execution traces were recorded (Table 1). These trace outputs detail the instructions executed by the simulation engine from the point of generation of a simulation entity to its departure from the system. It is evident that the number of instructions executed per arrival for the simplified model was significantly lesser than the number executed for the parent model. This reduction in the number of instructions executed for each arrival (RIEs) by the simulation engine for the simplified model presents a plausible explanation for the observed computational runtime savings, and hence, we selected RIEs for predicting the expected RS achieved by model simplification via abstraction.

Table 1: Example instructions from a two-stage $M/M/1$ tandem queueing system and corresponding simplified model with abstracted second stage. *Notes.* \sim indicates ‘sample from distribution’. β = mean arrival rate. γ, γ' = mean service rates of servers 1 and 2, respectively. s_* = length of stay in subsystem 2. ^aServer busy, simulation component awaits its turn. ^bRandom variable representing the time spent in abstracted out subsystem 2.

Parent model	Child model
Component generator: 1. Current 2. Pause for $\sim \exp\left(\frac{1}{\beta}\right)$ time	Component generator: 1. Current 2. Pause for $\sim \exp\left(\frac{1}{\beta}\right)$ time
Component process: 1. Create 2. Activate 3. Current 4. Enter <i>queue1</i> 5. Request <i>server1</i> 6. Request for <i>server1</i> is scheduled for time = ∞ , goes to passive state ^a 7. Request honoured, scheduled for time = s 8. At time = s , current (from passive state) 9. Leave <i>queue1</i> 10. Claims <i>server1</i> and pauses for $\sim \exp\left(\frac{1}{\gamma}\right)$ 11. At time $s_1 = s + \sim \exp\left(\frac{1}{\gamma}\right)$, current 12. Release <i>server1</i> 13. Enter <i>queue2</i> 14. Request <i>server2</i> 15. Request for the <i>server2</i> - scheduled for time = ∞ , goes to passive state ^a 16. Request honoured, scheduled for time $s = s_2$ 17. At time $s = s_2$, current 18. Claims server and pauses for $\sim \exp\left(\frac{1}{\gamma'}\right)$ 19. At time $s_3 = s_2 + \sim \exp\left(\frac{1}{\gamma'}\right)$, current 20. Release <i>server2</i> 21. End	Component process: 1. Create 2. Activate 3. Current 4. Enter <i>queue1</i> 5. Request <i>server1</i> 6. Request for the <i>server1</i> is scheduled for time = ∞ , goes to passive state ^a 7. Request honoured, scheduled for time = s 8. At time = s , current (from passive state) 9. Leave <i>queue1</i> 10. Claims <i>server1</i> and pauses for $\sim \exp\left(\frac{1}{\gamma}\right)$ 11. At time $s_1 = s + \sim \exp\left(\frac{1}{\gamma}\right)$, current 12. Release <i>server1</i> 13. Schedule for time $s = s_1 + \sim s_*^b$ 14. At time $s = s_1 + \sim s_*$, current 15. End

Additionally, we investigated how the change in the number of servers within a subsystem affects simulation runtime. To do so, we conducted a series of experiments using single-stage $M/G/n$ and $M/M/n$ systems. The number of servers (n) was varied between 25 and 1000 and computational runtimes were recorded at each level. The server occupancy level was kept constant for these experiments by adjusting the service rates of each server in accordance with the number of servers at the system in question. The outcomes

recorded are the average runtimes from 30 independent replications, and are presented via Figure 3. The results demonstrate that the number of servers had no visible impact on the computational runtime when the server count was less than 100 servers, beyond which an approximately linear increase in the runtime can be observed. A potential explanation for this observation involves the notion that at moderate or high workstation occupancy levels (e.g., $> 50\%$), searching for the first idle server requires more simulation runtime when the number of servers becomes large. Hence for this study, we assume that the number of servers within each subsystem is significantly less than 100, and as such, we exclude the number of servers as a contributing factor to RS. This experiment and the attendant observations also motivated our exclusion of one form of the ‘aggregation’ simplification operation that involves replacing multiple servers in a workstation / subsystem with a single server with an appropriately scaled service rate. However, our proposed RS prediction framework is applicable to the practice of aggregating multiple subsystems into a single subsystem, which is another (more widely practised) form of the aggregation simplification operation. This will be discussed in more detail once the RS prediction methodology itself is described.




Figure 3: The effect of the number of servers on the computational runtime for simulations of $M/M/n$ and $M/G/n$ systems.

From this discussion, the following primary principle underpinning our RS prediction framework can be derived.

The RS achieved with a simplified model relative to its parent model is primarily caused by the reduction in the total number of instructions executed. Further, the total RIE itself depends on the server occupancy indicating that characterising the relationships between the server occupancy and RIE, and then between RIE and the RS attained by abstraction, will comprise the RS prediction framework.

We now describe the process of characterising these relationships.

3.2. Runtime Savings Prediction Model Development

At this stage, we reiterate that, once the RS prediction models are available, the RS prediction is made before the simplified model is developed, and ideally without running the parent simulation even once for the purposes of model simplification. However, per the discussion in the previous subsection, the RS prediction framework will require at minimum occupancy levels of the subsystems being abstracted out, which implies that the parent simulation must have been executed at least once (for analyses of general interest, and not for the purpose of model simplification) from which key simulation outcomes are available.

These would include the subsystem occupancy values and, although this is not strictly required (see Section 4 for a more detailed discussion regarding this), the numbers of entity arrivals to the system over simulation run lengths of interest.

The RS prediction framework is developed in two stages. In the first stage, a model that relates server occupancy and the average number of instructions per arrival is derived for both the parent model and the simplified model. Outputs from these models are combined with the average number of arrivals to the subsystem subject to simplification to obtain the associated RIE. In the second stage, a model that relates the RS and RIE is developed.

In order to develop the above models, we considered simulations of simple queueing systems, for which we present the notation below.

- ‘ $2s$ ’ denotes a two-stage tandem queueing system simulation shown in Figure 1a. The system is composed of a generator and two identical single-server subsystems in series.
- ‘ $1s$ ’ refers to a single-stage queueing system DES with a generator, a queue, and a server.
- ‘ ss ’ is used to refer to a single (sub)system DES without a generator. It is essentially the second-stage system from a $2s$ system.
- ‘ ms ’ denotes the notation for the simplified version of the $2s$ system. It is constructed by substituting the second stage (ss stage) with a random variable modelling length-of-stay in that subsystem and can be seen in Figure 1b.

At this point, we pause to emphasize that as part of the simplification operation, the subsystems that are abstracted out are typically ss systems, and consequently the RIE from these operations can be estimated as a sum of the number of instructions associated with each ss system abstracted out. Here, the RIE itself will be calculated using as a function of the server occupancy levels of the subsystem(s) in question. Algorithm 3 in Section 4 provides a formal description of this process. This is the rationale for developing a model for the relationship between the server occupancy and number of instructions per arrival of an ss system. However, unlike the $2s$, $1s$ and ms systems, the average number of instructions per arrival associated with an ss system cannot be estimated directly via a DES given that a component generator for creating the entities will be required for any queueing system simulation. Hence the analysis for the ss system was done by subtracting the average number of instructions per arrival for the $1s$ system from that for the $2s$ system.

We now describe both stages of the RS prediction model development process.

Stage 1. Model derived: Average number of instructions per arrival versus server occupancy. Models are derived for the k^{th} system, where $k \in K = \{2s, 1s, ms\}$, and with the m^{th} queueing discipline, where $m \in M = \{M/M/1, M/G/1, G/G/1\}$. n server occupancy levels are used to fit the model, where occupancy levels ρ_i take values in $P = \{\rho_1, \rho_2, \dots, \rho_n\}$.

I. For the k^{th} ($k \in K$) system with the m^{th} subsystem configuration, $m \in M$, the following steps are carried out for each server occupancy value $\rho_i \in P$.

- (a) Run the DES and generate the trace.
- (b) Utilise the trace for the i^{th} server occupancy level to calculate and record the average number of instructions per arrival, denoted as $\theta_k^m(\rho_i)$.

II. Based on the data collected from step 1.I(a), for each $m \in M$ and $k \in K$, develop a regression model, $\theta_k^m = f(\rho|\beta_k^m, \epsilon_k^m)$, where β_k^m parameterises the model and ϵ_k^m captures the stochasticity in the relationship.

Stage 2. Model derived: RS as a function of the RIE achieved with the simplified model.

I. Carry out the following steps for $m \in M$ and $k \in \{2s, ms\}$ systems, for each server occupancy value $\rho_i \in P$:

- (a) From the simulation executions in Step 1.I(a), record the average execution time ($t_i^{m,k}$) and the average number of arrivals ($a_i^{m,k}$) for each of the ρ_i server occupancy values.
- (b) Using the regression model derived in Stage I, estimate the expected number of instructions per arrival as a function of server occupancy ρ_i ($\theta_k^m(\rho_i)$).
- (c) Estimate the average total number of instructions across the simulation run length of interest for the i^{th} server occupancy level as $I_i^{m,k} = a_i^{m,k} \times \theta_{k,i}^m$.

II. For each value of $I_i^{m,k}$ and $t_i^{m,k}$ ($k \in \{2s, ms\}$) collected in 2.I, perform the following steps.

- (a) Compute the difference between $I_i^{m,2s}$ & $I_i^{m,ms}$ to obtain the RIE as: $\bar{I}_i^m = I_i^{m,2s} - I_i^{m,ms}$.
- (b) Similarly, calculate the average RS as: $\phi_i^m = t_i^{m,2s} - t_i^{m,ms}$.

III. Using the data collected in 2.II, fit a regression model $\phi^m = g(\bar{I}^m|\alpha^m, \eta^m)$, where α^m and η^m parameterise the model.

The computational implementation of the RS prediction model development process for an example case is demonstrated in Algorithms 1 and 2. We then move to Section 4 for the description of the numerical experiments conducted to implement this RS prediction model development process.

4. Runtime Savings Prediction Model Development: Computational Implementation

In this section, we describe the computational experiments carried out to develop the RS prediction models. All computation was performed on a Windows 11 64-bit workstation, equipped with an Intel *i7* 4-core processor with a base clock speed of 3.3 gigaHertz and 16 gigabytes of memory.

To develop models relating server occupancy with the average number of instructions per arrival θ , we constructed DESs of the $2s$, ms , and $1s$ systems. The service and arrival patterns within these systems were then adjusted to represent the $M/M/$, $M/G/$, and $G/G/$ queueing disciplines.

We first developed a DES model of the $2s$ system (the parent model). This parent model was then modified to represent a) the single-stage ($1s$) system and b) the ms system. The $1s$ system was constructed by omitting the second stage from the $2s$ model. The following procedure is employed for the development of the ms DES system. In the ms system, the

Algorithm 1 Pseudocode for the implementation of Stage 1 of the RS prediction model development process.

```

1: function SIMULATE( $\lambda$ )
2:   Initialise simulation time & warm-up time
3:   Simulate the model for arrival rate  $\lambda$ 
4:   Record simulation trace in an array (TraceList)
5:   return TraceList
6: end function
7: function COUNTINSTRUCTIONS(TraceList,  $n$ )
8:   Read TraceList
9:   Remove first and last ten entries from the trace
10:  Sample  $n$  ( $= 100$ ) values at random from TraceList, sampled_trace  $\leftarrow$  TraceList
11:  Compute average number of instructions per arrival,  $\theta = \text{average}(\text{sampled\_trace})$ 
12:  return  $\theta$ 
13: end function

```

▷ Begin Procedure

```

14: Specify: Server occupancy values  $\rho \in P = \{\rho_1, \rho_2, \dots, \rho_n\}$ , mean service rate ( $\mu$ ) and
    the number of replications ( $r$ ) to be performed for each occupancy value
15: Initialise an array (NumInstructionsList), for data collection
16: for  $\rho \in P$  do
17:   Initialise an array for data collection, AverageList
18:    $j \leftarrow r$ 
19:   Calculate arrival rate,  $\lambda = \rho \times \mu$ 
20:   while  $j \neq 0$  do
21:     Execute simulation & obtain trace as output in an array, OutputList  $\leftarrow$  SIMU-
    LATE( $\lambda$ )
22:     Estimate average instructions per arrival,  $\theta_{\rho,r} \leftarrow$  COUNTINSTRUC-
    TIONS(OutputList, 100)
23:     Store  $\theta_{\rho,r}$  in an array(AverageList), addItem(AverageList,  $\theta_{\rho,r}$ )
24:      $j = j - 1$ 
25:   end while
26:   Calculate average value of  $\theta_\rho$  over  $r$  replicates & store the output, ad-
    dItem(NumInstructionsList,  $\bar{\theta}_\rho = \text{average}(\text{AverageList})$ )
27: end for

```

▷ End Procedure

```

28: Regress the average number of instructions per arrival on server occupancy to charac-
    terise  $\theta = f(\rho|\beta, \epsilon)$ 

```

Algorithm 2 Pseudocode for the implementation of Stage 2 of the RS prediction model development process.

- 1: Specify: Server occupancy values $\rho \in P = \{\rho_1, \rho_2, \dots, \rho_n\}$, mean service rate (μ), & number of replications (r) to be performed for each ρ
 - 2: Initialise arrays for data collection; ArrNumOfInstruction, ArrRunTime
 - 3: Compute average arrival rates $A = \{\lambda : \lambda = \rho \times \mu, \rho \in P\}$
 - 4: **for** $k \in \{2s, ms\}$ **do**
 - 5: **for** $\rho \in P$ **do**
 - 6: Initialise arrays RepTimeList() & RepArrivalList() for data collection
 - 7: $i \leftarrow r$
 - 8: **while** $i \neq 0$ **do**
 - 9: Execute simulation for λ and ρ values
 - 10: Collect number of arrivals (n) & model run time (t)
 - 11: Update arrays, addItem(RepArrivalList, n) & addItem(RepTimeList, t)
 - 12: Update $i = i - 1$
 - 13: **end while**
 - 14: Compute average number of arrivals & runtime over r as;
 - 15: $t_\rho^k = \text{average}(\text{RepTimeList})$ & $n_\rho^k = \text{average}(\text{RepArrivalList})$
 - 16: Update arrays: addItem(ArrTime, t_ρ^k) addItem(ArrInstructs, n_ρ^k)
 - 17: **end for**
 - 18: Estimate $\bar{\theta}_\rho^k$ as a function of ρ from Stage 1
 - 19: Compute $\bar{I}_\rho^k = \bar{\theta}_\rho^k \times n_\rho^k$
 - 20: Record average run time and number of instructions as
 - 21: addItem(ArrNumOfInstructions, I_ρ^k), addItem(ArrTime, t_ρ^k)
 - 22: **end for**
 - 23: Calculate the difference between the number of instructions, $\bar{I} = \text{ArrNumOfInstructions}[2s] - \text{ArrNumOfInstructions}[ms]$
 - 24: Calculate RS, $\phi = \text{ArrTime}[2s] - \text{ArrTime}[ms]$
 - 25: Regress ϕ on \bar{I}
-

full-featured second stage subsystem from the parent ($2s$) model is replaced by a random variable that represents the LOS within that stage. The parameterisation of the random variable is accomplished by collecting the LOS data from the second stage subsystem of the parent model and performing a curve-fitting procedure. However, if standard parametric distributions do not provide an acceptable level of fit, a nonparametric approach, specifically kernel density estimation (KDE), is employed to find the second stage subsystem LOS distribution. The second stage subsystem in the parent model is then replaced with its corresponding LOS random variable. Subsequently, the simplified model is executed and data for the overall LOS in the system is recorded. Next, the overall system LOS data from the simplified model and the parent models are used in a Kullback-Leibler (KL) divergence test procedure to compare their distributions. This procedure attempts to preserve the stochastic character of the simulation outputs of interest.

We demonstrate this model simplification procedure with three examples, one from each queueing system type ($M/M/$, $M/G/$, and $G/G/$), and with one randomly selected server occupancy value for each system type. Detailed information regarding the second-stage subsystem LOS modelling and the validation processes are provided in Table 2. For the $M/M/$ case, first the $2s$ simulation model was executed and LOS values were recorded for both the entire system and the second stage. Then, as outlined above, this dataset underwent a curve-fitting procedure using the *stats* module of Python’s *SciPy* (Virtanen et al., 2020) library and the best fitting distribution was selected based on the p -value of the Kolmogorov-Smirnov (KS) test. The simplified model was constructed using the LOS random variable for the second stage subsystem and subsequently executed. The overall system LOS data generated by the simplified and parent models were compared via the KL divergence test. A KL divergence value of 0.04 was obtained indicating that the overall system LOS distributions are statistically similar. The same procedure was followed for the $G/G/$ and $M/G/$ systems; however, for the $M/G/$ case, none of the standard parametric distributions available in the *SciPy* library provided an acceptable level of fit (p -value > 0.05) to the second stage subsystem LOS data. Consequently, the LOS distribution was estimated via kernel density estimation implemented using the Scikit-learn library (Pedregosa et al., 2011). The KDE estimator of the second stage subsystem LOS distribution was then used to construct the ms model. Histograms comparing the LOS data from the parent and child models can be found in Appendix A. The codes used for the curve-fitting process, KDE and validation can be accessed from Appendix B.4. Furthermore, the model execution time of the simplified model remains unaffected by whether a parametric distribution or a KDE estimator was used to model the second-stage subsystem LOS. Overall, from Table 2, it is evident that the abstraction operation yields simulation outcomes comparable to that of the parent simulation model.

We now discuss the implementation of the RS prediction model development process discussed in Section 3. We begin by providing information regarding the parameterisation of the subsystems within the $M/M/$, $M/G/$ and $G/G/$ systems in Table 3. In the $M/M/$ parent DES, interarrival times and service times at each server followed independent exponential distributions. The servers in both the first and second stages had a mean service time of 1 minute. For the $G/G/$ case, both subsystems service rates were modelled using a Gamma distribution, maintaining equal mean service times of 5 minutes with a standard deviation of 1.5 minutes. Furthermore, interarrival times were governed by a Gaussian distribution. In the $M/G/$ case, both the interarrival and the first subsystem’s service times were modelled using exponential distributions, while the second subsystem’s service time was modelled with a Gaussian distribution. A lower bound of 0.01 was imposed on the

Table 2: Example length of stay distribution modelling and validation results for the abstraction model simplification operation applied to three queueing systems.

Queueing System	Occupancy	Abstracted subsystem length of stay modelling	KL Divergence Estimate
$M/M/$	68%	Method: parametric; Distribution: Beta prime $(1.03, 1.37 \times 10^6, -8.58 \times 10^6, 5.01 \times 10^6)$; p -value: 0.58	0.04
$M/G/$	75%	Method: non-parametric (KDE); Kernel: Gaussian; Bandwidth: 0.1	0.14
$G/G/$	71%	Method: parametric; Distribution: Generalised Logistic $(14.76, 0.74, 1.54)$; p -value: 0.99	0.09

Gaussian distribution to avoid negative values.

Table 3: Parameterisation of the two stage and single stage queueing system simulations used for developing the runtime savings prediction models.

System	Arrival	Service	
		Subsystem 1	Subsystem 2
Two stage $M/M/$	Exponential (λ)	Exponential (1)	Exponential (1)
Single stage $M/M/$	Exponential (λ)	Exponential (1)	NA
Two stage $M/G/$	Exponential (λ)	Exponential (2)	Normal (2, 0.2); bounded at 0.01
Single stage $M/G/$	Exponential (λ)	Exponential (2)	NA
Two stage $G/G/$	Normal (λ , 1.5); bounded at 0.01	Gamma (11.11, 0.45); $\mu = 5$, $\sigma = 1.5$	Gamma (11.11, 0.45); $\mu = 5$, $\sigma = 1.5$
Single stage $G/G/$	Normal (λ , 1.5); bounded at 0.01	Gamma (11.11, 0.45); $\mu = 5$, $\sigma = 1.5$	NA

Note: $\lambda = \frac{\mu}{\rho}$, $\mu =$ mean service time, $\sigma =$ standard deviation of service time, $\rho =$ server occupancy, and $\rho \in \{0.2, 0.21, \dots, 0.93\}$; NA = not applicable.

Stage 1 demonstration. We recall that in Stage 1, models that estimate θ as a function of server occupancy are developed. The models were initialised with a warm-up time of 200 days of simulation time after which they were allowed to run for 10 days of simulation time. To collect the required data, models were executed for server occupancy levels ranging from 20% to 93% with a step size of 1%. This range was adopted because of the following two reasons. Firstly, in most physical systems, server occupancy in the range of 80% to 90% is considered desirable (Agarwal, 2016). Secondly, beyond this range the average queue waiting time rises very steeply, which is shown in Figure 4. Next, for each occupancy value, θ was recorded. This was achieved by following the procedure outlined in Algorithm 1.

The parent model was executed (10 replications) at predefined server occupancy values. For every replication, trace output was recorded and then analysed using a custom Python function we developed to quantify the number of instructions for each entry (arrival/entity) listed within the trace. Next, from the output of the previous step, one hundred entries were randomly selected, and their respective number of instructions was averaged to compute the average number of instructions per arrival. This average was further aggregated across




Figure 4: Average waiting time versus server occupancy for $M/M/1$, $M/G/1$, and $G/G/1$ queuing systems.

the ten replications to derive θ for a given server occupancy value. Following this, the data recorded in the above manner for the server occupancy range underwent a regression model fitting procedure with server occupancy serving as the independent variable and θ as the dependent variable.


In Figure 5, we present visualisations of the relationship between θ and second-stage subsystem server occupancy for the $2s$ $M/M/1$, $M/G/1$ and $G/G/1$ systems. A linear correlation between the two variables is evident in the $M/M/1$ case, as depicted in Figure 5a. Further, from Figure 5b, the relationship between the two variables in the $M/G/1$ case appears to be nonlinear, displaying a concave shape. Conversely, Figure 5c reveals an interesting pattern for the $G/G/1$ case where θ remains relatively constant from server occupancies between 20% and about 50%. A similar trend was also observed in the single-stage $G/G/1$ system. Based on these observations, we truncated the simulation data to exclude values up to 50% server occupancy. The results of the regression, including the R -squared values, are presented in Table 4.

Importantly, we note here that for the simplified (ms) system we found the second stage or the LOS random variable accounted for a fixed two instructions per arrival. This is due to the fact that there are no simulation components in this stage, such as queues and servers, and hence the processor executed only two instructions for each arriving entity to hold it in the system for the sampled length of time and then to release the entity. Consequently, the simplified ms system could be represented as a single-server ($1s$) system with only two additional instructions per arrival, i.e., $\theta_{ms} = \theta_{1s} + 2$.


Stage 2 demonstration. The second stage of the process involves developing models that take the reduction in the average number of instructions executed (RIE) as input to generate expected RS as output. This was accomplished by following the steps listed in Algorithm 2. The stage 2 process required executing both the $2s$ DES and its ms DES, while tracking the number of arrivals (notated as n) and the computational runtime for each model. These simulations were performed for the same server occupancy range as above - i.e., between 20% and 93%, incremented in steps of 1%. Utilising the equations for θ_{2s} and $\theta_{ms} (= \theta_{1s} + 2)$ derived in stage 1, θ values for both the models at each occupancy value were computed. Next, the total instructions were determined by multiplying the θ with total arrivals (n). Subsequent to this, the RIE and RS achieved with the simplified model were calculated using data from the above steps. Then, a regression model was fitted to the data using RIE

and RS as the independent and dependent variables, respectively.


The resulting RS versus RIE regression equations along with their respective R -squared values are displayed along with the θ versus server occupancy regression equations in Table 4. We also checked whether the observed pattern for the $G/G/$ case is specific to the choice of arrival and service pattern distributions. To do so, we experimented with different combinations of arrival and service rate distributions that included Gaussian, uniform, triangular, and beta, among others. Our experiments revealed similar relationships between θ and server occupancy.



(a) $M/M/$ system.



(b) $M/G/$ system.



(c) $G/G/$ system.

Figure 5: The relationship between the average number of instructions per arrival and server occupancy for the second subsystem within two-stage systems with $M/M/$, $M/G/$ and $G/G/$ systems.

The calculation of the total number of instructions was based on the average total number of arrivals (n), which we collected directly from the simulation outputs. An alternate approach to calculate this value could involve multiplying the average arrival rate, derived from the server occupancy and the mean service rate, by the run length of the simulation experiment. In constructing the RS prediction model, we also tested this estimation technique for n and found that it provided results that were comparable.

We conclude this section by describing the method for applying the RS prediction framework to a potential model simplification operation. Consider a DES of a system with m

Table 4: Regression equations part of the runtime savings prediction framework for model simplification operations.

DES	Queueing system model	Regression equation	R-squared value
$M/M/$	Two-stage	$\theta_{2s}^{mm} = 1.97x + 33.02$	0.99
	Single-stage	$\theta_{1s}^{mm} = 0.99x + 13.00$	0.99
	Single-server	$\theta_{ss}^{mm} = 0.97x + 9.02$	0.92
	RS prediction	$\phi_{mm} = 0.04x' - 0.05$	0.99
$M/G/$	Two-stage	$\theta_{2s}^{mg} = -0.69x^2 + 2.80x + 21.78$	0.99
	Single-stage	$\theta_{1s}^{mg} = 1.03x + 12.97x$	0.99
	Single-server	$\theta_{ss}^{mg} = -0.47x^2 + 1.51x + 9.87$	0.98
	RS prediction	$\phi_{mg} = 2.28 \times 10^{-5}x'^2 + 0.03x' + 0.091$	0.99
$G/G/$	Two-stage	$\theta_{2s}^{gg} = 5.90x^2 - 4.85x + 22.96$	0.99
	Single-stage	$\theta_{1s}^{gg} = 3.61x^2 - 3.40x + 13.79x$	0.99
	Single-server	$\theta_{ss}^{gg} = 2.48x^2 - 1.76x + 9.29$	0.98
	RS prediction	$\phi_{gg} = 0.03x + 0.07$	0.99

Note: x stands for server occupancy. x' is the reduction in the number of instructions between the parent and simplified models in 10000s, and ϕ is the expected runtime savings. For all the cases, $\theta_{ms} = \theta_{1s} + 2$.

subsystems, each with recorded occupancy ρ_i ($i \in M = \{1, 2, \dots, m\}$, where M is the index set of subsystems comprising the DES. In order to describe the method for deploying the RS prediction framework, we need to formally specify the types of simplification operations for which our framework can be used: (a) k_1 subsystems ($k_1 < m$) are abstracted out with k_1 LOS random variables (denoted by $S1$); (b) k_2 ($< m$) subsystems are abstracted out and replaced by a single random variable (denoted by $S2$); (c) k_3 ($< m$) subsystems are replaced by a single subsystem (denoted by $S3$) (an aggregation operation); (d) a combination of more than one of the above three types - for example, a simplification operation wherein k_1 subsystems undergo the $S1$ operation, k_2 subsystems undergo the $S2$ operation, and k_3 subsystems undergo the $S3$ operation, with the condition that $k_1 + k_2 + k_3 < m$. Note that if $k_1 + k_2 + k_3 = m$, we are no longer concerned with model simplification, but enter the realm of simulation metamodelling. In general, for the purposes of our study, we can specify a model specification operation as a tuple $O = (K_1, K_2, K_3)$, where each $K_i \subset M$ (with $|K_i| = k_i$ ($i \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ and $k_1 + k_2 + k_3 < m$)) indexes the subsystems subject to each of the three operations.

We provide in Algorithm 3 below a description of how to estimate RS for a model simplification operation using our proposed predictive framework.

Algorithm 3 makes it clear as to why incorporating the ss system in the RS prediction framework is important - while the $2s$ and ms systems are used to generate the equations for RS prediction, the subsystems subject to simplification can for the most part be modelled as ss subsystems. Further, it can also be seen how, even though the models within the RS prediction framework were characterised only using the abstraction operation, they can be applied to aggregation operations as well.

5. Runtime Savings Prediction Model: Deployment and Validation

We carried out three sets of experiments to demonstrate the deployment of and validate the proposed RS prediction framework. These are listed in Table 5. The first set of experiments involved applying the RS prediction models for an abstraction operation on a simple

Algorithm 3 Pseudocode for the deployment of the RS prediction framework for model simplification operations.

- 1: Initialise with information regarding parent DES: m workstations/subsystems with workstation index set $M = \{1, 2, \dots, m\}$
 - 2: Initialise with specification of model simplification operation $O = (K_1, K_2, K_3)$
 - 3: Initialise with information from parent DES: server occupancy vector for the parent DES $\rho = \{\rho_1, \rho_2, \dots, \rho_m\}$
 - 4: Initialise with information from parent DES: number of arrivals to the sets of subsystems corresponding to each element of O : $n_{Sl} = \{n_s : s \in K_l\}$, with n_{sim2} and n_{sim3} representing the overall number of arrivals to the sets of subsystems subject to simplification operation $S2$ and $S3$
 - 5: Initialise with regression equations for the average number of instructions per arrival θ_{ss}^v and expected RS ϕ_v from the RS prediction framework ($v \in \{mm, mg, gg\}$)
 - 6: Initialise storage variables $\bar{I}_1, \bar{I}_2, \bar{I}_3 = 0$
 - 7: **for** $j \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ **do**
 - 8: **for** $i \in K_j$ **do**
 - 9: Identify queueing discipline $v \in \{mm, mg, gg\}$ of the i^{th} subsystem and relevant equations θ_{ss}^v and ϕ_v from RS prediction framework
 - 10: Estimate $\theta_{ss,i}^v = f_{ss}^v(\rho_i)$
 - 11: Estimate total number of instructions associated with subsystem $I_{j,i} = \theta_{ss,i}^v \times n_i$ ($n_i \in n_{Sj}$)
 - 12: Estimate RIE w.r.t. removing i^{th} subsystem $\bar{I}_j = \bar{I}_j + I_{j,i}$
 - 13: **end for**
 - 14: **If** $j = 1$:
 - 15: $\bar{I}_1 = \bar{I}_1 - 2 \times \sum_{l \in n_{S1}} n_l$
 - 16: Estimate expected RS $\phi_1 = g_v(\bar{I}_1)$
 - 17: **Else If** $j = 2$:
 - 18: $\bar{I}_2 = \bar{I}_2 - 2 \times n_{sim2}$
 - 19: Estimate expected RS $\phi_2 = g_v(\bar{I}_2)$
 - 20: **Else**:
 - 21: ρ_{sim} = server occupancy of subsystem replacing subsystems $\in K_3$
 - 22: Identify queueing discipline $v \in \{mm, mg, gg\}$ of the simplifying subsystem and relevant equations θ_{ss}^v and ϕ_v
 - 23: Estimate $\theta_{ss,sim}^v = f_{ss}^v(\rho_{sim})$
 - 24: Estimate total number of instructions associated with subsystem $I_{sim} = \theta_{ss,sim}^v \times n_{sim3}$
 - 25: Estimate RIE as $\bar{I}_3 = \bar{I}_3 - I_{sim}$
 - 26: Estimate expected RS $\phi_3 = g_v(\bar{I}_3)$
 - 27: **end for**
 - 28: **Return** expected RS estimate as $\phi = \phi_1 + \phi_2 + \phi_3$
-

two-stage queueing system, as shown in Figure 1, where the second stage was abstracted out. For the second set of validation experiments, a more complex three-stage queueing system with two parallel routings in the third stage was conceptualised. This configuration is shown in Figure 6. For the third set of experiments, a simulation model of the flow of patients in a primary health centre (PHC) developed (displayed in Figure 7) by Shoab and Ramamohan (2022) was adopted. The code for this PHC simulation was accessed from its GitHub page.

Table 5: Overview of validation experiments for the runtime savings prediction models.

Validation experiment	DES model	Description
1	2-stage tandem queueing system (Figure 1)	Scenario: Second stage abstracted out and replaced with its LOS random variable; S_1 operation; $O = (\{2\}, \{\}, \{\})$
2	3-stage tandem queueing system with 2 parallel subsystems in the third stage (Figure 6)	Scenario 1: Stage 3 abstracted out and each subsystem replaced with its LOS random variable; S_1 operation, with $O = (\{3, 4\}, \{\}, \{\})$
		Scenario 2: Stages 2 & 3 abstracted out by a single LOS random variable; S_2 operation, with $O = (\{\}, \{2, 3, 4\}, \{\})$
3	Patient flow in a primary health centre (Figure 7)	Scenario 1: Laboratory abstracted out by its random variable; S_1 operation; S_1 operation, with $O = (\{Lab\}, \{\}, \{\})$
		Scenario 2: Pharmacy abstracted out by its LOS random variable; S_1 operation, with $O = (\{Pharmacy\}, \{\}, \{\})$
		Scenario 3: Laboratory & pharmacy abstracted out by a single LOS random variable; S_2 operation, with $O = (\{\}, \{Lab, Pharmacy\}, \{\})$

The approach adopted for the validation experiments is described in detail in Table 6. Note that while Algorithm 3 describes the process for deploying the RS predictive framework for a proposed model simplification endeavour, Table 6 describes the systematic procedure to generate both RS predictions as well as ground truth RS estimates for the experiments in Table 5 given that the purpose of these experiments was validation in addition to demonstration of the deployment of the RS predictive framework. We provide an overview of this procedure below.

Let us consider an example of any DES model comprising $M/G/$ systems (parent model) and its simplified version constructed by replacing a single subsystem within the parent model with its LOS random variable. First, the parent simulation model is executed for a given run length and a prespecified number of replications are performed. Next, key outcomes such as the average simulation runtime (t), the average number of arrivals (n), and average occupancy (ρ) of the server to be abstracted out are recorded. Then Algorithm 3 is deployed - that is, using the equation for an $M/G/$ system from Table 4, the average number of instructions per arrival (θ_{ss}^{mg}) is estimated using ρ from the previous step. Following this, the average total number of instructions (I_{ss}) is estimated for the subsystem in question within the parent model by combining n with θ_{ss}^{mg} . Subsequently, the expected RNI \bar{I} is estimated using the relation $I_{ss} - (2 \times n)$, and the value obtained is plugged into the appropriate RS prediction equation to estimate the expected RS (ϕ^{mg}).

To validate the results, the simplified model is executed under identical conditions and

the average computational runtime is calculated (t'). The average actual RS is then calculated as $t - t'$ and compared with the predicted RS ϕ^{mg} . The performance of the prediction is assessed with the mean absolute percentage error (MAPE), mean percentage error (MPE), the root mean squared error (RMSE), and the R-squared (R^2) metrics. The MAPE is calculated as $\sum_{j=1}^N \frac{|O_j - P_j|}{O_j} \times 100$, where O_j and P_j are the observed and predicted values of the regression dependent variable, and N represents the size of the sample. Similarly, the MPE is calculated as $\sum_{j=1}^N \frac{(O_j - P_j)}{O_j} \times 100$. The RMSE is calculated as $\sqrt{\sum_{j=1}^N (O_j - P_j)^2}$. The coefficient of determination R^2 is a well-established metric to assess the quality of regression fit.

Table 6: Runtime savings prediction model validation approach.

For each server occupancy value of the subsystem to be abstracted out, do:

Step 1: Execute parent model and record data.

- (a) Identify the subsystems to be abstracted out and their queueing disciplines (for example, single-server $G/G/1$ system).
- (b) Execute the parent model and record average server occupancy value (ρ), number of arrivals (n), and computational runtime (t).

Step 2: Generate runtime savings prediction.

- (a) Call Algorithm 3 to generate RS prediction ϕ_{pred} .

Step 3: Compare the predicted RS with the actual RS.

- (a) Execute the simplified model under conditions identical to that in Step 1(b) to obtain the average computational runtime t' .
- (b) Calculate the difference in actual and predicted runtimes ($\phi_{act} = t - t'$) to obtain the actual average RS.
- (c) Compare ϕ_{pred} and ϕ_{act} and record data for computing the performance metrics.

Validation experiment 1. For this set of validation experiments, we worked with the system depicted in Figure 1 and adhered to the process described in Table 6 for the experiment. The experiments were performed for three cases, wherein the second-stage subsystem (the one being abstracted out) was conceptualised as: (a) an $M/M/1$ system, (b) an $M/G/1$ system, and (c) a $G/G/1$ system. The validation was performed for 20 randomly generated utilisation values between 20% and 93% for the second-stage subsystem and 30 replications were performed at each utilisation value.

For both the $M/M/1$ and $M/G/1$ cases, the interarrival times of service-seeking entities, which was varied to generate the desired second stage subsystem occupancy level, were governed by the exponential distribution. With regard to the service time in the $M/G/1$ case, the service time for the first subsystem was modelled as an exponential random variable with mean 1 minute, and the second subsystem's server had a uniformly distributed service time ranging from 3 to 9 minutes. In the $G/G/1$ case, the first subsystem's server had an

exponentially distributed service time with a mean of 2 minutes. The second subsystem's server had a normally distributed service time with a mean of 2 minutes and a standard deviation of 0.2 minutes. The interarrival time of service-seeking entities was modelled using a uniform distribution. The outcomes from the experiments showing actual RS and predicted RS values at different server utilisation values are listed in Table 7. Performance metric estimates summarising the performance of the RS prediction approach for all three cases are shown in Table 8.

Table 7: Validation experiment 1 results for the $M/M/1$, $M/G/1$ and $G/G/1$ cases. Note: all runtime savings are in seconds; ρ = second-stage server utilisation level; RS = runtime savings.

Abstracted subsystem: $M/M/1$			Abstracted subsystem: $M/G/1$			Abstracted subsystem: $G/G/1$		
ρ	Actual RS	Predicted RS	ρ	Actual RS	Predicted RS	ρ	Actual RS	Predicted RS
22.03%	6.06	5.53	27.52%	0.59	0.63	23.27%	1.76	1.88
25.65%	6.24	6.48	28.22%	0.60	0.65	28.08%	2.09	2.25
30.50%	7.99	7.77	31.05%	0.64	0.71	28.63%	2.19	2.30
31.94%	8.25	8.16	36.99%	0.76	0.83	32.90%	2.52	2.63
33.09%	8.72	8.46	39.23%	0.86	0.88	36.88%	2.98	2.95
43.43%	11.02	11.27	43.13%	0.96	0.97	37.10%	2.86	2.96
45.14%	11.83	11.76	45.11%	0.99	1.01	37.77%	2.91	3.02
46.81%	11.65	12.21	57.28%	1.24	1.29	38.37%	2.98	3.07
57.48%	14.51	15.22	62.82%	1.38	1.41	44.76%	3.60	3.56
66.73%	17.72	17.86	64.66%	1.45	1.46	45.55%	3.55	3.63
67.51%	17.27	18.11	66.78%	1.52	1.51	46.24%	3.71	3.67
69.13%	16.71	18.58	71.90%	1.64	1.63	50.10%	3.95	3.99
70.30%	18.09	18.93	72.03%	1.58	1.63	50.55%	3.97	4.02
73.96%	19.41	20.02	73.53%	1.68	1.67	56.34%	4.44	4.49
77.10%	21.72	20.94	74.59%	1.69	1.69	62.12%	5.07	4.99
85.74%	23.64	23.54	75.92%	1.72	1.72	63.42%	5.16	5.10
87.83%	24.15	24.18	81.78%	1.83	1.87	79.19%	6.47	6.54
89.81%	24.34	24.79	82.83%	1.92	1.89	81.08%	6.81	6.71
90.23%	24.37	24.92	90.04%	2.05	2.07	85.61%	7.15	7.17
90.34%	24.48	24.95	90.24%	2.09	2.07	91.59%	7.88	7.83

Table 8: Validation experiment 1 results summary: performance metric values.

Second stage subsystem	MAPE	MPE	RMSE	R-squared
$M/M/1$	3.34%	-1.30%	0.63	0.99
$M/G/1$	2.93%	-2.43%	0.03	0.99
$G/G/1$	2.45%	-1.66%	0.08	0.99

From Tables 8 and 7, the performance of the RS prediction approach for all three cases is encouraging - for example, MAPE scores are below 4% and R^2 values are 99%.

Validation experiment 2. The three-stage queueing system developed for this validation experiment is depicted in Figure 6. The parent model is shown at the top of the figure. Two simplification scenarios were considered. For the first scenario, the third stage was abstracted as follows: subsystems 3 and 4 (enclosed in a dashed box in Figure 6) were




Figure 6: RS prediction validation: the parent model and two corresponding metasimulation models

each replaced with their corresponding LOS random variables - an $S1$ simplification operation. The corresponding simplified model is depicted in the middle system in Figure 6. In the second scenario, the second and third stages (enclosed with a dotted box) were jointly abstracted out with a single LOS random variable - an $S2$ operation. The simplified model thus constructed can be seen in Figure 6 (the bottom system). The validation experiment followed the process described in Table 6. In this section, we provide detailed results only for the $M/G/$ case, summary results for the performance of the RS prediction method for all cases, and provide detailed results for the $M/M/$ and $G/G/$ cases in the Appendices.

The subsystem service and interarrival times for the $M/G/$ case are as follows. Both subsystems 1 and 2 feature identical servers, each with service time following an exponential distribution with mean 2 minutes. The third and fourth servers, while maintaining the same average service time of 6 minutes and a standard deviation of 2 minutes, differ in their respective distributions. The third subsystem's service times were sampled from a Gaussian distribution, and the fourth server's from a Gamma distribution. The interarrival time of jobs to the system was governed by an exponential distribution whose parameter was calculated based on the desired subsystem server occupancy and subsystem service rate values. The outcomes of the experiments are listed in Table 9. Now, for the validation experiments, 20 random values were generated between 20% and 93% representing the server occupancy of the third subsystem. For these values, the parent model was executed and the number of arrivals, actual server occupancy values, and computational runtimes were recorded. These are listed in the first eight columns in Table 9. Then, to generate

RS predictions, Algorithm 3 was called for the simplification operation $O = (\{3, 4\}, \{\}, \{\})$. The predicted RS was then compared against the actual runtime recorded on executing the simplified model for each server occupancy value. Overall, the observed average MAPE value calculated across the experiments was 4.66%, indicating encouraging performance of the RS prediction framework.

Table 9: Validation experiment 2 scenario 1 outcomes comparing predicted and actual runtime savings for the M/G model. Note: ρ = server occupancy; n = average number of arrivals; s = subsystem; T_p = parent model average runtime (seconds); θ = average number of instructions per arrival; \bar{I} = expected reduction in the number of instructions; APE = absolute percentage error; PE = percentage error

ρ_{s1}	ρ_{s2}	ρ_{s3}	ρ_{s4}	n_{s1} & n_{s2}	n_{s3}	n_{s4}	T_p	θ_{s3}	θ_{s4}	\bar{I}_{s3}	\bar{I}_{s4}	$\bar{I}_{s3} +$ \bar{I}_{s4}	Predicted RS	Actual RS	Error	APE	PE
0.17	0.17	0.21	0.31	44927	17998	26928	4.91	9.16	9.29	128864	196304	325168	1.11	1.076	-0.03	2.90%	-2.90%
0.19	0.19	0.23	0.35	50634	20238	30395	5.67	9.19	9.34	145585	223030	368615	1.25	1.317	0.070	5.29%	5.29%
0.20	0.20	0.24	0.35	51523	20617	30906	5.76	9.20	9.35	148427	226990	375417	1.27	1.318	0.049	3.71%	3.71%
0.23	0.23	0.28	0.41	60453	24158	36295	6.79	9.25	9.42	175164	269144	444308	1.49	1.579	0.087	5.53%	5.53%
0.24	0.24	0.29	0.44	64262	25710	38553	7.25	9.27	9.44	186978	286998	473976	1.59	1.640	0.051	3.13%	3.13%
0.25	0.25	0.29	0.44	64542	25800	38742	7.30	9.27	9.45	187670	288495	476165	1.60	1.715	0.119	6.96%	6.96%
0.25	0.25	0.30	0.45	65312	26120	39192	7.39	9.28	9.45	190114	292060	482174	1.62	1.675	0.059	3.53%	3.53%
0.28	0.28	0.34	0.51	73997	29603	44394	8.22	9.33	9.52	216896	333661	550556	1.84	1.782	-0.058	3.27%	-3.27%
0.29	0.29	0.35	0.52	76265	30462	45803	8.61	9.34	9.53	223550	344991	568541	1.90	1.927	0.027	1.39%	1.39%
0.29	0.29	0.35	0.53	76935	30804	46130	8.78	9.34	9.54	226202	347624	573826	1.92	2.092	0.174	8.33%	8.33%
0.30	0.30	0.36	0.53	77898	31186	46712	8.67	9.349	9.54	229169	352327	581496	1.94	1.936	-0.007	0.37%	-0.37%
0.33	0.33	0.40	0.60	87163	34850	52312	9.94	9.40	9.61	257780	397864	655644	2.19	2.332	0.142	6.09%	6.09%
0.33	0.33	0.40	0.60	87894	35147	52746	10.04	9.40	9.61	260112	401416	661529	2.21	2.299	0.089	3.89%	3.89%
0.42	0.42	0.51	0.76	111468	44565	66903	12.88	9.52	9.75	335030	518586	853616	2.86	3.043	0.181	5.94%	5.94%
0.42	0.42	0.51	0.76	111577	44657	66920	12.90	9.52	9.75	335767	518727	854494	2.87	2.991	0.126	4.20%	4.20%
0.43	0.43	0.51	0.77	112550	45024	67526	13.05	9.52	9.76	338708	523804	862512	2.89	3.051	0.158	5.18%	5.18%
0.46	0.46	0.55	0.83	120413	48116	72297	13.94	9.56	9.8	363706	563817	927523	3.12	3.327	0.208	6.27%	6.27%
0.47	0.47	0.57	0.85	123980	49535	74445	14.43	9.58	9.82	375224	581893	957117	3.22	3.495	0.274	7.83%	7.83%

In the second scenario for validation experiment 2, the second and third stages of the parent model are abstracted out and replaced with a single random variable (an S_2 operation). The simplified model thus constructed is depicted in Figure 6 (third system from the top). With respect to calculation of the parent model data (including runtime), the data for the parent model generated for the first scenario is applicable for this scenario as well. Algorithm 3 is applied to generate the predicted RS for this simplification operation $O = (\{\}, \{3, 4\}, \{\})$.

Next, the simplified model was executed and the runtimes were recorded. Results from comparing the actual RS values against the predicted RS values are documented in Table B.21. The results of the experiments are once again encouraging, with a maximum MAPE score of approximately 9.5% and a minimum R^2 value of 91%.

The calculations and results for the $M/M/$ and the $G/G/$ cases are provided in Appendix B.2 and Appendix B.3.

Table 10: Validation experiment 2 outcomes for the $M/M/$, $M/G/$, and $G/G/$ cases.

Queueing disciplines of the simplified systems	Scenario	MAPE	MPE	RMSE	R-squared
$M/M/1$	1	9.48%	-9.48%	0.63	0.99
	2	3.90%	-3.90%	0.01	0.99
$M/G/1$	1	4.66%	3.93%	0.13	0.99
	2	5.81 %	-3.94%	0.33	0.96
$G/G/1$	1	7.72%	0.19%	0.18	0.95
	2	4.55%	-3.01%	0.31	0.91

Validation Experiment 3. We considered three scenarios as part of validation experiment 3, focusing on a DES model that represents patient flow in an Indian primary health centre (PHC). This PHC DES was developed by Shoab and Ramamohan (2022). PHCs cater to the healthcare needs of multiple types of patients, including (a) those visiting on an outpatient basis, (b) those requiring limited inpatient care, (c) pregnant women visiting for childbirth, and (d) pregnant women visiting for outpatient antenatal care. The majority of patients visit for outpatient care given that the focus of the PHC is on provision of primary care. For example, an average of 60-120 patients are served per day on an outpatient basis, whereas only 1-2 patients per day are served on an inpatient basis. Given the substantially higher volume of ‘outpatients’, our validation experiments focused on abstracting out subsystems in the outpatient section. The subsystems earmarked for abstraction are enclosed within coloured boxes and marked with letters A and B as shown in Figure 7. The first scenario considered the abstraction of the laboratory subsystem that consisted of a queue and a server (a laboratory technician / phlebotomist), marked by a blue box labelled ‘A’ in Figure 7. The second experiment focused on abstracting the pharmacy alone, indicated by a blue box marked as ‘B’. The pharmacy subsystem consisted of a queue and a pharmacist (server). The third experiment combined the abstraction of both the laboratory and pharmacy subsystems.

The validation experiments here were conducted for three sets of input parameters. We varied the interarrival rates and maintained the original settings for all the other parameters - such as service rates, number of servers at each subsystem etc. - described in Shoab and




Figure 7: Conceptual model of patient flow in the primary health centre. Source: [Shoab and Ramamohan \(2022\)](#).

Note: Coloured boxes (A, & B) are used to indicate the subsystems that were abstracted out for validation experiments.

[Ramamohan \(2022\)](#). However, we performed the following modifications to make the DES more amenable for model simplification.

- The time allocated to administrative work (e.g., paperwork for patients) for the NCD nurse, staff (inpatient/childbirth) nurse, and doctor was removed from the model. This adjustment was necessary because administrative work time was sampled from a Gaussian distribution in the original PHC model and included in the total activity time of these resources. This would artificially inflate server occupancy levels without influencing the events in the event list or the number of instructions processed by the simulation engine.
- The simulation run length was set to 10 years of simulation time.
- The original model generated outcomes in two separate MS Excel spreadsheets once the model completed its run. We consolidated the results into a single file.

We replicated the process in Table 6 for the validation experiment. The parent model was executed for 10 replications. The average computational runtime per replication recorded varied between 150 and 235 seconds for the selected interarrival rate values as listed in Table 11. Following this, per Algorithm 3, the RIE was estimated for each case and then expected RS predictions were made using the equation for ϕ_{gg} . Then the simplified models for each scenario were executed and the actual RS achieved was computed. The outcomes for each scenario are presented in Table 11. The results reveal a consistent pattern of

underestimation of the actual RS by the RS prediction model, which implies that there may be factors yielding more RS than those accounted for in our framework, especially for DES models such as the PHC model. We leave the investigation and incorporation of these factors into our RS prediction framework for future work. That said, we note that the maximum PE is 18.45%, with an average PE of approximately 15%, indicating that the prediction performance remains acceptable. Further, the R^2 value remains at 99%, indicating clearly that the RS prediction framework has clearly identified the pattern in the generation of RS from model simplification operations.

Overall, from the results of validation experiments 1 through 3, our RS prediction approach appears to yield acceptable results.

Table 11: Validation experiment 3 outcomes for the primary health centre DES model. *Notes. All runtimes shown are mean runtimes (in seconds), with standard deviations in parentheses. RS = runtime savings; PE = percentage error, ρ_l = laboratory utilisation level, ρ_p = pharmacy utilisation level.*

Experiment	Outcomes	Laboratory (A)	Pharmacy (B)	Laboratory & Pharmacy (A+B)
Set 1 $\rho_l = 46.60\%$ $\rho_p = 53.19\%$	Parent model runtime	187.18 (1.53)		
	Simplified model runtime	168.81 (1.09)	150.23 (1.15)	125.97 (0.63)
	Actual RS	18.37	36.95	61.21
	Predicted RS	15.23	30.6	49.91
	Error	3.14	6.35	11.29
	PE	17.12%	17.18%	18.45%
Set 2 $\rho_l = 57.57\%$ $\rho_p = 66.42\%$	Parent model runtime	235.56 (3.09)		
	Simplified model runtime	212.62 (1.34)	192.72 (1.82)	163.51 (1.81)
	Actual RS	22.94	42.83	72.05
	Predicted RS	19.26	39.06	63.73
	Error	3.68	3.77	8.32
	PE	16.04%	8.80%	11.55%
Set 3 $\rho_l = 37.70\%$ $\rho_p = 42.52\%$	Parent model runtime	152.11 (1.74)		
	Simplified model runtime	137.56 (2.06)	123.25 (1.45)	105.16 (1.00)
	Actual RS	14.55	28.85	46.95
	Predicted RS	12.18	24.28	39.92
	Error	2.37	4.57	7.02
	PE	16.28%	15.85%	14.96%
MPE = 15.14%; RMSE = 6.24; R-squared = 0.99				

6. Discussion and Conclusion

This study undertakes a methodological investigation into the simplification of DES models, introducing a queuing-theoretic approach designed to predict computational runtime savings from model simplification through the widely used abstraction and aggregation operations. The paper develops predictive models that estimate potential computational savings from model simplification prior to its actual development, and potentially without needing to run the parent model even once. This is the first study to address this, as previous work on simulation model simplification has primarily focused on model simplification

methods themselves via different approaches (Lidberg et al., 2021; van der Zee, 2017). Thus, we address a gap in existing literature, offering a tool for modellers to pre-emptively assess the benefit from simplification efforts.

In this paper, we discuss in detail the methodology behind the development of the RS prediction models. Our research highlights the key determinants of computational runtime for DESs and use these to develop the predictive framework for estimating RS via model simplification. The RS prediction framework is then validated through a series of computational experiments involving multiple systems of varying complexity, including a set of experiments involving a DES of a real-world healthcare facility. The results from the validation experiments are encouraging, thereby indicating the effectiveness of our approach and providing a way forward towards its eventual adoption into both commercial and open-source DES packages.

A limitation of this study is that it was designed and conducted using a particular programming language and DES package. Therefore, the specific equations derived as part of the RS prediction framework may not find direct applicability to other modelling paradigms. However, the study developed and demonstrated a general roadmap that can be replicated with other DES packages or programming languages. We also note that we have not considered DES models of queueing systems with more complex behaviour such as renegeing or balking behaviour, or systems with batch arrivals, or stochastic arrival and service patterns, etc. While the fact that our predictive framework relies primarily on server occupancy implies that the approach may be extended with minimal effort to handle behaviours such as balking / renegeing, a natural avenue of further research involves formally investigating extension of our approach to such systems.

We envision that this runtime (savings) prediction framework could be integrated into commercial or open-source DES platforms as follows. The generation of the specific equations within the RS predictive framework can be performed as part of the installation process of the simulation platform, given that the model development process does not rely on a specific DES, but only DESs of *ls*, *ms* and *ss* queueing systems. Consider the scenario of a modeller engaged in conceptualising a model simplification operation for a parent DES comprising a network of queueing subsystems, with attendant subsystem occupancy estimates. The modeller could select the subsystems meant for a specific simplification operation and click on a button that estimates the RS from the simplification operation using our predictive framework. We note here that the RS estimates generated by our proposed framework are in absolute terms - i.e., in units of time; however, the models can be modified with minimal effort to generate relative runtime savings estimates.

References


- S. Rank, C. Hammel, T. Schmidt, J. Müller, A. Wenzel, R. Lasch, G. Schneider, The correct level of model complexity in semiconductor fab simulation—lessons learned from practice, in: 2016 27th Annual SEMI Advanced Semiconductor Manufacturing Conference (ASMC), IEEE, 2016, pp. 133–139.
- D.-J. van der Zee, Approaches for simulation model simplification, in: 2017 Winter Simulation Conference (WSC), 2017, pp. 4197–4208. doi:[10.1109/WSC.2017.8248126](https://doi.org/10.1109/WSC.2017.8248126).
- S. Robinson, Exploring the relationship between simulation model accuracy and complexity, *Journal of the Operational Research Society* 74 (2023) 1992–2011.

- S. Lidberg, M. Frantzén, T. Aslam, A. H. C. Ng, Model simplification methods for coded discrete-event simulation models: A systematic review and experimental study, 2021. <http://his.diva-portal.org/smash/record.jsf?pid=diva2%3A1600921&dswid=-1718>, accessed 15.12.2022.
- N. Fatma, M. Shoaib, N. Mustafee, V. Ramamohan, Primary healthcare delivery network simulation using stochastic metamodels, in: K. Bae, B. Feng, S. Lazarova-Molnar, Z. Zheng, T. Roeder, R. Thiesing (Eds.), In Proceedings of the 2020 Winter Simulation Conference, IEEE, 2020, pp. 818–829.
- R. J. Brooks, A. M. Tobias, Simplification in the simulation of manufacturing systems, *International Journal of Production Research* 38 (2000) 1009–1027. doi:[10.1080/002075400188997](https://doi.org/10.1080/002075400188997).
- D. Huber, W. Dangelmaier, Controlled simplification of material flow simulation models, in: Proceedings of the 2009 Winter Simulation Conference (WSC), 2009, pp. 839–850. doi:[10.1109/WSC.2009.5429707](https://doi.org/10.1109/WSC.2009.5429707).
- L. Schruben, E. Yücesan, Complexity of simulation models: A graph theoretic approach, in: G. W. Evans, M. Mollaghasemi, E. Russell, W. Biles (Eds.), In Proceedings of the 1993 Winter Simulation Conference, IEEE, 1993, pp. 641–649.
- Y. F. Hung, R. C. Leachman, Reduced simulation models of wafer fabrication facilities, *International Journal of Production Research* 37 (1999) 2685–2701. doi:[10.1080/002075499190473](https://doi.org/10.1080/002075499190473).
- I. Adan, E. Lefeber, J. Timmermans, A. van de Waarsenburg, M. Wolleswinkel-Schriek, Aggregate model-based performance analysis of an emergency department, *International Journal of Privacy and Health Information Management (IJPHIM)* 2 (2014) 1–21.
- C. D. Pegden, R. P. Sadowski, R. E. Shannon, Introduction to simulation using SIMAN, McGraw-Hill, Inc., 1995.
- R. Piplani, S. A. Puah, Simplification strategies for simulation models of semiconductor facilities, *Journal of Manufacturing Technology Management* 15 (2004) 618–625. doi:[10.1108/17410380410555862](https://doi.org/10.1108/17410380410555862).
- R. Johnson, J. Fowler, G. Mackulak, A discrete event simulation model simplification technique, in: Proceedings of the 2005 Winter Simulation Conference, IEEE, 2005, pp. 2172 – 2176. doi:[10.1109/WSC.2005.1574503](https://doi.org/10.1109/WSC.2005.1574503).
- L. F. Etman, C. P. Veeger, E. Lefeber, I. J. Adan, J. E. Rooda, Aggregate modeling of semiconductor equipment using effective process times, in: S. Jain, R. R. Creasey, J. Himmelspach, K. P. White, M. Fu (Eds.), In Proceedings of the 2011 Winter Simulation Conference, IEEE, 2011, pp. 1790–1802. doi:[10.1109/WSC.2011.6147894](https://doi.org/10.1109/WSC.2011.6147894).
- O. Rose, Wip evolution of a semiconductor factory after a bottleneck workcenter breakdown, in: D. Medeiros, E. Watson, J. Carson, M. Manivannan (Eds.), In Proceedings of the 1998 Winter Simulation Conference, volume 2, IEEE, 1998, pp. 997–1003. doi:[10.1109/wsc.1998.745805](https://doi.org/10.1109/wsc.1998.745805).
- O. Rose, Estimation of the cycle time distribution of a wafer fab by a simple simulation model, *Proceedings of the SMOMS 99* (1999) 118.


- O. Rose, Improved simple simulation models for semiconductor wafer factories., in: S. G. Henderson, B. Biller, M.-H. Hsieh, J. Shortle, J. D. Tew, R. R. Barton (Eds.), In Proceedings of the 2007 Winter Simulation Conference, IEEE, 2007, pp. 1708–1712.
- I. Stogniy, W. Scholl, Using delays for process flow simplification, in: In Proceedings of the 2019 Winter Simulation Conference, IEEE, 2019, pp. 2372–2383.
- I. Stogniy, W. Scholl, Using accuracy measurements to evaluate simulation model simplification, in: In Proceedings of the 2020 Winter Simulation Conference, volume 2020-December, IEEE, 2020, pp. 1825–1836. doi:[10.1109/WSC48552.2020.9383918](https://doi.org/10.1109/WSC48552.2020.9383918).
- L. Pehrsson, M. Frantzén, T. Aslam, A. H. Ng, Aggregated line modeling for simulation and optimization of manufacturing systems, in: In Proceedings of the 2015 Winter Simulation Conference, IEEE, 2015, pp. 3632–3643.
- S. Völker, P. Gmilkowsky, Reduced discrete-event simulation models for medium-term production scheduling, Systems Analysis Modelling Simulation 43 (2003) 867–883. doi:[10.1080/0232929031000075313](https://doi.org/10.1080/0232929031000075313).
- S. N. Roy, B. J. Shah, H. Gajjar, Application of simulation in healthcare service operations: A review and research agenda, ACM Transactions on Modeling and Computer Simulation (TOMACS) 31 (2020) 1–23.
- M. Shoaib, V. Ramamohan, N. Mustafee, An approach towards predicting the computational runtime reduction from discrete-event simulation model simplification operations, in: 2023 Winter Simulation Conference (WSC), 2023, pp. 2554–2565. doi:[10.1109/WSC60868.2023.10407736](https://doi.org/10.1109/WSC60868.2023.10407736).
- T. Cheng, C. Sin, A state-of-the-art review of parallel-machine scheduling research, European Journal of Operational Research 47 (1990) 271–292.
- G. Kunz, S. Tenbusch, J. Gross, K. Wehrle, Predicting runtime performance bounds of expanded parallel discrete event simulations, in: 2011 IEEE 19th Annual International Symposium on Modelling, Analysis, and Simulation of Computer and Telecommunication Systems, IEEE, 2011, pp. 359–368.
- C.-C. Lim, Y.-H. Low, B.-P. Gan, S. Jain, W. Cai, W. J. Hsu, S. Y. Huang, Performance prediction tools for parallel discrete-event simulation, in: Proceedings Thirteenth Workshop on Parallel and Distributed Simulation. PADS 99.(Cat. No. PR00155), IEEE, 1999, pp. 148–155.
- J. Xu, M.-J. Chung, Predicting the performance of synchronous discrete event simulation, IEEE transactions on parallel and distributed systems 15 (2004) 1130–1137.
- R. L. Bagrodia, M. Takai, Performance evaluation of conservative algorithms in parallel simulation languages, IEEE Transactions on Parallel and Distributed Systems 11 (2000) 395–411.
- Z. Juhasz, S. Turner, K. Kuntner, M. Gerzson, A performance analyser and prediction tool for parallel discrete event simulation, Simulation 8 (2003) 4.
- R. van der Ham, Salabim: discrete event simulation and animation in python, Journal of Open Source Software 3 (2018) 767.

- P. Virtanen, R. Gommers, T. E. Oliphant, M. Haberland, T. Reddy, D. Cournapeau, E. Burovski, P. Peterson, W. Weckesser, J. Bright, S. J. van der Walt, M. Brett, J. Wilson, K. J. Millman, N. Mayorov, A. R. J. Nelson, E. Jones, R. Kern, E. Larson, C. J. Carey, Í. Polat, Y. Feng, E. W. Moore, J. VanderPlas, D. Laxalde, J. Perktold, R. Cimrman, I. Henriksen, E. A. Quintero, C. R. Harris, A. M. Archibald, A. H. Ribeiro, F. Pedregosa, P. van Mulbregt, SciPy 1.0 Contributors, SciPy 1.0: Fundamental Algorithms for Scientific Computing in Python, *Nature Methods* 17 (2020) 261–272. doi:[10.1038/s41592-019-0686-2](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41592-019-0686-2).
- F. Pedregosa, G. Varoquaux, A. Gramfort, V. Michel, B. Thirion, O. Grisel, M. Blondel, P. Prettenhofer, R. Weiss, V. Dubourg, et al., Scikit-learn: Machine learning in python, *Journal of machine learning research* 12 (2011) 2825–2830.
- K. Agarwal, What is an ideal bed occupancy rate?, 2016. URL: <https://medtalks.in/articles/what-is-an-ideal-bed-occupancy-rate>.
- M. Shoaib, V. Ramamohan, Simulation modeling and analysis of primary health center operations, *SIMULATION* 98 (2022) 183–208. doi:[10.1177/00375497211030931](https://doi.org/10.1177/00375497211030931).
- D.-J. van der Zee, Approaches for simulation model simplification, in: *In Proceeding of the 2017 Winter Simulation Conference*, IEEE, 2017, pp. 4197–4208.


Appendix A. Example Outputs from Parent and Simplified Models



(a) $M/M/$



(b) $M/G/$



(c) $G/G/$

Figure A.8: Distributions of lengths of stay data from parent and simplified (child) models.

Appendix B. Validation Experiment 2: Additional Results

Appendix B.1. Additional validation experiment 2 results for the M/G/ case.

Table B.12: Validation experiment 2, Scenario 2 results: the average number of instructions estimates for the abstracted subsystems 2, 3, & 4 for the simplified M/G/ case.

θ_{ss2}	θ_{ss3}	θ_{ss4}	RIE S2 ($I_2 = n_2 \times (\theta_{ss2} - 2)$)	RIE S3 ($I_3 = n_3 \times \theta_{ss3}$)	RIE S4 ($n_4 \times \theta_{ss4}$)
9.26	9.27	9.45	468656	239269	365980
9.26	9.28	9.45	474413	242353	370443
9.30	9.33	9.52	539877	276101	422449
9.30	9.34	9.53	557051	284474	436597
9.31	9.34	9.54	562157	287809	439884
9.31	9.35	9.54	569481	291541	445750
9.35	9.40	9.61	640225	327480	502488
9.35	9.40	9.61	645814	330406	506909
9.44	9.52	9.75	828809	424161	652392
9.44	9.52	9.75	829662	425081	652567
9.44	9.52	9.76	837383	428756	658856
9.47	9.56	9.80	899349	459937	708412
7.48	9.57	9.82	679717	474294	730782

Note: RIE S2 stands for the reduction in the number of instructions due to subsystem 2.

Appendix B.2. Validation experiment 2: results for the M/M/ case.

Appendix B.3. Validation experiment 2: results for the G/G/ case.

Table B.13: Validation experiment 2, Scenario 2 results: comparing expected and actual runtime savings for the simplified $M/G/$ case.

Predicted Runtime Savings	Actual Runtime Savings	Error	Percentage error (PE)	Absolute PE
3.85	3.60	-0.25	-6.98%	6.98%
3.89	3.76	-0.13	-3.57%	3.57%
4.44	4.57	0.12	2.69%	2.69%
4.59	4.20	-0.39	-9.20%	9.20%
4.63	4.35	-0.28	-6.51%	6.51%
4.69	4.21	-0.48	-11.50%	11.50%
5.29	5.35	0.06	1.05%	1.05%
5.34	5.02	-0.32	-6.36%	6.36%
6.91	6.42	-0.48	-7.50%	7.50%
6.91	6.46	-0.45	-6.96%	6.96%
6.98	6.66	-0.32	-4.80%	4.80%
7.52	7.68	0.16	2.08%	2.08%
6.77	7.22	0.45	6.30%	6.30%

Table B.14: Validation experiment 2, Scenario 1 results: parent simulation model outcomes - server occupancy values, number of arrivals, and runtime for the $M/M/$ case.

Server 1 utilisation	Server 2 utilisation	Server 3 utilisation	Server 4 utilisation	Arrivals in subsystem 1 & 2 (n_2)	Arrivals in subsystem 3 (n_3)	Arrivals subsystem 4 (n_4)	Run time (s)
0.13	0.19	0.18	0.19	34159	13654	20504	3.76
0.16	0.24	0.22	0.24	42038	16835	25204	4.71
0.20	0.30	0.28	0.30	52467	20978	31488	5.83
0.23	0.34	0.32	0.34	60374	24154	36221	6.73
0.25	0.37	0.35	0.38	65722	26289	39433	7.37
0.26	0.39	0.36	0.39	68237	27300	40937	7.67
0.29	0.43	0.41	0.43	76090	30451	45639	8.60
0.30	0.45	0.42	0.45	78708	31487	47222	8.91
0.31	0.46	0.43	0.46	81271	32505	48766	9.21
0.32	0.48	0.45	0.48	83938	33511	50426	9.53
0.33	0.49	0.46	0.49	86448	34580	51868	9.84
0.33	0.50	0.47	0.50	87833	35129	52703	9.99
0.33	0.50	0.46	0.50	87206	34914	52293	9.92
0.37	0.55	0.51	0.55	96039	38374	57665	10.97
0.40	0.60	0.56	0.60	104983	42010	62972	11.99
0.43	0.64	0.60	0.64	111715	44678	67036	12.95
0.44	0.66	0.62	0.66	115472	46206	69266	13.39
0.46	0.69	0.64	0.69	120289	48174	72116	13.99
0.47	0.71	0.66	0.71	124019	49600	74418	14.45

Table B.15: Validation experiment 2, Scenario 1 results: the number of instructions estimated for the abstracted subsystems 3 and 4, with comparisons between expected and actual runtime savings for the simplified $M/M/$ case.

θ_{ss3}	θ_{ss4}	RNI S3 ($I_3 = n_3 \times$ ($\theta_{ss3} - 2$))	RNI S4 ($I_4 = n_4 \times$ ($\theta_{ss4} - 2$))	Total RNI ($I_3 + I_4$)	Predicted RS	Actual RS	Error	PE	APE
9.30	9.31	153023	230286	383309	1.44	1.34	-0.11	-7.94%	7.94%
9.34	9.36	177166	266492	443657	1.68	1.56	-0.12	-7.87%	7.87%
9.36	9.39	193574	291328	484902	1.84	1.69	-0.15	-9.11%	9.11%
9.38	9.40	201393	302979	504372	1.92	1.74	-0.17	-9.95%	9.95%
9.42	9.45	225897	339800	565697	2.16	1.95	-0.20	-10.40%	10.40%
9.43	9.46	233992	352290	586282	2.24	1.98	-0.26	-13.16%	13.16%
9.44	9.47	241978	364497	606475	2.32	2.11	-0.20	-9.69%	9.69%
9.46	9.49	249932	377682	627613	2.40	2.18	-0.22	-9.99%	9.99%
9.47	9.50	258370	389153	647523	2.48	2.27	-0.20	-9.00%	9.00%
9.48	9.51	262702	395840	658542	2.52	2.31	-0.21	-9.10%	9.10%
9.48	9.51	260991	392598	653590	2.50	2.27	-0.23	-10.21%	10.21%
9.52	9.56	288626	435834	724460	2.78	2.56	-0.22	-8.63%	8.63%
9.57	9.61	317926	479028	796953	3.06	2.69	-0.37	-13.74%	13.74%
9.60	9.65	339713	512475	852189	3.27	3.02	-0.25	-8.36%	8.36%
9.62	9.67	352228	530929	883157	3.39	3.21	-0.19	-5.84%	5.84%
9.65	9.70	368462	554774	923236	3.55	3.25	-0.30	-9.11%	9.11%
9.67	9.71	380328	574038	954366	3.67	3.37	-0.30	-9.05%	9.05%

Table B.16: Validation experiment 2, Scenario 2 results: number of instructions estimated for the abstracted subsystems 2, 3, & 4 for the child $M/M/$ case.

θ_{ss2}	θ_{ss3}	θ_{ss4}	RNI S2 ($I_2 =$ $n_2 \times (\theta_{ss2} - 2)$)	RNI S3 ($I_3 =$ $n_3 \times \theta_{ss3}$)	RNI S4 ($I_4 =$ $n_4 \times \theta_{ss4}$)
9.36	9.33	9.36	444105	177166	266492
9.39	9.36	9.39	485241	193574	291328
9.40	9.38	9.40	504802	201393	302979
9.45	9.42	9.45	567190	225897	339800
9.46	9.43	9.46	587050	233992	352290
9.47	9.44	9.47	607248	241978	364497
9.49	9.46	9.49	629310	249932	377682
9.50	9.47	9.50	649402	258370	389153
9.51	9.48	9.51	660217	262702	395840
9.51	9.48	9.51	654894	260991	392598
9.56	9.52	9.56	725207	288626	435834
9.61	9.57	9.61	798429	317926	479028
9.64	9.60	9.64	853626	339713	512475
9.66	9.62	9.67	884191	352228	530929
9.69	9.65	9.69	926378	368462	554774
9.71	9.67	9.71	957053	380328	574038

Table B.17: Validation experiment 2, Scenario 2 results: comparing expected and actual runtime savings for the simplified $M/M/$ case.

Predicted RS	Actual RS	Error	PE	APE
3.41	3.26	-0.15	-4.66%	4.66%
3.73	3.60	-0.13	-3.63%	3.63%
3.89	3.73	-0.15	-4.04%	4.04%
4.37	4.19	-0.18	-4.34%	4.34%
4.53	4.35	-0.18	-4.13%	4.13%
4.68	4.51	-0.17	-3.85%	3.85%
4.85	4.67	-0.18	-3.94%	3.94%
5.01	4.81	-0.20	-4.17%	4.17%
5.09	4.89	-0.21	-4.23%	4.23%
5.05	4.86	-0.20	-4.02%	4.02%
5.60	5.41	-0.20	-3.65%	3.65%
6.17	5.87	-0.30	-5.07%	5.07%
6.60	6.39	-0.21	-3.36%	3.36%
6.84	6.64	-0.20	-3.01%	3.01%
7.16	6.96	-0.20	-2.86%	2.86%
7.40	7.16	-0.24	-3.38%	3.38%

Table B.18: Validation experiment 2, Scenario 1: parent simulation model outcomes showing server occupancy values, number of arrivals, and runtimes for the $G/G/$ case.

Server 1 utilisation	Server 2 utilisation	Server 3 utilisation	Server 4 utilisation	Arrivals in subsystem 1 & 2 (n_2)	Arrivals in subsystem 3 (n_3)	Arrivals subsystem 4 (n_4)	Runtime (s)
0.32	0.25	0.22	0.39	56603	22639	33964	6.43
0.35	0.28	0.24	0.43	62198	24886	37312	6.89
0.37	0.29	0.25	0.45	64989	26012	38976	7.03
0.39	0.31	0.26	0.47	68851	27537	41314	7.86
0.40	0.31	0.27	0.47	69382	27798	41583	7.93
0.43	0.33	0.29	0.52	75360	30104	45256	8.65
0.45	0.35	0.30	0.53	77971	31162	46810	8.94
0.45	0.35	0.30	0.53	78131	31285	46846	8.97
0.45	0.35	0.30	0.54	78658	31406	47252	9.02
0.48	0.37	0.32	0.58	84452	33786	50666	9.31
0.49	0.38	0.33	0.59	86001	34386	51615	9.53
0.49	0.38	0.33	0.59	86360	34528	51832	9.64
0.50	0.39	0.33	0.60	87104	34810	52294	9.98
0.53	0.41	0.36	0.64	93207	37278	55929	10.84
0.53	0.42	0.36	0.64	93729	37531	56198	10.87
0.62	0.49	0.42	0.75	109410	43749	65660	12.89
0.63	0.49	0.42	0.75	109580	43795	65785	12.86
0.63	0.49	0.42	0.75	110147	44051	66095	12.93
0.66	0.51	0.44	0.79	115298	46048	69250	13.54
0.67	0.52	0.45	0.81	117705	47122	70584	13.85

Table B.19: Validation experiment 2, Scenario 1 results: number of instructions estimated for the abstracted subsystems 3 and 4; and comparisons between expected and actual runtime savings for the simplified $G/G/$ case.

θ_{ss3}	θ_{ss4}	RNI S3 ($n_3 \times (\theta_{ss3} - 2)$)	RNI S4 ($n_4 \times (\theta_{ss4} - 2)$)	Total RNI ($I_3 + I_4$)	Predicted RS	Actual RS	Error	PE	APE
9.00	9.00	158471	237751	39.62	1.38	1.22	-0.16	-13.29%	13.29%
9.00	9.00	174204	261182	43.54	1.51	1.38	-0.13	-9.18%	9.18%
9.00	9.00	182086	272834	45.49	1.57	1.31	-0.26	-19.52%	19.52%
9.00	9.01	192758	289429	48.22	1.66	1.70	0.03	2.06%	2.06%
9.00	9.01	194589	291384	48.60	1.67	1.71	0.04	2.33%	2.33%
9.00	9.04	210728	318443	52.92	1.82	1.90	0.08	4.27%	4.27%
9.00	9.05	218132	330068	54.82	1.88	1.96	0.08	4.13%	4.13%
9.00	9.05	218992	330342	54.93	1.88	1.94	0.06	2.84%	2.84%
9.00	9.06	219841	333409	55.33	1.90	1.95	0.05	2.66%	2.66%
9.00	9.09	236501	359469	59.60	2.04	1.80	-0.24	-13.16%	13.16%
9.00	9.11	240700	366844	60.75	2.07	1.82	-0.26	-14.21%	14.21%
9.00	9.11	241699	368532	61.02	2.08	1.97	-0.12	-5.92%	5.92%
9.00	9.12	243667	372162	61.58	2.10	2.35	0.25	10.65%	10.65%
9.00	9.17	260945	401028	66.20	2.25	2.47	0.21	8.61%	8.61%
9.00	9.17	262716	403213	66.59	2.27	2.43	0.16	6.65%	6.65%
9.00	9.36	306242	483054	78.93	2.67	2.89	0.21	7.42%	7.42%
9.00	9.36	306564	484136	79.07	2.68	2.94	0.27	9.02%	9.02%
9.00	9.37	308359	486893	79.53	2.69	2.93	0.24	8.03%	8.03%
9.00	9.44	322335	515298	83.76	2.83	3.04	0.21	6.87%	6.87%
9.00	9.47	329852	527576	85.74	2.90	3.00	0.11	3.50%	3.50%

Table B.20: Validation experiment 2, Scenario 2 results: number of instructions estimated for the abstracted subsystems 2, 3, & 4 for the simplified $G/G/$ case.

θ_{ss2}	θ_{ss3}	θ_{ss4}	RNI S2 ($I_2 = n_2 \times (\theta_{ss2} - 2)$)	RNI S3 ($I_3 = n_3 \times \theta_{ss3}$)	RNI S4 ($I_4 = n_4 \times \theta_{ss4}$)
9.00	9.00	9.00	509407	203749	305680
9.00	9.00	9.00	559795	223977	335806
9.00	9.00	9.00	584900	234110	350787
9.00	9.00	9.01	619721	247832	372057
9.00	9.00	9.01	624410	250186	374550
9.00	9.00	9.04	678022	270936	408955
9.00	9.00	9.05	701709	280456	423688
9.00	9.00	9.05	703327	281561	424035
9.00	9.00	9.06	708036	282653	427914
9.00	9.00	9.09	760070	304073	460801
9.00	9.00	9.11	774003	309471	470074
9.00	9.00	9.11	777131	310756	472196
9.00	9.00	9.12	783818	313287	476751
9.00	9.00	9.17	838776	335500	512886
9.00	9.00	9.17	843409	337778	515609
9.01	9.00	9.36	986553	393740	614374
9.01	9.00	9.36	987685	394154	615707
9.02	9.00	9.37	992888	396462	619083
9.03	9.00	9.44	1041759	414431	653798
9.04	9.00	9.47	1064131	424095	668744

Appendix B.4. Details Regarding the Study Code on Github.

The code developed and used for this work can be accessed from its [GitHub](#) repository. The repository has the following files:

Table B.21: Validation experiment 2, Scenario 2 results: comparing expected and actual runtime savings for the child $G/G/$ case.

Predicted RS	Actual RS	Error	PE	APE
3.43	3.52	0.09	2.69%	2.69%
3.76	3.95	0.20	4.94%	4.94%
3.92	3.90	-0.03	-0.70%	0.70%
4.15	4.39	0.24	5.41%	5.41%
4.18	4.07	-0.12	-2.94%	2.94%
4.54	4.43	-0.11	-2.45%	2.45%
4.70	4.55	-0.15	-3.28%	3.28%
4.71	4.56	-0.15	-3.36%	3.36%
4.74	4.61	-0.13	-2.89%	2.89%
5.09	4.40	-0.70	-15.82%	15.82%
5.19	4.49	-0.70	-15.54%	15.54%
5.21	4.71	-0.49	-10.49%	10.49%
5.25	4.60	-0.65	-14.20%	14.20%
5.63	5.56	-0.06	-1.13%	1.13%
5.66	5.67	0.01	0.18%	0.18%
6.64	6.69	0.05	0.80%	0.80%
6.65	6.66	0.01	0.20%	0.20%
6.68	6.76	0.08	1.16%	1.16%
7.02	6.93	-0.08	-1.22%	1.22%
7.17	7.06	-0.11	-1.55%	1.55%

1. ArrivalCount: This corresponds to the first stage of the methodology (discussed in Section 4). The code was used to obtain a relationship between the server occupancy values and the average number of instructions per arrival by analysing the simulation trace. The code extracts trace as an output for a 2-stage tandem queueing system (parent model shown in Figure 4) and for the $1s$ and ms systems if appropriate modifications are made.
2. RunTime: This piece of code was used for the second stage of the methodology to establish a relationship between the average number of instructions and the number of arrivals. The output from the model is recorded in an MS Excel spreadsheet and contains server occupancy values, average number of arrivals, and computational runtime data.
3. DistributionFitting: The code in this file was used to fit various distributions to LOS data as part of the development of the simplified model, identify the best fitting distribution and estimate its parameters.
4. NpKdeFitting: The code in this file was utilised to fit a kernel density estimator (KDE), when no parametric distribution adequately fit the data.
5. ValidationKlDivergence: The code in this file was used to perform Kullback-Leibler (KL) divergence tests. This compares LOS distributions generated by the simplified model against those generated by the parent model.
6. 3StageValidationParentModel: This file contains the code used for validation experiment 2. It is a 3-stage tandem queueing system with two parallel subsystems in the third stage.

7. The code for the first validation experiment was a modification of the RunTime file.
8. The PHC model code corresponding to validation experiment 3 can be accessed from the link: [PHC code](#).