

On Schedulability Analysis of EDF Scheduling by Considering Suspension as Blocking^{*}

Mario Günzel and Jian-Jia Chen

Department of Informatics, TU Dortmund University, Germany

Abstract. During the execution of a job, it may suspend itself, i.e., its computation ceases to process until certain activities are complete to be resumed. This paper provides a counterexample of the schedulability analysis by Devi in Euromicro Conference on Real-Time Systems (ECRTS) in 2003, which is the only existing suspension-aware analysis specialized for uniprocessor systems when preemptive earliest-deadline-first (EDF) is applied for scheduling dynamic self-suspending tasks.

1 Introduction

Self-suspension behavior has been demonstrated to appear in complex cyber-physical real-time systems, e.g., multiprocessor locking protocols, computation offloading, and multicore resource sharing, as demonstrated in [3, Section 2]. Although the impact of self-suspension behavior has been investigated since 1990, the literature of this research topic has been flawed as reported in the review by Chen et al. [3].

Although the review by Chen et al. [3] provides a comprehensive survey of the literature, two unresolved issues are listed in the concluding remark. One of them is regarding the “*correctness of Theorem 8 in [4, Section 4.5] ... supported with a rigorous proof, since self-suspension behavior has induced several non-trivial phenomena*”. This paper provides a counterexample of Theorem 8 in [4, Section 4.5] and disproves the schedulability test.

We consider a set of implicit-deadline periodic tasks, in which each task τ_i has its period T_i , worst-case self-suspension time S_i , and worst-case execution time C_i . The relative deadline D_i is set to T_i . There are two main models of self-suspending tasks: the *dynamic* self-suspension and *segmented* (or *multi-segment*) self-suspension models. Devi’s analysis in [4] considers the dynamic self-suspension model. That is, a task instance (job) released by a task τ_i can suspend arbitrarily as long as the total amount of suspension time of the job is not more than S_i .

The analysis by Devi in Theorem 8 in [4, Section 4.5] extended the analysis proposed by Jane W.S. Liu in her book [7, Page 164-165] for uniprocessor preemptive fixed-priority scheduling to uniprocessor preemptive EDF scheduling. Under preemptive EDF scheduling, the job that has the earliest absolute deadline has the highest priority. Despite the non-optimality of EDF for scheduling self-suspending task systems as shown in [8,1], EDF remains one of the most adopted scheduling strategies.

^{*} This work has been supported by Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG), as part of Sus-Aware (Project no. 398602212) and the collaborative research center SFB876, subproject A1.

Devi's analysis quantifies the additional interference due to self-suspensions from the higher-priority jobs by setting up the *blocking time* induced by self-suspensions. The correctness of the analysis by Liu in [7, Page 164-165] has been proved by Chen et al. [2] in 2016 for fixed-priority scheduling. The authors in [2] noted that “*Even though the authors in this paper are able to provide a proof to support the correctness, the authors are not able to provide any rationale behind this method which treats suspension time as blocking time.*”

Devi's analysis for implicit-deadline task systems is rephrased as follows:

Theorem 1 (Devi [4]). *Let $\mathbf{T} = \{\tau_1, \tau_2, \dots, \tau_n\}$ be a system of n implicit-deadline periodic tasks, arranged in order of non-decreasing periods. The task set \mathbf{T} is schedulable using preemptive EDF if*

$$\forall k : 1 \leq k \leq n :: \frac{B_k + B'_k}{T_k} + \sum_{i=1}^k \frac{C_i}{T_i} \leq 1,$$

where

$$B_k = \sum_{i=1}^k \min\{S_i, C_i\}$$

$$B'_k = \max_{1 \leq i \leq k} (\max\{0, S_i - C_i\}).$$

Note that the notation follows the survey paper by Chen et al. [3] instead of the original paper by Devi [4]. Moreover, Devi considered arbitrary-deadline task systems with asynchronous arrival times. Our counterexample is valid by considering two implicit-deadline periodic tasks released at the same time.

2 Counterexample for Devi's Analysis

The following task set \mathbf{T} with only two tasks provides a counterexample for Devi's analysis:

- $\tau_1 : (T_1 = D_1 = 6, C_1 = 5, S_1 = 1)$ and
- $\tau_2 : (T_2 = D_2 = 8, C_2 = \epsilon, S_2 = 0)$, for any $0 < \epsilon \leq 1/3$.

The test of Theorem 1 is as follows:

- When $k = 1$, we have $B_1 = 1$ and $B'_1 = 0$. Therefore, when $k = 1$, $\frac{B_k + B'_k}{T_k} + \sum_{i=1}^k \frac{C_i}{T_i} = 1$.
- When $k = 2$, we have $B_2 = 1$ and $B'_2 = 0$. Therefore, when $k = 2$, $\frac{B_k + B'_k}{T_k} + \sum_{i=1}^k \frac{C_i}{T_i} = \frac{1}{8} + \frac{\epsilon}{8} + \frac{5}{6} = \frac{23+3\epsilon}{24} \leq 1$, since $\epsilon \leq 1/3$.

Therefore, Devi's schedulability test concludes that the task set is feasibly scheduled by preemptive EDF. But, a concrete schedule as demonstrated in Figure 1 shows that one of the jobs of task τ_1 misses its deadline even when both tasks release their first jobs at the same time.

The example in Figure 1 shows that a job of task τ_1 may be blocked by a job of task τ_2 , which results in a deadline miss of the job of task τ_1 . However, in Devi's schedulability analysis, such blocking is never considered since B_1 and B'_1 do not have any term related to τ_2 .




Fig. 1: A concrete EDF schedule with a deadline miss.

3 Conclusion and Discussions

The counterexample in Section 2 only requires task τ_1 to suspend once. It shows that applying Devi’s analysis in [4] is unsafe even for the segmented self-suspension model under EDF scheduling. We note that the above counterexample is only for Theorem 8 in [4]. We do not examine any other schedulability tests in [4].

Although there have been many different analyses for preemptive fixed-priority scheduling, the only results for preemptive EDF are the analyses by Liu and Anderson [6], and Dong and Liu [5], which are originally formulated for multiprocessor systems, the suspension-aware analysis by Devi, and the trivial suspension-oblivious analysis, which considers suspension time of the self-suspending tasks as if they are usual execution time. (Detailed discussions can be found in [3, Section 4].) The invalidation of Devi’s analysis implies, that for preemptive EDF scheduling, there is no suspension-aware schedulability test specialized for uniprocessor systems.

References

1. J.-J. Chen. Computational complexity and speedup factors analyses for self-suspending tasks. In *Real-Time Systems Symposium (RTSS)*, pages 327–338, 2016.
2. J.-J. Chen, G. Nelissen, and W.-H. Huang. A unifying response time analysis framework for dynamic self-suspending tasks. In *Euromicro Conference on Real-Time Systems (ECRTS)*, pages 61–71, 2016.
3. J.-J. Chen, G. Nelissen, W.-H. Huang, M. Yang, B. Brandenburg, K. Bletsas, C. Liu, P. Richard, F. Ridouard, N. Audsley, R. Rajkumar, D. de Niz, and G. von der Brüggen. Many suspensions, many problems: a review of self-suspending tasks in real-time systems. *Real-Time Systems*, 55(1):144–207, 2019.
4. U. C. Devi. An improved schedulability test for uniprocessor periodic task systems. In *15th Euromicro Conference on Real-Time Systems (ECRTS)*, pages 23–32, 2003.
5. Z. Dong and C. Liu. Closing the loop for the selective conversion approach: A utilization-based test for hard real-time suspending task systems. In *Real-Time Systems Symposium (RTSS)*, pages 339–350, 2016.
6. C. Liu and J. H. Anderson. Suspension-aware analysis for hard real-time multiprocessor scheduling. In *25th Euromicro Conference on Real-Time Systems, ECRTS*, pages 271–281, 2013.
7. J. W. S. Liu. *Real-Time Systems*. Prentice Hall PTR, 1st edition, 2000.
8. F. Ridouard, P. Richard, and F. Cottet. Negative results for scheduling independent hard real-time tasks with self-suspensions. In *Real-Time Systems Symposium (RTSS)*, pages 47–56, 2004.