

# Rate Lifting for Stochastic Process Algebra

## – Exploiting Structural Properties –

Markus Siegle and Amin Soltanieh

Department of Computer Science, Bundeswehr University Munich  
 markus.siegle@unibw.de, amin.soltanieh@unibw.de

**Abstract.** This report presents an algorithm for determining the unknown rates in the sequential processes of a Stochastic Process Algebra (SPA) model, provided that the rates in the combined flat model are given. Such a rate lifting is useful for model reengineering and model repair. Technically, the algorithm works by solving systems of nonlinear equations and – if necessary – adjusting the model’s synchronisation structure without changing its transition system. This report contains the complete pseudo-code of the algorithm. The approach taken by the algorithm exploits some structural properties of SPA systems, which are formulated here for the first time and could be very beneficial also in other contexts.

**Keywords:** Stochastic Process Algebra · Structural Properties · Markov Chain · Model Repair · Rate Lifting

## 1 Introduction

Stochastic Process Algebra (SPA) is a family of formalisms widely used in the area of quantitative modelling and evaluation. Typical members of this family are PEPA [6], TIPP [5], EMPA [2], CASPA [10], but also the reactive modules language of tools such as PRISM [11] and STORM [4]. Originally devised for classical performance and dependability modelling, SPA models are now frequently used in probabilistic model checking projects.

This paper presents a solution to the following problem: Given a compositional SPA specification where the transition rates of its components are unknown, but given all transition rates of the associated low-level, flat transition system, find the unknown transition rates for the components of the high-level SPA model. An alternative formulation of the same problem is for a compositional SPA specification with known original transition rates in its components, but given rate modification factors for (a subset of) the transition rates in its flat low-level model. Here the task is to find new transition rates for the components of the high-level SPA model, such that the resulting rates in the flat model will be modified as desired. The first formulation is from the perspective of systems reengineering (to be more specific, one could call it rate reengineering), whereas the second one pertains to model checking and model repair [1,3,13]. We will refer to both variants of the problem as “rate lifting problem”.

An algorithm that solves the rate lifting problem for SPA models with  $n = 2$  components was presented in [14], the equation system involved being studied in [15]. However, developing a rate lifting algorithm for a general number  $n \geq 3$  of processes turns out to be a much bigger challenge, since – firstly – SPA models with  $n$  components may have a much more complex synchronisation structure than for  $n = 2$ , and it is the synchronisation structure which plays an essential role during the execution of the algorithm. Secondly, components of SPA models may contain selfloops (meant to synchronise with other components), and – related to this – the transition system underlying a compositional SPA model is actually a flattened multi-transition system [6,5]. These two facts have to be considered during the necessary deconstruction of a flat transition, and they strongly contribute to the complication of the problem. So, in this paper we develop a rate lifting algorithm for an SPA system consisting of  $n$  components, where  $n$  is arbitrary. The algorithm will assign (new) values to the components' transition rates and – under certain circumstances – it will change the synchronisation structure of the SPA model. The latter means that the algorithm may add actions to certain synchronisation sets and in consequence it will insert additional selfloops at some specific component states, but it will do this in such a way that the set of reachable states and the set of transitions of the overall model are not changed. Only the transition rates of the overall model are set/changed as desired. Technically, the algorithm works by setting up and solving systems of nonlinear (actually multilinear) equations.

It is quite easy to see that an arbitrary assignment of rates to the transitions of the low-level transition system may not always be realisable by suitable rates in the components, i.e. not every instance of the rate lifting problem has a solution. Therefore, naturally, the algorithm presented in this paper will not always succeed. However, it is guaranteed that the algorithm will find a solution, if such a solution exists (see Sec. 6).

We build our algorithm based on certain structural properties of SPA systems, which can be exploited in the course of the algorithm. As an example, for a given transition in one of the SPA components, it is necessary to identify the partners which may or must synchronise with it. To the best of our knowledge, these fundamental properties have not previously been addressed in the literature, which is suprising, since they could be very valuable also in other contexts. For example, in compositional system verification, distinguishing between different types of neighbourhoods of processes or determining the participating set of a transition (see Sec. 2) is the key to establishing dependence / independence relations between processes.

## 2 Structural Properties of SPA

We consider a simple but fairly general class of Markovian Stochastic Process Algebra models constructed by the following grammar:

**Definition 1.** (SPA language) *For a finite set of actions  $Act$ , let  $a \in Act$  and  $A \subseteq Act$ . Let  $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}^{>0}$  be a transition rate. An SPA system  $Sys$  is a process of*

type  $Comp$ , constructed according to the following grammar:

$$\begin{aligned} Comp &:= (Comp \parallel_A Comp) \mid Seq \\ Seq &:= 0 \mid (a, \lambda); Seq \mid Seq + Seq \mid V \end{aligned}$$

$Seq$  stands for sequential processes, and  $Comp$  for composed processes.  $V$  stands for a process variable for a sequential process, which can be used to define cyclic behaviour (including selfloops). One could add a recursion operator, the special invisible action  $\tau$ , hiding and other features, but this is not essential for our purpose. The semantics is standard, i.e. the SPA specification is mapped to the underlying flat transition system (an action-labelled CTMC), see e.g. [6,5]. It should be mentioned that we assume multiway synchronisation<sup>1</sup>, i.e. the synchronisation of two  $a$ -transitions yields another  $a$ -transition (whose rate is a function of the two partner transitions, or – even more general – of the two partner processes), which can then participate in further  $a$ -synchronisations, etc..

An SPA system corresponds to a process tree whose internal nodes are labelled by the parallel composition operator, each one parametrized by a set of synchronising actions ( $\parallel_A$ , with  $A \subseteq Act$ ), and whose leaves are sequential processes of type  $Seq$ . For a specific action  $a \in Act$ , we write  $\parallel_a$  as an abbreviation to express that  $a$  belongs to the set of synchronising actions, and  $\parallel_{\neg a}$  that it does not.


**Definition 2.** *Let  $Sys$  be a given SPA system.*

- (a) *The set of all sequential processes within  $Sys$  is denoted as  $seqproc(Sys)$  (i.e. the set of all leaves of the process tree of  $Sys$ ).*
- (b) *The set of all (sequential or composed) processes within  $Sys$  is denoted as  $proc(Sys)$ .*

The set  $proc(Sys)$  equals the set of all nodes of the process tree of  $Sys$ . Obviously,  $seqproc(Sys) \subseteq proc(Sys)$ .

Let us denote all actions occurring in the syntactical specification of a sequential process  $P \in seqproc(Sys)$  as  $Act(P)$ . We can extend this definition to an arbitrary process  $X \in proc(Sys)$  by writing  $Act(X) = \bigcup Act(P_i)$ , where the union is over those sequential processes  $P_i$  that are in the subtree of  $X$ . For a sequential process  $P$ , the fact that  $a \in Act(P)$  means that  $P$  (considered in isolation) can actually at some point in its dynamic behaviour perform action  $a$ . However, for a process  $X \in proc(Sys) \setminus seqproc(Sys)$ , the fact that  $a \in Act(X)$  does not necessarily mean that  $X$  can actually perform action  $a$ . As an example, think of  $X = P \parallel_a Q$ , where  $a \in Act(P)$  but  $a \notin Act(Q)$ . As another example, think of the same  $X$  where  $a \in Act(P)$  and  $a \in Act(Q)$  but no combined state is reachable in which both  $P$  and  $Q$  can perform action  $a$ . Therefore, we define  $Act_{perf}(X) \subseteq Act(X)$  to be those actions that  $X$  (considered in isolation) can actually perform. While  $Act(X)$  is a purely syntactical concept,  $Act_{perf}(X)$  is a behavioural concept.

<sup>1</sup> Unlike, e.g., the process algebra CCS which has two-way synchronisation [12]

Fig. 1:  $(P_1 \parallel_{\{a\}} P_2) \parallel_{\{b\}} (P_3 \parallel_{\{b\}} (P_4 \parallel_{\{a\}} P_5))$ 

Given two processes  $X, Y \in \text{proc}(\text{Sys})$ , we say that  $X$  and  $Y$  are disjoint if and only if they do not share any part of the process tree of  $\text{Sys}$ . Inside the disjoint processes  $X$  and/or  $Y$ , different actions (from  $\text{Act}(X)$  and  $\text{Act}(Y)$ ) may take place, among them the specific action  $a$ , say. Synchronisation on action  $a$  between  $X$  and  $Y$  is possible if and only if the root of the smallest subtree containing both  $X$  and  $Y$  is of type  $\parallel_a$ . Maximal  $\parallel_a$ -rooted subtrees are called  $a$ -scopes, as formalized in the following definition.

**Definition 3.** Let  $a \in \text{Act}$ . An  $a$ -scope within an SPA system  $\text{Sys}$  is a subtree rooted at a node of type  $\parallel_a$ , provided that on all nodes on the path from that node to the root of  $\text{Sys}$  there is no further synchronisation on action  $a$  (i.e. all nodes on that path, including the root, are of type  $\parallel_{\neg a}$ ). Furthermore, as a special case, if  $P \in \text{seqproc}(\text{Sys})$  and there is no  $a$ -synchronisation on the path from  $P$  to the root of the process tree of  $\text{Sys}$ , we say that  $P$  by itself is an  $a$ -scope.

For example, in the system shown in Figure 1, subtrees rooted at  $X_1$  and  $X_4$  are  $a$ -scopes, and sequential process  $P_3$  is also an  $a$ -scope. The only  $b$ -scope of this system is at the root of the system, i.e.  $X_2$ .

Note that, according to this definition,  $a$ -scopes are always maximal, i.e. an  $a$ -scope can never be a proper subset of another  $a$ -scope. Clearly, if the root node of  $\text{Sys}$  requires synchronisation on action  $a$ , then the whole  $\text{Sys}$  is a single  $a$ -scope. Synchronisation via action  $a$  is impossible between two distinct  $a$ -scopes. But even within a single  $a$ -scope, not all processes can / need to synchronise on action  $a$ . The following definition answers the question (from the perspective of a sequential process  $P$ ) which processes cannot / may / must synchronise with an  $a$ -transition in process  $P$ .

**Definition 4.** For  $a \in \text{Act}$ , consider the  $a$ -transitions within process  $P \in \text{seqproc}(\text{Sys})$ . Let  $X \in \text{proc}(\text{Sys})$  be such that  $P$  and  $X$  are disjoint (i.e. that  $P$  is not part of  $X$ ). Let  $r$  be the root of the smallest subtree that contains both  $P$  and  $X$ .

(a)  $X \in N_{\text{cannot}}(\text{Sys}, P, a)$  iff  $r$  is of type  $\parallel_{\neg a}$ .

- (b)  $X \in N_{may}(Sys, P, a)$  iff  $r$  is of type  $\parallel_a$  but on the path<sup>2</sup> from  $r$  to  $X$  there exists a node of type  $\parallel_{\neg a}$ .
- (c)  $X \in N_{must}(Sys, P, a)$  iff  $r$  is of type  $\parallel_a$  and on the path from  $r$  to  $X$  all nodes are of type  $\parallel_a$ .

*Remark 1.* Note that for a process  $X$  it is possible that  $X \in N_{may}(Sys, P, a)$  or  $X \in N_{must}(Sys, P, a)$  even if  $a \notin Act_{perf}(X)$  (or even  $a \notin Act(X)$ ), which of course means that  $X$  will never be able to synchronise on action  $a$ . This is considered below in the definition of the set  $IS_r$  (cf. Def. 5). Related to this observation, note further that a process  $X \in N_{may}(Sys, P, a)$  could actually be forced to synchronise with  $P$  on action  $a$  (i.e. it could be that  $X$  must synchronise with  $P$  on  $a$ , even though  $X \notin N_{must}(Sys, P, a)$ ). For example, if  $Sys = P \parallel_a (Q \parallel_{\neg a} R)$  then  $Q \in N_{may}(Sys, P, a)$  and  $R \in N_{may}(Sys, P, a)$ , but if  $a \notin Act(Q)$  then  $P$  always needs  $R$  as a synchronisation partner on action  $a$ .

**Lemma 1.** (a) The neighbourhood  $N_{cannot}(Sys, P, a)$  is disjoint from  $N_{may}(Sys, P, a)$  and  $N_{must}(Sys, P, a)$ .  
 (b) Every  $X \in N_{may}(Sys, P, a)$  is a subtree of some  $Y \in N_{must}(Sys, P, a)$ .

*Proof.* Part (a) follows directly from the definition. Part(b): For given  $X$ , one such node  $Y$  is the node directly below  $r$  on the path from  $r$  (as defined in Def. 4) to  $X$ .

## 2.1 Moving Set and Participating Set

Given a system  $Sys$  constructed from  $n$  sequential processes  $P_1, \dots, P_n$ , its global state is a vector  $(s_1, \dots, s_n)$  where  $s_i$  is the state of  $P_i$ . We follow the convention that the ordering of processes is given by the in-order (LNR) traversal of the process tree of  $Sys$ . A transition  $t$  in the flat transition system of  $Sys$  is given by

$$t = ((s_1, \dots, s_n) \xrightarrow{a, \lambda_s} (s'_1, \dots, s'_n))$$

where for at least one  $k \in \{1, \dots, n\}$  we have  $s_k \neq s'_k$  and where the transition rate  $rate(t) = \lambda_s$  is a function of the rates of the transitions of the participating processes. For such a transition  $t$  we introduce the following notation:

$$\begin{aligned} action(t) &= a & rate(t) &= \lambda_s \\ source(t) &= (s_1, \dots, s_n) & target(t) &= (s'_1, \dots, s'_n) \\ source_i(t) &= s_i & target_i(t) &= s'_i \end{aligned}$$

But which are actually the participating processes in the above transition  $t$ ? For an  $a$ -transition  $t$  as above, we define the moving set  $MS(t)$  as the set of those sequential processes whose state changes, i.e.  $MS(t) = \{P_k \mid s_k \neq s'_k\}$ . The complement of the moving set is called the stable set  $SS(t)$ , i.e.  $SS(t) = \{P_1, \dots, P_n\} \setminus MS(t)$ .

<sup>2</sup> “Path” here means all nodes strictly between  $r$  and the root of  $X$ .

Since processes may contain selfloops and since synchronisation on selfloops is possible (and often used as a valuable feature to control the context of a transition), the participating set  $PS(t)$  of transition  $t$  can also include processes which participate in  $t$  in an invisible way by performing a self-loop. Therefore  $PS(t)$  can be larger than  $MS(t)$ , i.e. in general we have  $MS(t) \subseteq PS(t)$ . Processes in  $SS(t)$  which *must* synchronise on  $a$  with one of the elements of  $MS(t)$  must have an  $a$ -selfloop at their current state and must belong to  $PS(t)$ . Furthermore, processes in  $SS(t)$  which *may* synchronise on  $a$  with one of the elements of  $MS(t)$  and have an  $a$ -selfloop at their current state may also belong to  $PS(t)$ , provided that they are not in the  $N_{cannot}$ -neighbourhood of one of the processes of  $MS(t)$ . Altogether we get:

$$\begin{aligned}
 PS(t) = & MS(t) \cup \\
 & \left\{ P_i \in SS(t) \mid \right. \\
 & \left( \exists P_j \in MS(t) : \right. \\
 & \left( P_i \in N_{must}(Sys, P_j, a) \right. \\
 & \left. \vee (P_i \in N_{may}(Sys, P_j, a) \wedge (\text{selfloop } s_i \xrightarrow{a, \lambda_i} s_i \text{ exists and is enabled in } source(t))) \right) \\
 & \left. \wedge ( \nexists P_j \in MS(t) : P_i \in N_{cannot}(Sys, P_j, a) ) \right\}
 \end{aligned}$$

The condition “selfloop ... is enabled in  $source(t)$ ” means that the selfloop in  $P_i$  can actually take place in the source state of transition  $t$ , i.e. it is not blocked by any lacking synchronisation partner(s). Note that for the case  $P_i \in N_{must}(Sys, P_j, a)$  there obviously exists a selfloop in process  $P_i$ , but this existence is implicit, so we do not have to write it down. In Appendix E, a procedure for practically calculating  $PS(t)$  is given.

Using an example we show why the definition of  $PS(t)$  needs to be so complicated, in particular why being in the *may* neighbourhood of a moving component and having a selfloop is not enough to become a participating component. For the system shown in Figure 2, we wish to find  $PS(t)$  where  $t = ((1, 1, 3, 1, 2) \xrightarrow{a} (2, 1, 3, 1, 2))$ .  $P_1$  is the only moving component, and assume that there are  $a$ -selfloops in state 1 in  $P_2$  and also in state 3 in  $P_3$ , but that there are no  $a$ -selfloops in state 1 of  $P_4$  and in state 2 of  $P_5$ .  $P_2 \in N_{may}(Sys, P_1, a)$  is in  $PS(t)$ , since its selfloop can take place without hindrance, whereas  $P_3 \in N_{may}(Sys, P_1, a)$  is not included in  $PS(t)$ , since its selfloop, although it exists, is not enabled in the source state of transition  $t$  (it would need  $P_4$  or  $P_5$  as a synchronisation partner).

## 2.2 Involved Set

In addition to the Participating Set  $PS(t)$  of a transition  $t$ , we also need to define the Involved Set  $IS(t)$  which can be larger than  $PS(t)$ , since it also contains those processes which may synchronise on action  $a$  with one of the processes in  $PS(t)$  (in another transition  $t'$ ), and so on, inductively. Formally:

**Definition 5.** For a transition  $t$  with  $action(t) = a$  we define




Fig. 2:  $P_1 \parallel_{\{a,b,c\}} (P_2 \parallel_{\{c\}} (P_3 \parallel_{\{a\}} (P_4 \parallel_{\{b,c\}} P_5)))$

(i) *The Involved Set*

$$IS(t) = PS(t) \cup \left\{ P_k \in seqproc(Sys) \mid \exists P_j \in IS(t) : (P_k \in N_{may}(Sys, P_j, a)) \right\}$$

(ii) *The restricted Involved Set*  $IS_r(t) = \{P \in IS(t) \mid action(t) \in Act(P)\}$ .

So  $IS(t)$  represents the convex hull of the  $N_{may}$ -neighbourhood of one of the participating processes. That's why after the existential quantor in part (i) we have to write  $P_j \in IS(t)$  instead of only  $P_j \in PS(t)$ . The definition of the restricted Involved Set  $IS_r(t)$  is motivated by the observation in Remark 1. The idea is to omit those sequential processes  $P$  from  $IS(t)$  where  $a \notin Act(P)$ , since they will never actually synchronise on action  $a$  with any other process.

In some cases  $IS(t) = PS(t)$ , but it can be easily shown by example that  $IS(t)$  may be a strict superset of  $PS(t)$ . Consider the system

$$Sys = (P_1 \parallel_{-a} P_2) \parallel_a (P_3 \parallel_a P_4)$$

and the transition  $t = ((s_1, s_2, s_3, s_4) \xrightarrow{a, \lambda_s} (s'_1, s_2, s'_3, s_4))$ . The moving set is  $MS(t) = \{P_1, P_3\}$ , and there is obviously a selfloop in  $P_4$  of the form  $s_4 \xrightarrow{a, \lambda_4} s_4$ , so the participating set is  $PS(t) = \{P_1, P_3, P_4\}$ . However,  $P_2$  is also (indirectly) involved since it is possible that in some other transition  $P_3$  (and  $P_4$ ) will synchronise on action  $a$  with  $P_2$ . More concretely: The transitions  $s_3 \xrightarrow{a, \lambda_3} s'_3$  (in  $P_3$ ) and  $s_4 \xrightarrow{a, \lambda_4} s_4$  (in  $P_4$ ) may synchronise with  $s'_2 \xrightarrow{a, \lambda_2} s''_2$  (in  $P_2$ ) (for some states  $s'_2$  and  $s''_2$  of  $P_2$ ). Therefore we get  $IS(t) = \{P_1, P_2, P_3, P_4\}$ . This will be important for our rate lifting algorithm (Sec. 4), since if we didn't take the involvement of  $P_2$  into account, we might change some rates in  $P_3$  and/or  $P_4$  which would have side effects on other transitions. This means that we have to set up a system of equations involving all four processes.

The following lemma establishes the connection between a transition's Involved Set  $IS(t)$  (a behavioural concept) and the  $a$ -scope from Def. 3, which latter is a structural concept.

**Lemma 2.** *For a transition  $t$  of the SPA system  $Sys$ , with  $action(t) = a$ , let  $r$  be the root of the smallest tree containing all processes of  $IS(t)$ .*

- (i) *Then  $r$  is a node of type  $\parallel_a$ .*
- (ii) *There is no other node of type  $\parallel_a$  “above”  $r$  (i.e. on the path from  $r$  to the root of  $Sys$ ).*
- (iii) *The Involved Set  $IS(t)$  is exactly the set of all sequential processes in the subtree rooted at  $r$ .*
- (iv) *The Involved Set  $IS(t)$  is exactly the set of sequential processes in the  $a$ -scope rooted at  $r$ . So, in a sense, the Involved Set and the  $a$ -scope are equal.*

*Proof.* (i) Assume that  $r$  was of type  $\parallel_{-a}$ . Then no process  $P_l \in IS(t)$  in the left subtree of  $r$  could synchronise (on action  $a$ ) with any process  $P_r \in IS(t)$  in the right subtree of  $r$ , which contradicts the fact that the set  $IS(t)$  contains processes in both subtrees of  $r$ .

(ii) Furthermore, assume that there is another node  $r_2$  of type  $\parallel_a$  on the path from  $r$  to the root of  $Sys$ . Then any  $a$  transition in one of the processes of  $IS(t)$  would have to synchronise with some process in the other subtree of  $r_2$ , which means that the subtree rooted at  $r$  does actually not contain all processes of  $IS(t)$ , which is a contradiction.

(iii) Assume that there is a sequential process  $P_{not}$  in the left subtree of the tree rooted at  $r$  such that  $P_{not} \notin IS(t)$ . We know that there exists a sequential process  $P_r$  in the right subtree of the tree rooted at  $r$  such that  $P_r \in IS(t)$ . Then, since according to (i)  $r$  is of type  $\parallel_a$ , either  $P_{not} \in N_{may}(Sys, P_r, a)$  or  $P_{not} \in N_{must}(Sys, P_r, a)$ . But from this it follows that  $P_{not}$  would have to be in  $IS(t)$ , which is a contradiction. A symmetric argument holds if we assume that there is a sequential process  $P_{not}$  in the right subtree of the tree rooted at  $r$ . Furthermore, any sequential process  $P_{not}$  not in the subtree rooted at  $r$  cannot be in  $IS(t)$  because according to (ii) there is no  $a$ -synchronisation above  $r$ .

(iv) This is an immediate consequence of (i) - (iii).

**Lemma 3.** *For two transitions  $t_1$  and  $t_2$  with  $action(t_1) = action(t_2)$ , if  $IS(t_1) \cap IS(t_2) \neq \emptyset$  then  $IS(t_1) = IS(t_2)$ .*

*Proof.* This follows directly from the closure property of the  $IS$  definition.

### 3 “Parallel” Transitions and Relevant Selfloop Combinations

#### 3.1 Multi-Transition System

It is well known that the semantic model underlying an SPA specification is actually a *multi*-transition system [6,5]. This is usually flattened to an ordinary transition system by adding up the rates of “parallel” transitions, i.e. transitions which have the same source state, the same target state and the same action label. Thus a transition within  $Sys$  may be the aggregation of more than one transition. As an example, consider the system  $Sys = P \parallel_a (Q \parallel_{-a} R)$  and the



transition  $t = ((s_1, s_2, s_3) \xrightarrow{a, \lambda_s} (s'_1, s_2, s_3))$ . The moving set is  $MS(t) = \{P\}$ , but the participating set must be larger. Assume that  $Q$  has a selfloop  $s_2 \xrightarrow{a, \lambda_2} s_2$  and that  $R$  has a selfloop  $s_3 \xrightarrow{a, \lambda_3} s_3$ . Since  $Q$  and  $R$  do not synchronise on  $a$ , only one of those two selfloops synchronises with  $s_1 \xrightarrow{a, \lambda_1} s'_1$  at a time, but both selfloops may synchronise with the  $a$ -transition in  $P$ . This yields the two “parallel” transitions

$$((s_1, s_2, s_3) \xrightarrow{a, \lambda_{12}} (s'_1, s_2, s_3)) \quad \text{and} \quad ((s_1, s_2, s_3) \xrightarrow{a, \lambda_{13}} (s'_1, s_2, s_3))$$


(where  $\lambda_{12}$  is a function of  $\lambda_1$  and  $\lambda_2$ , and likewise for  $\lambda_{13}$ ) which are aggregated to the single transition  $((s_1, s_2, s_3) \xrightarrow{a, \lambda_{12} + \lambda_{13}} (s'_1, s_2, s_3))$ , so  $\lambda_s = \lambda_{12} + \lambda_{13}$ . As an anticipation of Eq. 1 in Sec. 4, let us mention that in this situation our rate lifting algorithm would create the equation  $x_{s_1 s'_1}^{(P)} x_{s_2 s_2}^{(Q)} + x_{s_1 s'_1}^{(P)} x_{s_3 s_3}^{(R)} = \lambda_s \cdot f$ .

### 3.2 Calculating Relevant Selfloop Combinations

In the simple (and most common) case that none of the sequential processes in the SPA specification of  $Sys$  has any selfloops (and also no “parallel” transitions), we know that any transition of the flat transition system has only one single semantic derivation. In consequence, for the considered flat transition  $t$  it then holds that  $PS(t) = MS(t)$ . However, as discussed above, in the general case the flat transition system underlying a compositional SPA specification is actually a multi-transition system which gets flattened to an ordinary transition system by amalgamating “parallel” transitions. In order to cover this general case, in the lifting algorithm (see Sec. 4) we have to do the opposite: Instead of amalgamation, we need to deconstruct a flat transition into its constituents. I.e., given a flat transition (which is possibly amalgamated from parallel transitions), we need to find out the contributing transitions, in order to be able to construct the correct equation in line 55 of the algorithm (Eq. 1 in Sec. 4).

Consider the flat transition  $t := ((s_1, \dots, s_n) \xrightarrow{c, \gamma \cdot f} (s'_1, \dots, s'_n))$ . We can determine its (non-empty) moving set  $MS(t)$  and its participating set  $PS(t)$ , where we know that  $MS(t) \subseteq PS(t)$ . We are particularly interested in the processes from the set  $(PS(t) \cap SS(t)) \setminus \bigcup_{P \in MS(t)} N_{must}(Sys, P, c)$ , since these are exactly the processes that may (but not must) contribute to transition  $t$ . Certain combinations of these processes (which have selfloops, otherwise they wouldn't be in  $PS(t)$ ) contribute to transition  $t$ . We call these combinations “relevant selfloop combinations (rslc)”. Note that there are also selfloops in  $\bigcup_{P \in MS(t)} N_{must}(Sys, P, c)$ , but they are not part of rslc.

It remains to calculate rslc for transition  $t$ . For this purpose, we define a function  $rslc(t)$  which returns a set of sets of sequential processes, i.e. each such set describes a relevant selfloop combination. In the process tree of  $Sys$ , let  $r$  be the root node of the smallest subtree containing  $PS(t)$ . We know that  $r$  is either an inner node of type  $\parallel_c$  or a leaf (if  $r$  were an inner node of type  $\parallel_{-c}$ , the participating set  $PS(t)$  couldn't span both subtrees of  $r$ ). Calling the recursive

Fig. 3:  $((P \parallel_{-c} Q) \parallel_c (R \parallel_{-c} S)) \parallel_c (T \parallel_{-c} U)$ 

algorithm in Appendix B by the top-level call  $RSLC(t, r)$  delivers all the relevant selfloop combinations<sup>3</sup>.

Example: Consider the SPA specification  $Sys = ((P \parallel_{-c} Q) \parallel_c (R \parallel_{-c} S)) \parallel_c (T \parallel_{-c} U)$  whose process tree is shown in Figure 3, and the transition  $t := ((s_P, s_Q, s_R, s_S, s_T, s_U) \xrightarrow{c, \gamma \cdot f} (s'_P, s_Q, s_R, s_S, s_T, s_U))$ . Obviously, the moving set is  $MS(t) = \{P\}$ , and if we assume that there are  $c$ -selfloops in states  $s_R, s_S, s_T$  and  $s_U$  (in all of them!), the participating set is  $PS(t) = \{P, R, S, T, U\}$ . So transition  $t$  can be realised as any combination of a selfloop in  $R$  or  $S$  with a selfloop in  $T$  or  $U$ , thus the algorithm will find the set of relevant selfloop combinations  $\{\{R, T\}, \{R, U\}, \{S, T\}, \{S, U\}\}$ .

Anticipating once again Eq. 1 from Sec. 4, this set of relevant selfloop combinations would lead to the desired equation

$$x_{s_P s'_P}^{(P)} x_{s_R s_R}^{(R)} x_{s_T s_T}^{(T)} + x_{s_P s'_P}^{(P)} x_{s_R s_R}^{(R)} x_{s_U s_U}^{(U)} + x_{s_P s'_P}^{(P)} x_{s_S s_S}^{(S)} x_{s_T s_T}^{(T)} + x_{s_P s'_P}^{(P)} x_{s_S s_S}^{(S)} x_{s_U s_U}^{(U)} = \gamma \cdot f$$

Alternatively, if we assumed that the participating set was smaller, say  $PS(t) = \{P, R, S, T\}$  (i.e. if there were no  $c$ -selfloop at  $s_U$ ), then the algorithm would find a smaller set of relevant selfloop combinations, namely  $\{\{R, T\}, \{S, T\}\}$ , leading to the simpler equation  $x_{s_P s'_P}^{(P)} x_{s_R s_R}^{(R)} x_{s_T s_T}^{(T)} + x_{s_P s'_P}^{(P)} x_{s_S s_S}^{(S)} x_{s_T s_T}^{(T)} = \gamma \cdot f$

## 4 Lifting Algorithm

Our new lifting algorithm processes the transitions whose rates are to be modified in a one by one fashion. It is, however, not strictly one by one, since in many situations a whole set of “related” transitions is taken into account together with the currently processed transition. The algorithm consists of four parts named A, B, C and D as shown in Figure 4. In part A, for a transition whose involved set consists of only one single sequential process, the algorithm first tries to change its rate by local repair, which means changing the rate locally in exactly this

<sup>3</sup> Note that  $rslc(t)$  as called in the lifting algorithm has one argument (a transition) but the recursive function  $RSLC(t, n)$  (see Appendix B) has two arguments (a transition and a node of the process tree).




Fig. 4: Overview of the algorithm

sequential process. Local repair will fail, however, if two flat transitions which both originate from the same local transition have different modification factors. In part B, which is the starting point for transitions whose involved set contains at least two processes, the algorithm creates a system of nonlinear equations and tries to solve it. This system of equations covers all transitions with the same action label and the same involved set, i.e. all these transitions are dealt with simultaneously in one system of equations. The basic idea behind the system of equations is to consider all involved local rates as variables whose values are to be determined. Part C, entered upon failure of Part B, is the first part where the system specification is modified by augmenting some synchronisation sets and inserting selfloops, all within the current  $c$ -scope. These modifications are done in such a way that the global transition system is not changed. Again, like in part B, the algorithm creates a set of nonlinear equations (but now the system of equations is larger since the model has been modified) and tries to solve it. If the previous steps have failed, Part D tries to expand the scope, by modifying the system in a larger scope than the current involved set. This means that the involved set is artificially augmented by adding action  $c$  to the synchronisation set at a higher node. Again, a similar but even larger system of equations of the same type is constructed. However, even this system of equations may not have a solution, in which case the desired rate lifting has turned out to be impossible.

#### 4.1 Spurious Transitions

As we have seen, in certain situations the rate lifting algorithm needs to change the synchronisation structure of the given system, i.e. it will change an inner node of type  $||_{-c}$  to a node of type  $||_c$ . Clearly, this needs to be done with great care, since such a step will – in general – change the behaviour of the system. Therefore the algorithm, before adding action  $c$  to a synchronisation set, has to ensure that no spurious transitions will be generated. Spurious transitions (sp. tr.) are

extra, superfluous transitions not present in the original system, and therefore incorrect. Furthermore, after action  $c$  has been added to a synchronisation set, the algorithm also has to ensure that all transitions in the original system are still possible (it could easily be that a previously existing transition now lacks a synchronisation partner in the newly synchronised system). For that purpose, the algorithm inserts selfloops into the sequential components, wherever necessary. There are actually two types of spurious transitions:

- (A) Superfluous transitions which appear when two previously  $c$ -non-synchronised components become synchronised over action  $c$ .
- (B) Superfluous transitions which appear when a new  $c$ -selfloop is inserted into a sequential process which is in the  $c$ -must- or  $c$ -may-neighbourhood of another process.

Overall, the algorithm guarantees that even though the synchronisation structure of the system may be altered and artificial selfloops are inserted, the set of reachable states and the set of transitions remain the same.

## 4.2 Informal Description of the Algorithm

Appendix A shows our new rate lifting algorithm. The arguments of the algorithm are the SPA system  $Sys$  and its flat transition system  $T$  (a set of transitions), the set of transitions whose rate is to be modified  $T_{mod} \subseteq T$  as well as a function  $factor$  that returns, for each transition in  $T_{mod}$ , its modification factor<sup>4</sup>. For transitions not in  $T_{mod}$ , the modification factor is supposed to be 1.

In each iteration of the outer while-loop, the algorithm picks one of the remaining transitions from  $T_{mod}$ , called  $\hat{t}$  with action label called  $c$ , and processes it (possibly together with other transitions that have the same action label).

**(Part A) Local repair:** If the involved set of the currently processed transition  $\hat{t}$  consists of only one single process, the algorithm tries to adjust the rate of exactly one transition in that process. This is done in lines 20–36 of the algorithm. However, this will only work if all transitions where this process makes the same move have the same, common modification factor. That set of transitions is denoted as  $T_{c, \hat{s}_{i_1}, \hat{s}'_{i_1}}$  in the algorithm, and the common modification factor is denoted as  $f_{com}$ .

**(Part B) System of equations for  $T_c$ :** If the involved set of the currently processed transition  $\hat{t}$  consists of two or more processes, all transitions with the same involved set and the same action as  $\hat{t}$  are processed together (lines 47–63). In the algorithm, this set of transitions is denoted  $T_c$ . For every transition  $t \in T_c$ , the algorithm determines its participating set  $PS(t)$ , calculates the relevant selfloop combinations (rslc) and from this information creates a nonlinear equation

$$\sum_{C \in rslc(t)} \prod_{P \in MS(t)} x_{s_P s'_P}^{(P)} \prod_{\substack{Q \in PS(t) \setminus MS(t) \\ \wedge \exists P \in MS(t): Q \in N_{must}(Sys, P, c)}} x_{s_Q s_Q}^{(Q)} \prod_{R \in C} x_{s_R s_R}^{(R)} = \gamma \cdot f \quad (1)$$

<sup>4</sup> Thus, this presentation of the algorithm addresses model repair rather than rate reengineering (cf. Sec. 1).

where the  $x$ 's are the unknown rates of the participating processes (some of which are rates of selfloops, if such exist in the system). The superscript of variable  $x^{(\cdot)}$  identifies the sequential process, and the subscript denotes the source/target pair of states. The equation reflects the fact that the rates of all synchronising processes are multiplied<sup>5</sup>, and that the total rate is obtained as the sum over all possible relevant selfloop combinations. Afterwards, this system of equations is solved, and if a solution exists, all  $c$ -transitions in the current  $c$ -scope have been successfully dealt with. We would like to point out that, if for some transition  $t$  the participating set  $PS(t)$  is equal to its moving set  $MS(t)$ , then the resulting equation has a much simpler form

$$x_{s_1 s'_1}^{(P_1)} \cdot x_{s_2 s'_2}^{(P_2)} \cdot \dots \cdot x_{s_k s'_k}^{(P_k)} = \gamma \cdot f$$

(assuming that  $|MS(t)| = k$ ), since in this case, there are no selfloops involved, and therefore also no combinations of selfloops to be considered.

**(Part C) Expanding the context of  $c$ -transitions by synchronising with more processes and inserting artificial selfloops within the current  $c$ -scope:** If the system of equations constructed in part (B) for the set  $T_c$  had no solution, it is the strategy of the algorithm to involve more processes (for the moment only from the current  $c$ -scope), since this opens up more opportunity for controlling the context of these  $c$ -transitions, and thereby controlling their rates. In this part of the algorithm (lines 68–96),  $action(\dot{t}) = c$  is added to the synchronisation set at each node of type  $||_{-c}$  in the current  $c$ -scope, except where this would lead to spurious transitions (of type A or type B). These tasks of the algorithm are outsourced to function TRYSYNC (called in line 75). In TRYSYNC (the details of which are elaborated on in Appendix C), checking for spurious transitions of type A is done by checking all source states of transitions in the current  $T_c$ , making sure that there are no concurrently enabled  $c$ -transitions in newly synchronised subprocesses. After adding action  $c$  to some synchronisation sets, we also have to make sure that all transitions originally in  $T_c$  can still occur, i.e. that they have not been disabled by the new synchronisations. This is also done in function TRYSYNC, by inserting the necessary selfloops in those processes which are now newly synchronising on action  $c$ , provided that those new selfloops do not lead to the existence of spurious transitions (of type B). The steps just described guarantee that the modified system  $Sys'$  has exactly the same set of transitions as the original system  $Sys$  (qualitatively), but it remains to find the correct rates of all  $c$ -transitions in the involved processes. For this purpose, a similar (but larger) system of equations as in part (B) is set up and solved.

**(Part D) Expanding the Involved Set by moving the current root upwards:** It is possible that the systems of equations constructed in part (B)

<sup>5</sup> Multiplication of rates is a de facto standard for Markovian SPAs, as implemented, for example, by the tools PRISM and STORM. If the rate resulting from the synchronisation of two or more processes were defined other than the product of the participating rates, the equation would have to be changed accordingly, but apart from this change, the lifting algorithm would still work in the same way.

N	6	7	8	9	10	11
Total number of states	576	1344	3072	6912	15360	33792
Total number of transitions	2208	5824	14848	36864	89600	214016
Number of $loop_{1a}$ -transitions	32	64	128	256	512	1024

Table 1: Model statistics of the combined model for different numbers of stations

and thereafter in part (C) both have no solution. In this case, the algorithm seeks to expand the current  $c$ -scope by moving its root up by one level (unless the root of the overall system has already been reached). Again, it needs to be ensured that no spurious transitions would be created from this step. This is done in lines 107–127 of the algorithm, again with the help of function TRYSYNC.

## 5 Experimental Result: Cyclic Server Polling System

This section considers – as a case study – the Cyclic Server Polling System from the PRISM CTMC benchmarks, originally described in [7] as a GSPNs. It is a system where a single server polls  $N$  stations and provides service for them in cyclic order. The SPA representation of this system is:

$$Sys = Server \parallel_{\Sigma_s} (Station_1 \parallel Station_2 \parallel \dots \parallel Station_N)$$

where  $\Sigma_s = \{loop_{ia}, loop_{ib}, serve_i \mid i = 1 \dots N\}$ . Assume that for each  $loop_{1a}$ -transition  $t$  in the combined flat model, a modification factor  $f(t) \neq 1$  is given. Using our new lifting algorithm (Appendix A), we lift this model repair information to the components. The modification factors  $f$  are chosen in such a way that local repair (Part A) and also Part B of the algorithm will not find a solution. In part C of the algorithm, it turns out that action  $loop_{1a}$  can be added to all  $\parallel_{-loop_{1a}}$ -nodes of the process tree, since it does not cause spurious transitions. Consequently,  $loop_{1a}$ -selfloops are added to all the states of the components  $Station_2, \dots, Station_N$ , leading to the modified SPA model

$$Sys' = Server \parallel_{\Sigma_s} (Station_1 \parallel_{loop_{1a}} Station'_2 \parallel_{loop_{1a}} \dots \parallel_{loop_{1a}} Station'_N)$$

where the stations with added selfloops are shown by  $Station'_i$ . With the chosen modification factors, a solution can be found in Part C of the algorithm. This example is a scalable model where the state space increases with the number of stations  $N$ . Note that the model contains symmetries, but the considered rate lifting problem is not symmetric, since only  $Station_1$  and the *Server* participate in the  $loop_{1a}$ -transitions.

Table 1 shows the model statistics for different numbers of stations. The last row of the table (number of  $loop_{1a}$ -transitions) equals the number of equations, each of the  $2^{N-1}$  equations containing the product of  $N + 1$  unknown variables. The whole system of equations has  $(N - 1) * 2 + 2$  variables stemming from  $(N - 1) * 2$  newly added  $loop_{1a}$ -selfloops plus two original  $loop_{1a}$ -transitions




Fig. 5: Runtime comparison for different number of stations

(in the *Server* and *Station<sub>1</sub>*). Figure 5 shows the required times to run our rate lifting algorithm (implemented as a proof-of-concept prototype in Matlab [8]) and to solve the system of equations (done by Wolfram Mathematica [9]) for different values of  $N$ <sup>6</sup>. For large  $N$ , the time for equation solving by far dominates the runtime of our algorithm (by a factor of 2.61 for  $N = 11$ ). As shown in the figure, the runtimes grow exponentially, which is not surprising since the number of equations increases exponentially.

## 6 Correctness and Optimality of the Algorithm

**Correctness:** It must be guaranteed that a solution found by the algorithm is correct, which means that the modified system (with the calculated rates, possibly modified synchronisation sets and added selfloops) possesses the same transition system, just with the transition rates modified as desired. Once a solution has been found by the algorithm, it is easy to check its correctness by simply constructing the flat transition system for the modified system and comparing it to the desired transition system. However, one can also constructively argue for the correctness of the algorithm: In Part A, if the condition in line 25 is fulfilled, only the transition rate of a single transition in one of the sequential processes is changed, resulting in the change of a well-defined set of global flat transitions, all having the same modification factor, which is the intended result. Parts B, C and D each work by setting up and solving a nonlinear system of equations relating to the original (Part B) resp. carefully modified SPA system (Parts C and D). Each of these systems of equations precisely reflects the synchronisation of sequential SPA processes within a certain scope, taking into account all transitions with action label  $c$  that take place in that scope, and making sure that the resulting rates of those transitions are all as desired (thereby considering all relevant selfloop combinations). All procedures in Parts B, C and D affect only

<sup>6</sup> Executed on a standard laptop with Intel Core i7-8650U CPU@ 1.90GHz-2.11GHz

a certain scope of the overall SPA system, so it is enough to ensure correctness for such a local context. If in Parts C and D the model is adjusted (by augmenting synchronisation sets and inserting artificial selfloops), care is taken that this will not affect the structure of the low-level transition system. Thus, since each individual step of the algorithm is correct, we can conclude by induction that the total effect of multiple steps is also correct.

**Optimality:** If the lifting algorithm doesn't find a solution, is it really guaranteed that there doesn't exist one? We do not provide a formal proof of optimality, but we briefly give the basic line of argument: If we start with part A of the algorithm and if local repair fails, this happens because the same local transition (involving only a single sequential process) should be executed in different contexts with different modification factors (i.e. different rates), which is of course not possible in the unmodified system. In order to solve this problem, some "controlling" context needs to be added. For this purpose, we synchronise the process with its neighbouring processes (where selfloops are added at specific states) in a subtree of a certain height, which leads to a set of equations (of the form of Eq. 1) in part D of the algorithm. We keep expanding the context until either a solution has been found or the root of the system has been reached, which means that the algorithm uses its full potential. Alternatively, if we start with part B (because the involved set of the currently processed transition is already larger than one), we first search for a solution in the "local" context, i.e. in the current involved set, which is a subtree of the system. First we try to leave the model unchanged, which also leads to a system of equations. If it turns out that this system of equations is inconsistent (thus not having a solution), we need to include more degrees of freedom into the equations. This is first done within the current scope (by synchronising with as many processes as possible, albeit all from within this same scope) in part C. If this also fails, i.e. if the thus extended system is also inconsistent, even more degrees of freedom can be added by expanding the current scope, leading us again to part D of the algorithm. In total, the algorithm uses all possible degrees of freedom, since at every step it involves all processes, except those whose involvement would cause damage (in the sense that spurious transitions would occur). Therefore, since the algorithm uses all possible degrees of freedom, it is optimal.

## 7 Conclusion

In this paper, we have studied some novel structural concepts of Markovian SPA, which enabled us to formulate an algorithm for the lifting of rate information from the flat low-level transition system of a general SPA model to its components. The algorithm works for SPA specifications with an arbitrary structure and any number of components. We have also presented a small case study that illustrates the practical use of the algorithm and remarked on the correctness and optimality of the algorithm. As future work, we are planning to develop improved implementation strategies for the algorithm. Another important point



for future work is to characterise a priori the set of problem instances for which a solution to the rate lifting problem exists.

## References

1. E. Bartocci, R. Grosu, P. Katsaros, C. R. Ramakrishnan, and S.A. Smolka. Model repair for probabilistic systems. In *Tools and Algorithms for the Construction and Analysis of Systems*, pages 326–340. Springer, LNCS 6605, 2011.
2. M. Bernardo. *Theory and Application of Extended Markovian Process Algebra*. PhD thesis, University of Bologna, 1999.
3. T. Chen, E.M. Hahn, T. Han, M. Kwiatkowska, H. Qu, and L. Zhang. Model repair for Markov decision processes. In *2013 International Symposium on Theoretical Aspects of Software Engineering*, pages 85–92, 2013.
4. C. Dehnert, S. Junges, J.-P. Katoen, and M. Volk. A storm is coming: A modern probabilistic model checker. In R. Majumdar and V. Kunčák, editors, *Computer Aided Verification*, pages 592–600, Cham, 2017. Springer, LNCS 10427.
5. N. Götz. *Stochastische Prozessalgebren: Integration von funktionalem Entwurf und Leistungsbewertung Verteilter Systeme*. PhD thesis, University of Erlangen-Nuremberg, Germany, 1994.
6. J. Hillston. *A Compositional Approach to Performance Modelling*. Cambridge University Press, New York, NY, USA, 1996.
7. O. Ibe and K. Trivedi. Stochastic Petri net models of polling systems. *IEEE Journal on Selected Areas in Communications*, 8(9):1649–1657, 1990.
8. The MathWorks, Inc. Matlab, Version 9.10, 2021.
9. Wolfram Research, Inc. Mathematica, Version 12.2.0.0. Champaign, IL, 2021.
10. M. Kuntz, M. Siegle, and E. Werner. Symbolic Performance and Dependability Evaluation with the Tool CASPA. In *Applying Formal Methods: Testing, Performance and M/E Commerce: FORTE 2004 Workshops, European Performance Engineering Workshop*, pages 293–307. Springer, LNCS 3236, 2004.
11. M. Kwiatkowska, G. Norman, and D. Parker. PRISM 4.0: Verification of probabilistic real-time systems. In *Proc. 23rd International Conference on Computer Aided Verification (CAV’11)*, volume 6806 of *LNCS*, pages 585–591. Springer, 2011.
12. R. Milner. *A Calculus of Communicating Systems*. Springer, LNCS 92, 1980.
13. S. Pathak, E. Ábrahám, N. Jansen, A. Tacchella, and J.-P. Katoen. A greedy approach for the efficient repair of stochastic models. In K. Havelund, G. Holzmann, and R. Joshi, editors, *NASA Formal Methods*, pages 295–309, Cham, 2015. Springer, LNCS 9058.
14. A. Soltanieh and M. Siegle. It sometimes works: A lifting algorithm for repair of stochastic process algebra models. In *Measurement, Modelling and Evaluation of Computing Systems*, pages 190–207. Springer, LNCS 12040, 2020.
15. A. Soltanieh and M. Siegle. Solving systems of bilinear equations for transition rate reconstruction. In H. Hojjat and M. Massink, editors, *Fundamentals of Software Engineering*, pages 157–172, Cham, 2021. Springer, LNCS 12818.

## Appendix A Rate Lifting Algorithm for an SPA System with $n$ Sequential Components

```

1: Algorithm RateLifting ( $Sys, T, T_{mod}, factor$ )
2: //  $T$  is the flat Markovian transition system of SPA system  $Sys$ ,
3: // consisting of sequential processes  $P_1, \dots, P_n$  as leaves of a process tree
4: // with synchronisation sets  $A_i$ 
5: // The algorithm lifts the repair information given in the form of
6: // rate modification factors  $factor(t)$  for transitions  $t \in T_{mod} \subseteq T$ 
7: // to the high-level components of  $Sys$ , if possible.
8: // The repaired system is returned as  $P'_1, \dots, P'_n$ 
9: // and possibly modified synchronisation sets  $A'_i$ 
10:
11:  $P'_1 := P_1, \dots, P'_n := P_n, \forall i : A'_i := A_i$  // initialisation
12:
13: while  $T_{mod} \neq \emptyset$  do
14:   choose  $\hat{t} := ((\hat{s}_1, \dots, \hat{s}_n) \xrightarrow{c, \hat{\gamma} \cdot \hat{f}} (\hat{s}'_1, \dots, \hat{s}'_n))$  from  $T_{mod}$ 
15:   //  $\hat{t}$  is the transition processed during one iteration of the outer while-loop
16:    $found := false$ 
17:   // indicates that no solution found yet while processing the current  $\hat{t}$ 
18:   determine  $IS(\hat{t}) := \{P_{i_1}, \dots, P_{i_m}\}$  // the Involved Set  $IS$  is also a  $c$ -scope
19:
20:   if  $|IS(\hat{t})| = 1$  then
21:     // Algorithm Part A:
22:     // try local repair in  $P_{i_1}$  by considering all “parallel transitions”
23:     // (same approach as in algorithm for  $n = 2$  in lines 37-47 of [14])
24:      $T_{c, \hat{s}_{i_1}, \hat{s}'_{i_1}} := \{t \in T \mid action(t) = c \wedge source_{i_1}(t) = \hat{s}_{i_1} \wedge target_{i_1}(t) = \hat{s}'_{i_1}\}$ 
25:     if  $\exists f_{com} \in \mathbb{R} : \forall t \in T_{c, \hat{s}_{i_1}, \hat{s}'_{i_1}} : factor(t) = f_{com}$  then
26:       // there exists a common factor  $f_{com}$  for all transitions in  $T_{c, \hat{s}_{i_1}, \hat{s}'_{i_1}}$ 
27:       in  $P'_{i_1}$  set  $\hat{s}_{i_1} \xrightarrow{c, \gamma_{i_1} \cdot f_{com}} \hat{s}'_{i_1}$  (where  $\gamma_{i_1}$  is the current rate in  $P'_{i_1}$ )
28:        $T_{mod} := T_{mod} \setminus T_{c, \hat{s}_{i_1}, \hat{s}'_{i_1}}$ 
29:       for each  $t \in T_{c, \hat{s}_{i_1}, \hat{s}'_{i_1}}$  do
30:          $factor(t) := 1$ 
31:         // the modification factor of the fixed transitions is changed to 1,
32:         // which is important in case they are considered again
33:         // when dealing with another  $c$ -transition from  $T_{mod}$  later
34:       end for
35:        $found = true$ 
36:     end if
37:   if  $found = false$  then
38:     // local repair was not successful
39:     // therefore, since  $|IS(\hat{t})| = 1$ , the algorithm has to move up in the tree
40:      $curr\_root := P_{i_1}$ 
41:     //  $curr\_root$  denotes the root of the subtree that is currently
42:     // considered as the context for transition  $\hat{t}$ 
43:   end if

```

```

44: else
45:   // Algorithm Part B:
46:   // it holds that  $|IS(\hat{t})| > 1$ 
47:    $T_c := \{t \in T \mid action(t) = c \wedge IS(t) = IS(\hat{t})\}$ 
48:   // all  $c$ -transitions in current  $c$ -scope are considered together
49:    $r := \text{root of current } c\text{-scope}$  // needed in lines 52 and 81
50:   for each  $t := ((s_1, \dots, s_n) \xrightarrow{c, \gamma \cdot f} (s'_1, \dots, s'_n)) \in T_c$  do
51:     determine  $PS(t) := \{P_{p_1}, \dots, P_{p_k}\} \subseteq IS(\hat{t})$ 
52:     find the set of relevant selfloop combinations  $\text{rslc}(t) := \text{RSLC}(t, r)$ 
53:     // for rslc see Appendix B and Sec. 3.2
54:     create an equation
55:     
$$\sum_{C \in \text{rslc}(t)} \prod_{P \in MS(t)} x_{s_P s'_P}^{(P)} \prod_{\substack{Q \in PS(t) \setminus MS(t) \\ \wedge \exists P \in MS(t): Q \in N_{\text{must}}(Sys, P, c)}} x_{s_Q s_Q}^{(Q)} \prod_{R \in C} x_{s_R s_R}^{(R)} = \gamma \cdot f$$

56:   end for
57:   solve system of equations, if successful set  $found := true$ 
58:   if  $found = true$  then
59:      $T_{\text{mod}} := T_{\text{mod}} \setminus T_c$ 
60:     for each  $T \in T_c$  do
61:        $factor(t) := 1$ 
62:       // needed in case same transition is considered again later
63:     end for
64:
65:   else
66:     // Algorithm Part C:
67:     // it still holds that  $found = false$ 
68:     // now try to change the model:
69:     if  $PS(\hat{t}) \neq IS(\hat{t})$  then
70:       // try to add  $c$  to the sync. set of every internal node  $X$ 
71:       // of the form  $X = X_1 ||_{\neg c} X_2$ , within the current  $c$ -scope,
72:       // but this must not lead to sp. tr. outgoing from a reachable state.
73:       // If  $c$  can be added, then the necessary  $c$ -selfloops must also be added.
74:       for all nodes  $X = X_1 ||_{\neg c} X_2$  in current  $c$ -scope (in bottom-up order) do
75:          $\text{TRYSYNC}(X, c)$ 
76:         //  $\text{TRYSYNC}$  tries to add  $c$  to the sync. set of node  $X$ ,
77:         // if possible changes  $X$  to  $||_c$  and adds necessary selfloops below  $X$ 
78:       end for
79:       for each  $t := ((s_1, \dots, s_n) \xrightarrow{c, \gamma \cdot f} (s'_1, \dots, s'_n)) \in T_c$  do
80:         determine  $PS(t) := \{P_{p_1}, \dots, P_{p_k}\} \subseteq IS(\hat{t})$ 
81:         find the set of relevant selfloop combinations  $\text{rslc}(t) := \text{RSLC}(t, r)$ 
82:         // similar calculations as in the two previous lines
83:         // have already been performed in lines 51 and 52, but now the
84:         // model is changed, so  $PS(t)$  will potentially be larger than before,
85:         // and the sets in  $\text{rslc}(t)$  will potentially be larger than before!
86:         create an equation
87:         
$$\sum_{C \in \text{rslc}(t)} \prod_{P \in MS(t)} x_{s_P s'_P}^{(P)} \prod_{\substack{Q \in PS(t) \setminus MS(t) \\ \wedge \exists P \in MS(t): Q \in N_{\text{must}}(Sys, P, c)}} x_{s_Q s_Q}^{(Q)} \prod_{R \in C} x_{s_R s_R}^{(R)} = \gamma \cdot f$$

88:       end for
89:       solve system of equations, if successful set  $found := true$ 

```

```

90:         if  $found = true$  then
91:             // changing the model was successful,
92:              $T_{mod} := T_{mod} \setminus T_c$ 
93:             for each  $T \in T_c$  do
94:                  $factor(t) := 1$ 
95:                 // needed in case same transition is considered again later
96:             end for
97:         else
98:             // no solution found in current  $c$ -scope, even with added selfloops
99:             // it still holds that  $found = false$ 
100:             $curr\_root :=$  root of current  $c$ -scope
101:        end if
102:    end if
103: end if
104: end if
105:
106: // Algorithm Part D:
107: while  $found = false$  and  $curr\_root \neq root(Sys)$  do
108:     // move current root upwards and try to expand  $c$ -scope
109:      $curr\_root := parent(curr\_root)$ 
110:      $success := \text{TRYSYNC}(curr\_root, c)$ 
111:     // TRYSYNC tries to add  $c$  to the sync. set of node  $curr\_root$ ,
112:     // and if possible changes  $curr\_root$  to  $||_c$  and adds the
113:     // necessary selfloops below  $curr\_root$ 
114:     if  $success$  then
115:          $IS_{new}(\hat{t}) :=$  all leaves of subtree rooted at  $curr\_root = \{P_{i_1}, \dots, P_{i_m}\}$ 
116:         // this  $m$  is now larger than in line 18,
117:         // it gets larger in each iteration of this while-loop
118:          $IS(\hat{t}) := IS_{new}(\hat{t})$ 
119:          $T_c := \{t \in T \mid action(t) = c \wedge PS(t) \cap IS(\hat{t}) \neq \emptyset\}$ 
120:          $r := curr\_root$  // root of current  $c$ -scope
121:         now the same code as in lines 50–103
122:         ...
123:     else
124:         BREAK while-loop of lines 107–127 and move  $curr\_root$  up further
125:         // it was not possible to add  $c$  to the sync. set at  $curr\_root$ 
126:     end if
127: end while
128: end while

```

## Appendix B RSLC Algorithm (Relevant Selfloop Combinations)

Note: RSLC is called from the main rate lifting algorithm in lines 52 and 81.

```

1: Algorithm RSLC ( $t, n$ )
2: //  $t \in T$  is a transition
3: //  $n$  is a node of the process tree of  $Sys$ 
4: // The algorithm returns a set of sets of sequential processes
5: // (each representing a relevant selfloop combination contributing to  $t$ )
6: if type( $n$ ) = leaf then
7:   if  $P_n \in (PS(t) \cap SS(t)) \setminus \bigcup_{P \in MS(t)} N_{must}(Sys, P, c)$  then
8:     //  $P_n$  denotes the process represented by leaf-node  $n$ 
9:     //  $P_n \in PS(t)$  ensures that  $P_n$  has a selfloop at its current state
10:    return  $\{\{P_n\}\}$ 
11:    // a set containing a singleton set is returned
12:   else
13:     return  $\{\emptyset\}$ 
14:     // the set containing the empty set is returned
15:   end if
16: else if type( $n$ ) =  $\parallel_c$  then
17:   return  $\{C_1 \cup C_2 \mid C_1 \in RSLC(t, lchild(n)) \wedge C_2 \in RSLC(t, rchild(n))\}$ 
18:   // all combinations of left and right subtree
19: else
20:   // it holds that type( $n$ ) =  $\parallel_{-c}$ 
21:   return  $\{C \mid C \in RSLC(t, lchild(n)) \vee C \in RSLC(t, rchild(n))\}$ 
22:   // the (disjoint) union of left and right subtree
23: end if

```

## Appendix C TRYSYNC Function

Note: TRYSYNC is called from the main algorithm in lines 75 and 110.

```

1: Function: TRYSYNC ( $X, c$ ) returns Boolean
2: // This function checks whether adding action  $c$  to node  $X$  of type  $\parallel_{-c}$ 
3: // is possible without creating spurious transitions.
4: // If possible, it changes  $X$  to  $\parallel_c$  and adds the necessary selfloops.
5: // The return value is true iff action  $c$  could be successfully added.
6: if changing  $X$  to  $\parallel_c$  would cause sp. tr. of type A then
7:   // checking for sp. tr. of type A can be done
8:   // by ensuring that for all reachable states  $\vec{s} = (s_1, \dots, s_n)$ ,
9:   // transitions  $\vec{s}_{X_1} \xrightarrow{c} \dots$  and  $\vec{s}_{X_2} \xrightarrow{c} \dots$  do not both exist,
10:  // where  $X_1$  and  $X_2$  are the children of node  $X$ .7
11:  return false // do nothing, since  $X$  can't be made  $c$ -synchronising
12: end if
13: compute  $C := COMB(X, c)$ 
14: // combinations of  $c$ -participants below  $X$ , assuming  $X$  was of type  $\parallel_c$ 
15:  $T_c^X = \{t \in T_c \mid PS(t) \cap P_X \neq \emptyset\}$ 
16: // the subset of  $c$ -transitions with some process from  $X$  participating
17: // compute the feasible combinations  $C^{feas} \subseteq C$ :
18:  $C^{feas} := \{C_i \in C \mid \forall t \in T_c^X :$ 
19:   (selfloops in all  $P_k \in C_i \setminus PS(t)$  at state  $source_k(t)$  are present
20:   or can be added without causing sp. tr. of type B) $\}$ 
21: if  $C^{feas} = \emptyset$  then
22:   return false // do nothing, since  $X$  can't be made  $c$ -synchronising
23: end if
24: // now we know that  $X$  can be made  $c$ -synchronising!
25: change  $X$  to type  $\parallel_c$ 
26: // now permanently add the new selfloops:
27: for each  $C_i \in C^{feas}$  do
28:   for each  $t \in T_c^X$  do
29:     // it suffices to look at projection  $t^X : \vec{s}_X \xrightarrow{c} \vec{s}_X'$ 
30:     for each  $P_k \in C_i \wedge P_k \notin PS(t)$  do
31:       if selfloop in  $P_k : s_k \xrightarrow{c} s_k$  does not exist then
32:         add selfloop in  $P_k : s_k \xrightarrow{c, x_{s_k, s_k}^{P_k}} s_k$ 
33:       end if
34:     end for
35:   end for
36: end for
37: return true //  $X$  has been changed to  $\parallel_c$  and the selfloops added
38: end function

```

<sup>7</sup>  $\vec{s}_{X_i}$  is a vector representing the states of the sequential components in process  $X_i$ , i.e. it is the projection of  $\vec{s}$  to  $X_i$ .

**Checking for Spurious Transitions of Type B:** We now discuss the details of how it can be checked whether a combination  $C_i \in C = COMB(X, c)$  is feasible or not, i.e. the details of lines 18 - 20 of function TRYSYNC. We are in the process of checking whether making node  $X = X_1 ||_c X_2$   $c$ -synchronising (and adding some selfloops as needed by combination  $C_i$ ) causes spurious transition of type B or not. The following program segment performs this check:

```

1: assume (temporarily) that  $X = X_1 ||_c X_2$ 
2: // i.e. assume that  $X$  was  $c$ -synchronising
3: // compute the set of newly needed selfloops for combination  $C_i$ :
4:  $Selfloops(C_i) := \{(P_k, s_{k_j}) \mid \exists t \in T_c^X : P_k \in C_i \setminus PS(t) \wedge s_{k_j} = source_{P_k}(t)$ 
5:    $\wedge \text{selfloop } s_{k_j} \xrightarrow{c} s_{k_j} \text{ does not yet exist}\}$ 
6: for all  $P_k$  where any new selfloops are needed for  $C_i$  do
7:   // assume that  $P_k$  is part of  $X_1$ , otherwise symmetric procedure
8:   let  $Y := Y_1 ||_c Y_2$  be the lowest  $c$ -synchronising node containing  $P_k$ 
9:   // assume that  $P_k$  is part of  $Y_1$ , otherwise symmetric procedure
10:  //  $Y$  is either part of  $X_1$ , or  $Y = X$ , or  $Y$  is even above  $X$  (when moving upwards)
11:  for all states  $s_{k_j}$  where a selfloop is needed and not yet present in  $P_k$  do
12:    temporarily add selfloop  $s_{k_j} \xrightarrow{c} s_{k_j}$ 
13:    set  $Z := P_k$  and  $\vec{z} := s_{k_j}$ 
14:    // we use  $Z$  to denote a subsystem with a selfloop and  $\vec{z}$  its state,
15:    // in order to be flexible when moving  $Y$  upwards (see line 25)
16:    if  $Y \neq X$  and  $\exists \vec{s}$  reachable state such that  $\vec{s}_Z = \vec{z}$  and  $\exists \vec{s}_{Y_2} \xrightarrow{c} \dots$ 
17:      then
18:        // non-selfloop  $c$ -transition in  $\vec{s}_{Y_2}$  would synchronise with
19:        // new (atomic or combined) selfloop at  $\vec{z}$ 
20:        remove all selfloops newly added while processing  $X$ 
21:        BREAK // a sp. tr. exists, therefore  $C_i$  is not feasible
22:      else if  $\exists \vec{s}$  reachable state such that  $\vec{s}_Z = \vec{z}$  and  $\exists \vec{s}_{Y_2} \xrightarrow{c} \vec{s}_{Y_2}$ 
23:        then
24:          // selfloop  $c$ -transition in  $\vec{s}_{Y_2}$  would sync
25:          // with new (atomic or combined) selfloop at  $\vec{z}$ 
26:          // yielding a new combined selfloop  $\vec{s}_Y \xrightarrow{c} \vec{s}_Y$ 
27:          move upwards, i.e. rerun the if-clause (lines 16 - 29) for  $Z := Y$ ,
28:           $\vec{z} := \vec{s}_Y$  and  $Y := \text{next higher node } Y \text{ of type } ||_c$ , if such a higher
29:          node  $Y$  exists
30:        else
31:          // no  $c$ -transition nor  $c$ -selfloop in  $\vec{s}_{Y_2}$ 
32:          selfloop can be added to  $s_{k_j}$  without causing sp. tr.
33:        end if
34:      end for
35:    end for
36:  // once both FOR-loops have terminated without BREAK, we know
37:  // that  $C_i$  is feasible

```

## Appendix D COMB Algorithm

Note: COMB is called from TRYSYNC in line 13.

```

1: Algorithm COMB ( $X, c$ )
2: // This algorithm returns all sequential component combinations under
3: // node  $X$  wrt action  $c$ . Every combination consists of some sequential
4: // components that may participate in a  $c$ -transition.
5: // Like RSLC, this algorithm returns a set of sets of sequential processes.
6: if type( $X$ )=leaf then
7:   return  $\{\{P_X\}\}$ 
8:   // the seq. process
9: else if type( $X$ )= $\parallel_c$  then
10:  return
11:   $\{C_1 \cup C_2 \mid C_1 \in \text{COMB}(\text{lchild}(X), c) \wedge C_2 \in \text{COMB}(\text{rchild}(X), c)\}$ 
12: else
13:  //type( $X$ )= $\parallel_{\neg c}$ 
14:  return
15:   $\{C \mid C \in \text{COMB}(\text{lchild}(X), c) \vee C \in \text{COMB}(\text{rchild}(X), c)\}$ 
16: end if

```



## Appendix E Calculating the Participating Set

In Sec. 2.1 quite a complicated closed-form expression for the Participating Set of a transition was given. In practice, the participating set  $PS(t)$  for a given transition  $t$  in an SPA system can be obtained by the following procedure: We first calculate a set of candidate processes  $PS_{cand}$ :

$$PS_{cand}(t) = \{P_i \in SS(t) \mid (\exists P_j \in MS(t) : (P_i \in N_{may}(Sys, P_j, a) \wedge (\text{selfloop } s_i \xrightarrow{a, \lambda_i} s_i \text{ exists}))) \wedge (\nexists P_j \in MS(t) : P_i \in N_{cannot}(Sys, P_j, a))\}$$

Then we determine the set  $PS_{may} \subseteq PS_{cand}$  as follows: For each  $P_k \in PS_{cand}(t)$ , let  $r$  of type  $\parallel_a$  be the root of the smallest subtree containing  $P_k$  and at least one of the components of  $MS(t)$ . For each node  $N$  of type  $\parallel_a$  on the path from  $P_k$  to  $r$ , excluding  $r$ , let  $X_N$  be the child process of node  $N$  which does not contain  $P_k$ . If a selfloop  $(\vec{s}_{X_N} \xrightarrow{a} \vec{s}_{X_N})$  exists in process  $X_N$  then  $P_k \in PS_{may}(t)$ . Overall we get:

$$PS(t) = MS(t) \cup PS_{may}(t) \cup \{P_i \in SS(t) \mid \exists P_j \in MS(t) : P_i \in N_{must}(Sys, P_j, a)\}$$

Returning to the example from Sec. 2.1 (Figure 2): For transition  $t = ((1, 1, 3, 1, 2) \xrightarrow{a} (2, 1, 3, 1, 2))$ , we assumed that there are selfloops in state 1 in  $P_2$  and also in state 3 in  $P_3$ , so both  $P_2$  and  $P_3$  are in  $PS_{cand}(t)$ . Since on the path from  $P_2$  to  $r (= X_1)$  there is no node of type  $\parallel_a$ , nothing else needs to be checked for  $P_2$ , so  $P_2$  is in  $PS_{may}$ . For  $P_3$ , we need to check whether the other child of  $X_3$  (which is  $X_4$ ) can perform an  $a$ -selfloop at the current state  $\vec{s}_{X_4} = (1, 2)$ . But since this is not the case,  $P_3$  is not in  $PS_{may}$  and therefore not in  $PS(t)$ .