Switched Max-Plus Linear-Dual Inequalities: Application in Scheduling of Multi-Product Processing Networks
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Abstract: P-time event graphs are discrete event systems suitable for modeling processes in which tasks must be executed in predefined time windows. Their dynamics can be represented by systems of linear dynamical inequalities in the max-plus algebra and its dual, the min-plus algebra, referred to as max-plus linear-dual inequalities (LDIs). We define a new class of models called switched LDIs (SLDIs), which allow to switch between different modes of operations, each corresponding to an LDI, according to an infinite sequence of modes called schedule. In this paper, we focus on the analysis of SLDIs when the schedule is fixed and periodic. We show that SLDIs can model single-robot multi-product processing networks, in which every product has different processing requirements and corresponds to a specific mode of operation. Based on the analysis of SLDIs, we propose an algorithm to compute minimum and maximum cycle times for these processes that improves the time complexity of other existing approaches.
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1. INTRODUCTION

P-time event graphs (P-TEGs) are event graphs in which tokens are forced to sojourn in places in predefined time windows. They have been applied to solving scheduling problems for several processing networks, including electroplating lines and cluster tools, cf. Becha et al. [2013], Kim et al. [2003]. A common feature of these processing networks is that operations need to be executed in specified time intervals in order to obtain the desired quality of the final product, and P-TEGs are the ideal tools for modeling such constraints.

In this paper, we introduce a new class of systems called switched max-plus linear-dual inequalities (SLDIs). They extend the modeling power of P-TEGs by allowing to switch among different modes of operations, each consisting in a system of inequalities describing the dynamics of a P-TEG. We first highlight the equivalence between bounded consistency, an important property extended to SLDIs from P-TEGs, and the existence of periodic trajectories. SLDIs are then applied to model single-robot multi-product processing networks, namely, processing networks in which the type of products to be processed can change over time, each type requires to visit different processing stations, and products are transported by a single robot (see Kats et al. [2008] for a formal definition). In this case, each mode is associated with a certain product type.

When the sequence of modes is fixed and periodic with period \(|v| \in \mathbb{N}\), the minimum and maximum cycle times of such systems can be computed in strongly polynomial time \(O(|v|^4n^4)\) (in the worst case) using an algorithm presented in Kats et al. [2008], where \(n\) corresponds to the total number of processing stations in the network. We provide other two algorithms based on SLDIs that solve instances of the same problem. The first one is derived from an existing procedure that computes the cycle times of P-TEGs, and achieves time complexity \(O(|v|^4n^4)\). The second one, of time complexity \(O(|v|n^3+n^4)\), improves the first one by using tools from automata theory to exploit the sparsity of a certain matrix in the max-plus algebra. Tests are performed on an example of single-robot multi-product processing network to show the advantages of the proposed methods.

Notation

The set of positive, respectively non-negative, integers is denoted by \(\mathbb{N}\), respectively \(\mathbb{N}_0\). The set of non-negative real numbers is denoted by \(\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}\). Moreover, \(\mathbb{R}_{\max} := \mathbb{R} \cup \{-\infty\}\), \(\mathbb{R}_{\min} := \mathbb{R} \cup \{\infty\}\), and \(\mathbb{R} := \mathbb{R}_{\max} \cup \{\infty\} = \mathbb{R}_{\min} \cup \{-\infty\}\).

If \(A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}\), we will use notation \(A^T\) to indicate \(-A^T\).
2. PRELIMINARIES

In the following subsections, some preliminary notions on idempotent semirings, precedence graphs, and multi-precedence graphs are recalled. For a more detailed discussion on the first two topics, we refer to Baccelli et al. [1992] and Hardouin et al. [2018]; multi-precedence graphs have been introduced in Zorzenon et al. [2022a].

2.1 Formal languages and the max-plus algebra

A dioid (or idempotent semiring) \((D, \oplus, \otimes)\) is a set \(D\) endowed with two operations: \(\oplus\) (addition), and \(\otimes\) (multiplication). Operation \(\otimes\) and \(\oplus\) are associative and have a neutral element indicated, respectively, by \(e\) and \(\mathbb{0}\); \(\oplus\) is commutative and idempotent (\(a \oplus a = a\)), \(\otimes\) distributes over \(\oplus\), and \(e\) is absorbing for \(\otimes\). For the sake of brevity, we will often omit symbol \(\otimes\). The order relation \(\preceq\) is induced by \(\oplus\): \(a \preceq b \iff a \oplus b = a\). A dioid is complete if it is closed for infinite sums and \(\oplus\) distributes over infinite sums. In complete dioids, \(\mathbb{T} = \bigoplus_{x \in D^*} x\) denotes the greatest element of \(D\), the Kleene star of an element \(a \in D\) is defined by \(a^* = \bigoplus_{i = 0}^\infty a^i\), where \(a^0 = e\), \(a^{i+1} = a^i \otimes a\), and the dual addition (or greatest lower bound) \(\oplus\) is defined by \(a \oplus b = \bigoplus_{x \in D^*} x\), where \(D_{ab} = \{x \in D \mid x \preceq a\ \text{and} \ x \preceq b\}\).

An example of a dioid that will be used in this paper is given by \((\mathbb{R}, \ominus, \otimes)\). A dioid is complete if it is closed for infinite sums, and \(\otimes\) distributes over infinite sums. In complete dioids, \(\mathbb{T} = \bigoplus_{x \in D^*} x\) denotes the greatest element of \(D\), the Kleene star of an element \(a \in D\) is defined by \(a^* = \bigoplus_{i = 0}^\infty a^i\), where \(a^0 = e\), \(a^{i+1} = a^i \otimes a\), and the dual addition (or greatest lower bound) \(\oplus\) is defined by \(a \oplus b = \bigoplus_{x \in D^*} x\), where \(D_{ab} = \{x \in D \mid x \preceq a\ \text{and} \ x \preceq b\}\).

Given a string \(s\), its concatenation with itself \(s^2\), and the concatenation of \(s\) with another string \(t\), \(s \otimes t\), are defined. The length of a string \(s\) is indicated by \(|s|\) (with \(|e| = 0\)), and \(|s|_a\) is the number of occurrences of letter \(a\) in \(s\). Moreover, \(s_i\) indicates the \(i\)th symbol of \(s\), with \(s_0 = e\). The prefix set of strings \(s \in \Sigma^*\) is defined by \(\text{Pre}(s) = \{t \in \Sigma^* \mid t \otimes s = s\}\), where \(t\) is a prefix of \(s\). The set \(\Sigma^*\) is the set of all strings over \(\Sigma\).

The tensor (or Kronecker) product \(\otimes\) of two strings \(A \in D^{m \times n}\) and \(B \in D^{p \times q}\) is defined as the matrix

\[
A \otimes B = \begin{bmatrix}
A_{11} \otimes B & \cdots & A_{1n} \otimes B \\
\vdots & & \vdots \\
A_{m1} \otimes B & \cdots & A_{mn} \otimes B
\end{bmatrix} \in D^{mp \times nq}.
\]

We recall the following properties of \(\otimes\), the first of which holds in commutative dioids, i.e., dioids in which \(\otimes\) is commutative.

**Proposition 1.** (Horn and Johnson [1991]). Let \((D, \oplus, \otimes)\) be a commutative dioid, \(A \in D^{m \times n}\), \(B \in D^{p \times q}\), \(C \in D^{n \times k}\), \(D \in D^{k \times r}\). Then \((A \otimes B) \otimes (C \otimes D) = (A \otimes C) \otimes (B \otimes D)\).

**Proposition 2.** Let \((D, \oplus, \otimes)\) be a dioid, \(A \in D^{m \times n}\), \(B \in D^{n \times p}\). Then, \(tr(A \otimes B) = tr(A) \otimes tr(B)\), where \(tr(M) = \bigoplus_{k=1}^m M_{kk}\) indicates the trace of matrix \(M \in D^{p \times q}\).

**Proof.**

\[
tr(A \otimes B) = \bigoplus_{k=1}^m \sum_{i=1}^n A_{ki} \otimes B_{ij} = \bigoplus_{k=1}^m A_{kk} \otimes tr(B) = \bigoplus_{k=1}^m \left(\bigoplus_{i=1}^n A_{ki}\right) \otimes tr(B) = tr(A) \otimes tr(B).
\]

The max-plus algebra is the complete and commutative idempotent semifield \((\mathbb{R}, \ominus, \otimes)\), i.e., the set of extended real numbers endowed with the standard maximum operation \(\ominus\), and the standard addition \(\otimes\). In the max-plus algebra, \(\ominus = -\infty\), \(\otimes = \mathbb{T}\), \(\ominus\) is the standard minimum operation, \(\ominus\) coincides with \(\ominus\). The dual product \(\otimes\) is such that \(a \otimes b = a + b\) if \(a, b \neq \mathbb{T}\), and \(a \otimes b = \mathbb{T}\) if \(a = \mathbb{T}\) or \(b = \mathbb{T}\). The extension of the max-plus algebra to square matrices \((\mathbb{R}^{m \times n}, \ominus, \otimes)\) is a complete dioid; in the rest of the paper, symbol \(\ominus\) will be reserved to compare matrices with elements from \(\mathbb{R}\), i.e., \(\forall A, B \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}, A \preceq B \iff A_{ij} \leq B_{ij} \forall i, j\).

2.2 Precedence graphs and multi-precedence graphs

A directed graph is a pair \((N, E)\) where \(N\) is a finite set of nodes and \(E \subseteq N \times N\) is the set of arcs. A weighted directed graph is a triplet \((N, E, w)\), where \((N, E)\) is a directed
The precedence graph associated with a matrix $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ is the weighted directed graph $G(A) = (N, E, w)$, where $N = \{1, \ldots, n\}$ and $E$ and $w$ are defined in the following (non-standard) way: there is an arc $(i, j) \in E$ from node $i$ to node $j$ if and only if $A_{ij} \neq -\infty$, and $w$ is such that $w((i, j)) = A_{ij}$. We adopt this non-standard convention of associating $A_{ij}$ to the weight of arc $(i, j)$ instead of $(j, i)$, as this will simplify the interpretation of the label of a path in multi-precedence graphs. When elements of $A$ are functions of some real parameters, $A = A(\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_p)$, we say that $G(A)$ is a parametric precedence graph. A sequence of $r + 1$ nodes $\rho = (i_1, i_2, \ldots, i_{r+1})$, $r \geq 1$, such that $(i_j, i_{j+1}) \in E$ for all $j \in \{1, \ldots, r\}$ is a path of length $r$; a path $\rho$ such that $i_1 = i_{r+1}$ is called a circuit. The weight of a path is the sum (in conventional algebra) of the weights of the arcs composing it. Elements of the max-plus power of a matrix have a clear meaning with respect to precedence graph $G(A)$; indeed, $(A^\alpha)_{ij}$ corresponds to the maximum weight of all paths in $G(A)$ of length $r$ from node $i$ to node $j$.

In this paper, we will make use of another class of graphs, called multi-precedence graphs, which will allow us to analyze parametric precedence graphs using tools from formal languages and automata theory. The reader familiar with max-plus automata will notice their similarity to multi-precedence graphs. The multi-precedence graph associated with matrices $A_1, \ldots, A_l \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ is the weighted multi-directed graph $G(\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_l) = (N, \Sigma, \mu, E)$, where $N = \{1, \ldots, n\}$ is the set of nodes, $\Sigma = \{a_1, \ldots, a_r\}$ is the alphabet of symbols $a_1, \ldots, a_r : \Sigma \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ is the morphism defined by $\mu(A_i) = A_i$ for all $i \in \{1, \ldots, l\}$, and $E \subseteq N \times \Sigma \times N$ is the set of directed arcs, defined such that there is an arc $(i, z, j)$ from node $i$ to node $j$ labeled $z$ with weight $\mu(z)$ if and only if $\mu(z) \neq -\infty$. A path in a multi-precedence graph $G(A_1, \ldots, A_l)$ is a sequence of alternating nodes and labels of the form $s = (i_1, z_1, i_2, z_2, \ldots, z_r, i_{r+1})$, $r \geq 1$, such that $(i_j, z_j, i_{j+1}) \in E$ for all $j = 1, \ldots, r$; we will say that path $s$ is labeled $s = z_1, z_2, \ldots, z_r$.

It is convenient to extend morphism $\mu$ to $\mu : 2^\Sigma \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ as follows: for all $z \in \Sigma$, $L_1, L_2 \subseteq \Sigma^*$, $\mu(\emptyset) = E$, $\mu(z) = \mu(z)$, $\mu(L_1 \cup L_2) = \mu(L_1) \oplus \mu(L_2)$, and $\mu(L_1 \cap L_2) = \mu(L_1) \boxplus \mu(L_2)$. In this way, given a language $L \subseteq \Sigma^*$, $\mu(L)_{ij} = \bigoplus_{s \in L} \mu(s)_{ij}$ corresponds to the supremum, for all strings $s \in L$, of the weights of all languages labeled $s$ in $G(A_1, \ldots, A_l)$ from node $i$ to node $j$ in particular, $\mu(L^*) = 0$ if and only if no circuits with positive weight exist in $G(A_1, \ldots, A_l)$ among those with label $s \in L$. Moreover, the following properties hold: for all $L_1, L_2, L_3 \subseteq \Sigma^*$, $L_1 \subseteq L_2 \Rightarrow \mu(L_1) \leq \mu(L_2)$, and $\mu(L^*) = \mu(L^*)$. We will indicate by $\Gamma$, respectively, $\Gamma_M$, the set of all precedence graphs, respectively, multi-precedence graphs, that do not contain circuits with positive weight.

The dynamics of a P-TPN net is briefly described as follows. A transition $t$ is enabled if it has no upstream place and each upstream place $p$ of $t$ contains at least one token which has resided in $p$ for a time between $\tau_p^+$ and $\tau_p^-$. When transition $t$ is enabled, it may fire; its firing causes one token to be removed instantaneously from each of the upstream places of $t$, and one token to be added, again instantaneously, to each of the downstream places of $t$. If a token sojourns more than $\tau_p^+$ time instants in a place $p$, then said token is dead, as it is forced to remain in $p$ forever.
transition. Without loss of generality (see Špaček and Komenda [2017]), we will suppose that the initial marking \( m(p) \) is less than or equal to 1 for each place \( p \in \mathcal{P} \) of a P-TEG. This allows to rephrase the dynamics of a P-TEG with \( |\mathcal{T}| = n \) transitions as a max-plus linear-dual inequality system (LDI), i.e., a system of dynamical \((\oplus, \otimes)\)- and \((\ominus, \ominus)\)-linear inequalities of the form

\[
\forall k \in \mathbb{N}_0, \quad \left\{ \begin{array}{l}
A^0 \otimes x(k) \leq x(k) \leq B^0 \ominus x(k) \\
A^1 \otimes x(k) \leq x(k+1) \leq B^1 \ominus x(k) \end{array} \right.,
\]

where \( x: \mathbb{N}_0 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n \) is called dater function, \( A^0, A^1 \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n} \), \( B^0, B^1 \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n} \) are called characteristic matrices of the P-TEG, and are defined as follows. If there exists a place \( p \) with initial marking \( \mu \in \{0,1\} \), upstream transition \( t_j \) and downstream transition \( t_i \), then \( A^0_{ij} = \tau_\rho \) and \( B^0_{ij} = \tau_x^+ \); otherwise, \( A^0_{ij} = -\infty \) and \( B^0_{ij} = \infty \). By convention, element \( x_i(k) \) of the dater function represents the time at which transition \( t_i \) fires for the \((k+1)\)st time. Since the \((k+2)\)nd firing of any transition cannot occur before the \((k+1)\)st, we require the dater to be a non-decreasing function, i.e., \( \forall i \in \{1, \ldots, n\} \), \( x_i(k+1) \geq x_i(k) \).

If a non-decreasing dater trajectory \( \{x(k)\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}_0} \), satisfying (1) exists, then the trajectory is said to be consistent for the P-TEG, as it does not cause the death of any token, and the P-TEG is said to be consistent. A trajectory \( \{x(k)\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}_0} \) is 1-periodic with period \( \lambda \in \mathbb{R}_{>0} \), if it has the form \( \{\lambda \cdot x(0)\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}_0} \), in the max-plus algebra sense; in standard algebra, this corresponds to a dater trajectory such that, for all \( i \in \{1, \ldots, n\} \), \( x_i(k) = k \lambda + x_i(0) \). Moreover, we indicate by \( A_{\text{P-TEG}}(A^0, A^1, B^0, B^1) \subseteq \mathbb{R} \) the set of \( \lambda \geq 0 \) for which there exists a 1-periodic trajectory of period \( \lambda \) that is consistent for the P-TEG characterized by matrices \( A^0, A^1, B^0, B^1 \); such periods are called cycle times. We say that a trajectory \( \{x(k)\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}_0} \) is delay-bounded if there exists a positive real number \( M \) such that, for all \( i, j \in \{1, \ldots, n\} \) and for all \( k \in \mathbb{N}_0 \), \( x_i(k) - x_j(k) < M \); a P-TEG admitting a consistent delay-bounded trajectory of the dater function is said to be boundedly consistent. To our knowledge, no algorithm that checks whether a P-TEG is consistent has been found until now; on the other hand, there exists an algorithm that checks bounded consistency of P-TEGs in time \( \mathcal{O}(n^5) \), which comes directly from the following result.

**Theorem 5.** (Zorzon et al. [2020, 2022b]) A P-TEG is boundedly consistent if and only if it admits a consistent 1-periodic trajectory, i.e., if and only if set \( A_{\text{P-TEG}}(A^0, A^1, B^0, B^1) \) is non-empty. Moreover, \( A_{\text{P-TEG}}(A^0, A^1, B^0, B^1) \) coincides with \( A_{\text{SCP}}(\lambda B^1 \ominus \lambda^{-1} A^1 \oplus (A^0 \ominus B^0)) \cap [0, \infty[ \).

**Example 6.** Consider the P-TEG represented in Figure 1, in which time windows are parametrized with respect to label \( z \); in Table 1, values of time windows are given for \( z \in \{a, b, c\} \). The matrices characterizing the P-TEG labeled \( z \) are:

\[
A^0_z = \begin{bmatrix}
-\infty & -\infty \\
0 & -\infty
\end{bmatrix}, \quad A^1_z = \begin{bmatrix}
\alpha_z & -\infty \\
-\infty & \beta_z
\end{bmatrix},
\]

\[
B^0_z = \begin{bmatrix}
\infty & \infty \\
\infty & \infty
\end{bmatrix}, \quad B^1_z = \begin{bmatrix}
\alpha_z & \beta_z
\end{bmatrix}.
\]

Since lower and upper bounds for the sojourn times of the two places with an initial token coincide, once dater \( x_z(0) \) is chosen (such that the first inequality in (1) is satisfied for \( k = 0 \), i.e., \( x_z(0) \geq x_1(0) \)), the only trajectory \( \{x_z(k)\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}_0} \) that is a candidate to be consistent for the P-TEG labeled \( z \) is deterministically given by

\[
\forall k \in \mathbb{N}_0, \quad x_z(k+1) = \begin{bmatrix}
\alpha_z + x_z(k) \\
\beta_z + x_z(k)
\end{bmatrix}.
\]

However, it is easy to see that, for any valid choice of the initial dater, candidate trajectory \( \{x_z(k)\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}_0} \) is not consistent (as for a sufficiently large \( k, x_z(2k) < x_1(1) \)), and \( \{x_z(k)\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}_0} \), despite being consistent, is not delay-bounded and results in the infinite accumulation of tokens in the place between \( t_1 \) and \( t_2 \) for \( k \rightarrow \infty \). On the other hand, \( \{x_z(k)\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}_0} \) is consistent and delay-bounded (in fact, it is 1-periodic with period 1); thus we can conclude that the P-TEG labeled \( a \) is not consistent, the one labeled \( b \) is consistent but not boundedly consistent, and the one labeled \( c \) is boundedly consistent. Of course, we would have reached the same conclusions regarding delay-boundedness by using Theorem 5. In particular, applying Algorithm 1, we get

\[
A_{\text{P-TEG}}(A^0_0, A^1_0, B^0_0, B^1_0) = A_{\text{P-TEG}}(A^0_1, A^1_1, B^0_1, B^1_1) = \emptyset,
\]

\[
A_{\text{P-TEG}}(A^0_0, A^1_0, B^0_0, B^1_0) = [1, 1] = \{1\}.
\]

### 4. SWITCHED MAX-PLUS LINEAR-DUAL INEQUALITIES

#### 4.1 General description

We start by defining a switched LDI (SLDI) as the natural extension of the dynamical inequalities of P-TEGs, in which the mode of operation can switch. Each mode is associated with a set of \( n \) events that have to satisfy certain time window constraints. An SLDI is a 5-tuple \( \mathcal{S} = (\Sigma, A^0, A^1, B^0, B^1) \), where \( \Sigma = \{a_1, \ldots, a_m\} \) is a finite alphabet whose symbols are called modes, and \( A^0, A^1 : \Sigma \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\text{max}}, B^0, B^1 : \Sigma \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\text{min}} \) are functions that associate a matrix to each mode of \( \Sigma \); for sake of simplicity, given a mode \( z \in \Sigma \), we will write \( A^0_z, A^1_z, B^0_z, B^1_z \) in place of \( A^0(z), A^1(z), B^0(z), B^1(z) \), respectively. A schedule \( u \in \Sigma^\omega \) is an infinite concatenation of modes.

The dynamics of an SLDI \( \mathcal{S} \) under schedule \( u \in \Sigma^\omega \) is expressed by the following system of inequalities: for all \( k \in \mathbb{N}_0 \),

\[
\left\{ \begin{array}{l}
A^0_{w_{k+1}} \otimes x(w_k) \leq x(w_{k+1}) \leq B^0_{w_{k+1}} \ominus x(w_k) \\
A^1_{w_{k+1}} \otimes x(w_k) \leq x(w_{k+1}) \leq B^1_{w_{k+1}} \ominus x(w_k)
\end{array} \right.,
\]

where function \( x : \mathbb{N}_0 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n \) is called dater of \( \mathcal{S} \) associated with schedule \( u \). Term \( x(w_k) \) represents the

---

**Table 1. Parameters for the P-TEG of Figure 1.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>( z )</th>
<th>( a )</th>
<th>( b )</th>
<th>( c )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( x_z(0) )</td>
<td>( -\infty )</td>
<td>( -\infty )</td>
<td>( -\infty )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( x_z(1) )</td>
<td>( \alpha_z )</td>
<td>( \alpha_z )</td>
<td>( \alpha_z )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( x_z(2) )</td>
<td>( \beta_z )</td>
<td>( \beta_z )</td>
<td>( \beta_z )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Figure 1. Example of P-TEG.**
time of the occurrence of event $i$ associated with mode $u_{k+1}$.

When schedule $w$ is fixed, we can extend the definition of some properties of P-TEGs to SLDis in a natural way. For instance, if there exists a trajectory of the dater \( \{x(w_{kj})\}_{k \in \mathbb{R}} \) that satisfies (2) for all $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$, then the trajectory is consistent for the SLDI under schedule $w$, and we say that the SLDI is consistent under schedule $w$. The definitions of delay-bounded trajectory and bounded consistency are generalized to SLDis under schedule $w$ in a similar way.

The interpretation of bounded consistency of an SLDI under a fixed schedule $w$ is analogous to the one of P-TEGs (see Zorzonon et al. [2020]). When a process consisting of several tasks (each represented by an event) is modeled by an SLDI that is not boundedly consistent under a schedule $w$, then the execution of every possible sequence of tasks following $w$ will either lead to the violation of some time window constraints (if the SLDI is not consistent under $w$), or to the infinite accumulation of delay between the execution of some tasks (if the only consistent trajectories are not delay-bounded).

### 4.2 Analysis of fixed periodic schedules

In this subsection, we analyze bounded consistency and cycle times of an SLDI when schedule $w$ is periodic, i.e., when it can be written as $w = v^\omega$, where $v \in \Sigma^*$ is a finite subsequence. Similarly to P-TEGs, it is natural to assume the following non-decreasingness condition for the dater of an SLDI: for all $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$, $h \in \{0, \ldots, |v| - 1\}$, $x(v^{k+1}v_{12} \ldots v_h) \geq x(v^{k}v_{12} \ldots v_h)$. The meaning is that events occurring during the $(k+2)^{th}$ repetition of mode $v_h$, at the $h^{th}$ position in subsequence $v$, cannot occur earlier than those taking place during the $(k+1)^{th}$ one.

We define $v$-periodic trajectories of period $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ for SLDis under schedule $w = v^\omega$ as those dater trajectories that, for all $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$, $h \in \{0, \ldots, |v| - 1\}$, satisfy $x(v^{k+1}v_{12} \ldots v_h) = \lambda x(v^{k}v_{12} \ldots v_h)$; $\Lambda_{\text{SLDI}}^v(S)$ denotes the set of all periods $\lambda$ called cycle times, for which there exists a consistent $v$-periodic trajectory. Their relationship with 1-periodic trajectories in P-TEGs is made clear by the following example.

**Example 7.** Let us analyze the SLDI $S$, with $\Sigma = \{a, b, c\}$, and $A_0^a, A_1^a, B_0, B_1^a$ defined as in Example 6; now label $z \in \Sigma$ is to be interpreted as a mode. Thus, for each event $k$, the dynamics of the SLDI may switch among those specified by the P-TEGs labeled $a$, $b$, and $c$. We consider periodic schedules $(ac)^\omega$ and $(ab)^\omega$; observe that for $w = v^\omega$, with $v \in \{ac, ab\}$ (i.e., $v_1 = a$ and $v_2 = c$ or $v_2 = b$ the SLDI following $w$ can be written as: for all $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$,

\[
\begin{align*}
A_0^a \otimes x(v^k) \preceq x(v^k) & \preceq B_0 \otimes x(v^k), \\
A_1^a \otimes x(v^k v_1) & \preceq B_0 \otimes x(v^k v_1), \\
A_0^b \otimes x(v^k v_1) & \preceq B_0 \otimes x(v^k v_1), \\
A_1^b \otimes x(v^k v_1) & \preceq B_0 \otimes x(v^k v_1). 
\end{align*}
\]

(3)

By defining $\tilde{x}(k) = [x(v^k), x(v^k v_1)]^T$, the above set of inequalities can be rewritten as an LDI: for all $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$,

\[
\begin{align*}
A_0^a \otimes \tilde{x}(k) & \preceq \tilde{x}(k) \preceq B_0 \otimes \tilde{x}(k), \\
A_1^a \otimes \tilde{x}(k) & \preceq \tilde{x}(k+1) \preceq B_1^a \otimes \tilde{x}(k), \\
A_0^b \otimes \tilde{x}(k) & \preceq \tilde{x}(k) \preceq B_0 \otimes \tilde{x}(k), \\
A_1^b \otimes \tilde{x}(k) & \preceq \tilde{x}(k+1) \preceq B_1^b \otimes \tilde{x}(k). 
\end{align*}
\]

(4a)

(4b)
4.3 Improved algorithm

Let us start by defining the multi-precedence graph $G_v$ associated with parametric precedence graph $G(\{\lambda_i|\lambda^{-1}I_0+\Sigma\})$: $G_v = G(Y_1,1 \otimes^t C_{v1}, Y_2,2 \otimes^t F_{v1}, I_1,1 \otimes^t \lambda^{-1}I_0, Y_3,3 \otimes^t I_0, \ldots) = (N, D, E)$ such that $N = \{1, \ldots, [v]n\}, D = \{p_1, \ldots, p_{[v]n}\}, E = \{[v]n\}$. For all $r \in \{1, \ldots, [v]-1\}, p_{[v]n} = Y_{[v]n}\otimes^t P_{v1}, p_1 = Y_{1,1}\otimes^t \lambda^{-1}I_0, p_{[v]n} = Y_{[v]n}\otimes^t \lambda^{-1}I_0, p_{[v]n} = Y_{[v]n}\otimes^t \lambda^{-1}I_0, p_{[v]n} = Y_{[v]n}\otimes^t \lambda^{-1}I_0$. Let $L$ be a finite sequence of positive integers. For all $r \in \{1, \ldots, [v]-1\}$, we define $L_r$ as the set of all terms $\{s_1, \ldots, s_{[v]n}\}$ such that $s_1 = p_{[v]n}, \ldots, s_{[v]n} = p_{[v]n}$. For $r \in \{1, \ldots, [v]-1\}$, we define $P_r$ as the set of all terms $\{s_1, \ldots, s_{[v]n}\}$ such that $s_1 = p_{[v]n}, \ldots, s_{[v]n} = p_{[v]n}$.

Observe that, for all $A, B, C \in \mathbb{R}^{[v]n \times [v]n}$ and $i, j \in \{1, \ldots, [v]\}$, the following properties hold: from $Y_{[v]n} = Y_{[v]n}$, Proposition 1, and the fact that in the max-plus algebra the tensor product distributes over infinite sums,

$$(Y_{[v]n} \otimes^t A)^* = \bigoplus_{k=0}^{[v]n} (Y_{[v]n} \otimes^t A)^k = \bigoplus_{k=0}^{[v]n} Y_{[v]n} \otimes^t A^*$$

moreover, since $Y_{[v]n} \otimes B \otimes C = Y_{[v]n}$,

$$(Y_{[v]n} \otimes A)(Y_{[v]n} \otimes B)(Y_{[v]n} \otimes C)^* = Y_{[v]n} \otimes (ABC)^*$$

Hence, for some matrices $L_P, L_{P1}, L_{PC}, L_{CL} \in \mathbb{R}^{[v]n \times [v]n}$, $\mu(P_{[v]n}) = Y_{1,1} \otimes^t \lambda^{-1}I_0, \mu(C_{[v]n}) = Y_{1,1} \otimes^t \lambda^{-1}I_0, \mu(C_{[v]n}) = Y_{1,1} \otimes^t \lambda^{-1}I_0, \mu(C_{[v]n}) = Y_{1,1} \otimes^t \lambda^{-1}I_0$. Finally, from Proposition 2 and $tr(Y_{[v]n}) = 0$, we get $tr(\mu(C_{[v]n})) = tr(\mu(C_{[v]n})) = \mu(C_{[v]n}) = Y_{1,1} \otimes^t \lambda^{-1}I_0$. Observe that we obtained an NCP that can be solved in $\mathcal{O}(n^4)$ using Algorithm 1.

To find all $\lambda$'s for which $G_v \in \Gamma_M$, we still need to verify that there are no circuits with positive weight among those visiting only nodes that are not in $\Gamma$ (if this is not true, then $\Lambda_{\text{SLDI}}(S) = \emptyset$). This can be done by checking that, for all $r \in \{1, \ldots, [v]\}, \mu(C_{[v]n}) = Y_{1,1} \otimes^t \lambda^{-1}I_0, \mu(C_{[v]n}) = Y_{1,1} \otimes^t \lambda^{-1}I_0$. Indeed, a circuit $\sigma$ starting from a node in $\Gamma$ that does not visit any node in $\Gamma$ either does not visit any node in other sets $\Gamma \neq \Gamma$, in which case the label $s$ of $\sigma$ belongs to $c_s^r$, or it does. In the second case, the size of $\Gamma$ is the smallest $j$ for which $\sigma$ visits nodes in $\Gamma$. If $\sigma$ is a circuit with label $s'$ that visits the same nodes of $\sigma$ using the same arcs, but starting from a node in $\Gamma$, then

$$(Y_{[v]n} \otimes A)(Y_{[v]n} \otimes B)(Y_{[v]n} \otimes C)^* = Y_{[v]n} \otimes (ABC)^*$$

The discussed procedure to compute the minimum and maximum cycle times of an SDLI $S$ under schedule $\nu^*$ is summarized in Algorithm 2. Note that the time complexity to run lines 1–11 is $\mathcal{O}([v]n^4)$, as the three for-loops perform

Figure 2. Lumped-node representation of $G_v$ when $[v] = 5$. Labels colored in blue, red, and black correspond to arcs whose weight depends proportionally, depends inversely, and does not depend on $r$, respectively.
Algorithm 2: Compute $A_0^{\mathcal{S}_{LD}}(S)$

Input: $P_a$, $I_a$, $C_a \in \mathbb{R}_{+}^{n \times n}$ for all $z \in \Sigma$, $v \in \Sigma^*$
Output: $A_0^{\mathcal{S}_{LD}}(S)$

1 for $r = 1$ to $|v|$ do
2 $\textbf{if } G(C_v) \notin \Gamma \textbf{ then return } 0$
3 $\textbf{if } |v| + 1 \rightarrow \tau_1$
4 $\textbf{if } 1 \rightarrow |v| \textbf{ do}$
5 $P_i \leftarrow C_n^{-1} P_i C_{i+1}^{-1}$, $L_i \leftarrow C_n^{-1} L_i C_{i+1}^{-1}$
6 $\textbf{enddo}$
7 $\textbf{if } v \rightarrow |v| \textbf{ then return } 0$
8 $\textbf{if } G(P_{|v|} \star \prod_{S \in \mathcal{S}} L_{|v|} \star \prod_{S \in \mathcal{S}} P_{|v|}) \notin \Gamma \textbf{ then}$
9 $\textbf{return } 0$
10 $P \leftarrow P_{|v|} \star \prod_{S \in \mathcal{S}} L_{|v|} \star \prod_{S \in \mathcal{S}} P_{|v|}$
11 $\textbf{enddo}$
12 return SolveNCP($L$, $L$, $\prod_{S \in \mathcal{S}} L_{|v|} \star \prod_{S \in \mathcal{S}} C_v$)

5. PRACTICALLY-MOTIVATED EXAMPLE

The example we present is a multi-product processing network taken from Kats et al. [2008]. Examples of such networks are electroplating lines and cluster tools. Consider a manufacturing system consisting of $5$ processing stations $S_1, \ldots, S_5$ and a robot of capacity $1$. The system can treat two types of parts, part $\alpha$, which requires to be processed in $S_1, S_3$, and $S_5$ in this order, and part $\beta$, which must follow route $S_2, S_1, S_1, S_2$. The task of the robot is to transport parts of type $\alpha$ and $\beta$ from an input storage $S_0$ to their first processing stations, between the processing stations (in the right order), and finally from the last processing station to an output storage $S_6$. The time the robot takes to travel from $S_i$ to $S_j$ is $\tau_{ij}$ when it is not carrying any part, and $\tau_{ij}^L$ when it is carrying part $z \in \{\alpha, \beta\}$. Moreover, the processing time for part $z$ in station $S_i$ must be within the interval $t_i = [L_i, R_i] \subseteq \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$.

We suppose that initially station $S_3$ is processing a part of type $\alpha$, and $S_2, S_4$ are processing parts of type $\beta$. We denote by $S_i \Rightarrow S_j$ robot operation "unload a part of type $z$ from $S_i$, transport it to and load it into $S_j"$ and by $\rightarrow S_j$ operation "travel from the current location to $S_j$ and wait if necessary". A schedule for this process is an infinite sequence of modes $w \in \{\alpha, \beta\}^\infty$, where mode $a$ represents the sequence of operations $\rightarrow S_3 \Rightarrow S_2 \rightarrow S_4 \Rightarrow S_5 \Rightarrow S_4 \rightarrow S_1 \Rightarrow S_5 \Rightarrow S_1 \Rightarrow S_0 \Rightarrow S_0 \rightarrow S_0$. Initially, the robot is positioned at $S_3$ if $w_1 = a$ or at $S_4$ if $w_1 = b$. We consider the following parameters for the processing network: $\tau_{ij} = |i - j|$, $\tau_{ij}^L = \tau_{ij} + 1$, $\tau_{ij}^H = \tau_{ij} + 2$, $c_1 = [10, 15]$, $c_2 = [20, 30]$, $c_3 = [50, 150]$, $c_4 = [10, 20]$, $c_5 = [30, 150]$, $c_6 = [20, 30]$. Let us first model the processing network when only part $\alpha$, respectively, $\beta$ is considered. In this way, we obtain two P-TEGs, P-TEG$_\alpha$ and P-TEG$_\beta$ (shown in Figure 3), each of which represents the behavior of the system when processing only parts of one type. Using Algorithm 1, we can find that the cycle times of the network when processing only parts of type $\alpha$, $\beta$ are all values in $[73, \infty]$, and $[72, 192]$, respectively. Now, from the obtained P-TEGs, we can model the processing network in the case where both part-types are considered as an SLDB $S = \{(\alpha, \beta), A^0, A^1, B^0, B^1\}$. To do so, we must define matrices $A_i^0, A_i^1, B_i^0, B_i^1 \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ for $z \in \{\alpha, \beta\}$ appropriately: we start by adding in P-TEG$_\alpha$ (respectively, P-TEG$_\beta$) the missing transitions from P-TEG$_\beta$ (respectively, P-TEG$_\alpha$) – the obtained P-TEGs have both $n = 12$ transitions (in general, $n = 2 + 2 \times n$ number of processing stations). For each new transition $t_i$ of P-TEG$_2$, we define $(A_{i}^{0})_{hi} = (B_{i}^{0})_{hi} = 0$; this is done to store in auxiliary variables $x_i(w_{j}|z) = x_i(w_{j}z)$ the last entrance and exit times of parts in stations that are not used in mode $z$. Moreover, to model the transportation of the robot from $S_3$ to $S_4$ (respectively, from $S_1$ to $S_3$) after each switching of mode from $a$ to $b$ (respectively, from $b$ to $a$), we set $(A_{j}^{1})_{out, 3m} = 31$ (respectively, $(A_{j}^{0})_{out, 4m} = 41$). The other elements of $A_i^0, A_i^1, B_i^0, B_i^1$ are taken from the characteristic matrices of P-TEG$_\beta$, for $z \in \{\alpha, \beta\}$. The modeling effort required to define $S$ is repaid by the possibility to use Algorithm 2 for computing the minimum and maximum cycle times corresponding to a schedule $w = v^*$. For instance, we get $A_{max}^{a,b}(S) = [77, 192]$. This means that, using schedule $\omega v^*$, we can obtain one product of each type every at least 77 and at most 192 time units.

To appreciate the advantage of using Algorithm 2, in Figure 4 we show the computational time to get $A_{max}^{a,b}(S)$ with increasing subsequence length $|v|$, using different methods: Algorithm 2, the algorithm derived from Proposition 8 directly, the algorithm developed in Kats et al. [2008], and a linear programming solver. The first three algorithms were implemented on Matlab R2019a, for solving the linear programs we used CPLEX’s dual simplex method; the tests were executed on a PC with an Intel i7 processor at 2.20Ghz. From the results, we can see that the most time-consuming approach is the one using Proposition 8 directly, while Algorithm 2 achieves the fastest computation. This shows how critical the exploitation of the sparsity of matrix $\lambda P_e \oplus \lambda^{-1} I_e \oplus C_v$ is for decreasing computation time.

6. FINAL REMARKS

We have shown that SLDIs can model plants such as multi-product processing networks, and provided an inexpensive method to compute minimum and maximum cycle times when they follow a fixed and periodic schedule. We remark that the complexity reduction achieved by exploiting the sparsity of matrix $\lambda P_e \oplus \lambda^{-1} I_e \oplus C_v$ through techniques from automata theory could be generalized to solve NCPs on matrices with different distributions of non-$\varepsilon$ elements; practical applications in a variety of scheduling problems are expected. Regarding SLDIs, plenty of problems of theoretical and practical relevance remain open, such as the complexity of verifying the existence of a schedule $w$ under which the SLDB is boundedly consistent. Finally, we argue that, as implicit switching max-plus linear systems generalize the dynamics of max-plus automata (cf. Van Den Boom and De Schutter [2006]), SLDIs generalize the
blue represents a part being processed in a station, the robot moving with, and without carrying a part,

Figure 3. P-TEGs modeling the processing network considering only one part-type. A token in a place colored red, black, and blue represents a part being processed in a station, the robot moving with, and without carrying a part, respectively.

Figure 4. Time to compute $\Lambda^v_{\text{SLDI}}(S)$ for increasing values of $|v|$ using different methods.

dynamics of interval weighted automata. This would imply that SLDIs can be used to represent and solve scheduling problems for systems modeled by safe P-time Petri nets (cf. Komenda et al. [2020]).
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