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Abstract—Synchronous dataflow graphs (SDFGs) are used extensively to model streaming applications. An SDFG can be extended with scheduling decisions, allowing SDFG analysis to obtain properties like throughput or buffer sizes for the scheduled graphs. Analysis times depend strongly on the size of the SDFG. SDFGs can be statically scheduled using static-order schedules. The only generally applicable technique to model a static-order schedule in an SDFG is to convert it to a homogeneous SDFG (HSDFG). This conversion may lead to an exponential increase in the size of the graph and to sub-optimal analysis results (e.g., for buffer sizes in multi-processors). We present a technique to model periodic static-order schedules directly in an SDFG. Experiments show that our technique produces more compact graphs compared to the technique that relies on a conversion to an HSDFG. This results in reduced analysis times for performance properties and tighter resource requirements.

I. INTRODUCTION

Synchronous dataflow graphs (SDFGs) are widely used to model digital signal processing and multimedia applications [1]–[4]. Model-based design-flows (e.g., [1], [5]–[8]) model binding and scheduling decisions into the SDFG. This enables analysis of performance properties (e.g., throughput [9]) or resource requirements (e.g., buffer sizes [10]) under resource constraints. Fig. 1 shows an example of an SDFG with four actors and three channels. An essential property of SDFGs is that every time an actor fires (executes) it consumes the same amount of tokens from its input edges and produces the same amount of tokens on its output edges. These amounts are called the rates (indicated next to the channel ends when the rates are larger than 1). The fixed port rates make it possible to statically schedule SDFGs.

Many SDFG analysis algorithms, e.g., throughput calculation or buffer sizing, are straightforward when a single processor platform is used. For instance, the buffer sizes can be determined by executing the SDFG according to a given schedule. However, in a multi-processor environment, SDFG analysis algorithms are not trivial because of the inter-processor communication amongst other reasons. For a multi-processor, it is possible to construct per processor to which actors of the SDFG are bound, a finite schedule that sequentially orders the actor firings and which is repeated indefinitely. Such a schedule is called a periodic static-order schedule (PSOS). PSOSs specify the order of actor firing which separates them from fully static schedules, which determine absolute start times of actors. A model-based design-flow usually uses PSOSs for an application modeled with an SDFG. In this way timing (throughput) and memory usage (buffers) can be analyzed.

There is only one technique [11] known to model PSOSs in an SDFG. This technique requires a conversion of an SDFG to a so-called homogeneous SDFG (HSDFG) in which all rates are equal to one [2]. Fig. 2 (without the blue edges) shows the equivalent HSDFG of our example SDFG of Fig. 1. The PSOS modeling technique of [11] sequentializes the actor firings by inserting a channel between each pair of consecutive actors in a processor schedule. At the end of each schedule, it adds a channel with one initial token from the last to the first actor in the schedule. All of these ensure an indefinite execution of the graph according to the schedules. The technique from [11] adds in total 15 channels to the HSDFG of our example graph (the blue edges in Fig. 2) to model PSOSs $s_0 = \langle a_0(a_2)^2 \rangle^*$ and $s_1 = \langle (a_1)^5a_3a_1(a_3)^3 \rangle^*$.

The SDFG to HSDFG conversion can lead to an exponential increase in the size of the graph. For example, converting the SDFG of an H.263 decoder [10] to the equivalent HSDFG increases the graph size from 4 actors to 200 actors. The run-time of SDFG analysis algorithms depends amongst others on the size of the graph. As a result, the run-time of many SDFG analysis algorithms may increase drastically when modeling PSOSs in the graph using the technique from [11]. For example, the buffer sizing algorithm from [10] takes less than 1 ms on the SDFG of an H.263 decoder. Modeling a schedule into this SDFG using the technique from [11], the run-time of the same algorithm increases to 1330 ms. SDFG analysis algorithms are usually repeated more than once in an iterative design-flow. For example, the design-flow from [6] performs 8 throughput calculations to determine the right solution for an H.263 decoder. Hence, it is vital to keep the size of the schedule-extended graph as small as possible to provide a fast and practical design trajectory. There is a second drawback to the technique from [11]. The original graph structure is
lost due to the conversion to an HSDFG. A single channel in an SDFG corresponds to a set of channels in the HSDFG. As a result, common buffer sizing techniques cannot find the minimal buffer size for the original SDFG. The H.263 decoder buffer sizes are for example overestimated by 43% when applying the technique of [10] to the HSDFG. Note that a conversion to an HSDFG may be required in a code generation step. However, if this conversion can be delayed until all analyses are carried out on the SDFG, then this can save a significant amount of resources (e.g., buffer space) and analysis time.

A novel technique is needed to model any PSOS in an SDFG. This technique should limit the increase in the number of actors such that analysis times do not increase too much when analyzing the SDFG with its schedules. The technique should also preserve the original graph structure as this enables accurate analysis of graph properties such as buffer sizes. This paper presents a technique that satisfies both requirements. The technique can be used in any model-based design-flow that models PSOSs into the SDFG (e.g., [1], [5]–[8]). The proposed technique can also directly be used to model PSOSs in scenario-aware dataflow graphs [12].

The remainder of the paper is structured as follows. The next section discusses related work. Sec. III introduces SDFGs. Sec. IV formalizes SDFG schedules. Sec. V presents our technique to model PSOSs in an SDFG. Sec. VI contains the correctness proof of the presented technique. We evaluate our technique by applying it to several realistic applications in Sec. VII. Sec. VIII concludes.

II. RELATED WORK

The technique from [11] is the only available technique to model PSOSs in an SDFG. As already explained, this technique may result in a long run-time for analysis algorithms and/or inaccurate results from these algorithms. Our technique alleviates both shortcomings of the technique from [11]. The work in [13] models the effect of a budget scheduler or preemptive TDMA on the temporal behavior of the SDFG, either by computing an accurate worst-case response time, or more precisely by introducing additional actors into a latency-rate model. In contrast, for non-preemptive schedules, such as PSOSs, we focus on the ordering of actor firings; their execution time remains the same. We enforce an SDFG to follow the PSOSs selected for each processor. This allows SDFG analysis to obtain properties like throughput or buffer sizes for the scheduled SDFG. This is also true for the models of [13]. However, our results are tighter since we do not overestimate response times. Since we only use the basic components of an SDFG (e.g., actors and channels) to model schedules in an SDFG, our schedule-extended SDFG can be directly used in any model-based design-flow (e.g., [1], [5]–[8]). Ref [14] uses some new (custom) components, e.g., if–then–else, to model schedules in an SDFG. The common model-based design-flows do not support these components and it is not possible to model these components by using the basic components of an SDFG. Our technique eliminates the need for any new (custom) component. As a result, any analysis technique for SDFGs is directly applicable on the schedule-extended SDFG.

III. SYNCHRONOUS DATAFLOW GRAPHS

Let $\mathbb{N}$ denote the positive natural numbers, $\mathbb{N}_0$ the natural numbers including 0, and $\mathbb{N}_{\infty}$ the natural numbers including 0 and infinity (\(\infty\)). Formally we define an SDFG as follows. We assume a set $\text{Ports}$ of ports, and with each port $p \in \text{Ports}$ we associate a finite rate $\text{Rate}(p) \in \mathbb{N}$.

Definition 1. (Actor) An actor $a_i$ is a tuple $(\text{In}, \text{Out})$ consisting of a set $\text{In} \subseteq \text{Ports}$ of input ports (denoted by $\text{In}(a_i)$) and a set $\text{Out} \subseteq \text{Ports}$ of output ports (denoted by $\text{Out}(a_i)$) with $\text{In} \cap \text{Out} = \emptyset$.

Definition 2. (SDFG) An SDFG is a tuple $(A, C)$ consisting of a finite set $A$ of actors and a finite set $C \subseteq \text{Ports}^2$ of channels. The channel source is an output port of some actor, the destination is an input port of some actor. All ports of all actors are connected to precisely one channel, and all channels are connected to ports of some actor. For every actor $a_i = (\text{In}, \text{Out}) \in A$, we denote the set of all channels that are connected to the ports in $\text{In}$ (Out) by $\text{InC}(a_i)$ (OutC$(a_i)$).

Fig. 1 shows an example of an SDFG with four actors ($A = \{a_0, a_1, a_2, a_3\}$) and three channels ($C = \{c_0, c_1, c_2\}$). These actors communicate with tokens sent from one actor to another over the channels. Channels may contain tokens, depicted with a solid dot (and an attached number in case of multiple tokens). An essential property of SDFGs is that every time an actor fires (executes) it consumes the same amount of tokens from its input edges and produces the same amount of tokens on its output edges. These amounts are called the rates (indicated next to the channel ends when the rates are larger than 1). An actor can only fire if sufficient tokens are available on the edges from which it consumes. Tokens thus capture dependencies between actor firings. Such dependencies may originate from data dependencies, but also...
from for example dependencies on shared resources. When an actor \( a_i \) starts its firing, it removes \( \text{Rate}(q) \) tokens from all \( c(p,q) \in \text{InC}(a_i) \) and when it ends, it produces \( \text{Rate}(p) \) tokens on every \( c(p,q) \in \text{OutC}(a_i) \). The rates determine how often actors have to fire with respect to each other such that the distribution of tokens over all channels is not changed. This property is captured in the repetition vector of an SDFG.

**Definition 3. (Repetition Vector)** A repetition vector of an SDFG \((A,C)\) is a function \( \gamma : A \rightarrow \mathbb{N}_0 \) such that for every channel \( c(p,q) \in C \) from \( a_i \in A \) to \( a_j \in A \), \( \text{Rate}(p) \cdot \gamma(a_i) = \text{Rate}(q) \cdot \gamma(a_j) \). A repetition vector \( \gamma \) is called non-trivial if and only if for all \( a_i \in A \), \( \gamma(a_i) > 0 \). An SDFG is called consistent if and only if it has a non-trivial repetition vector.

For a consistent graph, there is a unique smallest non-trivial repetition vector, which is designated as the repetition vector of the SDFG.

The repetition vector of the SDFG shown in Fig. 1 is equal to \((a_0, a_1, a_2, a_3) \rightarrow (1, 0, 2, 6)\). This shows that the SDFG is consistent as its repetition vector is non-trivial. Consistency and absence of deadlock are two important properties for SDFGs which can be verified efficiently [15], [16]. Any SDFG which is not consistent requires unbounded memory to execute or it eventually deadlocks. When an SDFG deadlocks, no actor is able to fire, which is due to an insufficient number of tokens in a cycle of the graph. Any SDFG which is inconsistent or deadlocks is not useful in practice. Therefore, we limit ourselves to consistent and deadlock-free SDFGs.

There exists a special class of SDFGs in which all port rates are equal to 1. These graphs are called homogeneous SDFGs (HSDFGs) [16]. Any consistent SDFG can be converted to an HSDFG [2], [16] that is equivalent from the timing perspective. This conversion may however lead to an exponential increase in the number of actors and it has an impact on the speed and possibly also the accuracy of the result of analysis techniques.

IV. SDFG STATIC-ORDER SCHEDULING

A firing of an actor leads to the consumption of tokens from its input channels and the production of tokens on its output channels. In order to capture the behavior of an SDFG, we need to keep track of the distribution of tokens over the channels. The following concept is defined to measure quantities related to channels (e.g., the number of tokens present in channels).

**Definition 4. (SDFG State)** A state of an SDFG \((A,C)\) is a function \( \omega : C \rightarrow \mathbb{N}_0 \) that returns the number of tokens stored in each channel. Each SDFG has an initial state \( \omega_0 \) denoting the number of tokens that are initially stored in the channels.

An actor can only be fired if there are sufficient tokens in all of its input channels. An actor that satisfies this condition in a particular state is said to be enabled in this state.

**Definition 5. (Enabled Actor)** An actor \( a_i \in A \) is called enabled in a state \( \omega_j \) of SDFG \((A,C)\) if and only if \( \omega_j(c) \geq \text{Rate}(c) \) for each channel \( c(p,q) \in \text{InC}(a_i) \).

**Definition 6. (Actor Firing)** The firing of an actor \( a_i \in A \) in an SDFG \((A,C)\) which is in state \( \omega_j \) results in the transition from state \( \omega_j \) to state \( \omega_j + 1 \) and is denoted by \( \omega_j \overset{a_i}{\rightarrow} \omega_j + 1 \).

This transition results in the consumption of \( \text{Rate}(q) \) tokens from each channel \( c(p,q) \in \text{InC}(a_i) \) and the production of \( \text{Rate}(p) \) tokens in each channel \( c(p,q') \in \text{OutC}(a_i) \), i.e., \( \omega_j + 1(c) = \omega_j(c) - \text{Rate}(q) + \text{Rate}(p') \).

Consider again our example graph shown in Fig. 1. Its initial state \( \omega_0 \) is equal to \((c_0, c_1, c_2) \rightarrow (0, 0, 0)\). In this state, actor \( a_0 \) is enabled. Firing actor \( a_0 \) would result in a transition from state \( \omega_0 \) to a state \((6, 0, 0)\). We use this concept of states and transitions to formalize the execution of an SDFG.

**Definition 7. (Execution)** An execution \( \sigma \) of an SDFG \((A,C)\) is an infinite alternating sequence of states and transitions \( \omega_0 \overset{a_1}{\rightarrow} \omega_1 \rightarrow \cdots \) starting from some designated initial state \( \omega_0 \).

In a multi-processor system multiple actors may be bound to the same processor. These actors may be enabled at the same time. In such a situation, a schedule is needed to determine the order in which these enabled actors are fired on the processor. The fixed port rates make it possible to statically schedule SDFGs with a finite schedule per processor that orders the actor firings for that processor and which is repeated indefinitely. Such a schedule is called a periodic static-order schedule (PSOS). Note that in a multi-processor system, a separate static-order schedule should be constructed for each processor. Each schedule should only include actors bound to this specific processor.

**Definition 8. (Periodic Static-Order Schedule)** A periodic static-order schedule is a finite ordered list of (a sub-set of) actors in an SDFG \((A,C)\). A periodic static-order schedule is denoted by \( s_i = (\alpha_1 \alpha_2 \cdots \alpha_n)^* \) where each \( \alpha_j \in A \) represents an actor from \( A \) and \( n \in \mathbb{N} \) is the length of the schedule \( s_i \), represented by \( n = |s_i| \). The set \( A_i \) contains all actors that appear at least once in \( s_i \) \((A_i \subseteq A)\).

**Definition 9. (SDFG Iteration)** Assume SDFG \((A,C)\) has repetition vector \( \gamma \). An SDFG iteration is a set of actor firings such that for all \( a_i \in A \), the set contains \( \gamma(a_i) \) firings of \( a_i \).

**Definition 10. (PSOS Iteration)** Given a PSOS \( s_i \) = \((\alpha_1 \alpha_2 \cdots \alpha_n)^* \) that schedules a subset of actors \( A_i \). A PSOS iteration is a sequence of actor firings respecting \( s_i \) starting from the actor \( \alpha_1 \) and ending with the actor \( \alpha_n \) with a length equal to the length of the schedule \( s_i \) and including only actor firings from actors in \( A_i \). We use \( \text{CNT}(\alpha_j, s_i) \) to denote the count, i.e., number of appearances, of actor \( \alpha_j \) in one iteration of the PSOS \( s_i \).

A looped schedule, \( s_i = ((\alpha_1)^{\beta_1}(\alpha_2)^{\beta_2} \cdots (\alpha_m)^{\beta_m})^* \), is defined as a successive execution of \( \alpha_1 \) repeated \( \beta_1 \) times followed by \( \alpha_2 \) repeated \( \beta_2 \) times and so on, where each
Definition 11. (NORMALIZED PSOS) A PSOS $s_i$ is called normalized if and only if each actor $a_j \in A_i$ appears $\gamma(a_j)$ times in one iteration of the PSOS $s_i$.

We limit ourselves in the remainder to PSOSs in which $r$ is a unit fraction (i.e., $r = \frac{u}{w}$ with $u = 1$ and $w \in \mathbb{N}$), although our technique can also be directly applied to model other PSOSs (i.e., in which $u \in \mathbb{N}$).

The order of actor firings in an execution $\omega_0 \overset{a_1}{\rightarrow} \omega_1 \overset{a_2}{\rightarrow} \cdots$ is an ordered list $\{a_1, a_2, \cdots\}$ ($\alpha_j \in \mathbb{N}$) represents an actor from $A$). The notation $\text{orderList}(\sigma, A_i)$ represents the ordered list extracted from execution $\sigma$ while actors which do not belong to $A_i$ are omitted from the ordered list. When an SDFG is executed according to a PSOS, we say that the corresponding execution of the SDFG satisfies that PSOS. We use the following definition to formalize this term.

Definition 12. (SATISFACTION) The execution $\sigma$ of an SDFG satisfies the PSOS $s_i$ for actors in $A_i \subseteq A$ if and only if for the ordered list $\text{orderList}(\sigma, A_i)$ results in the same actor ordering as specified in the PSOS $s_i$.

V. MODELING PERIODIC STATIC-ORDER SCHEDULES

In this section, we introduce a technique to model PSOSs in an SDFG. Algorithm 1 encapsulates our technique, called decision state modeling (DSM). Fig. 3 depicts the corresponding SDFG of Fig. 1 which models the PSOSs $s_0$ and $s_1$ using DSM. The remainder of this section discusses different parts of the algorithm in detail. There are several reasons why an SDFG cannot model PSOSs naturally. The following subsections discuss them and illustrate how we address them.

A. Auto-concurrency

An actor $a_i \in A$ in an SDFG state $\omega_j$ can possibly be enabled multiple times simultaneously in the state $\omega_j$. This property is called auto-concurrency. The firings related to actor $a_i$ should occur sequentially according to the PSOS to which actor $a_i$ belongs. This sequential execution can be enforced by adding a self-edge with one initial token to actor $a_i$ (Line 1 in Algorithm 1). In Fig. 3, channels $c_{SE-0} - c_{SE-3}$ (shown in red) are used to prevent any auto-concurrency in the SDFG of Fig. 1.

B. Inter-iteration execution

Enabled actors in a PSOS belonging to the next PSOS iteration prevent the execution of the SDFG from following the given PSOS; lines 4-8 in Algorithm 1 are used to control this undesirable actor enabling. This part of the algorithm adds (per PSOS) one actor and two channels to create a dependency between the last and first actor appearing in the PSOS. The added components limit, within one PSOS iteration, the firing of the first actor in the PSOS (i.e., $a_F$) to the count of actor $a_F$ (i.e., $\text{CNT}(a_F, s_i)$) in one iteration of the PSOS $s_i$. The function $\text{CNT}(a_F, s_i)$ in DSM returns the count of the actor $a_F$ in one iteration of the PSOS $s_i$. The next iteration of the PSOS $s_i$ can only commence if the last actor in PSOS $s_i$ (i.e., $a_L$) fires $\text{CNT}(a_L, s_i)$ times in one iteration of the PSOS $s_i$. In other words, the next iteration of a PSOS can only commence after the completion of the current iteration of this PSOS. In Fig. 3, actor $a_{0-end}$ and channels $c_{0-pre}$ and $c_{0-pre}$ are added to prevent any inter-iteration execution in PSOS $s_0$. Actor $a_{1-end}$ and channels $c_{1-pre}$ and $c_{1-pre}$ are added to prevent any inter-iteration execution in schedule $s_1$. These elements are shown in our example in blue in Fig. 3.
Algorithm 1: Decision State Modeling (DSM)

```plaintext
input : SDFG $G(A,C)$, PSOSs $\{s_0, \ldots, s_n\}$
output: $G$ extended with schedules $\{s_0, \ldots, s_n\}$
1. add a self edge with 1 initial token for each $a \in A$
2. $\{s_0', \mu_0, \ldots, s_n', \mu_n\} \leftarrow$ normalize$(G, \{s_0, \ldots, s_n\})$
3. for $i \leftarrow 0$ to $n$ do
   /* To control inter-iteration execution */
   4. $a_L :=$ last actor in $s_i$
   5. $a_F :=$ first actor in $s_i$
   6. $AA(G, a_{i-end})$
   7. $AC(G, c_i-prec, a_L, a_{i-end}, 1, CNT(a_L, s_i), 0)$
   8. $AC(G, c_i-prod, a_{i-end}, a_F, CNT(a_F, s_i), 1, CNT(a_F, s_i))$
   /* To control decision states */
   9. $\Omega \leftarrow$ getDecisionStates$(G, s_i', \{s_0', \ldots, s_n'\} \setminus s_i')$
   10. $\Omega \leftarrow$ reduceDecisionStates$(\Omega)$
   11. $\Omega \leftarrow$ foldDecisionStates$(\Omega, \mu_i)$
   12. foreach $\omega_j \in \Omega$ do
      13. $AA(G, a_{i-\omega_j})$
      14. foreach $a_k \in \Delta_j$ do
         if $a_k$ is the actor of choice then
            15. $AC(G, c_i-a_k \omega_j, a_k, a_{i-\omega_j}, 1, CNT(a_k, s_i), AFT(a_k, \omega_j, s_i))$
         else
            16. $AC(G, c_i-a_k \omega_j, a_k, a_{i-\omega_j}, a_k, CNT(a_k, s_i), 1, BEF(a_k, \omega_j, s_i))$
      end
   end
```

C. Decision states

1) Concept: The state space when executing our example SDFG using the PSOSs $s_0$ and $s_1$ is visualized in Fig. 4. In this figure, the actors mapped on processor $P_0$ ($P_1$) are surrounded by a square (circle). Auto-concurrency and inter-iteration execution are excluded using the constructs introduced in Sec. V-A and Sec. V-B respectively. The periodic behavior of the PSOSs is obvious from the state space. There are some states in which more than one actor is enabled ($\omega_5 - \omega_9$) on one processor. In such a situation, the execution related to those actors can deviate from the specified PSOS. We use the following definition to formalize such a situation.

**Definition 13. (Decision State) Consider the PSOS $s_i$ which schedules actors $A_i \subseteq A$ and an execution $\sigma$ of an SDFG $(A,C)$ which satisfies PSOS $s_i$. A state $\omega_j \in \sigma$ is a decision state if and only if multiple actors from $A_i$ are enabled in $\omega_j$.**

The finite set $\Omega$ occurring in DSM contains these decision states for the PSOS being considered. The following terminology is used to describe those enabled actors in a decision state.

**Definition 14. (Opponent Actor Set) Let $\omega_j \in \Omega$ be a decision state within PSOS $s_i$. The opponent actor set $\Delta_j$ of the decision state $\omega_j$ is a finite set which contains all actors that are enabled in decision state $\omega_j$ and that belong to $A_i$.**

The finite set $\Delta_j$ represents the opponent actors in the decision state $\omega_j \in \Omega$. One of the enabled actors in a decision state $\omega_j$, in line with the given PSOS $s_i$, should be selected to get fired. The following definition is used to describe such an actor.

**Definition 15. (Actor of Choice) Consider the PSOS $s_i$ which schedules actors $A_i \subseteq A$ and the opponent set $\Delta_j$ of the decision state $\omega_j$ in an execution $\sigma$ of the SDFG $(A,C)$ which satisfies PSOS $s_i$. An actor $a_c \in \Delta_j$ is called the actor of choice of the decision state $\omega_j$ if and only if the firing of actor $a_c$ in state $\omega_j$ is a necessity for the execution $\sigma$ in order to satisfy the PSOS $s_i$.**

One member of the set $\Delta_j$ is the actor of choice in decision state $\omega_j$; we denote that actor of choice with $a_c \in \Delta_j$.

Lines 9-18 in DSM show how we deal with uncertainty due to decision states. In the algorithm $n + 1$ ($n \in \mathbb{N}_0$) is the number of processors (or input PSOSs). DSM models the given PSOSs one-by-one iteratively. The ordering of PSOSs in DSM does not have any impact on the final outcome. In each iteration of the for-loop in line 3, we enforce the execution of the actors in the current schedule of interest (i.e., schedule $s_i$) to follow schedule $s_i$. The next sub-section explains how decision states of the schedule of interest are extracted. For each $\omega_j \in \Omega$ extracted from $s_i$, DSM adds an actor ($a_{i-\omega_j}$) in line 13 and one channel between the new actor $a_{i-\omega_j}$ and each opponent actor in the set $\Delta_j$ (lines 14-18 in Algorithm 1).

In our example, these elements are shown in green in Fig. 3. In practice, the elements added in each decision state (e.g., $\omega_j$) postpone the execution of the actors in $\Delta_j \setminus \{a_c\}$ to the state after decision state $\omega_j$. Hence, $a_c$ (i.e., the actor of choice) is the only actor which can be fired in the state $\omega_j$.

2) Decision state identification. Algorithm 2 shows our proposed technique to detect all decision states. In this algorithm, $s_c$ is the PSOS for which we want to determine the decision states. Assume $s_c$ is a PSOS for the actors mapped on processor $P_c$. Schedules $s_{o1} \cdots s_{on}$ are PSOSs for the other actors of the SDFG mapped on the other processors (with $P_{o1} \cdots P_{on}$ as the other processors). In Algorithm 2, the input schedules are normalized PSOSs. The function normalize (in line 2 of Algorithm 1) normalizes the input PSOSs. The function returns the normalized PSOSs along with their normalization factors. The normalized PSOS $s'_x$ can be achieved by repeating $\mu_x$ times the input PSOS $s_x$ (i.e., $s'_x = (s_x)^{\mu_x}$). $\mu_x$ is the normalization factor of $s_x$ and can be calculated by dividing the repetition vector entry of an arbitrary actor in $s_x$ by the count of that actor in the PSOS $s_x$ (in our example, $\mu_0$ and $\mu_1$ are equal to 1).

An actor in the schedule of interest $s_c$ could be affected by the execution of an actor in the other schedules as well as another actor in the schedule $s_c$. Processors can run at different clock rates; these differences and inter-processor dependencies cause variation in the amount of tokens on the inter-processor channels originating from the actors mapped on the other processors to the actors mapped on the processor of interest (i.e., $P_c$). The amount of tokens on the input channels of an actor determines whether an actor is enabled (ready to execute) or not. Our technique can determine any possible actor enabling when executing $s_c$ by considering the maximum amount of tokens on all inter-processor channels. Each iteration of the schedule of interest $s_c$ requires that the
actors mapped on the other processors are fired up-to at most their repetition vector entry values. Hence, only executing one iteration of the other schedules $s_{o1} \cdots s_{on}$ is enough to provide sufficient tokens on inter-processor channels entering to the actors mapped on processor $P_c$. Subsequent iterations of the other schedules $s_{o1} \cdots s_{on}$ are possible; this may enable an actor in the schedule $s_c$ to be enabled more than its designated amount in one iteration of the schedule $s_c$. The inter-iteration prevention constructs introduced in Sec. V-B are used to control this undesired actor enabling. So, we only extract decision states within one iteration of the normalized schedule. Also, DSM does not impose any limitation between PSOSs; PSOSs can independently be iterated if the dependencies in the SDFG allow that. We allow the actors on the other processors to be executed (according to their schedules) as much as they can. The execution of the actors on the other processors will stop at one point either due to their dependency on the actors on the processor $P_c$ or because one iteration of their schedule is completed. The state of the SDFG needs to be preserved to follow the subsequent execution of the actors. This maximal execution of the actors on the other processors is represented by the function $maxExec$ in Algorithm 2. After this maximal execution, the amount of tokens on the inter-processor channels entering into the actors on the processor $P_c$ determines any possible enabled actor. The current state (represented by $\omega_j$) will be added to the decision state set ($\Omega$) if more than one actor on the processor $P_c$ is enabled at this state (line 5 in Algorithm 2). All enabled actors will be recorded as opponent actors of the state $\omega_j$ (line 6 in Algorithm 2). The execution of the actors on the processor $P_c$ is continued by executing the enabled actor in line with $s_c$ in order to determine all possible decision states (line 7 in Algorithm 2). The function $fire(G, \omega_j, s_c[i])$ fires the actor at the $i^{th}$ position in the PSOS $s_c$. The maximal execution followed by decision state identification will be iterated to execute one iteration of $s_c$. In the end, the set $\Omega$ contains all possible decision states when executing PSOS $s_c$. In the SDFG of Fig. 1, five consecutive decision states ($\Omega = \{\omega_5, \cdots, \omega_9\}$) exist for PSOS $s_1$ and no decision state exists for PSOS $s_0$ (see Fig. 4).

3) Redundant decision states: It is possible to have several consecutive decision states which are postponing the firing of an actor to several states later. For example, three consecutive decision states ($\omega_7 - \omega_9$) exist in Fig. 4 that all postpone the same firing of actor $a_1$; the added components in decision state $\omega_7$ postpone the sixth firing of $a_1$ to the state $\omega_8$; the added components in decision state $\omega_8$ postpone the sixth firing of $a_1$ to the state $\omega_9$; and so on. The latest decision state in the sequence of decision states $\omega_7 - \omega_9$ is enough to postpone the firing of actor $a_1$ to state $\omega_{10}$. Hence, the decision states $\omega_7 - \omega_8$ are redundant and can be removed from the decision state set $\Omega$. The function $reduceDecisionStates$ is responsible for removing redundant decision states. Note that it would be possible to perform this reduction during the decision state identification step. This reduction can remove a significant amount of extra components in the final SDFG. Decision state $\omega_5$ is also redundant according to our optimization. So, only two decision states $\omega_5$ and $\omega_9$ are necessary to model $s_1$ in the SDFG of Fig. 1.

![Fig. 4. The state space of the SDFG of Fig. 1 when PSOSs $s_0 = (a_0(a_2)^2)^*$ and $s_1 = ((a_1)^3(a_3)^3(a_1)^3)^*$ are used.](image-url)

```
Algorithm 2: Get Decision States

input : SDFG $G$, PSOS $s_c$, PSOSs $\{s_{o1}, \cdots, s_{on}\}$
output: Decision state set $\Omega$

1. $\omega_j \leftarrow$ the initial state of $G$
2. for $i \leftarrow 1$ to $|s_c|$ do
3. \[
4. \omega_j \leftarrow \text{maxExec}(G, \omega_j, \{s_{o1}, \cdots, s_{on}\})
5. \text{if } \text{sizeOf(enabledActors)}(G, \omega_j, s_c) > 1 \text{ then}
6. \quad \Omega \leftarrow \Omega \cup \{\omega_j\}
7. \quad \Delta_j \leftarrow \text{enabledActors}(G, \omega_j, s_c)
8. \quad \omega_j \leftarrow \text{fire}(G, \omega_j, s_c[i])
\]

4) Decision state folding: In Algorithm 1, the input PSOSs are normalized to find all decision states. The normalization of PSOSs is required to explore all (sufficient) states of an SDFG. Consider PSOSs $s_2 = (a_0)^*$ and $s_3 = (a_2 a_1)^*$ for our second example SDFG in Fig. 5. To obtain normalized PSOSs, $\mu_2$ and $\mu_3$ must be equal to 3 and 4 respectively. This leads to the following normalized PSOSs: $s'_2 = ((a_0)^3)^*$ and $s'_3 = ((a_2 a_1)^4)^*$. Decision state identification for PSOS $s'_2$ results in 5 decision states. $\left(\left(\left(\left(\left(a_2^3\right)^3\left(a_2\right)^3\right)^3\right)^3\right)^3\right)$ shows the corresponding execution of $s'_2$. In construct $(a_2^3)^*$, $a_2$ is the enabled actor in line with the PSOS and $a_2$ is the other enabled actor if any at all. In this execution, the $1^{st}$, $3^{rd}$, $5^{th}$ and $7^{th}$ states are similar in behavior. In other words, the actor $a_2$ should be fired in all of those states.

Modeling a repetitive behavior for a PSOS $s_i$, also models this behavior for its normalized PSOS (i.e., $s'_i = (s_i)^{\mu_i}$). By considering this fact, we can merge decision states appearing in all $\mu_i$ repetitions of the PSOS $s_i$. We call this optimization decision state folding (line 11 in Algorithm 1). Folding groups the similar states. In our example, the $1^{st}$, $3^{rd}$, $5^{th}$ and $7^{th}$ states are grouped and represented with one state. Similar state grouping can be performed for the $2^{nd}$, $4^{th}$, $6^{th}$ and $8^{th}$
states. So, the above execution shrinks to \( (a_{2}) (a_{3}) \). If there is a decision state in any of the similar states in the original execution, a decision state will be placed in the substitution state of those states. In practice, a decision state in a state of the new folded execution will be considered as a decision state for each of the equivalent states in the original execution. This cannot violate the execution according to the input PSOS because DSM only ensures the execution of the actor of choice in a decision state. This optimization could reduce the number of decision states up to \( \mu t \) times in a normalized PSOS \( s' \). The decision state in the last state is ignored thanks to our inter-iteration execution prevention (which is explained in Sec. V-B). In our second example, decision state folding reduces the number of decision states from 5 to 1 for \( s_3 \).

5) Enforcing a schedule in decision states: In our first example SDFG, only two actors are enabled in decision state \( \omega_6 \) (i.e., \( A_0 = \{a_1, a_3\} \)) (see Fig. 4). Actor \( a_1 \) is the actor of choice in decision state \( \omega_6 \) and actor \( a_3 \) is the only opponent actor whose execution should be postponed to the state after state \( \omega_6 \). DSM adds actor \( a_1-\omega_6 \) and channels \( c_{1-\omega_6} \) and \( c_{1-a_3\omega_6} \) to the graph to control the actor firings in decision state \( \omega_6 \). DSM also adds actor \( a_1-\omega_9 \) and channels \( c_{1-a_1\omega_9} \) and \( c_{1-a_3\omega_9} \) to the graph for the other decision state \( \omega_9 \).

The actor \( a_1-\omega_9 \) is added to enforce the firing of \( a_3 \) in decision state \( \omega_9 \) and to postpone the execution of \( a_1 \) to the subsequent state. The actor \( a_1-\omega_9 \) is only responsible for decision state \( \omega_9 \) and it fires only once in an iteration. This means that its value in the repetition vector of the new graph (i.e., Fig. 3) is one. The production and consumption rates of the ports of the actor \( a_1 \) should be set to a value that preserves the consistency of the SDFG; for this purpose, the port rates of actor \( a_1 \) on its channels (i.e., \( c_{1-\omega_1} \) and \( c_{1-\omega_9} \)) are set to 6. The added dependency channels from the newly added actor in decision state \( \omega_9 \) (i.e., \( a_1-\omega_9 \) in decision state \( \omega_9 \)) to the opponent actors which are not the actor of choice (e.g., \( a_1 \) in decision state \( \omega_9 \)) only provide enough tokens for their execution in states \( \omega_9 - \omega_{j-1} \) (e.g., 5 tokens for \( a_3 \) in states \( \omega_9 - \omega_3 \)); these actors cannot be enabled due to the lack of tokens in the newly added channels in the corresponding decision state (i.e., there will be no token in channel \( c_{1-\omega_9} \) in decision state \( \omega_9 \)). Hence only the actor of choice amongst the opponent actors of a decision state will be enabled in that state (e.g., only \( a_3 \) can fire in decision state \( \omega_9 \)). The firing of the postponed actors in a decision state (e.g., decision state \( \omega_9 \)) will not depend on the newly added actor in the decision state (i.e., \( a_1-\omega_9 \)) after firing of the actor of choice in \( \omega_9 \). For example, there will be 6 tokens in channel \( c_{1-a_3\omega_9} \) after the firing of actor \( a_3 \) (i.e., the actor of choice) in decision state \( \omega_9 \); hence, the actor \( a_1-\omega_9 \) can immediately fire and its execution will provide sufficient tokens for later firings of actor \( a_1 \). So, the postponed actor in decision state \( \omega_9 \) will not be dependent on actor \( a_1-\omega_9 \) for its later execution in the current iteration of the PSOS \( s_1 \).

The firing of actor \( a_3 \) after decision state \( \omega_9 \) produces 3 tokens in channel \( c_{1-a_3\omega_9} \) and the firing of actor \( a_1 \) after decision state \( \omega_9 \) consumes 1 token from channel \( c_{1-a_1\omega_9} \); as a result, the amount of tokens in the new channels are reset to the initial values at the end of one iteration of the schedule \( s_1 \). Hence, the periodic behavior is also achievable for the added components. The components added in decision state \( \omega_9 \) show similar behavior as the components added in decision state \( \omega_9 \).

VI. CORRECTNESS OF DSM

This section discusses the correctness of DSM in modeling a single PSOS for a subset of the actors of the SDFG. If we can model a single PSOS in the SDFG, then we can also model multiple PSOSs by simply applying the algorithm multiple times.

DSM adds some extra actors and channels to model the PSOS \( s_1 \) in SDFG \( G(A, C) \). The sets \( A_1 \) and \( C_1 \) represent those extra actors and channels respectively. The notation \( G'(A', C') \) represents the SDFG which models the PSOS \( s_1 \) in the SDFG \( G \) using DSM where \( A' = A \cup A_1 \) and \( C' = C \cup C_1 \). The following proposition shows the consistency of the schedule-extended SDFG \( G' \).

**Proposition 1.** The SDFG \( G'(A', C') \) which models PSOS \( s_1 \) in the consistent SDFG \( G(A, C) \) is consistent.

**Proof.** The SDFG \( G(A, C) \) is consistent. In other words, a non-trivial repetition vector \( \gamma \) exists for SDFG \( G \). DSM adds some extra actors \( A_1 \) and channels \( C_1 \), to the SDFG \( G \) in order to model PSOS \( s_1 \). We need to show that a non-trivial repetition vector \( \gamma' \) exists for SDFG \( G' \). The repetition vector equality related to each self-loop \( c(a_p, a_p) \in C_1 \), \( a_p \in A_1 \) added by DSM (in line 1 of Algorithm 1) to remove anti-atomicity is always valid because the source and destination actor of the self-loop channel are identical with production and consumption rate equal to one. The rates of the other channels added by DSM (for decision states or inter-iteration execution) share the following properties: (1) the newly added channel \( c \in C_1 \), which is added by DSM (in all lines 7, 8, 16 or 18 of Algorithm 1), is between an actor \( a_p \in A_1 \) and an actor \( a_q \in A_{s_1} \); (2) the rate of the new channel on the side of the actor \( a_p \) is equal to the count of the actor \( a_p \) in one iteration of PSOS \( s_1 \) (i.e., \( CNT(a_p, s_1) \)); (3) the rate of the new channel on the side of the actor \( a_q \) is equal to one. From these properties we conclude that an actor \( a_q \in A_{s_1} \), which is added by DSM (in both line 6 and 13 of Algorithm 1), fires only once in each iteration of the PSOS \( s_1 \); if the actor \( a_q \) is
the producer (see Fig. 6(a)) of the newly added channel (i.e., \((a_q, a_p) \in C_s\)), the only firing of actor \(a_q\) in one iteration of the PSOS \(s_i\) provides \(CNT(a_p, s_i)\) tokens for all firings of actor \(a_p\) in one iteration of the PSOS \(s_i\) and if the actor \(a_q\) is the consumer (see Fig. 6(b)) of the newly added channel (i.e., \((a_p, a_q) \in C_s\)), all firings of actor \(a_p\) in one iteration of the PSOS \(s_i\) provide \(CNT(a_p, s_i)\) tokens for only one firing of actor \(a_q\).

Let set \(A_i\) be the set of the actors in the PSOS \(s_i\). Consider that each actor \(a_p \in A_i\) appears \(r \cdot \gamma(a_p)\) times in the PSOS \(s_i\) \((r = \frac{n}{v} \text{ where } u, v \in \mathbb{N})\) where the value \(r\) is identical for all actors in the PSOS \(s_i\). The appearance count of the actor \(a_p \in A_i\) in the PSOS \(s_i\) is represented by \(CNT(a_p, s_i)\) and it is assumed to be equal to \(\frac{n}{v} \cdot \gamma(a_p)\) where \(u, v \in \mathbb{N}\). We can write the above statement as follow: \(CNT(a_p, s_i) \cdot v = \gamma(a_p) \cdot u\). From this equation we can conclude that \(u\) iterations of the SDFG cause \(v\) iterations of the PSOS \(s_i\), leading to \(v\) firings of each of the actors added by DSM (i.e., actors from the set \(A_{s_i}\)). So, in \(v\) iterations of the SDFG \((v\) iterations of the PSOS \(s_i)\) the following equation holds for each channel \((a_p, a_q) \in C_{s_i}\) or \((a_p, a_q) \in C_{s_i}\) (where \(a_p \in A_i\) and \(a_q \in A_{s_i}\)):

\[
\frac{CNT(a_p, s_i)}{Rate(a_p)} \cdot v = \frac{1}{Rate(a_p)} \cdot \gamma(a_p) \cdot u \tag{1}
\]

Eqn. 1 shows the existence of a non-trivial repetition vector \(\gamma_i\) for the schedule-extended SDFG \(G'(A', C')\), \(\gamma'(a_q)\) (where actor \(a_q \in A_{s_i}\)) is equal to \(v\) and \(\gamma'(a_p)\) (where actor \(a_p \in A)\) is equal to \(\gamma(a_p) \cdot u\).

As stated before, inter-iteration execution could cause an uncertainty in the SDFG execution according to the designated schedule. Proposition 2 states that PSOS inter-iteration execution is eliminated from the schedule-extended SDFG \(G'\). As a result, no SDFG inter-iteration execution can happen in the schedule-extended SDFG \(G'\) because an SDFG iteration may contain one or more PSOS iterations.

**Proposition 2.** PSOS inter-iteration execution is impossible for any actor appearing in PSOS \(s_i = (a_1 a_2 \ldots a_n)^*\) in the SDFG \(G'(A', C')\), which models PSOS \(s_i\) in the SDFG \(G(A, C)\) using DSM.

**Proof.** Let set \(A_i\) be the set of the actors in the PSOS \(s_i\). In one iteration of a PSOS \(s_i\), an actor \(a_p \in A_i\) could be enabled more often than its designated amount (i.e., \(CNT(a_p, s_i)\) times). DSM prevents this by creating a dependency from the last actor appearing in PSOS \(s_i\) (i.e., actor \(a_L = a_n\)) to the first actor appearing in PSOS \(s_i\) (i.e., actor \(a_F = a_1\)) (see lines 4-8 in DSM). This dependency is created in the graph by inserting a new actor \(a_{i-end}\) and two channels \(c_{i-pre}\) and \(c_{i-pro}\). The source (destination) actor of the channel \(c_{i-pre}\) is \(a_L\) \((a_{i-end})\) with rate 1 \((CNT(a_L, s_i))\). So one firing of actor \(a_{i-end}\) needs \(CNT(a_L, s_i)\) tokens available in channel \(c_{i-pre}\), for this purpose actor \(a_L\) should fire \(CNT(a_L, s_i)\) times. The destination (source) actor of the channel \(c_{i-pro}\) is \(a_F\) \((a_{i-end})\) with rate 1 \((CNT(a_F, s_i))\). So the firing of actor \(a_F\) related to one iteration of PSOS \(s_i\) needs \(CNT(a_F, s_i)\) tokens available in channel \(c_{i-pro}\); for this purpose actor \(a_{i-end}\) should fire once. The \(CNT(a_F, s_i)\) initial tokens in channel \(c_{i-pro}\) provide sufficient tokens for \(CNT(a_F, s_i)\) times a firing of actor \(a_F\) related to one iteration of PSOS \(s_i\). The subsequent firing of actor \(a_F\) depends on the firing of the actor \(a_{i-end}\) and the firing of the actor \(a_{i-end}\) demands \(CNT(a_{L}, s_i)\) times firing of actor \(a_L\). Hence, the firing of actor \(a_F\) belonging to the subsequent iteration of \(s_i\) can be performed only after actor \(a_L\) finishes all of its firings belonging to the current iteration of \(s_i\). In other words, the firing of actor \(a_F\) belonging to the subsequent iteration of \(s_i\) can only be performed after completion of the current iteration of \(s_i\). The next iteration of the PSOS \(s_i\) can only start after completion of the current iteration of the PSOS \(s_i\) because actor \(a_F\) is the first actor which should be fired in an iteration of the PSOS \(s_i\) and other actors in \(s_i\) cannot get enabled before the first firing of the actor \(a_F\). This second fact is guaranteed by adding decision state constructs (i.e., lines 12-18 in DSM) for any possible decision state and Proposition 6 below.

Even after eliminating inter-iteration execution from the SDFG, multiple actors from a schedule may be enabled in an SDFG iteration. In this paper such a state is called a decision state. The following proposition explains that analyzing only one SDFG iteration is enough in order to identify all possible decision states.

**Proposition 3.** Executing an SDFG \(G(A, C)\) for one iteration is sufficient to determine all possible decision states within a PSOS \(s_i\).

**Proof.** Let set \(A_i\) be the set of the actors in the PSOS \(s_i\) and \(A_o = A \setminus A_i\) the remaining actors in \(A\). Consider inter-processor channels \(C_{ipc} = \{(a_p, a_q) \in C|a_p \in A_o \land a_q \in A_i\}\). The execution of an actor \(a_p \in A_o\) where \((a_p, a_q) \in C_{ipc}\) up-to its entry in the repetition vector of the SDFG produces \(\gamma(a_p) \cdot Rate(a_p)\) tokens in the corresponding channel \((a_p, a_q) \in C_{ipc}\). Actor \(a_q \in A_i\) consumes those produced tokens within one iteration of the normalized PSOS \(s_i\) (because \(\gamma(a_p) \cdot Rate(a_p) = \gamma(a_q) \cdot Rate(a_q))\). Hence, actors in \(A_i\) can receive the required tokens from all inter-processor channels \(C_{ipc}\) for one iteration of the normalized PSOS \(s_i\). This means that all possible decision states related to PSOS \(s_i\) are detectable.

Actors in \(A_o\) could possibly fire more than the amount mentioned above (i.e., corresponding value in vector \(\gamma\)) if the channel dependencies in the SDFG allow additional firings of these actors. This could cause more than enough tokens (for one iteration of the normalized PSOS \(s_i\)) in channels \(C_{ipc}\). This could enable an actor in \(A_i\) more than its designated amount in one iteration of the normalized PSOS \(s_i\). To avoid this undesirable actor enabling, the inter-iteration execution prevention constructs are used (see Proposition 2). As a result, extra tokens produced by further firing of the actors \(A_o\) cannot enable any actor in \(A_i\) more than its designated value in one iteration of the normalized PSOS \(s_i\). So, executing actors in
the SDFG up-to their repetition vector entry (i.e., one SDFG iteration) is enough to determine all possible decision states within the PSOS $s_i$. □

The identified decision states may be redundant. Proposition 4 discusses the proposed decision state reduction in the DSM.

**Proposition 4.** Let $\sigma$ be an execution for an SDFG $(A, C)$ and a PSOS $s_i$ which schedules actors $A_i \subseteq A$. In the execution $\sigma$, consider $y$ consecutive decision states $\omega_{x+1}, \omega_{x+2}, \cdots, \omega_{x+y}$. Assume that $a_o \in A_i$ is an opponent actor in each of these decision states but not the actor of choice in any of them. It is sufficient to only consider the last decision state $\omega_{x+y}$ to postpone the firing of the opponent actor $a_o$ in those consecutive decision states to the state $\omega_{x+y+1}$. □

**Proof.** The purpose of the components added by DSM (i.e., lines 13-18 in Algorithm 1) in a decision state $\omega_j \in \Omega$ is to prevent any opponent actor $a_o$ which is not the actor of choice in decision state $\omega_j$ from getting enabled in that state and as such to postpone firing to the state $\omega_{j+1}$. It is assumed that the opponent actor $a_o$ is enabled in the consecutive decision states $\omega_{x+1}, \omega_{x+2}, \cdots, \omega_{x+y}$. Suppose that the opponent actor $a_o$ was fired $e$ times before the first decision state (i.e., $\omega_{x+1}$) where $0 \leq e < \gamma(a_o)$. The actor $a_o$ cannot be enabled in decision states $\omega_{x+1}, \omega_{x+2}, \cdots, \omega_{x+y-1}$ when actor $a_o$ was fired $e$ times before the decision state $\omega_{x+1}$ because the components added by DSM in the last decision state $\omega_{x+y}$ prevent the opponent actor $a_o$ from getting enabled for the $(e+1)^{th}$ time in decision state $\omega_{x+y}$. As a result, the opponent actor $a_o$ can also not be enabled in states $\omega_{x+1}, \omega_{x+2}, \cdots, \omega_{x+y-1}$ after adding DSM components for decision state $\omega_{x+y}$. So, the components added by DSM in the last decision state of consecutive decision states are enough to prevent the firing of an opponent actor which is not the actor of choice in those consecutive decision states. □

Decision state folding overlaps the consecutive repetitions of the designated PSOS in an SDFG iteration to reduce the number of decision states. The following proposition states that decision states folding does not dismiss any decision state.

**Proposition 5.** Consider PSOS $s_i = \langle \alpha_1 \alpha_2 \ldots \alpha_n \rangle^*$ for the subset of actors $A_i$ from SDFG $(A, C)$; assume $s_i$ is repeated $\mu_i$ times to form the corresponding normalized PSOS ($s'_i = \langle (s_i)^{\mu_i} \rangle$) to identify decision states related to PSOS $s_i$. After decision state folding all decision states are preserved.

**Proof.** Normalization can be done by repeating PSOS $s_i \mu_i$ times ($\mu_i$ is the normalization factor of $s_i$). Decision state identification is applied on the normalized PSOS $s'_i = \langle (s_i)^{\mu_i} \rangle^* = \langle \alpha_1 \alpha_2 \ldots \alpha_n \alpha_1 \alpha_2 \ldots \alpha_n \alpha_1 \alpha_2 \ldots \alpha_n \rangle^{\mu_i}$. Decision point constructs are added based on the given PSOS $s_i$. The folding optimization groups the identified decision states of the normalized PSOS $s'_i$ in the following manner: the actor $\alpha_j$ from PSOS $s_i$ is marked if a decision state is identified at least in one of the corresponding states of the $\mu_i$ firings of the actor $\alpha_j$ in the normalized PSOS $s'_i$. The corresponding state related to firing of the marked actor $\alpha_j$ in PSOS $s_i$ is considered as decision state.

The corresponding state related to firing of the actor $\alpha_j$ in PSOS $s_i$ which is considered as a decision state imposes a decision state to all $\mu_i$ corresponding states of actor $\alpha_j$ in PSOS $s'_i$. So, no decision state will be lost after decision state folding and the only effect is introducing unnecessary decision state controlling. We need to show that this extra controlling does not effect the execution of the SDFG according to the schedule. The construct added in a decision state is used to guarantee execution of the actor of choice of that decision state. This does not violate the actor firing order according to the PSOS in that state. It only forces the only enabled actor in that state to be fired.

DSM adds some components per decision state to enforce the firing of the enabled actor in a decision state which is in line with the given PSOS (i.e., actor of choice). Proposition 6 explains how those components can guarantee the firing of the actor of choice in the decision state.

**Proposition 6.** The PSOS $s_i$ is a schedule for actors $A_i \subseteq A$ from SDFG $(A, C)$. Let $\omega_j \in \Omega$ be a decision state within PSOS $s_i$ and $\Delta_j \subseteq A_i$ the set of the opponent actors in decision state $\omega_j$. The actor of choice in decision state $\omega_j$ (denoted by actor $a_c$) is the only actor which can fire in decision state $\omega_j$ among all actors in $\Delta_j$ after applying DSM and the periodic behavior of the SDFG is also preserved.

**Proof.** We need to show that the opponent actors $\Delta_j \{a_c\}$ can not be enabled in the decision state $\omega_j$ after applying DSM. Accordingly, the actor of choice $a_c$ in the decision state $\omega_j$ is the only actor which can fire in decision state $\omega_j$ among all actors in $\Delta_j$.

In the DSM technique, actor $a_i \omega_j$ is added for each decision state $\omega_j \in \Omega$ within the PSOS $s_i$. An opponent actor $a_k \in \Delta_j \{a_c\}$ in the decision state $\omega_j$ is dependent on the new actor $a_i \omega_j$, because of the added channel $c_i \preceq a_k \omega_j$; this channel is initialized with $BEF(a_k, \omega_j, s_i)$ tokens. The new actor $a_i \omega_j$ is also dependent on the actor of choice $a_c$, the decision state $\omega_j$ because of the added channel $c_i \preceq a_c \omega_j$; this channel is initialized with $AFT(a_c, \omega_j, s_i)$ tokens. For each opponent actor $a_k \in \Delta_j$, a channel is added between the actor $a_i \omega_j$ and the opponent actor $a_k$. The rate of the added channel on the side of the actor $a_k$ (actor $a_i \omega_j$) is equal to one ($\text{CNT}(a_k, s_i)$).

An opponent actor $a_k \in \Delta_j \{a_c\}$ fires $BEF(a_k, \omega_j, s_i)$ times before decision state $\omega_j$ and every time the opponent actor $a_k$ consumes one token from channel $c_i \preceq a_k \omega_j$. So, the $BEF(a_k, \omega_j, s_i)$ firings of actor $a_k$ before state $\omega_j$ consume all tokens which were available in channel $c_i \preceq a_k \omega_j$. Hence, the opponent actor $a_k \in \Delta_j \{a_c\}$ cannot fire in state $\omega_j$. Firings of the opponent actor $a_k \in \Delta_j \{a_c\}$ from decision state $\omega_j$ onward will be dependent on the firing of the actor $a_i \omega_j$, to provide the required tokens in channel $c_i \preceq a_k \omega_j$. As mentioned before, the actor $a_i \omega_j$ depends on the actor of
choice \( a_c \). So, firings of the opponent actor \( a_k \in \Delta_j \setminus \{a_c\} \) from decision state \( \omega_j \) onward cannot happen before firing of the actor of choice \( a_c \) of the decision state \( \omega_j \) in that state. Hence, the actor of choice \( a_c \) is the only actor among the other opponent actors in state \( \omega_j \) which can fire. The actor of choice \( a_c \) is fired \( BEF(a_c, \omega_j, s_i) \) times by state \( \omega_j \) and this results in \( BEF(a_c, \omega_j, s_i) \) tokens being produced in channel \( c_{i-\omega_j} \); as channel \( c_{i-\omega_j} \) is initialized with \( AFT(a_c, s_i) \) tokens, the number of tokens in this channel is \( BEF(a_c, \omega_j, s_i) + AFT(a_c, \omega_j, s_i) = CNT(a_c, s_i) \) after firing actor \( a_c \) in decision state \( \omega_j \). So, there will be sufficient tokens (for one firing of the actor \( a_{i-\omega_j} \)) on the only channel leading to actor \( a_{i-\omega_j} \) after firing of the actor of choice \( a_c \) in decision state \( \omega_j \). Then, firing of actor \( a_{i-\omega_j} \) consumes all \( CNT(a_c, s_i) \) tokens that are present in channel \( c_{i-\omega_j} \) and it produces \( CNT(a_k, s_i) \) tokens in channel \( c_{i-k\omega_j} \) for \( a_k \in \Delta_j \setminus \{a_c\} \); therefore, the opponent actors \( \Delta_j \setminus \{a_c\} \) are not any more dependent on the actor \( a_{i-\omega_j} \) in the remainder of the current iteration of the PSOS \( s_i \).

The firings of the opponent actor \( a_k \in \Delta_j \setminus \{a_c\} \) after decision state \( \omega_j \) consumes \( AFT(a_k, \omega_j, s_i) \) tokens from channel \( c_{i-k\omega_j} \); as a result, at the end of the PSOS iteration, the token amount on this channel returns to its initial amount (see Proposition 2). Hence, for any execution \( \sigma \) of \( G(A', C') \) it holds that \( \sigma \) satisfies \( s_i \) where it is assumed that \( \sigma \) is the execution of \( G(A, C) \) with \( \text{orderList}(\sigma, A) = \text{orderList}(\sigma', A) \).

**Theorem 1.** Consider PSOS \( s_i \) as a schedule for actors \( A_i \subseteq A \) from SDFG \( G(A, C) \). For any execution \( \sigma' \) of \( G(A', C') \) it holds that \( \sigma \) satisfies \( s_i \) where it is assumed that \( \sigma \) is the execution of \( G(A, C) \) with \( \text{orderList}(\sigma, A) = \text{orderList}(\sigma', A) \).

**Proof.** Proposition 6 states that in a decision state of PSOS \( s_i \), an enabled actor of the decision state which is in line with PSOS \( s_i \) is the only actor able to fire in that state among all enabled actors in \( A_i \). So, the order of \( s_i \) is the only possible order of actor firing for those actors of the SDFG \( G' \) in the set \( A_i \). Proposition 2 implies that the next PSOS iteration cannot interfere. Hence, for any execution \( \sigma' \) of SDFG \( G'(A', C') \), \( \text{orderList}(\sigma', A_i) \) has the form of \( (s_i)^k \) where \( k \in \mathbb{N} \) (i.e., infinite repetition of \( s_i \)). It is assumed that \( \text{orderList}(\sigma, A) = \text{orderList}(\sigma', A) \); as \( A_i \subseteq A \), we can conclude that \( \text{orderList}(\sigma, A_i) = \text{orderList}(\sigma', A_i) \). Hence, \( \text{orderList}(\sigma, A_i) \) also has the form of \( (s_i)^k \) and this form satisfies \( s_i \); in other words, \( \sigma \) satisfies \( s_i \).

**Theorem 2.** Consider PSOS \( s_i \) as a schedule for actors \( A_i \subseteq A \) from SDFG \( G(A, C) \). For any execution \( \sigma \) of \( G(A, C) \) that satisfies \( s_i \) it holds that there is exactly one \( \sigma' \) that is an execution of \( G'(A', C') \) such that \( \text{orderList}(\sigma, A) = \text{orderList}(\sigma', A) \).

**Proof.** DSM adds actors \( A_s \) and channels \( C_s \) to model the PSOS \( s_i \) in the SDFG \( G(A, C) \).

It is assumed that the firing order of actors belonging to the set \( A \) in execution \( \sigma' \) has the same actor firing order as in execution \( \sigma \) and execution \( \sigma \) satisfies the PSOS \( s_i \). We need to show that there is precisely one execution with the property of execution \( \sigma' \) and that is a valid execution for SDFG \( G' \). In a precise way, the actor firing order related to the set \( A \) in execution \( \sigma \) (i.e., \( \text{orderList}(\sigma, A) = \{\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \ldots\} \)) is a possible actor firing order for the original actors (i.e., actors not added by DSM) of the SDFG \( G' \) when \( \sigma' \) is an execution of the SDFG \( G' \). Actor \( \alpha_k \) from \( \text{orderList}(\sigma, A) \) belongs either to \( A_i \) or to \( A_o = A \setminus A_i \) (\( x \in \mathbb{N} \)). The state transition \( \omega_x \xrightarrow{\alpha_k} \omega_{x+1} \) in execution \( \sigma \) is related to the firing of actor \( \alpha_k \). The state transition \( \omega_y \xrightarrow{\alpha_k} \omega_{y+1} \) in execution \( \sigma' \) is related to the firing of actor \( \alpha_k \). The difference between states from execution \( \sigma \) and \( \sigma' \) is only in the extra channels added by DSM (i.e., \( C_s \)). Any channel from \( C_s \) is connected to an actor from \( A_i \); in other words, it is not connected to any actor from \( A_o \). Incoming channels of an actor determine whether that actor can fire or not. Consider state \( \omega_y \) from execution \( \sigma' \) has the same content of state \( \omega_x \) from execution \( \sigma \) for all channels in \( C \). So, when an actor \( \alpha_x \) belongs to \( A_o \), it means that actor \( \alpha_x \) which can fire in state \( \omega_x \) of execution \( \sigma \) can fire in state \( \omega_y \) of execution \( \sigma' \) (i.e., \( \alpha_y = \alpha_x \)) because the content of the state related to channels \( C_s \) has no influence on actor enabling in that particular state for any actor from \( A_o \). But, when an actor \( \alpha_x \) belongs to \( A_i \), the content of the state related to channels \( C' \) could manipulate the actor firing order. As we assume firings of actor \( \alpha_x \) in execution \( \sigma \) satisfy the PSOS \( s_i \), actor \( \alpha_x \) can fire in the corresponding state (i.e., \( \omega_y \) of execution \( \sigma' \) (i.e., \( \alpha_y = \alpha_x \)) because components added by DSM force the firing of the actor which is in line with the given PSOS \( s_i \) among all actors in \( A_i \) (see Proposition 6) and it is assumed that \( \alpha_x \) is in line with PSOS \( s_i \). So, the firing order of actors from \( A' \setminus A_s \) in execution \( \sigma' \) follows the same firing order as it is indicated in execution \( \sigma \). Each actor \( a \in A_s \) also has a single possible firing order in each PSOS iteration; if \( a \) is added to control the actor firing in a decision state, it fires before the actor of choice in the decision state (see Proposition 6) and if it is added for the sake of inter-iteration prevention purpose, it fires at the end of the PSOS iteration (see Proposition 2). Hence, there exists only one possible firing order in execution \( \sigma' \) for each actor \( a \in A_s \). So, all actors from \( A' \) have exactly one firing order in execution \( \sigma' \) where \( \text{orderList}(\sigma, A) = \text{orderList}(\sigma', A) \).

The size of the schedule-extended graph (e.g., SDFG \( G' \)) is dependent on the number of decision states found in the given schedule (e.g., PSOS \( s_i \)). In this section, decision state
identification for a sub-set of actors of the SDFG G (i.e., \( A_i \subseteq A \)) which belong to the schedule of interest (i.e., \( s_i \)) is explained regardless of existing other schedules for the rest of the actors in the SDFG (i.e., actors in \( A_o = A \setminus A_i \)). In our implementation, we consider other possible schedules designated for the rest of the actors (i.e., actors in \( A_o \)) to reduce the number of the decision states and as a result the size of the schedule-extended graph. As we explained in Sec. V-C2, actors which do not belong to schedule \( s_i \) should fire according to their schedule (if there is any) to perform their maximal execution. Any actor \( a_o \in A_o \), which belongs to another PSOS \( s_j \) (\( j \neq i \)), is fired in function \( \text{maxExec} \) of the DSM algorithm when (1) it is enabled and (2) its firing satisfies \( s_j \). Without the second condition, firing of \( a_o \) could enable an actor from PSOS \( s_i \) and lead to unnecessary decision states. So, considering other schedules in the function \( \text{maxExec} \) of DSM algorithm removes such redundant decision states.

VII. EXPERIMENTAL RESULTS

We used a set of DSP and multimedia applications to assess our DSM technique. The following SDFGs are extracted from realistic applications: modem [1], sample-rate converter [1], satellite receiver [18], mp3playback [19], channel equalizer [20], H.263 decoder [10], H.263 encoder [21], and MP3 decoder [10]. We also consider the bipartite SDFG [18] which is a commonly used artificial SDFG.

A PSOS determines the actor firing order and as such it influences the enabled actors in a state; as a result, the number of decision states can be different for different PSOSs. The size of the schedule-extended graph using DSM depends on the number of decision states in the given schedules. So, the compactness of the schedule-extended graph depends on the input schedule which should be modeled. We use the common list scheduler [22] to determine the PSOSs for the applications. We use two different variations of list scheduling to verify DSM in different situations. The first list schedule uses forward priorities (Lfp) and the second one uses reverse priorities (Lrp). Actors closer to the inputs of the graph have higher priority in the Lfp schedules compared to actors closer to the outputs of the graph and vice-versa in Lrp schedules.

Fig. 7 shows the reduction percentage in the size of the schedule-extended graph when using DSM in contrast to the HSDFG-based technique. Using schedules generated by Lfp, the number of decision states is less than when Lrp is used, except in the channel equalizer and mp3playback applications. By using Lfp scheduling, actors closer to inputs have higher priority compared to actors closer to outputs. This leads to consecutive execution of an actor followed by consecutive execution of another actor with lower priority and so on. Thanks to our optimization in DSM, considering only one decision state before a context switch will be sufficient (e.g., decision state \( \omega_{99} \) in Fig. 4) and the number of decision states can be reduced significantly. Usually actors closer to outputs are dependent on actors closer to inputs in an SDFG; this dependency can prevent an actor from being executed consecutively in a graph scheduled by Lrp. As a result of that, the number of context switches in a graph scheduled by Lrp will typically be larger compared to Lfp. Hence, the effectiveness of the decision state optimization in DSM reduces and extra elements are required to model the schedules in the graph. The exceptions in the channel equalizer and mp3playback are due to the existence of a cycle in the SDFG; the cycle can increase the number of context switches in the schedule and as a result, Lfp could result in the same or a higher amount of decision states in DSM compared to Lrp. Important, however, is that in our experiments, DSM always outperforms the HSDFG-based technique regardless of the input schedule. The number of actors (channels) using DSM is 66% (71%) lower compared to the HSDFG-based technique on average, 99% (99%) lower in the best-case and 28% (20%) lower in the worst-case observed in our experiments. Besides the compactness of the schedule-extended graph, DSM preserves the original structure of an SDFG which is not guaranteed for the state of the art technique.

To further analyze the effectiveness of DSM, we applied a buffer sizing algorithm from [10] on the schedule-extended SDFGs of the H.263 decoder and MP3 decoder applications. The H.263 decoder is mapped on a platform with two processors. The actor \( \text{vld} \) and \( \text{iq} \) are mapped on the first processor with a PSOS \( \langle \text{vld}(\text{iq})^{99} \rangle \) and the actor \( \text{idct} \) and \( \text{mc} \) are mapped on the second processor with a PSOS \( \langle \text{idct}^{99}\text{mc} \rangle \). The analysis time for buffer sizing on the schedule-extended
H.263 decoder is less than 1 ms when using DSM to model the schedules. The same analysis lasts for 1330 ms when using the technique from [11] to model the same schedules in the same graph. Fig. 8(a) shows the complete design space (Pareto space) of throughput and buffer size when modeling the schedule with DSM and the HSDFG-based technique [11]. A single channel in an SDFG corresponds to a set of channels in the equivalent HSDFG. As a result, the buffer sizing technique cannot find the minimal buffer size when applying it on the equivalent HSDFG. Our experiments show these inaccuracies. Applying buffer sizing on the graph which models the schedules using the technique from [11] results in 43% overestimation in required buffer space compared to applying the same buffer sizing technique on the graph which models the same schedules when using our technique. Fig. 8(b) shows results for the MP3 decoder. We used the mapping and scheduling from [12] which maps the MP3 decoder on a platform with 3 processors. The analysis time on the graph which models the schedule using our technique is 594 ms while 141610 ms is required to perform the same analysis on the graph using the technique from [11]. Using the technique from [11] results in 2.26 times overestimation in buffer size compared to using our technique.

Modeling a PSOS in an SDFG using DSM requires executing one complete SDFG iteration. The number of states in one iteration could be exponential in the number of actors in the graph. However, for all real-world SDFGs used in our experiments, the execution time of the DSM is below 1 ms.

VIII. CONCLUSION

We presented a technique, DSM, to model periodic static-order schedules directly in an SDFG. The resulting graphs are much smaller (often much less than half the size) than graphs resulting from the state of the art technique that first converts an SDFG to an HSDFG. This results in a speed-up of performance analysis. Computing the trade-off between buffering and throughput for multi-processor implementations, for example, becomes several orders of magnitude faster. Moreover properties like buffer sizes can be analyzed more accurately. For future work, we would like to investigate to further optimize the models for some specific scheduling classes, e.g., single appearance schedules.
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