Use Case 2 The second use case used to evaluate the framework is defined as follows:

Table 1: Task set with balanced structure

| task | Execution Time (ms) | Type | Priority | Period | Dependency Set |
|---------------|---------------------|--------------|----------|--------|-------------------------------|
| θ_1 | 15 | Periodic | 1 | 100 | - |
| θ_2 | 20 | Periodic | 2 | 180 | - |
| θ_3 | 25 | Event-Driven | 1 | - | $\{	heta_1\}$ |
| $	heta_4$ | 30 | Event-Driven | 4 | - | $\{	heta_1\}$ |
| $	heta_5$ | 20 | Event-Driven | 3 | - | $\{	heta_2\}$ |
| θ_6 | 35 | Event-Driven | 1 | - | $\{	heta_2\}$ |
| θ_7 | 40 | Event-Driven | 2 | - | $\{	heta_3,	heta_4\}$ |
| θ_8 | 25 | Event-Driven | 1 | - | $\{	heta_5,	heta_6\}$ |
| $	heta_9$ | 30 | Event-Driven | 0 | - | $\{	heta_3\}$ |
| $	heta_{10}$ | 20 | Event-Driven | 4 | - | $\{	heta_4\}$ |
| θ_{11} | 45 | Event-Driven | 2 | - | $\{	heta_7\}$ |
| θ_{12} | 30 | Event-Driven | 0 | - | $\{	heta_8\}$ |
| θ_{13} | 35 | Event-Driven | 3 | - | $\{	heta_9,	heta_{10}\}$ |
| θ_{14} | 25 | Event-Driven | 1 | - | $\{	heta_{11}\}$ |
| θ_{15} | 40 | Event-Driven | 3 | - | $\{	heta_{12}\}$ |
| θ_{16} | 20 | Event-Driven | 3 | - | $\{	heta_{13}\}$ |
| θ_{17} | 50 | Event-Driven | 4 | - | $\{\theta_{14},\theta_{15}\}$ |
| θ_{18} | 25 | Event-Driven | 1 | - | $\{	heta_{16}\}$ |
| θ_{19} | 35 | Event-Driven | 4 | - | $\{	heta_{17},	heta_{18}\}$ |
| θ_{20} | 30 | Event-Driven | 2 | - | $\{	heta_{19}\}$ |

The generated Directed Acyclic Graph (DAG) based on Table 1 is shown in Fig. 1.




Fig. 1: Task set with balanced dependencies