

# Performance analysis of a parallel PDEVS simulator handling both conservative and optimistic protocols

Ben Cardoen<sup>†</sup> Stijn Manhaeve<sup>†</sup> Tim Tuijn<sup>†</sup>  
{firstname.lastname}@student.uantwerpen.be

Yentl Van Tendeloo<sup>†</sup> Kurt Vanmechelen<sup>†</sup>  
Hans Vangheluwe<sup>†‡</sup> Jan Broeckhove<sup>†</sup>  
{firstname.lastname}@uantwerpen.be

<sup>†</sup> University of Antwerp, Belgium  
<sup>‡</sup> McGill University, Canada

## ABSTRACT

With the ever increasing complexity of simulation models, parallel simulation becomes necessary to perform the simulation within reasonable time bounds. The built-in parallelism of Parallel DEVS is often insufficient to tackle this problem on its own. Several synchronization algorithms have been proposed, each with a specific kind of simulation model in mind. Due to the significant differences between these algorithms, current Parallel DEVS simulation tools restrict themselves to only one such algorithm. In this paper, we present a Parallel DEVS simulator, grafted on C++11, which offers both conservative and optimistic simulation. We evaluate the performance gain that can be obtained by choosing the most appropriate synchronization protocol. Our implementation is compared to ADEVS using hardware-level profiling on a spectrum of benchmarks.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

## 2. BACKGROUND

In this section, we provide a brief introduction to two different synchronization protocols for parallel simulation, and the features offered by C++11 that aid in our implementation.

### 2.1 Conservative Synchronization

### 2.2 Optimistic Synchronization

### 2.3 C++11 Parallelism Features

## 3. FEATURES

### 3.1 Based on PythonPDEVS

### 3.2 Different Synchronization protocols

### 3.3 Performance Improvements

## 4. PERFORMANCE

### 4.1 Sequential Simulation

CPU Usage

Memory Usage

### 4.2 Parallel Simulation

## 5. RELATED WORK

## 6. CONCLUSIONS

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This work was partly funded with a PhD fellowship grant from the Research Foundation - Flanders (FWO).

## REFERENCES

1. Barros, F. J. Modeling formalisms for dynamic structure systems. *ACM Transactions on Modeling and Computer Simulation* 7 (1997), 501–515.
2. Chen, B., and Vangheluwe, H. Symbolic flattening of DEVS models. In *Summer Simulation Multiconference* (2010), 209–218.
3. Chow, A. C. H., and Zeigler, B. P. Parallel DEVS: a parallel, hierarchical, modular, modeling formalism. In *Proceedings of the 26th Winter Simulation Conference*, SCS (1994), 716–722.
4. Fujimoto, R. M. Performance of Time Warp under synthetic workloads. In *Proceedings of the SCS Multiconference on Distributed Simulation* (1990).
5. Fujimoto, R. M. *Parallel and Distribution Simulation Systems*, 1st ed. John Wiley & Sons, Inc., New York, NY, USA, 1999.
6. Glinsky, E., and Wainer, G. DEVStone: a benchmarking technique for studying performance of DEVS modeling and simulation environments. In *Proceedings of the 2005 9th IEEE/ACM International Symposium on Distributed Simulation and Real-Time Applications* (2005), 265–272.
7. Glinsky, E., and Wainer, G. New parallel simulation techniques of DEVS and Cell-DEVS in CD++. In *Proceedings of the 39th annual Symposium on Simulation* (2006), 244–251.
8. Himmelspach, J., and Uhrmacher, A. M. Sequential processing of PDEVS models. In *Proceedings of the 3rd European Modeling & Simulation Symposium* (2006), 239–244.
9. Jafer, S., and Wainer, G. Conservative vs. optimistic parallel simulation of devs and cell-devs: A comparative

- study. In *Proceedings of the 2010 Summer Computer Simulation Conference, SCSC '10* (2010), 342–349.
10. Kim, K. H., Seong, Y. R., Kim, T. G., and Park, K. H. Distributed simulation of hierarchical DEVS models: Hierarchical scheduling locally and time warp globally. *Transactions of the SCS* 13, 3 (1996), 135–154.
  11. Muzy, A., and Nutaro, J. J. Algorithms for efficient implementations of the DEVS & DSDEVS abstract simulators. In *1st Open International Conference on Modeling and Simulation (OICMS)* (2005), 273–279.
  12. Muzy, A., Varenne, F., Zeigler, B. P., Caux, J., Coquillard, P., Touraille, L., Prunetti, D., Caillou, P., Michel, O., and Hill, D. R. C. Refounding of the activity concept? towards a federative paradigm for modeling and simulation. *Simulation* 89, 2 (2013), 156–177.
  13. Nutaro, J. J. ADEVs.  
<http://www.ornl.gov/~1qn/adevs/>, 2015.
  14. Troccoli, A., and Wainer, G. Implementing Parallel Cell-DEVS. In *Annual Simulation Symposium* (2003), 273–280.
  15. Van Tendeloo, Y., and Vangheluwe, H. Activity in pythonpdevs. In *Activity-Based Modeling and Simulation* (2014).
  16. Van Tendeloo, Y., and Vangheluwe, H. The Modular Architecture of the Python(P)DEVS Simulation Kernel. In *Spring Simulation Multi-Conference, SCS* (2014), 387 – 392.
  17. Van Tendeloo, Y., and Vangheluwe, H. PythonPDEVs: a distributed Parallel DEVS simulator. In *Proceedings of the 2015 Spring Simulation Multiconference, SpringSim '15*, Society for Computer Simulation International (2015), 844–851.
  18. Vangheluwe, H. DEVS as a common denominator for multi-formalism hybrid systems modelling. *CACSD. Conference Proceedings. IEEE International Symposium on Computer-Aided Control System Design* (2000), 129–134.
  19. Zeigler, B. P., Praehofer, H., and Kim, T. G. *Theory of Modeling and Simulation*, second ed. Academic Press, 2000.