

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

Ben Cardoen[†] Stijn Manhaeve[†] Tim Tuijn[†]
{firstname.lastname}@student.uantwerpen.be

Yentl Van Tendeloo[†] Kurt Vanmechelen[†]
Hans Vangheluwe^{†‡} Jan Broeckhove[†]
{firstname.lastname}@uantwerpen.be

[†] University of Antwerp, Belgium
[‡] 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

DEVS [18] is a popular formalism for modelling complex dynamic systems using a discrete-event abstraction. In fact, it can serve as a simulation “assembly language” to which models in other formalisms can be mapped [17]. A number of tools have been constructed by academia and industry that allow the modelling and simulation of DEVS models.

With the ever increasing complexity of simulation models, parallel simulation becomes necessary to perform the simulation within reasonable time bounds. And while Parallel DEVS [4] was introduced to increase parallelism, this is often still insufficient. Several synchronization algorithms from the discrete event simulation community [8] have been applied to DEVS simulation in particular. While several parallel DEVS simulation kernels exist, they often restrict themselves to a single synchronization protocol. This is a logical choice, as these synchronization protocols have nearly no commonalities. But the exact reason for different synchronization protocols, is that their distinct nature makes them very applicable to specific situations. As such, current DEVS simulation ker-

nels always allow parallel simulation, but good performance can only be expected from some models.

Users that wish to simulate a set of distinct models, with different synchronization protocols, are therefore out of luck: Either they accept the lower performance for some of the models, or they use two distinct simulation kernels. Neither of these options is acceptable for the simulation of complex models, as the performance can become arbitrary worse, and the simulation kernels can diverge significantly.

In this paper, we introduce DEVS-Ex-Machina (“dxex”), our simulation tool which offers multiple synchronization protocols: no synchronization (sequential execution), conservative synchronization, or optimistic synchronization. The selected synchronization protocol is transparent to the simulated model. Users should merely determine, at the start of simulation, which protocol they wish to use. Our tool is implemented in C++11, to increase both performance and portability across different platforms.

A simple model is used to prove that the ideal synchronization algorithm is indeed dependent on model details. In our case, a single parameter of the model can have a significant impact on simulation performance, and especially on which is the ideal synchronization protocol. In order to show that this flexibility does not counter our performance, we compare our tool to Adevs, currently one of the fastest DEVS simulation tools available [16, 6].

Dxex, as well as all of our benchmark models, results, and profiling results, can be found online at <https://bitbucket.org/bcardoen/devs-ex-machina>.

We introduce the necessary background for this paper in Section 2. Section 3 elaborates on our features and design. In Section 4, we evaluate performance of our tool by comparing its different synchronization protocols. Related work is discussed in Section 5. Section 6 concludes the paper and gives future work.

2. BACKGROUND

This section briefly introduces two distinct synchronization protocols, as used by dxex. Furthermore, we make note of several new features of C++11.

2.1 Conservative Synchronization

The first synchronization protocol that we will introduce, is *conservative synchronization* [8]. In conservative synchronization, a node is allowed to progress in simulated time, independent of all other nodes, up to the point where it can guarantee that no causality errors can happen. When this point in time is reached, the node has to block until it is allowed to progress any further. In practice, this means that all nodes need to be aware of the current simulation time of all other nodes, and the time it takes an event to propagate (called *lookahead*). Several algorithms are defined in the literature to implement this behaviour. An overview is given in [8].

Deadlock can occur when a dependency cycle occurs and the amount of exchanged messages is low. Multiple algorithms are defined to handle this situation, such as deadlock avoidance and deadlock recovery.

The main advantage of conservative synchronization is that it has a low overhead if high parallelism exists between nodes. Each node can simulate in parallel, while sporadically notifying other nodes that they can progress even further. The disadvantage, however, is that the amount of parallelism is explicitly limited by the size of the lookahead. If a node can influence another (almost) instantaneously, no matter how rarely it occurs, the amount of parallelism is severely reduced. It is also up to the user to define the size of the lookahead, depending on how the model is known to behave. Slight changes in model behaviour can cause significant changes to the lookahead, and can therefore also have a significant influence on simulation performance.

2.2 Optimistic Synchronization

A completely different synchronization protocol is *optimistic synchronization* [11]. Whereas conservative synchronization would prevent causality errors at all costs, optimistic synchronization will allow them to happen, but correct them afterwards. Each node is allowed to progress in simulated time as much as possible, without taking note of the state of any other node. When an event arrives at a node, which is already further in simulated time, the node will have to roll back its state to right before the event would normally have to be processed. As the simulation time is now rolled back to before the event is processed, the event can simply be processed as if no causality error ever occurred.

Rolling back the simulation time requires the node to store past model states, such that they can be restored later on. Furthermore, all incoming and outgoing events need to be stored as well. Incoming events need to be passed to the models again, when the correct simulation time has again been reached, and outgoing events need to be cancelled, as potentially a different series of output events would normally have been generated. Cancelling events, however, can cause further rollbacks, as the receiving node might also have to roll back its state. In practice, a single causality error could have significant repercussions on the complete simulation.

Further changes are required for unrecoverable operations, such as I/O (e.g., tracing, writing to file, printing output) and memory management. Lightweight algorithms are still re-

quired to determine the lower bound of all simulation times, through the computation of a *Global Virtual Time* (GVT).

The main advantage is that performance is not limited by a small lookahead, caused by a very infrequent event. If an (almost) instantaneous event occurs rarely, performance will only be impacted if it occurs, and not at every simulation step. The main disadvantage is unpredictable performance and arbitrary cost of rollbacks due to the propagation of causality errors. If rollbacks occur frequently, simulation quickly becomes slow, as the overhead of the recovery mechanisms becomes significant. Apart from overhead in CPU time, a significant memory overhead is present: all intermediate states are stored up to a point where it can be considered *irreversible*.

While optimistic synchronization does not explicitly depend on the lookahead, simulation performance is still bound by the lookahead implicitly.

2.3 C++11 Parallelism Features

Apart from various other additions, C++11 adds a wide range of portable synchronization primitives to the Standard Library. In earlier versions of the language standard, one had to resort to non-portable C implementations. Furthermore, C++11 is the first version of the standard that explicitly defines a multi-threaded abstract machine memory model. Most modern compilers support the full standard, allowing the kernels to be portable by default on any standard compliant platform.

Simulation values that need to be shared between nodes, can now be coded portable and efficiently through the use of atomic fields. This avoids latencies caused by the exchange of synchronization messages. For an in-depth study, we refer to [5].

3. FEATURES

Historically, dxex is based on PythonPDEVS [16]. While Python is a good language to create software prototypes, its performance has proven to be insufficient to compete with other simulation kernels [14]. Dxex implements only a subset of PythonPDEVS, but makes some of its own additions. The core simulation algorithm and optimizations, however, are highly similar.

While we will not make a detailed comparison with PythonPDEVS here, dxex also supports direct connection [3], Dynamic Structure DEVS [1], termination conditions, and a modular tracing framework [16]. But whereas PythonPDEVS only supports optimistic synchronization, dxex supports multiple synchronization protocols. This is in line with the design principles of PythonPDEVS: offer users the option to pass information on how to efficiently simulate the model. In our case, it now becomes possible to pass the simulation kernel the “hint” as to which synchronization protocol would be ideal for this model. Furthermore, the implementation in C++11 allows many more (static) optimizations, which were plainly impossible when using an interpreted language.

Note that, since there is no universal DEVS model standard, dxex models are incompatible with PythonPDEVS and vice

versa. This is due to dxex models being grafted on C++11, whereas PythonPDEVS models are grafted on Python.

In the remainder of this section, we will elaborate on our prominent new feature: support for multiple synchronization protocols within the same simulation tool.

3.1 Synchronization protocols

We have previously shown that different synchronization protocols exist, with each of them being optimized for a specific kind of model. As no single synchronization protocol is ideal, a general purpose simulation tool should support multiple situations. Currently, however, most parallel simulation tools chose only a single synchronization protocol due to the inherent differences between these approaches. An uninformed choice on which to implement is insufficient, as performance is likely to be bad. We therefore argue that a real general purpose simulation tool should support sequential, conservative, and optimistic synchronization.

Each of them is applicable in specific model configurations. Conservative synchronization is ideal when high lookahead exists between different nodes, and barely any blocking is necessary. Optimistic synchronization is ideal when lookahead is unpredictable, or there are rare (almost) instantaneous events. Finally, sequential simulation is still required for models where parallelism is bad, causing significant overhead.

Sequential

Our sequential simulation algorithm is very similar to the one found in PythonPDEVS, including most of its optimizations. However, the simulation algorithm is designed to be overloaded by different synchronization protocol implementations. This way, the DEVS simulation algorithm is implemented once, but parts can be overwritten as needed. In theory, more synchronization protocols (e.g., other algorithms for conservative synchronization) can be added without altering our design.

Conservative

For conservative synchronization, each node determines the nodes it is influenced by. Each model provides a lookahead function, which determines the lookahead depending on the current simulation state. Within this time interval, it is an error if a model raises an event, thus violating its previous promise. The node uses this information to compute its earliest output time (EOT), and writes out the value in shared memory through the use of C++11 synchronization primitives.

Optimistic

For optimistic synchronization, each node needs to keep track of all intermediate simulation states. This needs to be done carefully, in order to avoid unnecessary copies, and minimize the overhead induced for each transition function. We use Mattern's GVT algorithm [12] to determine the Global Virtual Time (GVT) using at most $2n$ synchronization messages. This process runs asynchronously from the simulation itself. Once the GVT is found, all nodes are informed of the new value, after which fossil collection is performed.

3.2 Transparency

A user must only provide one model, implemented in C++11, which can be simulated by each synchronization kernel. The exception is conservative synchronization: a lookahead function is required, whereas this is not possible in other synchronization kernels. Two options are possible: either a lookahead function is always provided, even when it is not required and possibly not used, or using a default lookahead function if none is defined.

Always defining a lookahead function might seem redundant, especially if users will never use conservative synchronization. The more attractive option is for the simulation tool to provide a default lookahead function, defined by the minimum detected time advance. This lookahead value is most likely too small, but will prevent causality errors at the cost of performance. Depending on the model, simulation performance might still be faster than sequential simulation.

Defining a lookahead function is therefore recommended in combination with conservative synchronization, but is not a necessity.

4. PERFORMANCE

In this section, we evaluate the performance of our simulation tool. We show that the inclusion of multiple synchronization protocols does not decrease our performance to the point where it is unusable. To this end, we compare to adevs, one of the most efficient simulation kernels at this time [6]. A comparison is made for both the CPU and memory usage of both sequential simulation and parallel simulation.

We start off with a comparison of sequential simulation, to show how adevs and dxex relate in this simple case. We not only show that our approach does not influence performance negatively, but also that our main simulation algorithm, similar to the one of PythonPDEVS, is significantly faster than the one found in adevs. Similar differences, compared to adevs, can also be seen in the parallel simulation benchmarks. In the parallel simulation benchmarks, the benefit of our different synchronization protocols is also indicated.

For all benchmarks, results were all well within 1% deviation of the average, such that only the average is used in the remainder of this section. The same compilation flags were used for both adevs and dxex benchmarks ("O3"). To guarantee comparable results, no IO was performed during the benchmarking phase. Simulation traces were used to verify that both adevs and dxex models have exactly the same behaviour. All benchmarks were performed using Linux, but our simulation tool works equally well on Windows and Mac.

4.1 Benchmarks

We use a selection of benchmarks, based on those found in the literature. Three different types of benchmark are defined, each for a different purpose:

1. *Queue* model, based on the HI model of DEVStone [10], creates a chain of atomic models, which are hierarchically nested in each other. A single generator will push events into the queue, which get processed by the processors after a fixed or random delay. It takes two parameters: width

Figure 1. Queue model for depth 3 and width 2.

Figure 2. HighInterconnect model for four models.

Figure 3. PHOLD model for four models, split over two nodes. In parallel simulation, each coupled model is simulated at a different node.

and depth, which determine the width and depth of the hierarchy. This benchmark shows how the complexity of the simulation kernel behaves with an increasing amount of atomic models, and an increasingly deep hierarchy. If the processing delay is fixed for all processors, further insight is provided in the collision handling performance of the simulation kernel. An example for width 2 and depth 3 is shown in Figure 1.

2. *PHOLD* model, presented by [7]. It creates a set of n atomic models, and each model has exactly $n - 1$ output ports: one for every other atomic model. Couplings are made such that each atomic model is directly connected to each other atomic model, such that every atomic model can directly send an event to every other atomic model. After a random delay, atomic models will send out an event to a randomly selected output port. Output port selection happens in two phases: first it is decided whether the event should be sent to an atomic model inside or outside of this coupled model. Afterwards, a uniform selection is made between the possible ports. It takes one parameter: the percentage of remote events, which influences the fraction of messages routed to other coupled models. This benchmark shows how the simulation kernel behaves in the presence of many local or remote events. An example for four models, split over two nodes, is shown in Figure 3.
3. *HighInterconnect* model, a merge of the HI model of DEVStone [10] and PHOLD [7]. It creates a structure similar to the one from PHOLD, but instead of $n - 1$ output ports, every atomic model has only a single output port. All models are still connected to each other, but through the use of broadcasting: every model will receive a generated event. It takes one parameter: the number of models. This benchmark investigates the complexity of the routing algorithm. An example for four models is shown in Figure 2.

We opted to deviate from the DEVStone benchmark, as DEVStone tends towards unrealistic models since all internal and external transitions occur simultaneously. In our benchmark models, there is always the option for simultaneous transition functions (*fixed time advance*), or scattered transition functions (*random time advance*). Furthermore, they defined the use of an artificial load function, which easily skews the result, making the actual simulation algorithm barely comparable.

4.2 Sequential Simulation Execution Time

Despite our core contribution being mainly in the parallel simulation, we still value a comprehensive comparison of sequential simulation results. First, and foremost, as parallel simulation results are tightly linked to the sequential simulation results: parallel simulation merely adds a synchronization layer over different, essentially sequential, simulation




Figure 4. Queue benchmark results for sequential simulation.

kernels. Second, since parallel simulation results are validated through the use of adevs. To provide a more comprehensive comparison to adevs in the parallel simulation benchmarks, sequential simulation results need to be compared. Only the Queue and HighInterconnect models are relevant for sequential simulation.

Queue

In the Queue model, we increase both the width and depth simultaneously, causing a quadratic growth in the number of atomic models. As can be seen in Figure 4, dxex considerably outperforms adevs. Through careful analysis of profiling results, we determined that adevs spends much time in handling simulation messages, whereas this is mostly avoided due to the differently designed simulation algorithm of dxex. Both simulation tools have quadratically increasing execution times, though dxex is much faster thanks to its more efficient simulation control algorithms.

HighInterconnect

In the HighInterconnect model, we increase the number of atomic models, thus quadratically increasing the number of couplings. As can be seen in Figure 5, adevs now outperforms dxex by a fair margin. Analysis showed that this slowdown is caused by the high amount of exchanged events. Event creation is found to be much slower in dxex than it is in adevs, even despite the use of memory pools in dxex.

4.3 Parallel Simulation Execution Time

We now perform an analysis of parallel simulation execution times of our previously defined benchmarks. For dxex, we mention results for both conservative and optimistic synchronization. Since adevs supports only conservative synchronization, we don't mention optimistic synchronization results there. All experiments were performed using four simulation nodes, and executed on a quad-core machine.




Figure 5. Interconnect benchmark results for sequential simulation.

We highlight two main results: (1) dxex conservative synchronization is competitive with adevs; (2) dxex optimistic synchronization is sometimes more efficient than conservative synchronization. This shows that our contribution, offering both conservative and optimistic synchronization, is indeed beneficial for a general-purpose simulation tools.

Queue

In the Queue model, we allocate the chain of models such that each node is responsible for a series of connected models. This minimizes the number of inter-node messages. As the model is a queue, however, the last models will only activate much later on in the simulation. Since these are allocated to separate nodes, some nodes will remain idle until simulation has progressed sufficiently far.

Similar to the sequential benchmarks, Figure 6 shows that dxex again outperforms adevs, using both optimistic and conservative synchronization. Behaviour is exactly the same as in sequential simulation, but some speedup is achieved. In this case, conservative synchronization seems to be better than optimistic synchronization, at the cost of providing the lookahead.

PHold

In the Phold model, we first investigate the influence of the fraction of remote events.

Secondly, we verify that our contribution fulfills our projected use case: a single model that can be tweaked to favor either conservative or optimistic synchronization. We slightly modified the Phold benchmark, to include high-priority events. Contrary to normal events, which offer a sufficiently large lookahead, high-priority events happen almost instantaneous, thus restricting lookahead to a very small value. Even though the normal events will occur most oftenly, a conservative implementation should always block since these high-priority




Figure 6. Queue benchmark results for parallel simulation using 4 cores.

events can always occur. An optimistic implementation, however, will simply go forward in simulation time and roll back the few times that these high-priority events happen. This situation closely mimics the case made in the comparison between both synchronization algorithms by [8].

Figure 7 shows how simulation performance is influenced by the fraction of high-priority events. If barely any high-priority events occur, conservative synchronization is penalized due to its excessive blocking, which often turned out to be unnecessary. Should many high-priority events occur, however, optimistic synchronization is penalized due to its mindless progression of simulation, which frequently needed to be reverted. These results show that there is no single perfect synchronization algorithm for this model. Depending on model configuration, either synchronization protocol might be better. We therefore claim that our contribution is invaluable for high performance simulation: depending on the observed communication behaviour, modellers can use the most appropriate synchronization protocol.

Interconnect

In the Interconnect model, we determine how broadcast communication is supported across multiple nodes. Results are shown in Figure 8 While conservative simulation delivers the expected speedups, dxex is still significantly slower than adevs. Interestingly, adevs does not achieve any noticeable speedup from the use of multiple cores in this situation. Optimistic synchronization is not shown in this case: due to the high amount of exchanged events, all of which need to be stored in the sending *and* receiving node, it quickly runs out of memory. Several fixes to this problem have been proposed in the literature [8], but none of these is implemented by dxex.

4.4 Memory Usage




Figure 7. Phold benchmark results with high-priority events.

Figure 8. Interconnect benchmark results for parallel simulation.

Apart from simulation execution time, memory usage during simulation is also of great importance. While execution time only becomes a problem if it takes way too long, coming short only a bit of memory can make simulation infeasible. We therefore also investigate memory usage of different synchronization protocols.

We do not tackle the problem of states that become too large for a single machine to hold. This problem can be mitigated by distribution over multiple machines, which neither dxex or adevs support. Comparison of memory usage should thus only be seen in the context of which models are feasible to be simulated by the tool.

Remarks

Both dxex and adevs use tcmalloc as memory allocator. Additionally, dxex uses memory pools to further reduce the frequency of expensive system calls (*e.g.*, malloc and free). Tcmalloc only gradually releases memory back to the OS, whereas our pools will not do so at all. If memory has been allocated once, it is, at least from a performance point of view, better to keep that memory in the pool indefinitely. Due to our motivation for memory usage analysis, we will only measure peak allocation. Profiling is done using Valgrind’s massif tool [13].

Results

Adevs passes messages by value, dxex passes a pointer. The runtime effects of this choice have already been demonstrated in the Interconnect benchmark, so, in this section, we measure memory usage in number of allocated pages combining text, stack and heap memory for the program profiled. For the OS and/or user, this is the actual memory footprint of the application. It is important to note that, especially in the optimistic case, not all this memory is always in use by the kernels. During simulation, the pools will generally not return deallocated memory to the OS, but keep it for later reuse.

Results

Devstone




Figure 9. Memory usage results.

adevs	adevs con	dxex	dxex con	dxex opt
44	70	42	75	363

Table 1. Devstone 40x40 t5e5, unit MiB, 4 kernels (if parallel)

Since, in the conservative case, messages are passed by pointer, a GVT/LBTS implementation is required to organise the garbage collection. This inevitable delay explains the higher memory usage compared to adevs.

Optimistic’s TimeWarp requires state/event saving, and its GVT algorithm is more complex (with a resulting higher latency) than the LBTS calculation in the conservative case. Moreover, the differences in LP virtual times are far larger compared to conservative time synchronization. All these factors explain the heavier memory usage. Devstone (flattened) is allocated in a chain. Leafs in the dependency graph will therefore do a lot of unnecessary simulation before having a revert, leading to an increased memory pressure. Unlike conservative and sequential execution, memory usage in the optimistic case varies greatly depending on scheduling of kernel threads and drifting between kernels.

PHold

adevs	adevs con	dxex	dxex con	dxex opt
40	x	37	61	682

Table 2. Phold n 4 s 16 t1e6 r 10, unit MiB, 4 kernels (if parallel)

With only 10% of all messages being inter-kernel, we expect conservative to have memory consumption near that of the single threaded implementation, since intra-kernel messages are reclaimable after each round. The counterintuitive high memory usage can be explained by conservative’s stalled round behaviour which occurs whenever a kernel cannot advance (*eit* == *time*). In such a round messages are sent out but the kernel does not execute any transitions until it has received all input from all influencing kernels.

With lookahead ϵ this then leads to a high frequency of polling on shared null-times, which are used to determine lbts and thus garbage collection. The lbts calculation will not wait until a new value is found, since this can create unwanted contention with the simulation. The resulting longer time intervals within which no new lbts is found delay memory deallocation. Adevs’ conservative fails to complete the benchmark under valgrind even with a significantly reduced load. Optimistic exhibits the expected high memory usage.

adevs	adevs con	dxex	dxex con	dxex opt
39	39	35	43	259

Table 3. Interconnect w 20 t5e5, unit MiB, 2 kernels (if parallel)

Interconnect

In section 4.2 the parallel performance of this benchmark is further explained. Interconnect highlights dxex’s lower performance due to message allocation overhead.

5. RELATED WORK

5.1 PythonPDEVS

Dxex is closely related to PyPDEVS in design and philosophy. PyPDEVS allows anyone who grasps the PDEVS formalisms to immediately simulate his/her model without having to consider the kernel implementation. A Python based implementation offers the advantage of very fast prototype/run/evaluate cycles, this can’t be matched by a C++ simulator. It should be noted that, once the kernels have been compiled (in shared libraries), the actual compilation time of the model is small enough to make prototyping possible. Advanced features such as activity based relocation and the performance gains this results in, are still unique to PyPDEVS.

5.2 Adevs

Adevs is still under active development, allowing for an exact comparison in performance and features. It remains a very fast simulation engine for the PDEVS formalism, but it lacks an optimistic synchronization implementation. Due to the fact that adev does not flatten the Coupled Models, it’s performance degrades significantly if the hierarchy becomes deeper. Dxex, on the other hand, manages lookahead with more overhead than adevs, leading to a performance difference as the model count increases. Finally, adevs employs the full dependency graph this in contrast with dxex kernels, which only observe 1-edge removed nodes.

5.3 CD++

Different projects on CD++ offer conservative (CCD++) as well as optimistic (PCD++) parallel simulation. In contrast to dxex, neither projects offer both synchronization protocols. CD++ relies on the WARPED kernel. It is a middleware that provides memory, event, file, time and communication scheduling. We did not use the WARPED kernel (nor the underlying MPI) because dxex is designed specifically for a shared memory architecture and, as such, any middleware, however feature-rich, would have lead to an unacceptable overhead.

6. CONCLUSIONS AND FUTURE WORK

6.1 Memory

Our optimistic implementation can benefit from a faster GVT algorithm such as used in [9] or, more recently in [2]. With access to the memory subsystem already in place (pools), the optimistic case could be constrained using per kernel quota, preventing the simulation from exhausting memory. While less sensitive to memory pressure, the same approach could improve the conservative case.

6.2 Activity

As shown in [15], activity and allocation of models across kernels is a key aspect in achieving high performance in any parallel implementation. Allocating models so that there are no dependency cycles between their containing kernels is a first step, but not always possible. For the optimistic case, one can use re-allocation to break (runtime dependency) cycles and/or perform load-balancing. If kernels are unevenly balanced, they will begin to drift fast, causing increasingly more reverts. In dxex, we implement a limited framework to track model activity for debugging purposes; this could be extended to enable the above strategies.

6.3 Hybrid

The optimistic implementation could use (null/eot/eit) from the conservative case to detect and/or reduce the cost of reverts without completely stalling on influencing kernels.

The eot calculation in the conservative case can be enhanced by using the entire dependency graph between kernels (not models). The implementation could detect dependency cycles between kernels and, instead of waiting on dependent kernels, advance as a synced group with better scaling. LBTS calculation could leverage this as well to reduce memory usage, though this is not that stringent in the conservative case. Ultimately, the simulation could switch at runtime between protocols based on the information provided by activity tracking. This requires the above mentioned framework, and can only be done at timepoints where a GVT/LBTS time is agreed upon between the kernels. From the model’s perspective, no changes are needed, although a non-trivial lookahead is obviously desired.

In this paper, we presented dxex, a new C++-based PDEVS implementation supporting both sequential and parallel processing models.

We showed that, in the sequential case, dxex outperforms adevs in hierarchical simulations and that adevs produces better results in broadcast-like simulations.

In the parallel case, the results are more subtle. The sensitivity to broadcast simulations is carried over in the parallel implementation, resulting in performance loss for both synchronization protocols. The optimistic case can still achieve good performance if the volume of inter-kernel messages is low. Both synchronization protocols are fast in non-cyclic simulations, whereas the conservative case is better suited whenever state-saving becomes expensive; the optimistic case, on the other hand, is better suited when a lookahead is not available. Finally, the current optimistic implementation is ill-suited for memory constrained systems, especially in simulations where the frequency of reverts is high.

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. Bauer, D., Yaun, G., Carothers, C. D., Yuksel, M., and Kalyanaraman, S. Seven-o'clock: A new distributed gvt algorithm using network atomic operations. In *Proceedings of the 19th Workshop on Principles of Advanced and Distributed Simulation*, PADS '05, IEEE Computer Society (Washington, DC, USA, 2005), 39–48.
3. Chen, B., and Vangheluwe, H. Symbolic flattening of DEVS models. In *Summer Simulation Multiconference* (2010), 209–218.
4. 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.
5. De Munck, S., Vanmechelen, K., and Broeckhove, J. Revisiting conservative time synchronization protocols in parallel and distributed simulation. *Concurrency and Computation: Practice and Experience* 26, 2 (2014), 468–490.
6. Franceschini, R., Bisgambiglia, P.-A., Touraille, L., Bisgambiglia, P., and Hill, D. A survey of modelling and simulation software frameworks using Discrete Event System Specification. In *2014 Imperial College Computing Student Workshop*, Schloss Dagstuhl–Leibniz-Zentrum fuer Informatik (2014), 40–49.
7. Fujimoto, R. M. Performance of Time Warp under synthetic workloads. In *Proceedings of the SCS Multiconference on Distributed Simulation* (1990).
8. Fujimoto, R. M. *Parallel and Distributed Simulation Systems*, 1st ed. John Wiley & Sons, Inc., New York, NY, USA, 1999.
9. Fujimoto, R. M., and Hybinette, M. Computing global virtual time in shared-memory multiprocessors. *ACM Trans. Model. Comput. Simul.* 7, 4 (Oct. 1997), 425–446.
10. 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.
11. Jefferson, D. R. Virtual time. *ACM Trans. Program. Lang. Syst.* 7, 3 (July 1985), 404–425.
12. Mattern, F. Efficient algorithms for distributed snapshots and global virtual time approximation. *Journal of Parallel and Distributed Computing* 18, 4 (1993), 423–434.
13. Nethercote, N., and Seward, J. Valgrind: A framework for heavyweight dynamic binary instrumentation. *SIGPLAN Not.* 42, 6 (jun 2007), 89–100.
14. Van Tendeloo, Y. Activity-aware DEVS simulation. Master's thesis, University of Antwerp, Antwerp, Belgium, 2014.
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. 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.
18. Zeigler, B. P., Praehofer, H., and Kim, T. G. *Theory of Modeling and Simulation*, second ed. Academic Press, 2000.