



**HAL**  
open science

# On Timed Event Graphs Stabilization by Output Feedback in Dioid

Bertrand Cottenceau, Laurent Hardouin, Jean-Louis Boimond

► **To cite this version:**

Bertrand Cottenceau, Laurent Hardouin, Jean-Louis Boimond. On Timed Event Graphs Stabilization by Output Feedback in Dioid. 1st IFAC Symposium on System Structure and Control, Workshop on (max,+) algebras, Aug 2001, Prague, Czech Republic. pp.x-x. hal-00845418

**HAL Id: hal-00845418**

**<https://hal.science/hal-00845418>**

Submitted on 17 Jul 2013

**HAL** is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

# ON TIMED EVENT GRAPH STABILIZATION BY OUTPUT FEEDBACK IN DIOID

Bertrand Cottenceau, Laurent Hardouin, Jean-Louis Boimond <sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Laboratoire d'Ingénierie des Systèmes Automatisés, 62, avenue Notre-Dame du lac, 49000 ANGERS, FRANCE, Tel: (33) 2 41 36 57 33, Fax: (33) 2 41 36 57 35. E-mail: [bertrand.cottenceau, laurent.hardouin, jean-louis.boimond]@istia.univ-angers.fr

## Abstract

This paper deals with *output feedback synthesis* for Timed Event Graphs (TEG) in dioid algebra. The feedback synthesis is done in order to

- stabilize a TEG without decreasing its original production rate,
- optimize the initial marking of the feedback,
- delay as much as possible the tokens input.

## Keywords

Timed Event Graphs,  $(\max, +)$  algebra, Residuation, Stability, Feedback Synthesis.

## 1 Introduction

We are interested here in the problem of Timed Event Graphs (TEG) stabilization. We first recall that a TEG is a Petri net whose each place has one upstream transition and one downstream transition. This class of Petri nets admits a linear representation on  $(\max, +)$  or  $(\min, +)$  algebra [1] [4].

Property of stability is closely related to TEG structure. A TEG is said to be structurally stable if its marking (*i.e.*, its number of tokens) remains limited for all firing sequence of input transitions (this definition is introduced in [1, chap. 6]).

The problem of TEG stabilization has been considered by Cohen *et al.* in [3] and more recently by Commault [5]. Commault obtains a sufficient condition of stability for TEG. Such a condition is satisfied if TEG is made strongly connected by adding paths (*i.e.*, successions of places and transitions) between the output and the input of the TEG. Consequently, each place of the resulting TEG necessarily belongs to a circuit and its marking is then bounded.

In addition, it is shown in [1] that a controllable and observable TEG can be made stable, by adding an output feedback, without altering its own production rate. Gaubert has shown in [9] that the number of tokens that must be placed in the feedback, in order to stabilize a TEG, is a resource optimization problem which can be formulated as an integer linear program.

The approach presented here is based, on the one hand, on Gaubert's work [9] and, on the other hand, on the work initiated in [7]. The objective is here to synthesize a dynamic feedback which minimizes the number of tokens required, under the constraint that feedback keeps the original throughput.

In section 2, we will recall the algebraic tools necessary to feedback synthesis. We will briefly recall, in section 3, TEG modelization over dioid  $\mathcal{M}_{in}^{ax}[[\gamma, \delta]]$  and some periodic properties of TEG. In section 4, we will present how an existing feedback in a TEG can be improved and the way in which this can be applied to the problem of TEG stabilization.

## 2 Algebraic tools

The reader is invited to consult [1] or [4] for a complete presentation of the following theoretical recalls.

### 2.1 Dioid Theory

**Definition 1 (Dioid, Complete Dioid)** A dioid  $\mathcal{D}$  is a set endowed with two internal operations denoted  $\oplus$  (addition) and  $\otimes$  (multiplication), both associative and both having a neutral element denoted  $\varepsilon$  and  $e$  respectively such that  $\oplus$  is commutative and idempotent ( $\forall a \in \mathcal{D}, a \oplus a = a$ ),  $\otimes$  is distributive with respect to  $\oplus$  and  $\varepsilon$  is absorbing for the product ( $\forall a \in \mathcal{D}, \varepsilon \otimes a = a \otimes \varepsilon = \varepsilon$ ).

A dioid  $(\mathcal{D}, \oplus, \otimes)$  is said to be complete if it is closed for infinite sums and if multiplication distributes over infinite sums too. The sum of all its elements is generally denoted  $T$ .

**Definition 2 (Order relation)** A dioid is endowed with a partial order denoted  $\preceq$  and defined by the following equivalence:  $a \succeq b \iff a = a \oplus b$ .

**Definition 3 (Subdioid)** Let  $(\mathcal{D}, \oplus, \otimes)$  a dioid and  $\mathcal{C} \subset \mathcal{D}$ .  $(\mathcal{C}, \oplus, \otimes)$  is said subdioid of  $\mathcal{D}$  if  $\varepsilon, e \in \mathcal{C}$ , and  $\mathcal{C}$  is closed for  $\oplus$  and  $\otimes$ .

**Theorem 1 (Kleene star theorem)** The implicit equation  $x = ax \oplus b$  defined over a complete dioid admits  $x = a^* \otimes b$  as least solution with  $a^* = \bigoplus_{i \geq 0} a^i$ . The star operator  $*$  is usually called Kleene star.

## 2.2 Residuation Theory

In ordered set, equations  $f(x) = b$  may have either no solution, one solution, or multiple solutions. In order to give always a unique answer to this problem of mapping inversion, residuation theory [2] provides, under some assumptions, either the greatest solution (in accordance with the partial order) to the inequation  $f(x) \preceq b$  or the least solution to  $f(x) \succeq b$ .

**Definition 4 (Isotone mapping)** *A mapping  $f$  defined over ordered sets is said to be isotone if  $a \preceq b \Rightarrow f(a) \preceq f(b)$ .*

**Definition 5 (Residuation)** *Let  $f : \mathcal{E} \rightarrow \mathcal{F}$ , with  $(\mathcal{E}, \preceq)$  and  $(\mathcal{F}, \preceq)$  ordered sets. Mapping  $f$  is said residuated if for all  $y \in \mathcal{F}$ , the least upper bound of the subset  $\{x \in \mathcal{E} \mid f(x) \preceq y\}$  exists and lies in this subset. It is then denoted  $f^\sharp(y)$ . Mapping  $f^\sharp$  is called the residual of  $f$ . When  $f$  is residuated,  $f^\sharp$  is the unique isotone mapping such that*

$$f \circ f^\sharp \preceq \text{Id} \text{ and } f^\sharp \circ f \succeq \text{Id}.$$

**Theorem 2 ([1])** *Let  $f : (\mathcal{D}, \oplus, \otimes) \rightarrow (\mathcal{C}, \oplus, \otimes)$  a mapping defined over complete dioids. Mapping  $f$  is residuated if, and only if,  $f(\varepsilon) = \varepsilon$  and,  $\forall A \subseteq \mathcal{D}$ ,  $f(\bigoplus_{x \in A} x) = \bigoplus_{x \in A} f(x)$ .*

**Corollary 1** *Let  $L_a : x \mapsto a \otimes x$  and  $R_a : x \mapsto x \otimes a$  defined on a complete dioid. Mappings  $L_a$  and  $R_a$  are both residuated. Their residuals will be denoted respectively  $L_a^\sharp(x) = a \backslash x$  and  $R_a^\sharp(x) = x \diagdown a$*

**Proof:** by definition,  $\varepsilon$  is absorbing for  $\otimes$  and product distributes over sums in complete dioids. ■

## 2.3 Mapping restriction

**Definition 6** *Let  $f : E \rightarrow F$  a mapping and  $A \subseteq E$  a subset. We will denote  $f|_A : A \rightarrow F$  the mapping defined by equality  $f|_A = f \circ \text{ld}|_A$  where  $\text{ld}|_A : A \rightarrow E$  is the canonical injection. Identically, let  $B \subseteq F$  with  $\text{lm}f \subseteq B$ . Mapping  $B|f$  will be defined by equality  $f = \text{ld}|_B \circ B|f$  where  $\text{ld}|_B : B \rightarrow F$  is the canonical injection.*

**Proposition 1** *Let  $\mathcal{D}$  a complete dioid and  $\mathcal{D}_{sub}$  a complete subdioid of  $\mathcal{D}$ . Then, the canonical injection  $\text{ld}|_{sub} : \mathcal{D}_{sub} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}, x \mapsto x$  is residuated. Its residual will be denoted  $\text{Pr}_{sub}$ .*

**Proof:** since  $\mathcal{D}_{sub}$  is a subdioid of  $\mathcal{D}$  and is complete, the result is immediate according to theorem 2. ■

## 3 TEG description in dioid $\mathcal{M}_{in}^{ax}[\gamma, \delta]$

### 3.1 Dioid $\mathcal{M}_{in}^{ax}[\gamma, \delta]$ .

The input-output behavior of a TEG may be represented by a transfer relation in some particular dioids. Hereafter, we will essentially represent TEG behavior on dioid  $\mathcal{M}_{in}^{ax}[\gamma, \delta]$ . Let us recall that dioid  $\mathcal{M}_{in}^{ax}[\gamma, \delta]$  is formally the quotient dioid of  $\mathbb{B}[\gamma, \delta]$ , set of formal power series in two variables  $(\gamma, \delta)$  with Boolean coefficients and with exponents in  $\mathbb{Z}$ , by the equivalence relation  $x \mathcal{R} y \iff \gamma^*(\delta^{-1})^*x = \gamma^*(\delta^{-1})^*y$  (see [1],[4] for an exhaustive presentation). Dioid  $\mathcal{M}_{in}^{ax}[\gamma, \delta]$  is complete with a bottom element  $\varepsilon = \gamma^{+\infty}\delta^{-\infty}$  and a top element  $T = \gamma^{-\infty}\delta^{+\infty}$ . Let us consider a representative  $s = \bigoplus_{i \in \mathbb{N}} f(n_i, t_i) \gamma^{n_i} \delta^{t_i}$  in  $\mathbb{B}[\gamma, \delta]$  of an element belonging to  $\mathcal{M}_{in}^{ax}[\gamma, \delta]$ . The support of  $s$  is then defined as  $\{(n_i, t_i) \mid f(n_i, t_i) \neq \varepsilon\}$  and the valuation (resp. degree) of this element, denoted  $val_\gamma(s)$  (resp.  $deg_\delta(s)$ ) as the lower bound (resp. upper bound) of its support. A series of  $\mathcal{M}_{in}^{ax}[\gamma, \delta]$  is said polynomial if its support is finite. When an element of  $\mathcal{M}_{in}^{ax}[\gamma, \delta]$  is used to code a set of informations concerning a transition of a TEG, then a monomial  $\gamma^k \delta^t$  may be interpreted as : *the  $k^{th}$  event occurs at least at date  $t$ .*

### 3.2 Realizability, Periodicity and Rationality

**Definition 7 (Causality)** *Let  $h \in \mathcal{M}_{in}^{ax}[\gamma, \delta]$ .  $h$  is causal either if  $(h = \varepsilon)$  or  $(val_\gamma(h) \geq 0)$  and  $h \succeq \gamma^{val_\gamma(h)}$ . The set of causal elements of  $\mathcal{M}_{in}^{ax}[\gamma, \delta]$  has a complete dioid structure. This dioid will be denoted  $\mathcal{M}_{in}^{ax+}[\gamma, \delta]$ . A matrix is said causal if each of its entries is causal.*

**Definition 8 (Periodicity)** *Let  $h \in \mathcal{M}_{in}^{ax}[\gamma, \delta]$ .  $h$  is periodic if it exists two polynomials  $p$  and  $q$ , and a monomial  $r = \gamma^\nu \delta^\tau$  such that  $h = p \oplus qr^*$ . The ratio  $\lambda = \nu/\tau$  is called the production rate of the series. The set of periodic series of  $\mathcal{M}_{in}^{ax}[\gamma, \delta]$  has a dioid structure denoted  $\mathcal{M}_{in}^{ax\text{per}}[\gamma, \delta]$ . A matrix  $H \in \mathcal{M}_{in}^{ax}[\gamma, \delta]^{p \times m}$  is said periodic if all its entries are periodic. The production rate of this periodic matrix is then defined as  $\bar{\lambda} = \min_{1 \leq i \leq p, 1 \leq j \leq m} \lambda_{ij}$ .*

**Definition 9 (Realizability)**  *$H \in \mathcal{M}_{in}^{ax}[\gamma, \delta]^{p \times m}$  is said realizable if it exists four matrices  $A1, A2, B$  and  $C$  with entries in  $\{\varepsilon, e\}$  such that  $H = C(\gamma A1 \oplus \delta A2)^* B$ .*

**Remark 1** *In other words, there is a TEG whose transfer is  $H$ .*

**Definition 10 (Rational)** *Let  $h \in \mathcal{M}_{in}^{ax}[\gamma, \delta]$ .  $h$  is rational if it may be written as a finite composition of sums, products and Kleene stars of element belonging to the set  $\{\varepsilon, e, \gamma, \delta\}$ . A matrix is said rational if all its entries are rational.*

The following theorem recalls that the input-output transfer of a TEG is characterized by periodic properties.

**Theorem 3** ([4]) *Let  $H \in \mathcal{M}_{in}^{ax}[\gamma, \delta]^{p \times m}$ . Are equivalent*

- $H$  is periodic and causal
- $H$  is rational
- $H$  is realizable.

**Proposition 2** *The canonical injection  $\text{Id}_{|+} : \mathcal{M}_{in}^{ax+}[\gamma, \delta] \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_{in}^{ax}[\gamma, \delta], x \mapsto x$  is residuated. Its residual will be denoted  $\text{Pr}_+(x)$ .*

**Proof:** according to theorem 2, it suffices to remark that canonical injection verifies  $\forall A \subseteq \mathcal{M}_{in}^{ax+}[\gamma, \delta], \text{Id}_{|+}(\bigoplus_{x \in A} x) = \bigoplus_{x \in A} x$ . ■

Practically, for all  $x \in \mathcal{M}_{in}^{ax}[\gamma, \delta]$ , the computation of  $\text{Pr}_+(x)$  is obtained by :

$$\text{Pr}_+(\bigoplus_{i \in \mathbb{N}} f(n_i, t_i) \gamma^{n_i} \delta^{t_i}) = \bigoplus_{i \in \mathbb{N}} g(n_i, t_i) \gamma^{n_i} \delta^{t_i} \text{ where } g(n_i, t_i) = \begin{cases} f(n_i, t_i) & \text{if } (n_i, t_i) \geq (0, 0) \\ \varepsilon & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}.$$

**Theorem 4** ([8],[10]) *Let  $s_1, s_2 \in \mathcal{M}_{in}^{ax \text{ per}}[\gamma, \delta]$ . Then,  $s_1 \& s_2 \in \mathcal{M}_{in}^{ax \text{ per}}[\gamma, \delta]$ .*

**Proposition 3** *Let  $s \in \mathcal{M}_{in}^{ax \text{ per}}[\gamma, \delta]$  a periodic series.  $\text{Pr}_+(s) \in \mathcal{M}_{in}^{ax \text{ rat}}[\gamma, \delta]$  is the greatest rational element less than or equal to  $s$ .*

**Proof:** (sketch of proof) see [6] for further details. The proof consists in remarking that  $\forall s \in \mathcal{M}_{in}^{ax \text{ per}}[\gamma, \delta], \text{Pr}_+(s)$  belongs to  $\mathcal{M}_{in}^{ax \text{ per}}[\gamma, \delta]$  too. Moreover,  $\text{Pr}_+(s) \in \mathcal{M}_{in}^{ax+}[\gamma, \delta]$ . According to theorem 3, such an element is then rational. ■

**Proposition 4** *Let  $a, b \in \mathcal{M}_{in}^{ax \text{ rat}}[\gamma, \delta]$ . The element  $\text{Pr}_+(a \& b)$  is the greatest rational solution of  $a \otimes x \preceq b$ . In that sense, we can consider that  $L_a^{\text{rat}} : \mathcal{M}_{in}^{ax \text{ rat}}[\gamma, \delta] \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_{in}^{ax \text{ rat}}[\gamma, \delta], x \mapsto a \otimes x$  is residuated.*

**Proof:** since  $a$  and  $b$  are rational, they are periodic too (cf. theorem 3). Therefore, according to theorem 4,  $a \& b$  is a periodic element but not necessarily causal<sup>1</sup>. Furthermore, according to proposition 3,  $\text{Pr}_+(a \& b)$  is then the greatest rational solution of  $a \otimes x \preceq b$ . ■

<sup>1</sup>for instance,  $\gamma \delta$  and  $\gamma^2 \delta^2$  are periodic and causal series, nevertheless  $\gamma^2 \delta^2 \& \gamma \delta = \gamma^{-1} \delta^{-1}$  is not causal.

## 4 Feedback Synthesis for TEG

### 4.1 Greatest feedback

In previous section, we have recalled that a TEG can be represented by its input-output transfer. For instance, considering a TEG with  $m$  inputs and  $p$  outputs, its input-output behavior may be simply written  $Y = HU$ , with  $H \in \mathcal{M}_{in}^{ax \text{ rat}}[\gamma, \delta]^{p \times m}$  a rational matrix. Figure 1 represents the block diagram of a system




Figure 1: System  $H$  with an output feedback  $F$

denoted  $H$  on which has been added an output feedback  $F$ . By applying theorem 1, closed-loop transfer of fig. 1 is

$$Y = H(FH)^*U$$

where  $H \in \mathcal{M}_{in}^{ax \text{ rat}}[\gamma, \delta]^{p \times m}$  is the open-loop transfer and  $F \in \mathcal{M}_{in}^{ax \text{ rat}}[\gamma, \delta]^{m \times p}$  is the output feedback transfer.

Later on, we will denote  $M_H$  the following mapping

$$M_H : \begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{M}_{in}^{ax}[\gamma, \delta]^{m \times p} & \rightarrow & \mathcal{M}_{in}^{ax}[\gamma, \delta]^{p \times m} \\ X & \mapsto & H(XH)^* \end{array}$$

The mapping  $M_H$  clearly represents the way in which a feedback  $F$  modifies the closed-loop transfer of a system  $H$ . In particular,  $M_H$  is isotone since it is a composition of isotone mappings.

**Remark 2**  $M_H(X)$  may also be written  $(HX)^*H$  since  $H(XH)^* = H \oplus HXH \oplus HXH^2H \oplus \dots = (HX)^*H$ .

Thanks to theorem 2, one can check that  $M_H$ , defined over complete dioids, is not residuated. Indeed,  $M_H(a \oplus b) \neq M_H(a) \oplus M_H(b)$ . Nevertheless, the following result shows that there exists a restriction of  $M_H$  that is residuated.

**Proposition 5** *Let us consider mapping*

$${}_{\text{Im}M_H}M_H : \begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{M}_{in}^{ax}[\gamma, \delta]^{m \times p} & \rightarrow & M_H(\mathcal{M}_{in}^{ax}[\gamma, \delta]^{m \times p}) \\ X & \mapsto & H(XH)^* \end{array}$$

${}_{\text{Im}M_H}M_H$  is residuated and its residual is

$$({}_{\text{Im}M_H}M_H)^\sharp : \begin{array}{ccc} M_H(\mathcal{M}_{in}^{ax}[\gamma, \delta]^{m \times p}) & \rightarrow & \mathcal{M}_{in}^{ax}[\gamma, \delta]^{m \times p} \\ X & \mapsto & H \& X \& H. \end{array}$$

**Proof:** this result rests on  $L_a$  and  $R_a$  residuation (cf. corollary 1). It suffices to show that inequality

$$H(XH)^* \preceq H(aH)^* \tag{1}$$

admits a greatest solution  $\forall a \in \mathcal{M}_{in}^{ax}[\gamma, \delta]^{m \times p}$ . By considering the Kleene star operator, (1) amounts to satisfying the infinite sequence of inequalities

$$HXH \preceq H(aH)^*, H(XH)^2 \preceq H(aH)^*, \text{ etc.}$$

Indeed, once the first one is satisfied, the second one follows since

$$\begin{aligned} H(XH)^2 &= (HXH)(XH) \\ &\preceq H(aH)^*(XH) \\ &= (Ha)^*HXH \\ &\quad \text{since } (Ha)^*H = H(aH)^* \\ &\preceq (Ha)^*H(aH)^* \\ &= H(aH)^*(aH)^* \\ &= H(aH)^* \\ &\quad \text{since } (aH)^*(aH)^* = (aH)^*. \end{aligned}$$

The same holds true recursively for the next inequalities. Hence we can concentrate on the first one only, and clearly  $H \setminus (H(aH)^*) \not\phi H$  provides the answer. ■

**Proposition 6** *Let us consider a TEG whose transfer is  $H \in \mathcal{M}_{in}^{ax \text{ rat}}[\gamma, \delta]^{p \times m}$  endowed with an output feedback whose transfer is  $F \in \mathcal{M}_{in}^{ax \text{ rat}}[\gamma, \delta]^{m \times p}$ . Then,  $\hat{F}_+ = \text{Pr}_+(H \setminus M_H(F) \not\phi H)$  is the greatest realizable feedback such that  $M_H(F) = M_H(\hat{F}_+)$ .*

**Proof:** clearly,  $M_H(F) \in \text{Im}M_H$ . So, according to proposition 5, since  ${}_{\text{Im}M_H}M_H$  is residuated, inequation

$$M_H(X) \preceq M_H(F) \quad (2)$$

admits  $\hat{F} = H \setminus M_H(F) \not\phi H$  as greatest solution. In particular, since for  $X = F$  the equality of (2) is verified,  $\hat{F}$  is then the greatest solution to equation  $M_H(X) = M_H(F)$ . In other hand,  $M_H(F)$  is realizable, then periodic (cf. theorem 3), since it represents the closed-loop transfer. Therefore, according to theorem 4,  $H \setminus M_H(F) \not\phi H$  is a periodic matrix but not necessarily causal matrix. According to proposition 3,  $\hat{F}_+ = \text{Pr}_+(H \setminus M_H(F) \not\phi H)$  is the greatest rational solution of  $M_H(X) = M_H(F)$ . ■

**Remark 3** *Another interpretation consists in saying that for any realizable system  $H$  closed by a realizable feedback  $F$ , there is an optimal realizable feedback preserving the transfer of closed-loop system. Since  $\hat{F}_+ \succeq F$ , the system  $\hat{F}_+$  delays the input of tokens in system  $H$ , compared to the feedback  $F$ , while ensuring the same output. So, compared to the system  $F$ , the feedback  $\hat{F}_+$  decreases the number of tokens, or their sejour times, in the system  $H$ .*

## 4.2 Stabilization of TEG

For TEG, stability property essentially means that tokens do not accumulate indefinitely inside the graph

or differently that, for all inputs, marking remains bounded. This property is obtained when all transitions fire with the same average frequency.

A TEG is said structurally controllable (resp. observable) if every internal transition can be reached by a direct path from at least one input transition (resp. is the origin of at least one direct path to some output transition)(see [1]). It has been showed that a structurally controllable and observable TEG can be made stable by adding an output feedback [3] [10]. Indeed, as soon as all transitions belongs to a single strongly connected component, the TEG is stable. Therefore, it suffices that output feedback makes the TEG strongly connected to enforce stability. Moreover, stability may be obtained in order to preserve initial TEG production rate. The following theorem, coming from [1], formalizes this result.

**Theorem 5** *Any structurally controllable and observable event graph can be made internally stable by output feedback without altering its original throughput.*

### 4.2.1 Resource optimization in feedback

According to theorem 5, a TEG can be made stable while preserving its intrinsic throughput. Obviously, this feedback stabilization requires some amount of initial tokens in feedback arcs. In manufacturing context, for instance when a TEG describes a production system, the initial feedback marking can represent some resources like transport means (used to convey parts) or recyclable machines. Consequently, it is particularly significant to limit as much as possible their number. Here, we consider the problem of feedback marking minimization under both constraints of TEG stabilization and production rate preserving. This resource optimization problem, described more precisely thereafter, is tackled<sup>2</sup>, and solved, by Gaubert in [9].

Let us consider a TEG made up of  $m$  inputs and  $p$  outputs. Arcs provided with a place are added between outputs and inputs so as the TEG becomes strongly connected<sup>3</sup>. When strongly connectedness is reached, the problem consists in calculating the minimal number of tokens to be placed in each of these arcs in order to preserve the throughput of the open-loop system.

The transfer of feedback system can be represented by a matrix  $F = (F_{ij}) \in \mathcal{M}_{in}^{ax \text{ rat}}[\gamma, \delta]^{p \times m}$  where  $F_{ij} = \gamma^{q_{ij}}$  if  $q_{ij}$  tokens are initially allocated to place located between output  $j$  and input  $i$ , and  $F_{ij} = \varepsilon$  if there is no arc.

The problem lies in the computation and minimization of  $q = \{q_{ij}\}$  in order that closed-loop system keeps the same production rate as the open-loop

<sup>2</sup>other authors have solved such a problem but not necessarily with (max,+) approaches.

<sup>3</sup>Practically, it is not always necessary to connect all outputs to all inputs to obtain strongly connectedness.

one. Gaubert [9] has shown that such a problem may be solved as an integer linear programming problem where the linear cost function is

$$J(q) = \sum_{i=1, j=1}^{i=m, j=p} \alpha_{ij} q_{ij},$$

with  $\alpha_{ij}$  a price associated to each resource, and the constraint is

$$\lambda(q) \geq \bar{\lambda},$$

where  $\bar{\lambda}$  is the production rate of the open-loop system and  $\lambda(q)$  is the production rate with feedback.

If we denote  $w_{N_c}(q)$  (resp.  $w_{T_c}$ ) the (classical) sum of tokens (resp. holding times) in a circuit  $c$ , then

$$\lambda(q) = \min_c \frac{w_{N_c}(q)}{w_{T_c}},$$

*i.e.*, for each circuit the following constraint will be satisfied

$$w_{N_c}(q) \geq \bar{\lambda} \times w_{T_c}.$$

The solution of this integer linear program yields to  $q_{ij}$  tokens that must be placed in each feedback arc. We denote  $F_{\mathcal{R}\mathcal{O}}$  this feedback. Then,  $F_{\mathcal{R}\mathcal{O}}$  ensures closed-loop stability, preserves the same production rate and minimizes the cost function.

#### 4.2.2 Synthesis of a greater stabilizing feedback

We propose here to improve the feedback obtained above by computing the greatest dynamic feedback which preserves  $M_H(F_{\mathcal{R}\mathcal{O}})$ .

**Proposition 7** *Let us denote  $F_{\mathcal{R}\mathcal{O}}$  a feedback loop obtained by solving a resource optimization problem. The feedback loop  $\hat{F}_{\mathcal{R}\mathcal{O}_+} = \text{Pr}_+(H \setminus M_H(F_{\mathcal{R}\mathcal{O}}) \setminus H)$  is the greatest realizable feedback such that  $M_H(F_{\mathcal{R}\mathcal{O}}) = M_H(\hat{F}_{\mathcal{R}\mathcal{O}_+})$ .*

**Proof:** direct from proposition 6. ■

This feedback can be seen as a refinement to the solution brought by Gaubert in [9]. Indeed, as we have explained in remark 3, feedback  $\hat{F}_{\mathcal{R}\mathcal{O}_+}$  verifies  $\hat{F}_{\mathcal{R}\mathcal{O}_+} \succeq F_{\mathcal{R}\mathcal{O}}$ . Therefore, feedback  $\hat{F}_{\mathcal{R}\mathcal{O}_+}$  releases input firings latter than with feedback  $F_{\mathcal{R}\mathcal{O}}$  while ensuring the same output and the same resource number in each feedback. Indeed, since the initial marking (*i.e.*, the resource number) of a path described by a periodic series  $s$  is equal to  $\text{val}_\gamma(s)$ , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{F}_{\mathcal{R}\mathcal{O}_+} \succeq F_{\mathcal{R}\mathcal{O}} &\iff \forall i, j \hat{F}_{\mathcal{R}\mathcal{O}_+} \succeq F_{\mathcal{R}\mathcal{O}} \\ &\implies \forall i, j \text{val}_\gamma(\hat{F}_{\mathcal{R}\mathcal{O}_+}) \leq \text{val}_\gamma(F_{\mathcal{R}\mathcal{O}}). \end{aligned}$$

The last statement means that the resource number of each path of feedback  $\hat{F}_{\mathcal{R}\mathcal{O}_+}$  is less than or equal to the ones of  $F_{\mathcal{R}\mathcal{O}}$ . In the other hand,  $M_H(\hat{F}_{\mathcal{R}\mathcal{O}_+}) = M_H(F_{\mathcal{R}\mathcal{O}})$ , and  $\text{val}_\gamma(F_{\mathcal{R}\mathcal{O}})$  is the minimal number of tokens which allows to minimize  $J(q)$  while preserving the production rate. This latest statement leads to equality  $\text{val}_\gamma(\hat{F}_{\mathcal{R}\mathcal{O}_+}) = \text{val}_\gamma(F_{\mathcal{R}\mathcal{O}})$ .

#### 4.2.3 Illustrative example

We present here how the preceding results can be implemented. Let us consider the structurally controllable and observable TEG drawn in solid lines in fig.2. Its transfer matrix in  $\mathcal{M}_{in}^{ax}[\gamma, \delta]^{2 \times 2}$  is

$$H = \begin{pmatrix} \delta^9(\gamma\delta)^* & \delta^5(\gamma\delta)^* \\ \varepsilon & \delta^{15}(\gamma^2\delta^5)^* \end{pmatrix}.$$

From this transfer matrix, we deduce that the TEG production rate is  $\bar{\lambda} = 2/5$  (see definition 8). This TEG represents a production unit with 4 machines denoted  $M1$  to  $M4$ . Because of the difference of production rates of machines constituting this workshop, one notices that TEG model is not stable. Indeed, by firing all inputs an infinity times at a given date we can observe an accumulation of tokens upstream machine  $M4$ . Therefore, stability of that system can be obtained by adding an output feedback. It is sufficient to make the TEG strongly connected to ensure its stability. In that particular case, the TEG becomes strongly connected by adding a feedback of the form :

$$F = \begin{pmatrix} \gamma^{q_{11}} & \varepsilon \\ \gamma^{q_{21}} & \gamma^{q_{22}} \end{pmatrix}.$$

We consider here the resource optimization problem in order to minimize the following cost function  $J(q) = q_{11} + q_{21} + q_{22}$  (*i.e.*,  $\alpha_{ij} = 1$ ). This problem can be solved by considering the sum of tokens and temporization of each elementary circuit<sup>4</sup> which yields to the TEG production rate denoted  $\lambda(q)$  :

$$\lambda(q) = \min \left( \frac{2}{5}, \frac{q_{11}}{9}, \frac{q_{21}}{5}, \frac{q_{22}}{15} \right).$$

Therefore, for  $q = (4, 2, 6)$ , cost  $J(q)$  is minimum, *i.e.*,

$$F_{\mathcal{R}\mathcal{O}} = \begin{pmatrix} \gamma^4 & \varepsilon \\ \gamma^2 & \gamma^6 \end{pmatrix}.$$

This stabilizing feedback that keeps original throughput and minimizes resources number (tokens) is drawn in dotted lines in fig. 2. On the basis of this solution  $F_{\mathcal{R}\mathcal{O}}$  (obtained by linear programming approach) and according to proposition 7, we can refine this result by computing  $\hat{F}_{\mathcal{R}\mathcal{O}_+} = \text{Pr}_+(H \setminus F_{\mathcal{R}\mathcal{O}} \setminus H)$ . We do not detail calculus here. The result obtained is :

$$\hat{F}_{\mathcal{R}\mathcal{O}_+} = ((e \oplus \gamma\delta)(\gamma^2\delta^5)^*) \begin{pmatrix} \gamma^4\delta & \gamma^8 \\ \gamma^2 & \gamma^6 \end{pmatrix}.$$

A realization of that system is drawn in fig.3.

**Remark 4** *We can notice that feedback  $\hat{F}_{\mathcal{R}\mathcal{O}_+}$  has an arc  $y1 \rightarrow u2$  that does not exist in feedback  $F_{\mathcal{R}\mathcal{O}}$ .*

<sup>4</sup>the naive enumeration of elementary circuits is simpler than writing the linear program. But, for large graphs, such an enumeration becomes practically impossible (for a complete graph with  $n$  vertices, the enumeration complexity is  $O((n-1)!)$ ). Gaubert's approach [9] allows to consider only  $n^2$  inequalities.




Figure 2: System  $H$  with feedback  $F_{RO}$




Figure 3: System  $H$  with feedback  $\hat{F}_{RO+}$

Figure 4 represents the  $v1$  firing sequence with  $\hat{F}_{RO+}$  (dotted line) and the  $v1$  firing sequence with  $F_{RO}$  (solid line) for the same input  $u1$  (dashed line). Clearly, feedback  $\hat{F}_{RO+}$  delays tokens entrance in system  $H$ . For lack of place, we have not described firing sequences  $v2$ ,  $y1$  nor  $y2$  for that simulation. We can only assert that outputs are identical in both cases and that sequence  $v2$  is not improved by the feedback  $\hat{F}_{RO+}$ .

## References

- [1] F. Baccelli, G. Cohen, G.J. Olsder, and J.P. Quadrat. *Synchronization and Linearity: An Algebra for Discrete Event Systems*. John Wiley and Sons, New York, 1992.
- [2] T.S. Blyth and M.F. Janowitz. *Residuation Theory*. Pergamon Press, Oxford, 1972.
- [3] G. Cohen, P. Moller, J.P. Quadrat, and M. Viot. Linear system theory for discrete-event systems. In *23rd IEEE Conf. on Decision and Control*, Las Vegas, Nevada, 1984.




Figure 4:  $v1$  with  $\hat{F}_{RO+}$  (dotted lines),  $v1$  with  $F_{RO}$  (solid lines) and  $u1$  for both systems (dashed lines).

- [4] G. Cohen, P. Moller, J.P. Quadrat, and M. Viot. Algebraic Tools for the Performance Evaluation of Discrete Event Systems. *IEEE Proceedings: Special issue on Discrete Event Systems*, 77(1):39–58, January 1989.
- [5] C. Commault. Feedback stabilization of some event graph models. *IEEE Trans. on Automatic Control*, 43(10):1419–1423, October 1998.
- [6] B. Cottenceau. *Contribution à la commande de systèmes à événements discrets : synthèse de correcteurs pour les graphes d'événements temporisés dans les dioïdes*. Phd thesis (in french), ISTIA Université d'Angers, 1999.
- [7] B. Cottenceau, L. Hardouin, J.L. Boimond, and J.L. Ferrier. Synthesis of greatest linear feedback for timed event graphs in dioid. *IEEE Trans. on Automatic Control*, 44(6):1258–1262, June 1999.
- [8] S. Gaubert. *Théorie des systèmes linéaires dans les dioïdes*. Phd thesis (in french), Ecole des Mines de Paris, Paris, 1992.
- [9] S. Gaubert. Resource optimization and  $(\min, +)$  spectral theory. *IEEE TAC*, 40(11):1931–1934, November 1995.
- [10] Max Plus. Second Order Theory of Min-linear Systems and its Application to Discrete Event Systems. In *Proceedings of the 30th CDC*, Brighton, England, December 1991.