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ABSTRACT

If a manufacturing system enters into a state where a task enters into a state of suspended animation for perpetuity, we say it is in a livelocked state. In contrast, all tasks of the system remain suspended for perpetuity in a deadlocked state of the system. A livelock-free manufacturing system can never experience deadlocks, but the converse is not necessarily true. A livelock-prone manufacturing system can be regulated using a supervisory policy such that the resulting supervised system is livelock-free. If a liveness enforcing supervisory policy (LESP) prevents the occurrence of an event at a given state of the manufacturing system, and every other LESP, irrespective of the implementation paradigm, prescribes the same control for that state, we say the original LESP is minimally restrictive.

This paper is about two enhancements to an existing software tool that synthesizes the minimally restrictive LESP for a manufacturing system modeled using a class of weighted Petri nets (PNs). The first enhancement is about broadening the scope of the software tool to a larger class of PNs. The second enhancement is about improving the running time of the software tool using a property identified in this paper.

We identify a class, \( \mathcal{H} \), of general Petri net (PN) structures where the existence of a liveness enforcing supervisory policy (LESP) for an instance of this class, initialized at a marking, is sufficient to infer the existence of an LESP when the same instance is initialized at a larger marking. As a consequence, the existence of an LESP for the PN that results when a member of this class is initialized with a marking, is decidable. Additionally, the maximally permissive LESP, when it exists, can be synthesized using a software tool described in an earlier paper. We also highlight a property that plays a critical role in the speed of convergence of the iterative procedure for the synthesis of the minimally restrictive LESP, when it exits, for any instance of \( \mathcal{H} \) that uses the aforementioned software package.
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1. INTRODUCTION

Manufacturing systems belong to a class of systems called Discrete-Event/Discrete-State (DEDS) systems. The (discrete-)states of these systems have a logical, as opposed to numerical, interpretation. At each state, there are potential (discrete-)events that can occur, the occurrence of any one of them would change the state of the system, which then results in a new set of potential events, and this process can be repeated as often as necessary. DEDS systems are regulated by a supervisory policy, which determines which event is to be permitted at each state, in such a
manner that some behavioural specification is satisfied. Our focus is on *livelock-avoidance*. A manufacturing system is in a *livelocked-state* if a task enters into a state of suspended animation for perpetuity. If all tasks in the manufacturing system are prevented from progressing to completion, we say the manufacturing system has entered a *deadlocked-state* (cf. [1], for example). A livelock-free manufacturing system does not have deadlocked-states, but a deadlock-free manufacturing system can still experience livelocks. Livelock freedom is harder to achieve, compared to deadlock freedom.

Petri nets (PNs) have been extensively used to model manufacturing systems (cf. [2,3], for example). In this paper we consider the synthesis of *liveness enforcing supervisory policies* (LESPs) in PN models of manufacturing systems. The results in the literature range from heuristic procedures to provably correct methods that can synthesize LESP s for a variety of PN classes. Since the existence of an LESP in an arbitrary PN instance is not even semi-decidable, it is imperative that any provably correct scheme restricts its attention to a sub-class of PN structures. This paper identifies one such a class, \( \mathcal{H} \), which strictly includes all other classes of PNs for which a LESP can be automatically synthesized (cf. [4–6], for example). Additionally, the software tool identified in reference [7] can be used to synthesize the minimally restrictive LESP, when it exists, for any member of the class \( \mathcal{H} \), thus broadening its scope. We also identify a characterization of the minimally restrictive LESP for any instance of \( \mathcal{H} \), which can be used to improve the running time of the aforementioned software tool.

This paper is organized as follows – section 2 introduces the notations and definitions used in this paper. This section also reviews the supervisory control paradigm for PN models, along with a brief review of the relevant results from the literature. The main results are presented in section 3. Section 4 presents the conclusions.

### 2. Notations and Definitions and Some Preliminary Observations

\( \mathbb{N} (\mathbb{N}^+) \) denotes the set of non-negative (positive) integers. The cardinality of a set \( A \) is represented as \( \text{card}(A) \). A Petri net (PN) structure \( N = (\Pi, T, \Phi, \Gamma) \) is an ordered 4-tuple, where \( \Pi = \{p_1, \ldots, p_n\} \) is a set of places, \( T = \{t_1, \ldots, t_m\} \) is a collection of transitions, \( \Phi \subseteq (\Pi \times T) \cup (T \times \Pi) \) is set of arcs, and \( \Gamma: \Phi \rightarrow \mathbb{N}^+ \) is the weight associated with each arc. The weight of an arc is represented by an integer that is placed alongside the arc. If an arc has a unitary weight, it is uniquely defined by its finite set of minimal-elements.

If all arcs of a PN are unitary, it is said to be an ordinary PN, otherwise it is a general PN. The initial marking of a PN structure \( N \) is a function \( m^0: \Pi \rightarrow \mathbb{N} \), which identifies the number of tokens in each place. A Petri net (PN), \( N(m^0) \), is a PN structure \( N \) together with its initial marking \( m^0 \).

\( T^* \) represents the set of all finite-length strings of transitions. For \( \sigma \in T^* \), we use \( x(\sigma) \) to denote the Parikh vector of \( \sigma \). That is, the \( i^{th} \) entry, \( x_i(\sigma) \), corresponds to the number of occurrences of transition \( t_i \) in \( \sigma \).

Let \( \tau := \{y | (y,x) \in \Phi \} \) and \( \tau^* := \{y | (x,y) \in \Phi \} \). If \( \forall p \in \tau, m^t(p) \geq \Gamma((p,t)) \) for some \( t \in T \) and some marking \( m^t \), then \( t \in T \) is said to be enabled at marking \( m^t \). The set of enabled transitions at marking \( m^t \) is denoted by the symbol \( T_e(N, m^t) \). An enabled transition \( t \in T_e(N, m^t) \) can fire, which changes the marking \( m^t \) to \( m^{t+1} \) according to \( m^{t+1}(p) = m^t(p) - \Gamma(p,t) + \Gamma(t,p) \).

A set of markings \( \mathcal{M} \subseteq \mathbb{N}^\Pi \) is said to be right-closed if \( \forall (m^1 \in \mathcal{M}) \wedge (m^2 \geq m^1) \Rightarrow (m^2 \in \mathcal{M}) \), and is uniquely defined by its finite set of minimal-elements.
When the marking is interpreted as a nonnegative integer-valued vector, it is useful to define the input matrix IN (output matrix OUT) as an \( n \times m \) matrix, where \( \text{IN}_{i,j} \) (\( \text{OUT}_{i,j} \)) equals \( \Gamma((p,t_i)) \) (\( \Gamma((p,t_i)) \) if \( p \in T_i \), \( p \in T_i' \)) and is zero-valued otherwise. The incidence matrix \( C \) of the PN \( N \) is an \( n \times m \) matrix, where \( C = \text{OUT} - \text{IN} \).

2.1. Supervisory Control of PNs

Under this paradigm, the set of transitions in the PN is partitioned into a set of controllable transitions \( (T_c \subseteq T) \) and a set of uncontrollable transitions \( (T_u \subseteq T) \). The controllable (uncontrollable) transitions are represented as filled (unfilled) boxes in graphical representation of PNs.

A supervisory policy \( \phi : \mathbb{N}^n \times T \rightarrow \{0,1\} \), is a function that returns a 0 or 1 for each transition and each reachable marking. Transition \( t \in T \) is control-enabled (state-enabled) if \( \phi(m,t) = 1 \) \( (t \in T_o(N,m)) \) for some marking \( m \). A transition that is state- and control-enabled can fire, which results in a new marking as indicated in the previous section. Since uncontrollable transitions cannot be prevented from firing by the supervisory policy, we require the following condition to be true of all supervisory policies: \( \forall m \in \mathbb{N}^n, \phi(m,t) = 1, \) if \( t \in T_u \).

A valid firing string \( s = t_1 t_2 \cdots t_k \in T^* \) for a marking \( m \) satisfies the following conditions:

1. (1) \( t_1 \in T_o(N,m^i) \), \( \phi(m^i,t_1) = 1 \), and (2) for \( j \in \{1,2,\ldots,k-1\} \) the firing of transition \( t_j \) produces a marking \( m_j^i t_j+1 \in T_o(N,m_j^i) \), and \( \phi(m_j^i,t_j+1) = 1 \).

\( \mathcal{R}(N,m^0,\phi) \) denotes the set of markings that are reachable from \( m^0 \) under the supervision of \( \phi \) in \( N \). We use \( m^i \rightarrow m^j \) to denote that \( m^j \) results from the firing of \( \sigma \in T^* \) from \( m^i \).

A transition \( t_i \) is live under the supervision of \( \phi \) if \( \forall m^i \in \mathcal{R}(N,m^0,\phi), \exists m^j \in \mathcal{R}(N,m^i,\phi) \) such that \( t_k \in T_o(N,m^j) \) and \( \phi(m^j,t_k) = 1 \). If all transitions in \( N(m^0) \) are live under \( \phi \), then it is a liveness enforcing supervisory policy (LESP) for \( N(m^0) \). The policy \( \phi \) is said to be minimally restrictive if for every LESP \( \phi : \mathbb{N}^n \times T \rightarrow \{0,1\} \), the following condition holds \( \forall m^i \in \mathbb{N}^n, \forall t \in T, \phi(m^i,t) \geq \phi^*(m^i,t) \).

There is an LESP for \( N(m^0) \) if and only if \( m^0 \in \Delta(N) \), where \( \Delta(N) = \{m^0 \in \mathbb{N}^{\text{card}(I)} | \exists \text{ an LESP for } N(m^0) \} \) is the set of initial markings \( m^0 \) for which there is an LESP for \( N(m^0) \). It follows that \( \Delta(N) \) is control invariant (cf. [9,10]) with respect to \( \mathcal{N} \); that is, if \( m^i \in \Delta(N) \), then \( m^j t_k \in T_o \cap T_e(N,m^i) \) and \( m^1 t_k \leq m^2 \) in \( N \), then \( m^2 \in \Delta(N) \). Equivalently, only the firing of a controllable transition at any marking in \( \Delta(N) \) can result in a new marking that is not in \( \Delta(N) \).

If \( \phi \) is an LESP for \( N(m^0) \), then \( \mathcal{R}(N,m^0,\phi) \subseteq \Delta(N) \). Additionally, the LESP \( \phi^* \), that prevents the firing of a controllable transition at any marking when its firing would result in a new marking that is not in \( \Delta(N) \), is the minimally restrictive LESP for \( N(m^0) \). That is, there can be no other LESP, independent of the implementation paradigm, that can be better than \( \phi^* \).

Neither the existence, nor the non-existence, of an LESP for an arbitrary PN is semi-decidable; the existence of an LESP is decidable if all transitions in the PN are controllable, or if the PN structure belongs to specific classes identified in the literature [4–6,11]. The process of deciding the existence of an LESP in an arbitrary instance from these classes is NP-hard.
2.2. Review of Relevant Prior Work

Monitors were introduced into supervisory control of PNS by Giua [12], and were reused by Moody et al. [13], and Iordache et al. [14] to derive sufficient conditions for the existence of certain classes of PNs. Sufficient conditions for minimally restrictive, closed-loop liveness of a class of Marked Graph PNs supervised by monitors were derived by Basile et al. [15]. There are necessary and sufficient conditions for classes of PNs known as $S^p$PR and $S^d$PR nets that can be used to synthesize liveness enforcing enhancements in instances of these classes [16, 17]. Reveliotis et al. [18] and Ghaflari et al. [19] used the theory of regions to identify minimally restrictive LESPs for Resource Allocation Systems. Marchetti et al. [20] presented a polynomial time sufficient condition for liveness, for the class of Unitary Weighted Event Graphs. Ferrarini et al. [21] compare the performance of a selection of deadlock avoidance policies in PN models of flexible manufacturing systems. Chen et al. [22] use Integer Linear Programming to synthesize invariant monitors that enforce liveness in a class of PNs. Hu et al. [23, 24] use a set of inequalities to characterize insufficiently marked siphons that is subsequently used to develop an algebraic LESP-synthesis procedure. Li et al. [25] develop an iterative siphon-based control scheme for preventing deadlocks in PN models of manufacturing systems using a mixed integer programming approach involving what are known as necessary siphons.

3. Main Results

Let $\Omega(t) = \{ \dot{t} \in T | ^*t \cap \dot{t} \neq \emptyset \}$, denote the set of transitions that share a common input place with $t \in T$ for a PN structure $N = (\Pi, T, \Phi, I)$. Consequently, $(t_1 \in \Omega(t_2)) \Rightarrow (t_2 \in \Omega(t_1))$. Let $\mathcal{H}$ denote a class of PN structures where the following property is true:

$$\forall \mathbf{m} \in \Delta(N), \forall \mathbf{t}_u \in \mathcal{T}_u, \forall t \in \Omega(t_u), \left( t \in \mathcal{T}_N(N, \mathbf{m}) \right) \Rightarrow \left( t_u \in \mathcal{T}_N(N, \mathbf{m}) \right).$$

That is, $\mathcal{H}$ is a class of PN structures where, if a transition $t$ is state-enabled, then all uncontrollable transitions that share a common input place with $t$ are also state enabled at any marking in $\Delta(N)$. The following lemma finds use in the proof of theorem 2.

**Lemma 1:** (Lemma 5.1, [5]) Let $\mathcal{H}$ be a LESP for $N^{m^0}$, where $m^0 \in \Delta(N)$, for a PN structure $N \in \mathcal{H}$. Suppose $m^0 \xrightarrow{\sigma} m^l$ under the supervision of $\mathcal{H}$, and $m^0 \xrightarrow{\sigma} \tilde{m}^l$ without supervision in $N$, where the number of occurrences of each controllable transition in $\sigma$ and $\tilde{\sigma}$ are identical, and $\tilde{m}^l \geq m^0$. There exists strings $\sigma_1, \sigma_2 \in T^*$ such that (1) $m^0 \xrightarrow{\sigma_1} m^k$ under the supervision of $\mathcal{H}$ in $N$, (2) $\tilde{m}^0 \xrightarrow{\sigma_2} \tilde{m}^l$ without supervision in $N$, and (3) $x(\sigma_1) = x(\sigma_2)$. Consequently, $\tilde{m}^l \geq \tilde{m}^k$.

**Proof:** Let $\tilde{T}_u \subseteq \mathcal{T}_u$ denote the set of uncontrollable transitions that appear more often in $\tilde{\sigma}$ as compared to $\sigma$. If $\tilde{T}_u = \emptyset$, then $\tilde{\sigma} = \sigma$ and the result holds trivially. If $\tilde{T}_u \neq \emptyset$, there is a string $\sigma_1$ such $m^l \xrightarrow{\sigma_1} m^{l+1}$ under the supervision of the LESP $\mathcal{H}$ such that (1) at least one member of $t_u \in \tilde{T}_u$ is state-enabled at $m^{l+1}$, and (2) none of the members of $\tilde{T}_u$ are state-enabled at any marking that results from the firing of a proper prefix of $\sigma_2$ at $m^l$. It follows that $\tilde{m}^l \xrightarrow{\sigma_2} \tilde{m}^{l+1}$, without any supervision, in $N$. If this were not the case, there must be a proper prefix of $\sigma_2$, of the form $\sigma_2m$, such that $\tilde{m}^l \xrightarrow{\sigma_2m} \tilde{m}$ in $N$, but $m^0 \not\in \mathcal{T}_u(N, \tilde{m})$. Additionally, $t_m \in \Omega(t_u)$ for some $t_u \in \tilde{T}$. Since $N \in \mathcal{H}$, and $\tilde{m} \in \Delta(N)$, it follows that $t_u \in \mathcal{T}_N(N, \tilde{m})$, which contradicts requirement (2).

Suppose $m^l \xrightarrow{\sigma_1t_u} m^{l+1}$ under $\mathcal{H}$ in $N$, and $\tilde{m}^l \xrightarrow{\sigma_1t_u} \tilde{m}^{l+1}$ without supervision in $N$. We let $m^l \leftarrow m^{l+1}$, $\tilde{m}^l \leftarrow \tilde{m}^{l+1}$, $\sigma_1 \leftarrow \sigma_\sigma_1t_u$, and $\sigma_1 \leftarrow \sigma_\sigma_1t_u$. The result follows by repeating the above construction as often as necessary till $\hat{T}_u = \emptyset$.  

\[\Box\]
The following theorem notes that $\Delta(N)$ is right-closed if $N \in \bar{\mathcal{H}}$.

**Theorem 2:** \( m^0 \in \Delta(N) \wedge (\hat{m}^0 \geq m^0) \Rightarrow (\hat{m}^0 \in \Delta(N)), \text{if} N \in \bar{\mathcal{H}}. \)

**Proof:** Since $m^0 \in \Delta(N)$, there is an LESP $\hat{\varphi}$ for $N(m^0)$. Following reference [5], we define an LESP $\hat{\varphi}$ for $N(m^0)$ as follows (1) $\forall t \in T, \hat{\varphi}(m^0, t) = \varphi(m^0, t)$, (2) $\hat{\varphi} \rightarrow \hat{m}^0 \text{ under } \hat{\varphi}$, then (2a) $\forall t \in T_u, \hat{\varphi}(\hat{m}^0, t) = 1$, and (2b) $\forall c \in C, (\hat{\varphi}(\hat{m}^0, t_c) = 1) \iff (\exists \sigma \in T^*, \text{such that } m^0 \rightarrow^\sigma \hat{m}^0 \text{ under } \hat{\varphi})$, and the number of occurrences of each controllable transition in $\sigma$ and $\sigma_c$ are identical.

If $\hat{m}^0 \rightarrow^\delta \hat{m}^i$ under $\hat{\varphi}$, then $\exists \sigma \in T^*$ such that $m^0 \rightarrow^\sigma m^i$ under $\varphi$, and the number of occurrences of each controllable transition in $\sigma$ and $\delta$ are identical. Using lemma 1, and the definition of $\hat{\varphi}$, we know $\exists \sigma_1, \sigma_2 \in T^*$ such that $m^0 \rightarrow^\sigma_1 m^i$ under $\varphi$, $m^0 \rightarrow^\sigma_2 m^i+1$ under $\varphi$, and $m^i+1 \geq m^i+1$. Consequently, for any $\sigma_2 \in T^*$ such that $m^i+1 \rightarrow^\sigma_2 m^i+2$ under $\varphi$, we have $\hat{m}^i+1 \rightarrow^\delta \hat{m}^i+2$ under $\hat{\varphi}$ as well. Since $\varphi$ is an LESP for $N(m^0)$, it follows that $\hat{\varphi}$ is an LESP for $N(\hat{m}^0)$. \[
\hat{\varphi}
\]

Lemma 1 and theorem 2 together imply the following theorem.

**Theorem 3:** $\Delta(N)$ is right-closed if $N \in \bar{\mathcal{H}}$.

The above condition is not necessary for the right-closure of $\Delta(N)$. For instance, $\Delta(N_1)$ is right-closed for the general PN $N_1$ shown in figure 1(a), but $N_1 \notin \bar{\mathcal{H}}$. Specifically, $\Delta(N_1)$ is identified by the inequality $(1111111) \geq 1$, and $m = (10000) \in \Delta(N_1)$, $t_2 \in T_u, t_3 \in T_e(N_1, m)$, but $t_2 \notin T_e(N_1, m)$.

There is an LESP for the PN $N(m^0)$ if and only if $\hat{m}^0 \in \Delta(N)$, and the existence of an LESP is undecidable for a general PN (cf. corollary 5.2, [11]). This would mean that the set $\Delta(N)$ cannot be computed for an arbitrary PN structure $N$. To overcome this limitation, we modify the requirement of equation 1 as

\[
\forall m \in \mathbb{N^n}, \forall t \in T_u, \forall \Omega(t_u), (t \in T_e(N, m)) \Rightarrow (t_u \in T_e(N, m)) \quad (2)
\]

This requirement defines a class of PNs, which we denote as $\mathcal{H}(\subseteq \bar{\mathcal{H}})$, and from theorem 3, we conclude $\Delta(N)$ is right-closed for any $N \in \mathcal{H}$.

**Theorem 4:** A PN structure $N = (\Pi, T, \Phi, \Gamma)$ belongs to the class $\mathcal{H}$ if and only if $\forall p \in \Pi, \forall t_u \in p^* \cap T_u$,

\[
\left( \Gamma(p, t_u) = \min_{t \in p^*} \Gamma(p, t) \right) \wedge (\forall t \in \Omega(t_u), t_u \subseteq ^t).
\]

**Proof:** (If) Suppose, $t \in T_e(N, m)$ for $m \in \mathbb{N^n}$, and $\exists t_u \in \Omega(t) \cap T_u \Rightarrow t \in \Omega(t_u))$. Since $t_u \subseteq ^t$ and $\forall p \in t_u, \Gamma(p, t_u) = \min_{t \in \mathcal{P}} \Gamma(p, t)$, it follows that $t_u \in T_e(N, m)$.

(Only If) We will show that the violation of requirement in the statement of the theorem for a PN structure $N$ would imply that $N \notin \mathcal{H}$. Suppose $\exists p \in \Pi, \exists t_u \in p^* \cap T_u$ such that either

1. $\Gamma(p, t_u) > \min_{t \in \mathcal{P}} \Gamma(p, t)$, or
2. \( \exists t \in \Omega(t_u), \ ˆt_u - t \neq \emptyset \)

In each of these cases we construct a marking \( m \in \mathbb{N}^m \) such that \( \exists t \in \Omega(t_u) \cap T_e(N, m) \) and \( t_u \notin T_e(N, m) \), which leads to the conclusion that \( N \notin \mathcal{H} \).

For the first case, the marking \( m \) places tokens exactly \( (m_{t \in \mathbb{E}} \Gamma(p, t)) \)-many tokens in \( p \), and sufficient tokens in the input places of any transition \( \Gamma \in \Omega(t_u) \), such that \( \Gamma(p, t) = \min_{t \in \mathbb{E}} \Gamma(p, t) \) that will result in \( t \in T_e(N, m) \) and \( t_u \notin T_e(N, m) \).

Similarly, for the second case, the marking \( m \) places sufficient tokens in the input places of \( t \) such that \( t \in T_e(N, m) \), while ensuring that the places in \( (\hat{t}_u - t) \) remain empty. Consequently, \( t \in T_e(N, m) \) and \( t_u \notin T_e(N, m) \).

\[ \Delta(N_2) = \{ (0 0 0 1 0)^T, (1 0 1 0 2)^T, (0 0 2 0 2)^T, (2 0 0 0 2)^T, (1 1 1 0 1)^T, (0 1 2 0 1)^T, (2 1 0 0 1)^T, (0 2 2 0 0)^T, (1 2 1 0 0)^T, (2 2 0 0 0)^T \} \]

There is an \( O(n^2m^2) \) algorithm that decides if an arbitrary PN structure belongs to the class \( \mathcal{H} \), where \( n = \text{card}(\Pi) \) and \( m = \text{card}(T) \). The right-closure of \( \Delta(N) \) for any \( N \in \mathcal{H} \), along with the results in reference [5] implies that the existence of an LESP for \( N(m^0) \) is decidable. Furthermore, the software package described in reference [7] can be used to compute the minimally restrictive LESP for \( N(m^0) \), when it exists. As noted in the introduction section, each decidable class of PN structures identified in references [4–6] are strictly contained in the class \( \mathcal{H} \). As an illustration, the PN structure \( N_2 \) shown in figure 1(b) is a member of \( \mathcal{H} \) as it meets the structural requirements of theorem 4, and it does not belong to any of the classes of structures identified in references [4–6]. Additionally,

\[ \min(\Delta(N_2)) = \{ (0 0 0 1 0)^T, (1 0 1 0 2)^T, (0 0 2 0 2)^T, (2 0 0 0 2)^T, (1 1 1 0 1)^T, (0 1 2 0 1)^T, (2 1 0 0 1)^T, (0 2 2 0 0)^T, (1 2 1 0 0)^T, (2 2 0 0 0)^T \} \]

There is an LESP for \( N_2(m^0) \) if and only if \( m^0 \in \Delta(N_2) \).

**Figure 1.** (a) The PN structure \( N_1 \) is not a member of the class \( \mathcal{H} \). However, \( \Delta(N_1) \) is right-closed (cf. figure 1, [4]). (b) The PN structure \( N_2 \) is a member of \( \mathcal{H} \) as it meets the structural requirements of theorem 4 (cf. figure 2a, [6]). (c) The PN structure \( N_3 \) is not a member of the class \( \mathcal{H} \), and \( \Delta(N_3) = \{ m \in \mathbb{N}^2 | (m(p_1) + m(p_2) + m(p_3) + m(p_4) \geq 1) \cap (m(p_4) \mod 2 = 1) \} \) is not right-closed.
A transition $t \in T$ is said to be a choice-transition (resp. non-choice transition) if ($t^* \neq \{t\}$ (resp. ($t^* = \{t\}$). In reference [26] it is shown that the minimally restrictive LESP for a class of ordinary PNs called Free-choice PNs does not control-disable a non-choice (controllable) transition. The following result shows that a similar observation holds for any minimally restrictive LESP for $N(m^0)$ where $N \in \mathcal{H}$.

**Theorem 5:** [26] Suppose $m^0 \in \Delta(N)$ for a PN $N(m^0)$, where $N \in \mathcal{H}$, then the minimally restrictive LESP $\varphi^*$ for $N(m^0)$ does not disable any controllable transition $t_c \in T_c$ that satisfies the requirement ($t_c^* = \{t_c\}$).

**Proof:** (Sketch) Suppose $\exists m^1 \in \mathcal{R}(N,m^0,\varphi^*) (\subseteq \Delta(N))$, $\exists m^2 \in \mathcal{R}(N,m^0)$, such that $m^1 \xrightarrow{t_c} m^2$ in $N$ for some $t_c \in T_c$ that satisfies the requirement ($t_c^* = \{t_c\}$). We willshow that

1. $\exists \tilde{m} \in T^*$ such that $m^2 \xrightarrow{t_c} \tilde{m}$ in $N$, where $\tilde{m} \in \Delta(N)$.
2. Additionally, if $\tilde{m} = \tilde{m}_1 \tilde{m}_2$, $m^2 \xrightarrow{t_c} \tilde{m}_1 \rightarrow \tilde{m}_2$, and $\tilde{m}_1 \xrightarrow{t_{u_1}} \tilde{m}_2$ in $N$ for some $t_{u_1} \in T_u$, then $\exists \tilde{m} \in T^*$, $\exists m^3 \in \mathcal{R}(N,\tilde{m})$, such that $m^1 \xrightarrow{t_{u_1}} \tilde{m}_1 \rightarrow m^3$ and $m^3 \in \Delta(N)$.

Following the repeated application of the above observation, we conclude that $m^2 \in \Delta(N)$.

Since $\varphi^*$ is an LESP, $\exists \omega_1 \in (T - \{t_c\}^*)$, and $m^2 \xrightarrow{t_{u_1}} m^3 \xrightarrow{t_c} m^4$ in $N$ under the supervision of $\varphi^*$. Since ($t_c^* = \{t_c\}$), it follows that $m^4 \xrightarrow{t_{u_1}} m^5$ in $N$, and $\{m^1, m^2, m^3, m^4\} \subseteq \Delta(N)$ (cf. figure 2(a)). Suppose $\omega_1 = \omega_2 \omega_3, m^2 \xrightarrow{t_{u_1}} m^3 \xrightarrow{t_c} m^4$, and $t_{u_1} \in T_u$ such that $m^9 \xrightarrow{t_{u_1}} m^{10}$. Also, $\exists m^2 \in \Delta(N)$ such that $m^1 \xrightarrow{t_{u_1}} m^5$. There are two cases to consider – (i) $t_{u_1} \in T_e(N,m^5)$, and (ii) $t_{u_1} \in T_e(N,m^5)$.

In the first case, $\exists m^6 \in \Delta(N)$ such that $m^2 \xrightarrow{t_{u_1}} m^6$ (cf. figure 2(b)). Since $\varphi^*$ is an LESP, $\exists \omega_4 \in (T - \{t_c\}^*)$, $\exists m^7, m^8 \in \Delta(N)$, such that $m^5 \xrightarrow{t_{u_1}} m^7 \xrightarrow{t_c} m^8$. Since ($t_c^* = \{t_c\}$), we have $m^{10} \xrightarrow{t_{u_1}} m^4$, where $m^4 \in \Delta(N)$.

For the second case where $t_{u_1} \in T_e(N,m^5)$, since $t_{u_1} \in T_e(N,m^0)$, it follows that $\exists p \in \Pi$ such that $\{t_c(p), (p, t_{u_1})\} \subseteq \Phi$, and the prior-firing of $t_c$ is necessary to place sufficient tokens in $p \in \Pi$, for $t_{u_1}$ to be state-enabled at $m^5$ (cf. figure 2(c)). Since $N \in \mathcal{H}$, it follows that none of the transitions in $\Omega(t_{u_1})$ can fire at any marking that is reachable in the segment identified by $m^1 \xrightarrow{t_{u_1}} m^3$. Consequently, $t_{u_1} \in T_e(N,m^4)$, and $m^1 \xrightarrow{t_{u_1}} m^{11}$ under the supervision of $\varphi^*$, where $m^{11} \in \Delta(N)$. Consequently, $m^{10} \xrightarrow{t_{u_1}} m^{11}$. 

Theorem 5 does not hold for general PN structures. The PN structure $N_3$ shown in figure 1(c) does not belong to the class $\mathcal{H}$. This is because $\operatorname{min}_{t \in p_5^*} \Gamma(p_5, t) = 1$, while $\Gamma(p_5, t_6) = 2$, and $t_6 \in p_5^* \land T_u$. Additionally, $\Delta(N_3) = \{m \in N^5 | (m(p_4) + m(p_3) + m(p_3) + m(p_4) \geq 1) \lor (m(p_5)mod2 = 1)\}$, which is not right-closed. The minimally restrictive LESP for $N_3$ for any $m^0 \in \Delta(N_3)$ control-disables a controllable transition at a marking in $\Delta(N_3)$ only if its firing results in a new marking that is not in $\Delta(N_3)$. The minimally restrictive LESP would control-disable the non-choice transition $t_2 \in T_c$ at the marking $(01001)^7 \in \Delta(N_3)$.

As a consequence of theorem 5, without loss of generality, we can assume all non-choice transitions are uncontrollable, even when they are not, for any instance of the class of PN structures $\mathcal{H}$. This is formally stated in the following theorem.
Theorem 6: Let $N = (Π, T, Φ, Γ)$ be a PN structure from the family $ℋ$, where the set of transitions is partitioned into the set of uncontrollable transitions $T_u$, and controllable transitions $T_c$ (i.e. $T = T_c ∪ T_u$ and $T_u ∩ T_c = \emptyset$). Suppose $\bar{N}$ is another member of the family $ℋ$ that is structurally identical to $N$, but the set of transitions in $\bar{N}$ are partitioned into a different set of uncontrollable- and controllable-transitions, where

$$\hat{T}_u = T_u ∪ \{ t ∈ T | (\cdot t)' = \{ t \} \},$$

and $\hat{T}_c = T - \hat{T}_u$. Then $Δ(N) = Δ(\bar{N})$.

**Proof:** Since $\hat{T}_c ⊆ T_c$, it follows that $Δ(\bar{N}) ⊆ Δ(N)$. The reverse inclusion is shown by contradiction. Suppose $Δ(\bar{N}) ⊂ Δ(N)$, then $Δ(N)$ is not control invariant with respect to $\bar{N}$. That is, $\exists m^1 ∈ Δ(N), \exists \hat{t}_u ∈ \hat{T}_u$ such that $m^1 \xrightarrow{\hat{t}_u} m^2$ and $m^2 ∉ Δ(N)$. Since $\subseteq Δ(N)$ is control invariant with respect to $N$, it must be that $\hat{t} ∈ \{ t ∈ T | (\cdot t)' = \{ t \} \}$. But, from theorem 5, we know that $m^2 ∉ Δ(N)$, which establishes the result. ♣

As an illustration, the non-choice, controllable transition $t_2$ in the PN structure $N_2$ of figure 1(b) can be considered to be uncontrollable, which effectively results in a PN structure with no controllable transitions. There is an LESP for a PN $N(m^1)$ without controllable transitions if and only if the PN is live. This leads to the observation that the PNN$_2(m^0_2)$ is live for any $m^0_2 ∈ Δ(N_2)$. 
The observation that we can assume all non-choice transitions are uncontrollable, even when they are not for any \( N \in \mathcal{H} \), is critical to the speeding-up the execution of the software package described in reference [7]. This is illustrated in subsequent text.

The PN structures \( N_4 \) and \( N_5 \) shown in figure 3(a) and 3(b) are FCPN structures, and consequently they belong to the class \( \mathcal{H} \). The only difference between them is that the non-choice transition \( t_5 \) is controllable (resp. uncontrollable) in \( N_4 \) (resp. \( N_5 \)).

As a consequence of theorem 6, the sets \( \Delta(N_4) \) and \( \Delta(N_5) \) are identical, and are identified by the twenty-four minimal elements shown in figure 4, which shows the output generated by the above mentioned software for \( N_5 \). The algorithm in references [5,7], finds a series of outer-approximations \( \Psi_i \) for \( \Delta(N) \) for an appropriate PN structure \( N \), that are control invariant with respect to \( N \).

The iteration starts with \( \Psi_0 \), the largest controllable, right-closed subset of the set of initial markings for which there is an LESP for the fully-controlled version of \( N \). In the context of this example, eight minimal elements identify the right-closed of initial markings for which there is an LESP for the fully-controlled version of \( N_5 \) shown in figure 4. The second and third among this list of eight minimal elements are not control invariant with respect to \( N \).

For any right-closed set of markings \( \Psi \) that is control invariant with respect to a PN structure \( N \), we can envisage a supervisory policy \( \wp_\Psi \) that disables the firing of a controllable transition at a marking if its firing would result in a new marking that is not in \( \Psi \). It is possible to construct the coverability graph for the PN \( N(m^0) \), under the influence of this supervisory policy. The loop-test procedure of reference [7] checks if there is a closed-path identified by \( \sigma \in T^* \) in this coverability graph, where (1) every transition in \( T \) appears at least once in \( \sigma \), and (2) \( Cx(\sigma) \geq 0 \), that is, the net token-load change after the execution of the string \( \sigma \) is non-negative.

With reference to the examples at hand, the loop-test checks if the above mentioned path-condition is satisfied in the coverability graph that is generated by each minimal element of \( \Psi_0 \) under the influence of the supervisory policy \( \wp_\Psi \). If a minimal element fails this test, it is elevated by a set of unit-vectors, which defines a right-closed proper subset of \( \Psi_i \). The largest controllable subset of this right-closed set is \( \Psi_{i+1} \), which used in lieu of \( \Psi_i \) in the next iteration.

As shown in figure 4, four minimal elements,

\[
\begin{align*}
(1\ 0\ 0\ 0\ 0\ 0\ 0\ 0\ 0)^T, (0\ 0\ 0\ 0\ 0\ 1\ 0\ 0)^T, (0\ 0\ 0\ 0\ 0\ 0\ 1\ 0)^T, \text{and } (0\ 0\ 0\ 0\ 0\ 0\ 0\ 1)^T
\end{align*}
\]

that define \( \Psi_0 \) for \( N_5 \), fail this test. The loop-test will fail for the first minimal element \( (1\ 0\ 0\ 0\ 0\ 0\ 0\ 0)^T \in \min(\Psi_0) \), as \( \Delta(N_5,(1\ 0\ 0\ 0\ 0\ 0\ 0)^T) = \{t_1, t_3\}(\subseteq T_c) \).

But,

\[
\begin{align*}
(1\ 0\ 0\ 0\ 0\ 0\ 0\ 0)^T \xrightarrow{t_1} (0\ 1\ 0\ 0\ 0\ 0\ 0\ 0)^T \text{ and } \\
(1\ 0\ 0\ 0\ 0\ 0\ 0\ 0)^T \xrightarrow{t_3} (0\ 0\ 1\ 1\ 0\ 0\ 0\ 0)^T.
\end{align*}
\]

Since, \( (0\ 1\ 0\ 0\ 0\ 0\ 0\ 0)^T, (0\ 0\ 1\ 1\ 0\ 0\ 0\ 0)^T \notin \Psi_0 \), the supervisory policy \( \wp_\Psi \) would disable these transitions at the marking \( (1\ 0\ 0\ 0\ 0\ 0\ 0\ 0)^T \), which effectively creates a policy-induced deadlock state. The test fails for second, third and fourth minimal elements.
\((0 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0 \ 1 \ 0 \ 0)^T,(0 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0 \ 1 \ 0)^T,(0 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0 \ 1)^T \in \min(\Psi_0),\)
as the marking \((1 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0)^T\) is inevitably reached after the firing of an appropriate set of transitions. Specifically,
\[
\begin{align*}
(0 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0 \ 1 \ 0 \ 0)^T & \xrightarrow{t_5} (1 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0)^T, \\
(0 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0 \ 1 \ 0)^T & \xrightarrow{t_{10}} (1 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0)^T,
\end{align*}
\]
and \((0 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0 \ 1)^T \xrightarrow{t_{11}} (1 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0)^T.\)

Since the marking \((1 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0)^T\) failed the loop-test, it follows that these three marking would fail the test, as well.

The four minimal elements, that failed the loop-test, are elevated by nine unitvectors, and the largest controllable, right-closed set of this newly constructed set is identified by the twenty-four minimal elements shown in figure 4, which identifies the next iterate \(\Psi_1\). Each of these twenty-four minimal elements pass the loop-test referred to earlier, implying that \(\Delta(N_4) = \Psi_1\). From theorem 6, we infer \(\Delta(N_4) = \Psi_1\), as well.

We turn our attention to the iteration scheme for \(N_4\) where \(t_5\) is left as a controllable transition. The right-closed set of initial markings for which there is an LESP for the fully-controlled version of \(N_4\) is identified by the same set of eight minimal elements shown in the initial part of the output of figure 4. The largest controllable subset of this set \((\Psi_0)\) is identified by the six minimal elements of figure 4 along with the vector \((0 \ 1 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0)^T\). This extra minimal element is due to the fact that \(t_5\) is controllable in \(N_4\), which fails the loop-test along with the four that failed the test in figure 4. After the elevation by unit-vectors as described above, the next iterate \(\Psi_1\) has the twenty-four minimal elements shown in figure 4 together with eight new elements
\[
\begin{align*}
(1 \ 0 \ 1 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0)^T,(0 \ 1 \ 1 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0)^T,(0 \ 0 \ 2 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0)^T,(0 \ 0 \ 1 \ 1 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0)^T, \\
(0 \ 0 \ 1 \ 0 \ 1 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0)^T,(0 \ 0 \ 1 \ 0 \ 0 \ 1 \ 0 \ 0)^T,(0 \ 0 \ 1 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0 \ 1 \ 0)^T,(0 \ 0 \ 1 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0 \ 1)^T
\end{align*}
\]
That is, the minimal element \((0 \ 1 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0)^T\) of \(\Psi_0\) is replaced by these eight elements, which defines \(\Psi_1\). These eight elements fail the loop-test, and are replaced with additional elevated vectors, and so on. The right-closed set that is defined by this iteration scheme, in the limit, is the set \(\Delta(N_5)\) described earlier. But, as a computations scheme this procedure will not terminate. This issue is mitigated by ensuring that all controllable, non-choice transitions are interpreted as being a part of the set of uncontrollable transitions. This has theoretical sanction as per theorems 5 and 6. There are other examples where the improvement in runtime is not as dramatic as this illustrative example.

The method \(\text{isNetFreeChoice}\) within the class \text{PetriNet} of the previous version of the code (cf. reference [7]), is replaced by \(\text{isNetHClass}\) instead. The program terminates if the PN structure under consideration does not belong to the class \(H\). If the the PN structure belongs to the class \(H\), the method \(\text{relabelNonChoiceTransitions}\) is used to relabel all controllable non-choice transitions in the PN structure as uncontrollable transitions. Following this, the procedures outlined in reference [7] are executed to synthesize the minimally restrictive LESP for the PN structure at hand.
Figure 3. (a) The PN structure $N_4$ is a member of $\mathcal{H}$ as it is an FCPN structure. (b) The PN structure $N_5$ is also a member of $\mathcal{H}$. The non-choice transition $t_5$ is controllable (resp. uncontrollable) in $N_4$ (resp. $N_5$). From theorem 6, we infer that $\Delta(N_4) = \Delta(N_5)$.

4. Concluding Remarks

If some process in a manufacturing system enters into a state of suspended animation for perpetuity, while other events proceed towards completion with no impediment, we say the system is in a livelocked-state. Procedures that can synthesize supervisory policies that can prevent the manufacturing system from entering into livelocked states are highly desirable.

In this paper we identified two enhancements to the software tool [7] that synthesizes the minimally restrictive, liveness enforcing supervisory policy (LESP) for a class of manufacturing systems modeled using a class of weighted Petri nets (PNs).

For the first enhancement, we identified a class of PN structures, $\mathcal{H}$, that includes all known classes of PN structures where the existence of a LESP for an instance initialized at a marking is sufficient to conclude that there is an LESP when the same instance is initialized with a larger marking. This broadens the scope of the software tool of reference [7]. For the second enhancement, we showed that the minimally restrictive LESP does not control disable non-choice transitions in the PN model of the manufacturing system. This observation plays a crucial role in improving the speed of convergence of the iterative scheme used in the software described above, which was illustrated by an example.
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Figure 4. The output file generated by the software described in reference [7] for the FCPN structure shown in Figure 3(b).


