

# Comparison of Business Process Modeling and Business Process Simulation Tool Survey

<sup>1</sup>Jayesh Gamar, <sup>2</sup>Dr. B.S. Agrawal

<sup>1</sup>Supervisor Instructor, <sup>2</sup>Director

ITI Pavi-Jetpur, Chhotaudepur

Rollwala Computer Centre

**Abstract**— Nowadays, many procedure mindful data frameworks are actualized (e.g., work process the executives frameworks) and business forms are assessed and updated. The control identified with this field of study is called Business Process Modeling Notation (BPMN). A significant piece of the assessment of structured and updated business forms is Business Process Simulation (BPS). In spite of the fact that a bounty of reproduction apparatuses exist, the relevance of these instruments is different. In this paper we talk about various reproduction apparatuses that are important for the BPM field, we assess their appropriateness for BPS and plan proposals for further research. The paper gives the depiction of 3 reproduction displaying frameworks: AnyLogic, Arena, Bizagi Modeler.

**Index Terms**— Business Process Modeling Notation (BPMN), Business Process Simulation (BPs), Business Process Re-engineering (BPR), Simulation Modeling Systems (SSMS).

## I. INTRODUCTION (HEADING 1)

Business Process Management (BPM) is pulling in consideration over 10 years now, and its consideration is currently moving from the order of business forms towards improving business forms. The field of BPM currently bolsters the structure, establishment, control, and examination of business forms [6]. Organizations are improving their exhibition by a steady assessment of the esteem included all pieces of their procedures. Business forms are in a persistent improvement cycle in which plan and overhaul assume a significant job. Different potential outcomes to change a procedure are available and the best elective structure ought to supplant the present procedure. Settling on an instinctive decision may prompt unsavory shocks and lower process execution as opposed to yielding the normal additions. In [16] reenactment is referenced as one of the procedures appropriate for the help of overhaul. The reenactment of business forms helps in comprehension, dissecting, and structuring forms. With the utilization of reproduction the (re)designed procedures can be assessed and thought about. Reproduction gives quantitative evaluations of the effect that a procedure configuration is probably going to have on procedure execution and a quantitatively upheld decision for as well as can be expected be made. Mimicking business forms is, to an enormous degree, covering with the reproduction of other discrete occasion frameworks. In [32] a diagram is given of the means that are completed with regards to Business Process Simulation (BPS). 3 frameworks have been looked over the arrangement of reenactment displaying frameworks given in [2]; there is no programming procedure for huge scale clients in them, their free forms are accessible on the Internet: AnyLogic, Arena, Bizagi Modeler First the business procedure is mapped onto a procedure model, perhaps enhanced with procedure documentation offices. At that point the sub procedures and exercises are recognized. The control stream definition is made by distinguishing the elements that course through the framework and depicting the connectors that interface the various pieces of the procedure. Ultimately, the assets are recognized and doled out to the exercises where they are important. The procedure model ought to be confirmed to guarantee that the model does not contain blunders. Before reenactment of a business procedure, the exhibition attributes, for example, throughput time and asset usage, should be incorporated. For measurably legitimate reproduction results a recreation run should comprises of different sub runs and every one of these sub runs ought to have an adequate run length. Amid the reproduction, the reenactment clock progresses. The recreation device may demonstrate an energized image of the procedure stream or constant vacillations in the key execution measures. At the point when the reproduction has been done, the recreation results can be dissected. To make valuable and right determinations from these outcomes, measurable info and yield information examination is performed. In spite of the fact that the means in BPS will be the equivalent regardless of the recreation device utilized, every reproduction instrument will have an alternate appropriateness. There is a plenitude of recreation apparatuses accessible of which some are appropriate to the BPM field. In this paper we examine a few reenactment apparatuses taken from three significant regions: business process displaying, business process the board and general reproduction devices. We assess the demonstrating, recreation and yield examination abilities and we go for giving bits of knowledge in the preferences and weaknesses of every reenactment apparatus.

## II. TOOLS FOR BUSINESS PROCESS SIMULATION

Numerous product instruments exist to mimic procedures. While reproducing business forms, some particular prerequisites are appropriate. The idea of the business procedure requires adequate demonstrating intensity of the instrument. At the point when specific decisions or a synchronization can't be executed, the recreation result slackens its qualities. Then again, recreation of business forms plans to help process proprietors or procedure directors. At the point when the apparatus or the reproduction yield can scarcely be comprehended by the customer, the device exceeds itself. In this area, we depict three unique classes of programming apparatuses that might be pertinent for BPS:

- Business process modelling tools,
- Business process management tools,
- General purpose simulation tools

For each type a general introduction and the description of two specific tools are given.

### **III. BUSINESS PROCESS MODELING TOOLS**

Business Process Modeling apparatuses are created to portray and examine business forms. The examination part may give information helpful to the administration of these procedures. The apparatus underpins the procedure to set up the control stream of business forms, the asset jobs included, reports being utilized and it archives guidelines for the execution of ventures in the business procedure. Subsequently, reports can be created for procedure documentation, manuals, directions, practical determinations, and so forth.

### **IV. BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF SIMULATION MODELING SYSTEM**

AnyLogic. AnyLogic SSM [5] was structured by the Russian organization XJ Technologies. The principal adaptation of AnyLogic framework 4.0 was made in 2003. AnyLogic 7.0 was made in 2014. AnyLogic SSMS incorporates graphical demonstrating language and enables the client to amplify made models with the assistance of Java. The connection of the ideas acknowledged in AnyLogic SSMS to the ideas acknowledged in the lining framework hypothesis is the accompanying: claims - elements, lines - lines, administration machines - errands. There are numerous references including [5].

Field. Field SSMS [31] was designed by Systems Modeling Corporation. Its first form showed up in 2003. In 2014 Arena SSMS 3.0 was created. The establishment of Arena incorporates displaying Meta compiler Siman and movement framework Cinema Animation. The connection of the ideas acknowledged in the framework to the ideas acknowledged in the lining framework hypothesis is the accompanying: claims - elements, lines [7], administration machines - errands [8]. The key preferred position of Arena SSMS is the likelihood to exchange consequently from IDEF3 outline, generally spread in BPwin [9], to an organized model in Arena SSMS. Field is a universally useful recreation apparatus created by Rockwell Automation. The Arena item family comprises of a Basic Edition for uncomplicated procedures and a Professional Edition for increasingly complex enormous scale extends in assembling, dissemination, forms, co-ordinations, and so on. The Professional Edition additionally gives (and permits meaning of) formats for complex dreary rationale, e.g., for bundling and contact focuses. When opening the apparatus, various procedure boards are accessible, e.g., for fundamental and propelled forms and for detailing. The model can be made by intuitive from the procedure panel to the model window. By double-clicking on the icons, options for the different building blocks can be set such as delay types, time units and the possibility to report statistics. Many more building blocks are available and can be attached when necessary.

Bizagi Modeler. Bizagi Modeler SSMS [32] was structured by a gathering of organizations Object Management Group built up in 1989. Bizagi Modeler SSMS was created in 2007. In 2016 the eleventh form of Bizagi BPM Suite was worked out. Business-process displaying documentation is utilized to demonstrate demonstrated framework components (BPMN 2.0). The connection of the ideas acknowledged in Bizagi Modeler to the ideas acknowledged in the queueing framework hypothesis is the accompanying: claims - messages, lines, administration machines - activities. Doors are utilized to show the course determination of substances developments.

### **V. EVOLUTION CRITERIA FOR BPS TOOLS**

While assessing BPS instruments, the demonstrating, reenactment and yield examination abilities of the device are significant. In this area we present our view on these abilities and determine criteria to assess every capacity in detail.

#### **V.I Modelling capabilities**

- Ease of model building  
Model structure ought to be anything but difficult to enable clients to be associated with the displaying of their procedures. A graphical UI with predefined business objects which can be moved encourages the model structure. The hard coding of procedure parts is difficult to perform or comprehend for clients and ought to be maintained a strategic distance from.
- Formal semantics and verification of correctness  
Formal semantics give an exact and unambiguous portrayal of the conduct of the displayed procedure. Van der Aalst presumes that many demonstrating systems need formal semantics and in this manner incredible investigation strategies and devices [4]. In [2] he outlines three valid justifications for utilizing a Petrinet based work process the board framework which seem, by all accounts, to be basic in huge BPM ventures. These reasons are: (1) the presence of formal semantics in spite of the graphical nature, (2) the state based charts rather than occasion based outlines (as can be experienced in numerous work process items) and (3) the wealth of investigation systems.
- Workflow patterns  
The work process designs [5], or control stream designs, are utilized to assess the expressive intensity of displaying dialects. The examples recognize both essential and complex displaying builds. The quantity of upheld designs show how well a demonstrating language can give a decent portrayal of the genuine business process.

#### **V.II SIMULATION CAPABILITIES**

The reason for the recreation capacities is to assess in which way a reproduction can be done and which parameter settings can be made. The reproduction assessment criteria are:

- **PERFORMANCE DIMENSIONS**

A reproduction model should consolidate the presentation measurements one is keen on. Much of the time it should be conceivable to recreate a few diverse time as well as costs angles. Other significant execution measurements are quality and adaptability [25].

- **DISTRIBUTIONS**

The normal execution of a mimicked procedure may appear to be fine while, in actuality, numerous issues would happen on account of its inconstancy. Lines might be vacant at certain minutes and over-burden at different minutes, making worker and client disappointment [24]. Considering the disseminations of execution qualities won't just demonstrate the normal conduct of the procedure, yet additionally its limits.

- **ANIMATION**

With reenactment the last reproduction results as well as the recreation itself can give helpful bits of knowledge in the mimicked procedure. A replay or liveliness of the reenactment will demonstrate the states the recreation model has been in amid reproduction. This perception may uncover bottlenecks and different issues in the execution of the procedure.

- **SCENARIOS**

With the utilization of situations the results of changes can be explored. While the procedure remains the equivalent, various setups of the reenactment model reflect potential changes in, i.e., the entry example or asset accessibility. With the utilization of situations the impacts of changes can be anticipated and counter measures can be taken to maintain a strategic distance from terrible presentation once the change happens in actuality.

### **V.III Output analysis capabilities**

The yield investigation abilities mean to assess the result of a recreation, which information can be broke down and which portrayal styles are given. The yield examination assessment criteria are:

- **STATISTICS**

Reproduction ought to give measurably legitimate outcomes and it ought to be clear how these outcomes are determined. Recreation settings (for example recreation length, number of replications, begin and stop conditions [9, 24]) ought to be demonstrated to or far and away superior be set by the client. An arbitrary generator ought to be utilized for the age of cases. For every presentation measure the mean, yet additionally the standard deviation and certainty interims ought to be introduced.

- **FORMAT**

The apparatus ought to have a simple to peruse design for the introduction of the outcomes and potential outcomes for activity, putting away and reuse of results.

- **WHAT-IF ANALYSIS**

Before a procedure configuration is picked consider the possibility that investigation is performed. In this examination various situations (of a similar recreation model) are thought about. The correlation of certainty interims of a presentation measure demonstrates which situations perform fundamentally superior to others on this measure. It likewise demonstrates under which conditions a specific procedure configuration will perform inside its necessities and under which conditions an exhibition level can't be come to.

- **CONCLUSION-MAKING SUPPORT**

End making support encourages the understanding of the reproduction results. Valuable help is the distinguishing proof of patterns, the cutting and dicing of information and the following of the reason for explicit results. In Section 3 we depicted six distinct apparatuses which might be appropriate for BPS, and which have been created from different perspectives: process displaying, process execution and recreation. In Section 4 we built up a structure with a lot of assessment criteria to discover qualities and shortcomings of these apparatuses. In this segment, we report our discoveries. We will score the BPS apparatuses for every one of the assessment criteria extending from great (++) and nonpartisan (+/-) to awful (-).

## **VI COMPARISON OF BPS TOOLS**

### **vi.i MODELLING CAPABILITIES**

In this area we assess how well and how exact a business procedure can be demonstrated in the instruments. We give a short review for every apparatus and toward the finish of the segment we abridge the discoveries in Table 1.

#### **ANYLOGIC**

Anylogic support following things for modeling

Discrete occasion displaying with procedure flowcharts

- "Discrete rate" displaying
- Scripting notwithstanding intuitive
- 2D and 3D activity
- Optimization
- Parameter variety and Monte Carlo tests
- Built-in database
- Visualize, import and fare information

#### **ARENA**

Field models can be made in all respects effectively, however to determine precisely those things you might want to demonstrate is progressively troublesome. When perusing through a model, the dimension of detail is helpful, because of the utilization of sub models and the way that numerous subtleties are covered up in the symbol properties. While

making models, great information pretty much all fundamental structure squares and their careful particular is required. Much of the time utilized control stream designs are bolstered, yet some further developed examples require more roundabout demonstrating [12].

#### **BIZAGI**

Utilizing a displaying standard BPMN Bizagi modeler completely goes along the BPMN standard Communication among business and IT clients for procedure documentation

Features	AnyLogic	Arena	Bizagi
Ease of model building	++	+	++
Formal semantics/verify.	++	+-	++
Workflow patterns	+-	+	++
Level of detail	+-	++	+-

Table -1 Modelling capabilities Comparison

#### **V.II SIMULATION CAPABILITIES**

In this area, we assess in which way a reproduction can be completed and which parameter settings can be made.

We give a short diagram for every apparatus and toward the finish of the area we outline the discoveries in Table 2.

#### **V.III ANYLOGIC SIMULATION CAPABILITIES**

- Powerful and adaptable multi-technique reenactment condition
- Agent based/state charts, choice guidelines, systems,
- Discrete occasion/process flowcharts
- System Dynamics/stock and stream outlines, numeric solvers

#### **IX. ARENA SIMULATION CAPABILITIES**

In Arena a model can be recreated by squeezing the go-catch in the toolbar. The model at that point enters the reenactment mode and can't be altered any longer. The reenactment should be possible well-ordered and in typical and quick forward modes. All exhibition measurements and regularly utilized circulations can be included those spots important in the model. Activitys are gotten by symbols coursing through the model or 3D movements (in a post-handling instrument). Elective models can be characterized and assessed in the Process Analyzer.

#### **X. BIZAGI SIMULATION “LEVELS”**

##### **PROCESS VALIDATION**

Checks to see if the process is “simulation ready” Assumes equal likelihood splits on gateways unless you change these; infinite resources on service tasks Reports errors if problems detected in process diagram

##### **TIME ANALYSIS**

Wants the arrival (start event) and service (task) distribution and timing values Runs simulation assuming “infinite” performer resources

- Resource analysis
- Assign performers resources to tasks (number available) Simulation now limited to who and how many are available to do work
- CALENDAR ANALYSIS

Add-in when (what days, times) resources are available over a day, week or month

Features	AnyLogic	Arena	Bizagi
Performance dimensions	+	++	++
Distributions	+	++	+
Animation	++	++	+
Scenarios	++	+	++

Table 2 Simulation Capabilities Comparison

#### **XI. Output analysis capabilities**

**AnyLogic** provides standard statistics for 3D, 2D and excel, pdf file.

##### **Arena**

Field gives standard insights to all presentation pointers determined. For every measurement, the base and most extreme esteem is given, just as mean and half length of the 95% certainty interim. At the point when a reproduction has raced to completion, you can see the outcomes in a standard report, it very well may be broke down later in the yield analyzer (in the propelled procedure board) or it tends to be kept in touch with an Excel record (by embeddings the read-compose module). End making support is given in the process analyzer.

**Bizagi** output is available in 2D and excel file.

Features	AnyLogic	Arena	Bizagi
Statistics	++	++	++
Format	+-	+	++
What-if analysis	++	-	++
Conclusion-making support	+	+	+

			-
--	--	--	---

Table 3 Output Capabilities Comparison

## XII. Conclusion

BPS. The devices have been assessed on their demonstrating capacities, recreation abilities and potential outcomes for yield examination. The devices were chosen for various reasons. Field were chosen due to their astounding reputation in recreation. The two instruments performed well on this viewpoint. The previously mentioned apparatuses, notwithstanding, were not just assessed on their particular "known" solid focuses, obviously additionally on every single other perspective pertinent when demonstrating and reenacting business forms. Both business process the board apparatuses missed the mark on their reproduction abilities. The three residual devices, AnyLogic, Arena and Bizagi Tools, each of the three meet all requirements for BPS examines. These instruments have various rules that decide the appropriateness of the device for a specific reenactment think about. AnyLogic process demonstrating language of EPCs and experiences issues to show work process designs. Be that as it may, its solid point is the reasonableness for correspondence with procedure proprietors, which as often as possible is a significant condition in such reproduction ponders. Field is a solid reproduction device that demonstrated to be proper for BPS. The displaying with this apparatus depends on predefined fabricating squares, which can be adjusted and broadened if essential. In this apparatus, it is essential to have a significant information about the structure hindrances that are accessible and about the careful method of activity. At last, Bizagi Tools depends on the formal displaying strategies. This opens numerous potential outcomes for the formal confirmation of the reproduction model. Like demonstrating in Arena, a significant information is required, yet AnyLogic and Bizagi varies from Arena in that regard that the subsequent models are difficult to comprehend by general procedure proprietors who ought to have the option to comprehend and approve the model.

## REFERENCES

- [1] 1. W.M.P. van der Aalst. Modelling and Analysis of Complex Logistic Systems. In Proceedings of the IFIP WG 5.7 Working Conference on Integration in Production Management Systems, pages 203–218, Eindhoven, the Netherlands, 2012.
- [2] W.M.P. van der Aalst. Three Good Reasons for Using a Petri-net-based Workflow Management System. In S. Navathe and T. Wakayama, editors, Proceedings of the International Working Conference on Information and Process Integration in Enterprises (IPIC'96), pages 179–201, Cambridge, Massachusetts, Nov 2013.
- [3] W.M.P. van der Aalst and P.J.S. Berens. Beyond Workflow Management: Product-Driven Case Handling. In S. Ellis, T. Rodden, and I. Zigurs, editors, International ACM SIGGROUP Conference on Supporting Group Work (GROUP 2001), pages 42–51. ACM Press, New York, 2015.
- [4] W.M.P. van der Aalst and K.M. van Hee. Business Process Redesign: A Petri-netbased approach. Computers in Industry, 29(1-2):15–26, 2012.
- [5] W.M.P. van der Aalst, A.H.M. ter Hofstede, B. Kiepuszewski, and A.P. Barros. Workflow Patterns. Distributed and Parallel Databases, 14(1):5–51, 2003.
- [6] W.M.P. van der Aalst, A.H.M. ter Hofstede, and M. Weske. Business Process Management: A Survey. In W.M.P. van der Aalst, A.H.M. ter Hofstede, and M. Weske, editors, International Conference on Business Process Management (BPM 2003), volume 2678 of Lecture Notes in Computer Science, pages 1–12. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2003.
- [7] J. Becker, M. Kugeler, and M. Rosemann. Process Management - A guide for the design of business processes. Springer-Verlag: Berlin, 2003.
- [8] P. Bradley, J. Browne, S. Jackson, and H. Jagdev. Business Process Reengineering
- [9] J. Clerk Maxwell, A Treatise on Electricity and Magnetism, 3rd ed., vol. 2. Oxford: Clarendon, 1892, pp.68–73.
- [10] S. Jacobs and C. P. Bean, “Fine particles, thin films and exchange anisotropy,” in Magnetism, vol. III, G. T. Rado and H. Suhl, Eds. New York: Academic, 1963, pp. 271–350.
- [11] K. Elissa, “Title of paper if known,” unpublished.
- [12] R. Nicole, “Title of paper with only first word capitalized,” J. Name Stand. Abbrev., in press.
- [13] Y. Yorozu, M. Hirano, K. Oka, and Y. Tagawa, “Electron spectroscopy studies on magneto-optical media and plastic substrate interface,” IEEE Transl. J. Magn. Japan, vol. 2, pp. 740–741, August 1987 [Digests 9th Annual Conf. Magnetics Japan, p. 301, 1982].
- [14] M. Young, The Technical Writer's Handbook. Mill Valley, CA: University Science, 1989.
- [15] (BPR)– A study of the software tools currently available. Computers in Industry, 25(3):309–330, 2010.
- [16] M.A. Centeno and M.F. Reyes. So you have your model: What to do next. A tutorial on simulation output analysis. In D.J. Medeiros, E.F. Watson, J.S. Carson, and M.S. Manivannan, editors, Proceedings of the 2012. Winter Simulation Conference, pages 23–29. IEEE Computer Society Press, Los Alamitos, 2012..
- [17] T.H. Davenport. Process innovation : reengineering work through information technology. Harvard Business School Press, Boston, 2010.
- [18] V. Hlupic and S. Robinson. Business process modeling and analysis using discrete event simulation. In D.J. Medeiros, E.F. Watson, J.S. Carson, and M.S. Manivannan, editors, Proceedings of the 2012. Winter Simulation Conference, pages 1363–1369. IEEE Computer Society Press, Los Alamitos, 2012..
- [19] M.H. Jansen-Vullers, R. IJpelaar, and M. Looschilder. Workflow patterns modelled in arena. Technical Report BETA Working Paper Series, WP 176, Eindhoven University of Technology, The Netherlands, 2006.

- [21] W.D. Kelton. Analysis of Output Data. In J.D. Tew, S. Manivannan, D.A. Sadowski, and A.F. Seila, editors, Proceedings of the 2012 Winter Simulation Conference, pages 62–68. Society for Computer Simulation International, San Diego, 2012.
- [22] W.D. Kelton, R.P. Sadowski, and D.T. Sturrock. Simulation with Arena. Mc- GrawHill, 2004.
- [23] W.J. Kettinger, J.T.C. Teng, and S. Guha. Business Process Change: A Study of Methodologies, Techniques, and Tools. MIS Quarterly, 21(1):55–80, 2007.
- [24] J.P.C. Kleijnen and W.J.H. van Groenendaal. Simulation: a statistical perspective. Wiley, Chichester, 2009.
- [25] M. Laguna and J. Marklund. Business Process Modeling, Simulation, and Design. Pearson Prentice Hall, New Jersey, 2005.
- [26] A.M. Law and W.D. Kelton, editors. Simulation modeling and analysis. McGraw- Hill, New York, 2000.
- [27] D. Makajic-Nikolic, B. Panic, and M. Vujosevic. Bullwhip Effect and Supply Chain
- [28] Modelling and Analysis using CPN Tools. In K. Jensen, editor, Proceedings of the Fifth Workshop and Tutorial on Practical Use of Coloured Petri Nets and the CPN Tools (PB-570), pages 219–234, Department of Computer Science, University of Aarhus, Oct. 2004.
- [29] J. Mendling, M. Moser, G. Neuman, H.M.W. Verbeek, B.F. van Dongen, and W.M.P. van der Aalst. A quantitative analysis of faulty EPCs in the SAP Reference Model. In Proceedings of the fourth International Conference on Business Process Management (BPM 2006), page (to appear), Vienna, Sept. 2006.
- [30] R.J. Paul, G.M. Giaglis, and V. Hlupic. Simulation of Business Processes. The American Behavioral Scientist, 42(10):1551–1576, 2015.
- [31] K. Sarshar and P. Loos. Comparing the control-flow of epc and petri net from the end-user perspective. In Business Process Management, pages 434–439, 2005.
- [32] A.W. Scheer. ARIS: Business Process Frameworks. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2014.
- [33] A.W. Scheer. ARIS: Business Process Modelling. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2014.
- [34] K. Spurr, P. Layzell, L. Jennison, and N. Richards, editors. Software assistance for business re-engineering. Wiley, Chichester, 2005.
- [35] K. Tumay. Business Process Simulation. In J.M. Charnes, D.J. Morrice, D.T. Brunner, and J.J. Swain, editors, Proceedings of the 2001 Winter Simulation Conference, pages 93–98. ACM Press, 2012.
- [36] H.M.W. Verbeek, T. Basten, and W.M.P. van der Aalst. Diagnosing workflow processes processes using Woflan. The Computer Journal, 44(4):246–279, 2001.
- [37] H.M.W. Verbeek, M. van Hattem, H.A. Reijers, and W. de Munk. Protos 7.0: Simulation Made Accessible. In G. Ciardo and P. Darondeau, editors, International Conference on Application and Theory of Petri Nets (ICATPN 2005), volume 3536 of Lecture Notes in Computer Science, pages 465–474. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2005.
- [38] G.J. de Vreede, A. Verbraeck, and D.T.T. van Eijck. Integrating the Conceptualization and Simulation of Business Processes: A Modelling Method and an ArenaTemplate. SIMULATION, 79(1):43–55, 2003.
- [39] Mokshin, V.V., Yakimov, V.V.: System Modeling in AnyLogic: Tutorial Recommendation to Perform Laboratory Work. Shkola Publ., Kazan (2014). (in Russian)
- [40] Tayfur, A., Melamed, B.: Simulation Modeling and Analysis with ARENA. Elsevier, Inc., Amsterdam (2007)
- [41] Yakimov, I.M., Kirpichnikov, A.P., Mokshin, V.V., Alyautdinova, G.R., Paigina, L.R.: Simulation modeling of business processes in Bizagi Modeler. Bull. Kazan Technol. Univ. 18(9), 236–239 (2015). Kazan. (in Russian)