1 RESEARCH PROBLEM

Software systems form an integral part of the most complex artifacts built by humans, and we have become totally dependent on these complex software artifacts (van der Aalst, 2015). Communication, healthcare, education and government all rely on software systems that take over more and more duties. Modern enterprises continue to invest in the creation, maintenance and change of complex software systems. However, numerous software projects still experience significant problems. Moreover, the complexity of modern software containing millions of lines of codes and thousands of dependencies among components is extremely high (Rubin et al., 2014), (Liu et al., 2016), (Liu et al., 2018c), (Liu et al., 2018d). This complexity makes it difficult to understand, maintain, evolve, improve, and etc.

During the execution of software systems, many crashes and exceptions may occur, and it is a real challenge to understand how a software system is behaving. By exploiting the data recorded during the execution of software systems, one can discover behavioral models to describe the actual execution of software. The discovered behavioral models provide extensive insights into the real usage of software, enable new forms of model-based testing and improvements. Replaying execution data on such models helps to localize performance problems and architectural challenges.

To help understanding the runtime behavior of a software system, we aim to discover an architectural model from the execution data. An architectural model typically structures a software system in terms of components, interfaces and interactions. Generally speaking, our research aims to answer the following questions:

- How does the software system behave at runtime?
  - How many components are involved during the execution of the software system and how they really behave?
  - How many interfaces does a component contain and do they adhere to a typical (pre-defined) behavioral contract?
  - How do components interact with each other during execution?
  - What does the architectural model discovered from the execution data look like?

- How is the quality of the architectural model that we discovered from the execution data? Does it conform to the reality (i.e., execution data)?

2 OUTLINE OF OBJECTIVES

To answer the research questions, our research aims to target the following challenges:

- Challenge 1: propose automated approaches to discover architectural model from software execution data.
  - Challenge 1.1: propose a standardized format for software execution data exchange.
  - Challenge 1.2: propose effective approaches to support the component identification and behavioral model discovery.
  - Challenge 1.3: propose effective approaches to support the interface identification and contract model discovery.
  - Challenge 1.4: propose effective approaches to support the discovery of architectural models.

- Challenge 2: propose effective approaches to support conformance checking based on the discovered architectural model and execution data.

- Challenge 3: evaluate and validate the applicability and effectiveness of the previous approaches using real-life software cases.
3 STATE OF THE ART

In this section, we briefly review the state-of-the-art from the following three perspectives: (1) software dynamic analysis; (2) software process mining; and (3) software architecture reconstruction.

3.1 Software Dynamic Analysis

Software dynamic analysis is used to understand the behavior of software by exploiting its execution data. Several techniques and tools have been presented to extract information from running software. Most existing approaches, such as (Lo et al., 2009) and (Walkinshaw and Bogdanov, 2008), generate automaton-based models using different variants of the K-Tail algorithm which was first defined by Biermann and Feldman (Biermann and Feldman, 1972). However, these techniques cannot discover concurrency explicitly, resulting in a so-called state explosion for complex models. Although automaton-based models are popular in software analysis, there are several other techniques to learn other types of models. For example, some techniques visualize software execution traces as sequence diagrams (McGavin et al., 2006) and some of them are extended with loops (Briand et al., 2006). Similar to automaton-based models, the (classic) sequence diagram-based models also lack concurrency description. Moreover, each sequence diagram or automaton-based model only describes the behavior of a single execution trace. Given software execution data referring to thousands of traces, these existing approaches will obtain an excessive number of behavioral models rather than a compact model for the whole data. In addition, considering the hierarchical nature of software, the discovered flat sequence diagrams or flat automation-based models cannot accurately capture the real behavior in a meaningful way.

3.2 Software Process Mining

With the development of process mining (van der Aalst, 2016) on the one hand, and the growing availability of software execution data on the other hand, a new form of software analytics comes into reach, i.e., applying process mining techniques to analyze software execution data. This inter-disciplinary research area is called Software Process Mining (SPM) (Liu et al., 2016), (Rubin et al., 2007), and aims to analyze software execution data from a process-oriented perspective. One of the first papers addressing SPM is (van der Aalst et al., 2015). For the mining of software systems, the recorded events explicitly refer to parts of the system (components, services, etc.). References to system parts facilitate the generation of localized event logs. A generic process discovery approach is proposed based on such localized event logs. Experimental results show that location information indeed helps to improve the quality of the discovered models. Leemans and van der Aalst (Leemans and van der Aalst, 2015) discover and analyze the operational processes of software systems using process mining techniques. They propose to discover flat behavioral models using Inductive Miner (Leemans et al., 2013). By taking full consideration of component-based architecture and hierarchical structure of a software system, Liu et al. (Liu et al., 2016) propose to discover a hierarchical behavioral model for each component. The discovered component model describes the software behavior from the perspective of individual component. However, this work neglects the functions (interfaces) that each component provides to other components as well as the interaction among components.

3.3 Software Architecture Reconstruction

Software architecture reconstruction aims to abstract, identify, and present high-level views from low-level data to help understanding software. The recovered architectural views play a pivotal role in software understanding, reuse, evolution, maintenance, etc. (Garan, 2000), (Stéphane and Damien, 2009). Crnkovic et al. (Ivica et al., 2011) discuss fundamental principles of software architectural models and compare a large number of existing architectural models, such as Enterprise JavaBeans, Microsoft Component Object Model and CORBA Component Model.

For software systems that are implemented by object-oriented technology, a component is composed of a set of classes and an interface is composed of a set of methods. Various clustering-based techniques are proposed to identify components based on different criteria such as coupling, cohesion and modularity. According to the required input, these approaches can be classified as development documents based approaches (e.g., (Lee et al., 2001), (Kim and Chang, 2004), (Chang et al., 2005), (Hasheminejad and Jalili, 2015)), source code based approaches (e.g., (Washizaki and Fukazawa, 2005), (Kebir et al., 2012a), (Kebir et al., 2012b), (Cui and Chae, 2011), (Luo et al., 2004), (Chiricota et al., 2003), (Mancoridis et al., 1999)) and execution data based approaches (e.g., (Qin et al., 2009), (Allier et al., 2009), (Allier et al., 2010)). A common drawback of many
As for interface identification, Simon et al. (Allier et al., 2011) propose to identify interfaces by grouping methods of the same class, i.e., one interface for each class if this class has methods that are used by other components. Hence, this approach defines interfaces based on the internal structure of components. Seriai et al. (Seriai et al., 2014) give an approach to identify interfaces of a component by grouping methods that are called by another component. Methods that are used by the same component(s) are grouped as an interface. Hence, this approach leads to different components using a single interface regardless of the functions they need. With respect to architectural model reconstruction, Simon et al. (Allier et al., 2011) propose to discover an architectural model from source code to help understand the behavior of a software system. The components are extracted as a set of classes and interfaces are identified by grouping methods of same classes and the interactions among components are represented by binding interfaces in a static way. Differently, Seriai et al. (Seriai et al., 2014) also presents an approach to discover architectural model from source code whereas interfaces of a component are identified by grouping methods that are called by the same component.

By taking execution data as input, Dragomir and Lichter (Dragomir and Lichter, 2013) try to present an architectural description by visualizing object-level interactions based on sequence diagrams. However, object-level information are too fine-grained and not understandable for large-scale software. In addition, the interactions among components are also represented by simply binding interfaces in a static manner, which neglects the behavioral aspects.

4 METHODOLOGY

Figure 1 gives an overview of our methodology, based on which we describe the approaches adopted in the research. Generally speaking, we start from the instrumentation and standardization of software execution data (see ① in Fig. 1). By taking the standardized execution data as input, we identify components and discover component behavioral models as shown in Fig. 1 ②. Then, we identify interfaces and discover interface contract models for each component as shown in Fig. 1 ③. Next, the architectural model can be discovered as shown in Fig. 1 ④. Finally, we evaluate the conformance between the architectural model and the execution data (see ⑤ in Fig. 1).
4.1 Standardization of Software Execution Data

The input of our research is software execution data, which can be obtained by instrumenting and monitoring real software execution. The software execution data consist of method calls. Normally, a method call records software-specific information, including the method name, the class name, the object that invokes this method, the package name, the line number of the method, the input parameter types and values, the time (in nanosecond precision), the complete time (in nanosecond precision), the caller method name, the caller class name, the caller object, the method name, the called class name, the called object, and the timestamp for software events within a log. For more detailed information, please refer to (Leemans and Liu, 2017).

To the best of our knowledge, there is no standardization of software execution data which supports reproducibility and shareability of existing research results. The XES standard (Verbeek et al., 2011) defines a grammar for a tag-based language whose aim is to provide designers of information systems with a unified and extensible methodology for capturing systems behaviors by means of event logs and event streams. It is supported by XES Working Group1. To provide a unified format for software execution data exchange, we introduce a standardized XES-based extension, i.e., Software Event Extension.

The software extension defines the called class name, the called package name, the line number of the called method, the input parameter types and values of the called method, the caller method name, the caller class name, the caller object, the caller package name, and the timestamp for software events within a log. For more detailed information, please refer to (http://www.win.tue.nl/ieeetfpm/doku.php).

4.2 Component Identification and Behavioral Model Discovery

Generally speaking, the identification of components from software execution data is based on clustering classes (Liu et al., 2018a). To understand the behavior of each component, we propose to discover a behavioral model per component using process mining techniques.

- **Component Identification.**
  - **Step 1: Class Interaction Graph Construction.** Starting from the software execution data, we propose to construct a class interaction graph (CIG). In the CIG, each node represents a class and each edge represents the calling relation among the connected two classes.
  - **Step 2: Component Identification from Class Interaction Graph.** By taking the constructed CIG as input, we partition it into a set of subgraphs using community detection algorithms (e.g., Newman’s algorithm (Newman, 2006)). Classes that are grouped in the same cluster naturally form a component, known as component configuration.
  - **Step 3: Quality Evaluation of the Identified Components.** After identifying a set of components, we want to evaluate the quality of the identified components. Several quality metrics, e.g., size, cohesion, coupling, and modularity, will be evaluated.

- **Component Behavioral Model Discovery.**
  - **Step 1: Component Instance Identification.** Starting from the original software execution data, we first propose a novel approach to identify component instance. It serves as the basic case notion to generate a software event log for each component. Here, a component instance refers to one independent run of a software component.
  - **Step 2: Hierarchical Software Event Log Construction.** Because a software (component) usually has a hierarchical structure represented as multi-level nested method calls, the discovered behavioral model should depict this hierarchy nature. For each component, we recursively transform its event log to a hierarchical one using calling relations among methods.
  - **Step 3: Component Behavioral Model Discovery using Process Mining.** For each component, we discover a hierarchical behavioral model from its corresponding hierarchical software event log. Given the hierarchy of a software event log, we only need to traverse through different levels of the log and discover a process model for each sub-log. Note that we can use any existing process discovery approach (e.g., Inductive Miner (Leemans et al., 2013)) in this step.

4.3 Interface Identification and Contract Model Discovery

Starting from the software execution data and component configuration, we propose to first identify a set of interfaces for each component by clustering its methods (Liu et al., 2018b). Normally, when an interface is used by a component, the execution of its methods should follow a specific contract. This contract defines the behavior of the interface by explic-
itly specifying in which order the methods should be invoked. Therefore, for each identified interface, we then discover a behavioral model to represent the actual behavior using process mining techniques.

- **Component Interface Identification.**
  - **Step 1: Candidate Interface Identification.**
    For each component, we identify a set of candidate interfaces by grouping methods with respect to their caller methods. Note that identified candidate interfaces may have duplication problem, i.e., some methods may be included in different interfaces.
  - **Step 2: Similar Interface Candidate Merge.**
    To solve the method duplication problem among candidate interfaces within the same component, we merge similar candidates in a way such that the overlap of shared methods among interfaces is limited to a reasonable range.
  - **Step 3: Quality Evaluation of the Identified Interfaces.** After identifying interfaces of each component, we want to evaluate the functional consistency of each interface.

- **Interface Contract Model Discovery.**
  - **Step 1: Interface Event Log Construction.**
    To enable the discovery of interface contract model using process mining techniques, we obtain the event log from the software execution data for each identified interface.
  - **Step 2: Interface Contract Model Discovery using Process Mining.** For each interface, we discover a contract model using existing process mining techniques (e.g., Inductive Miner (Leemans et al., 2013)).

### 4.4 Formal Specification and Discovery of Software Architectural Model

After identifying components and interfaces (as well as their behavioral models), we then try to recover the architectural model of software. The architectural model is composed of components, interfaces and interactions. A component can interact with other components by interaction methods (or interfaces). Each interaction is described by an interaction model that contains a connector behavioral model (a process model describing the behavior of the invoked interfaces) and the interface instance cardinality information. It can be discovered by performing the following steps:

- **Interaction Method Identification.** An interaction method is a method of an interface that can invoke methods (or interfaces) of other components. It can be detected directly from the software execution data.

- **Connector Behavioral Discovery.** For each interaction method, we first generate its interaction log where each event refers to an interface. A connector behavioral model can be discovered from this interaction log.

- **Interface Instance Cardinality Identification.** Interface instance cardinality information reveals the instance level relationships between the interaction method and the invoked interfaces. The cardinality information for each interface can be obtained by investigating the number of interface instances that is invoked by the interaction method.

- **Multi-view Architectural Models.** Besides a detailed architectural view with interface protocol model, cardinality information and connector behavioral model, we provide multiple views to allow users navigate from fine-grained architectural models to coarse-grained ones.

### 4.5 Conformance Checking based Architectural Model Quality Evaluation

In this section, we propose to evaluate the quality of the discovered architectural model with respect to the execution data. Conformance checking based quality evaluation measures the fitness of the architectural model against the execution data. It involves the following steps:

- **Mapping Execution Data to Architectural Elements.** Given software execution data and an architectural model, we first create the mapping from method calls in the execution data to architectural elements (e.g., interface, interaction model) in the architectural model.

- **Compute Alignment between Software Execution Data and Architectural Model.** Based on the mapping, we compute the alignment between software execution data and the architectural model.

- **Measure the Fitness Between Software Execution Data and Architectural Model.** Based on the computed alignment between the software execution data and an architectural model, we compute the fitness of the architectural model with respect the execution data. It reveals how well the architectural model fits the execution data.
Table 1: Stage of The Research.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stage 1</td>
<td>2015-08 ∼ 2016-12</td>
<td>(1) Standardize software execution data; and (2) Component identification and behavioral model discovery.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 2</td>
<td>2017-01 ∼ 2018-03</td>
<td>(1) Interface identification and contract behavior discovery; and (2) Formal specification and discovery of architectural model.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 3</td>
<td>2018-04 ∼ 2019-07</td>
<td>(1) Conformation checking based architectural model evaluation; (2) Empirical evaluation using real-life software systems; and (3) Finish the Ph.D thesis.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.6 Empirical Evaluation using Real-life Software Systems

Based on open-source software systems and their execution data (e.g., JUnit 3.7, JGraphx, JHotdraw), we perform a comprehensive empirical evaluation of all proposed approaches. In addition, we also plan to contribute some real-life case studies where the feedback from stakeholders are available. The evaluation should involve the following aspects:

- For component identification, we evaluate the cohesion and coupling metrics for different community detection or graph clustering algorithms (e.g., (Qin et al., 2009), (Allier et al., 2009), (Allier et al., 2010)).
- For interface identification, we compare our approach with existing interface identification approaches (e.g., (Allier et al., 2011) (Seriai et al., 2014)).
- For architectural model discovery, we evaluate our approach that combining different component/interface identification strategies. In addition, we also compare our discovered architectural model with existing ones if possible (e.g., (Dragomir and Lichter, 2013)).

5 EXPECTED OUTCOME

This section describes in detail the expected outcome of our research. It includes the following:

- A process mining based approach to discover hierarchical behavioral models for each identified component.
- An extensible framework to support the interface identification. This framework should implement various of interface identification strategies.
- A process mining based approach to discover contract models for each identified interface.
- An effective approach to support the discovery of multi-view architectural models from software execution.
- An effective approach to support conformance checking between the discovered architectural model and software execution data.
- A set of user-friendly software tools that support the previous techniques.

6 STAGE OF THE RESEARCH

This research is fully supported by the NIRICT 3TU.BSR (Big Software on the Run) research project. This high-profile project is a collaboration between 3 universities, 6 research groups. It starts from August 1, 2015 and runs four years until July, 2019. My role in the project is mainly on creating more abstract representations of the massive amounts of software event data. We aim to develop techniques for generating models and visualizations showing what is really going on in a software system or collection of systems. Generally, we organize the whole research into three stages, as shown in Table 4.4.
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