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Introduction

Problem:

During large-scale development, engineers inevitably have to deal with large collections of models representing different perspectives, different versions across time, different system components, etc.

*A key problem is how to integrate these models!*
Hospital Information System (HIS) – 1/2
Hospital Information System (HIS) – 2/2

Figure 1. Example models originating from different sources.
Introduction

• Models built for a system (for example: HIS) are not stand-alone objects but inter-related.

• Possible Relationships:
  • models may overlap with one another
  • models may interact at run-time
  • models may be cross-cutting
Introduction

- 3 core types of model integration activities:
  - merge
  - composition
  - weaving

- The choice of integration activity is determined by the relationship between the models. (See Table 1)
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Model integration process:

- Specify relationships between models
- Choose appropriate operator

Figure 2. Model integration process.
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Model Integration Operators

Compose:

- Composition refers to the process of assembling a set of autonomous but interacting models that capture different components of a system.
Model Integration Operators

Compose:

- acquire in $C_1$ maps to lock in $C_3$
- release in $C_1$ maps to unlock in $C_3$
- acquire in $C_2$ maps to lock in $C_3$
- release in $C_2$ maps to unlock in $C_3$

Figure 3. Interconnections between processes running in parallel.
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Compose:

Figure 4. Specification of processes and their parallel composition.
Model Integration Operators

Weave:

- In Aspect-Oriented Software Development (AOSD), weaving is used to incorporate cross-cutting concerns into a base system.
- A classic example of a cross-cutting concern is logging, affecting all logged activities in a system.
Model Integration Operators

Weave:

Object₁ in M₇ maps to Doctor in M₂
Object₂ in M₇ maps to MedicalRecord in M₂
update*() in M₇ maps to update() in M₂

Object₁ in M₇ maps to Nurse in M₄
Object₂ in M₇ maps to Chart in M₄
update*() in M₇ maps to update() in M₄

Figure 5. Weaving model M₇ into M₂ and M₄.
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Merge:

- Merge is used to build a global view of a set of overlapping models that capture different perspectives on a certain functionality.
- The goal of merging is to combine the input models by unifying their overlaps.
- Existing merging approaches:
  - Some require only consistent models be merged
  - Some tolerate inconsistencies
Model Integration Operators

Merge:

Patient in M1 maps to Patient in M3
MedicalRecord in M1 maps to Chart in M3
Aggregation in M1 maps to Aggregation in M3
update() in M1 maps to update() in M3
getRecord() in M1 maps to getChart() in M3

Note: The source models here have different vocabularies, preference is given to terminology in one of the source models.
Model Integration Operators

Important Considerations:

- What notation(s) are the source models expressed in?
- What assumptions are made about the application context, the nature of the models, and their intended use?
- What are the exact details of the relationships that need to be established (in terms of the level of granularity, semantics, representation)?
- What quality and correctness criteria do we expect of the result of the integration?
I. Introduction
II. Model Integration Operators
III. Model Merging Frameworks
IV. Two Example Merge Operators
V. Tool Support
VI. Discussion and Conclusion
Model Merging Frameworks

Overlap Relationships:

- Before a merge can be applied, the exact nature of the overlap of the concepts between the two models needs to be explicated.
- Overlap types:
  - Equivalence
  - Similarity
  - Generalization
  - Aggregation
  - Overriding
  - Information Gaps
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overlap Type</th>
<th>Graph-Based (Class Diagrams)</th>
<th>Semantics-Based (State Machines)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Equivalence</td>
<td><img src="image1" alt="Diagram" /></td>
<td><img src="image2" alt="Diagram" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Similarity</td>
<td><img src="image3" alt="Diagram" /></td>
<td><img src="image4" alt="Diagram" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generalization</td>
<td><img src="image5" alt="Diagram" /></td>
<td><img src="image6" alt="Diagram" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggregation</td>
<td><img src="image7" alt="Diagram" /></td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overriding</td>
<td><img src="image8" alt="Diagram" /></td>
<td><img src="image9" alt="Diagram" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Gap</td>
<td><img src="image10" alt="Diagram" /></td>
<td><img src="image11" alt="Diagram" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Model Merging Frameworks

Equivalence:

An equivalence mapping between two elements means that they refer to exactly the same concept in the real world.

Note: Even when the two endpoints are equivalent, links between them may not be so.
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Similarity:
Two elements might be similar in some respects but not necessarily equivalent.
Model Merging Frameworks

Equivalence vs Similarity:

- Two elements related via equivalence relation will be collapsed into one by merge. If this is intended, use equivalence, otherwise similarity.
- Equivalence is a transitive notion, whereas similarity is not.
Model Merging Frameworks

Generalization:
An element in one model can be a generalization or specialization of elements in another model.

Diagram showing critical care unit in one model and ward and special unit in another.
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**Aggregation:**

A pair of elements can be related through a has-a or is-part-of relationship.
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Overriding:

Override, or retrenchment allows developers to withdraw from their positions as their knowledge evolves or to avoid inconsistency with other developers.
Model Merging Frameworks

Information Gaps:

There may be information gaps between the source models that need to be bridged first, before meaningful relationships can be defined.
Model Merging Frameworks

Desirable Criteria for Merge:

- Completeness
- Non-redundancy
- Minimality
- Totality
- Soundness
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Two Example Merge Operators

Two instantiations of merge operator:

- Algebraic merge
- State Machine Merge
Two Example Merge Operators

**Algebraic Merge:**
- Algebraic merge is a generic operator that works over graph-based models.
- Relationships between the models are captured by sub-graphs, also referred to as connectors.
- The outcome of merge is characterized by an algebraic concept called *colimit*. 
Example:
Algebraic merge of M5 and M6

Step 1: Create a connector model
Step 2: Compute the merge with respect to their overlaps as described by the connector.

Note: algebraic merge unifies into a single element any set of source model elements that have been mapped through the connector.
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State Machine Merge:
- Specifically aimed at state machine models.
- Motivated by the need to preserve the semantic properties of these models in their merges.
Example:

State machine merge of M5 and M6

Step 1: Identify a relationship between the input state machines.
Step 2: Compute the merge with respect to the binary relation defined above.

Note:
1. Non-shared behaviors are guarded by conditions;
2. Unlike the algebraic merge, state machine merge does not collapse distinct states.
## Two Example Merge Operators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Merge operators</th>
<th>Input Models</th>
<th>Relationships</th>
<th>Soundness</th>
<th>Properties</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Algebraic Merge</td>
<td>Homogeneous, graph-based</td>
<td>Applies to all overlap relations in Table 2</td>
<td>Preserves positive existential LFP properties and one level of universal quantification</td>
<td>Complete, Non-Redundant, Minimal, Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Open-world assumption</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Machine Merge</td>
<td>Homogeneous, state machines with trace-based semantics</td>
<td>Applies to the overlap relations (2), (4), (6), and (12) in Table 2</td>
<td>Preserves all LTL properties</td>
<td>Complete, Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Closed-world assumption</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Tool Support

- The two merge operators described above are implemented as part of a tool called TReMer+.
- TReMer+ has been applied in two real case studies, both dealing with independently-developed models.
- Most recent version of TReMer+ along with material are available at:  
  http://se.cs.toronto.edu/index.php/TReMer+
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Discussion and Conclusion

- The complexity of integration of a set of models can be reduced by explicating the type of relationships which hold between the models.
- The result of this article would provide a useful guide for the development of new model integration operators.