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Abstract—Megamodels are often used in MDE to describe collections of models and relationships between them. Typical collection-based operations — map, reduce, filter — cannot be applied directly to megamodels since these operators need to take relationships between models into consideration. In this paper, we propose adapted versions of these operators, demonstrating them on four megamodeling scenarios. We then analyze their applicability for handling industrial-sized megamodels. Finally, we report on a reference implementation of the operators and experimental results using it.

I. INTRODUCTION

The use of models can benefit software engineering practice; however, a proliferation of models creates accidental complexity that must be managed. The field of Model Management [1] has emerged to address this challenge. Model management focuses on a high-level view in which entire models and their relationships (i.e., mappings between models) can be manipulated using specialized operators to achieve useful outcomes. For example, a model match operator [1] finds correspondences between the elements of two models and packages these as a mapping between the models. A merge operator [1] can then be used to combine the content of the two models using the correspondence information in the mapping. Model management approaches typically use megamodels [2] to represent sets of models and their relationships in this high-level view. For example, a megamodel could be a graphical model that uses nodes to represent models and edges to represent relationships.

Model management has been studied from many perspectives including algebraic properties of operators [3], [4], categorical foundations [5], type theory [6], megamodeling languages [7], [8] and practical implementations [9], [10], [4], [11]. In these investigations, the focus is on the general manipulation of models rather than specifically on the manipulation of megamodels – since these are kind of models, general model operators apply to them equally well. Yet other operators are needed due to the special role of megamodels in model management. Specifically, megamodels function as collections (of models and relationships) and so their manipulation should be like that of other collection types (e.g., lists, graphs, etc.) commonly found in modern programming languages. In particular, three collection operators are widely used: map for applying a function to every element of a collection, reduce for aggregating elements in a collection and filter for extracting a subset of the collection using a property as a selector. These operators would have great utility if available in the model management context. But while megamodels bear similarity to collections in programming, they also have their unique challenges that limit our ability to apply these techniques without some adaptation. We illustrate these below.

A Motivating Scenario. A company uses a megamodel to track its modeling artifacts (models and relationships between them). The company identified a particular construct of some of its models as undesirable (e.g., multiple inheritance in class diagrams), and now (1) would like to identify all models that are of type class diagram and contain this construct, (2) refactor them using a predefined transformation to remove the construct, and (3) merge the modified class diagrams in order to compare the result to the merged version of the original bad class diagrams. A natural way to execute these steps is to (1) use filter to extract the bad class diagrams and the relationships between these, (2) use map to apply the refactoring transformation to these and also allow the use of the corresponding refactoring transformation for the relationships and, (3) use reduce with a merge transformation to combine all the refactored models pairwise, correctly taking into account the relationships between them. The reduce with merge also can be used to combine the original models. Thus, we need collection operators to manipulate the entire graphs of related models rather than just lists of models. Furthermore, we need to allow invoking map and reduce with transformations that can accept graphs of models and relationships as input and produce these as output.

Contributions. We make the following contributions:

1) We define the set of megamodel collection operators which treat relationships between models as first class entities:
   • map – for applying a transformation to the elements of a megamodel;
   • reduce – for aggregating the elements of a megamodel using a transformation; and
   • filter – for extracting a subset of elements of a megamodel that satisfy a property.

2) We analyze the complexity of the operators and discuss their applicability to industrial scale contexts.
(3) We demonstrate the approach by using them to express several non-trivial megamodel management scenarios.
(4) We report on an implementation of the operators.

The rest of this paper is organized as follows: After fixing the terminology in Sec. II, we define the three collection operators for megamodels in Sec. III. Sec. IV illustrates these on four practical scenarios. Sec. V analyzes the complexity of having performed a given transformation on a set of input models and relationships to produce a set of output models and relationships. We make no further assumptions about the way models, relationships or transformation applications are represented or what they contain. The “mega” versions of these artifacts: megamodels, megarels and megApps are defined below. We assume the existence of a repository.

Definition 2 (Repository): A repository \( R \) is a store for artifacts that is itself structured as an mgraph of artifacts (i.e., rather than an mgraph of symbols). Thus, a relationship has references to the models on its ends, etc.

Models, relationships and transformation applications are typed by model types, relationship types and transformations, respectively. We assume that type compatibility (e.g., via subtyping) is given by a relation \( \text{TypeComp} \).

Definition 3 (Type compatibility): Given a type compatibility relation \( \text{TypeComp}, \text{TypeComp}(T, T') \) indicates that an artifact of type \( T \) can be used wherever the type \( T' \) is required. The relation \( \text{TypeComp} \) must be reflexive.

Mappings between mgraphs are called mgraph homomorphisms.

Definition 4 (mgraph homomorphism): Given mgraphs \( G, G' \) and type compatibility relation \( \text{TypeComp} \), an mgraph homomorphism \( f : G \rightarrow G' \) is a function \( f_{\text{node}} : G_{\text{node}} \rightarrow G'_{\text{node}} \) that satisfies the following conditions for preserving all node classes \( C \), references \( R \) and types:

1) \( \forall n \in G \cdot n \in G_C \Rightarrow f_{\text{node}}(n) \in G'_C \)
2) \( \forall n, n' \in G \cdot n. R \Rightarrow f_{\text{node}}(n') \in f_{\text{node}}(n). R \)
3) \( \forall n \in G_{\text{TypedNode}} \cdot \text{TypeComp}(n. \text{type}, f_{\text{node}}(n). \text{type}) \)

A typed mgraph homomorphism is one where TypeComp is equality. An mgraph isomorphism is one where \( f_{\text{node}} \) is a bijection.

Condition (1) ensures that \( f \) preserves node classes and condition (2) ensures that \( f \) preserves the endpoints of references. These are standard conditions for a homomorphism to be a structure-preserving mapping. Condition (3) additionally ensures that for typed nodes, \( f \) preserves type compatibility of nodes. Note that, node names need not be preserved by \( f \).

Mega Types. Intuitively, all the mega types represent collections of artifacts.

Definition 5 (Megamodels): Let a model repository \( \mathcal{R} \) of artifacts be given. A megamodel is a pair \( \langle G, d \rangle \), where \( G \) is an mgraph and \( d : G \rightarrow \mathcal{R} \) is a typed mgraph homomorphism, called the dereferencing mapping, that maps the nodes of \( G \) to the artifacts they represent in \( \mathcal{R} \).

When it is clear from the context, we will use a megamodel interchangeably with its mgraph.

Definition 6 (Megarel): A megarel is a megamodel restricted to containing only Relationship and Megarel nodes but end references of these nodes are contained within the ends of the megarel.

Thus, a megarel is a “relationship-like” collection that itself has megamodels on its ends.

Definition 7 (megaApp): A megaApp is a megamodel restricted to containing only Transformation Application and Transformation MegApp nodes but the in and out references of these elements are contained within the input and output connections of the megaApp. That is, both megarel and megaApp artifacts are connected to other artifacts in \( \mathcal{R} \).

Fig. 2 gives an example of a repository including three megamodels, a megarel (as well as other artifacts shown as shaded boxes). To avoid visual clutter in this example, the dereferencing mappings are not shown but are implied by the names; however, in general, names across the mapping may be different. The examples of the megamodels and megarels show the concrete syntax we use for illustrations in this paper. Models are shown as boxes, relationships are shown as diamonds with binary relationships shown optionally as a
line. A transformation application is given as an oval, with the input elements connected with arrows pointing into the oval and output elements connected with arrows pointing out of the oval. All models, relationships and transformation applications have a label of form name:type, where the name is optional. Megamodels, megarels and megaApps are shown similarly as their non-“mega” counterparts but with thick borders. Furthermore, these elements are not typed. For example, in megamodel X at the top of the figure, the box with label C:CD refers to the class diagram with name C. The diamond R2:CDrel refers to the corresponding CRrel artifact with name R2, the thick bordered box labeled X1 refers to the megamodel X1 shown below it which itself refers to models B and E, etc. No megaApp is shown but this will be illustrated in the subsequent sections of the paper.

Properties and Transformations. Models can satisfy properties and participate in transformations. We define these below.

Definition 8 (Property): A property is a constraint on an artifact. Given an artifact A and a property P, we write A |= P to denote that A satisfies P. Every property is defined for an artifact of a specific type. If A has type T, P has type T′ and the type compatibility relation TypeComp is given, the following condition must hold: (A |= P) ⇒ TypeComp(T, T′).

Thus, we assume that artifacts not compatible with the type of the property do not satisfy the property.

Definition 9 (Transformations): A transformation is a function that maps an mgraph of models and relationships to another mgraph of models and relationships. Given a transformation F, the signature of F is a pair (I, O) where I ∪ O is an mgraph, I is an mgraph called the input signature and O is a set of mgraph nodes called the output signature.

Note that we make no assumptions about what language is used for expressing properties or defining transformations.

Fig. 3 gives an example of the signature for a transformation CDMerge that accepts two class diagrams and a relationship between them and produces the merged class diagram with relationships back to the original two class diagrams. The input signature consists of the models a, b and relationship r and the output signature has model ab with relationships ra and rb. Written textually, the signature consists of I = {a:CD,b:CD,r(a,b):CDrel}, and O = {ab:CD,ra(a,ab):CDrel,rb(b,ab):CDrel}. Even though a relationship is an output of a transformation, it can connect input elements. For example, both output relationships ra and rb are connected to inputs.

Definition 10 (Transformation binding): Given transformation F with signature (I, O), a binding K of F is a megamodel (I, d₁) where d₁ is an mgraph homomorphism (rather than a typed mgraph homomorphism). We write F(K) to denote the corresponding megamodel (I ∪ O, d₁:red₁) giving the result of applying F to K. We say that F is commutative if for every pair of isomorphic bindings K, K′ (i.e., mgraph isomorphisms of I), F(K) is isomorphic to F(K′).

Thus, a binding K of F assigns artifacts to the nodes of its input signature I and then F(K) can be evaluated to assign newly created artifacts to the nodes of the output signature. CDMerge in Fig. 3 is an example of a commutative transformation – given any two class diagrams M₁, M₂ related by a relationship R, the merged output is the same regardless of whether we use the binding {a := M₁, b := M₂, r := R} or {a := M₂, b := M₁, r := R}.

Definition 11 (binding with megamodel): Given megamodel X = (Gₓ,dₓ) and transformation F with signature (I, O), a binding of F within X is the megamodel (I, dₓ⊙b) where b is an injective mgraph homomorphism b: I → X.

That is, a binding of F within X is formed by finding a set of nodes in X that match I.

Traditional Megamodeling Operators. As discussed in Sec. I, a number of model management operators have been defined, with match, merge, diff, and slice among them. For the illustrations in this paper, we require only one of them – a simple type of megamodel merge that we call union. We define it in more detail below. The union operator combines the content of a set of megamodels into a single megamodel in which elements that refer to the same artifact are merged into a single element.

There are two possibilities for the set of input megamodels: (1) either they are an mgraph of megamodels and megarels, or (2) they are a set of megarels that share the same endpoints. Fig. 4 illustrates both cases. In case (1), the result is a megamodel while in case (2) it is a megarel with the same endpoints as the inputs.

The union process can cause conflicts coming from the following two sources. If megamodel elements refer to the same artifact but the names of these elements differ, it is not clear which name to use for the merged element. To resolve this, we assume that the names in the union is a combination of the original names. Another conflict occurs when different artifacts are referred to by different elements using the same name. In this case, we assume that the names are made distinct in the union. Both of these conflict scenarios are illustrated at the bottom of case (1) in Fig. 4. Both A and D refer to the
same model and in the union the name A_D is used. However, the element C in X2 refers to a different model than C in X3 and the latter is assigned the name C_1 in the union.

III. MEGAMODEL COLLECTION OPERATORS

In this section, we define the set of megamodel collection operators we are proposing in this paper: map – Sec. III-A, reduce – Sec. III-B and filter – Sec. III-C. Their signatures are $\text{map}[\mathcal{T}]: \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{M}) \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{M})$, $\text{reduce}[\mathcal{T}]: \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$, and $\text{filter}[\mathcal{P}]: \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$, respectively, where $\mathcal{T}$ is the set of model transformations, $\mathcal{M}$ is the set of megamodels, $\mathcal{P}$ is the set of model properties and $\mathcal{P}$ is the powerset operator. All three are higher-order operators that accept a transformation or a model property as a parameter (indicated in square brackets). We describe each operator as follows: first the standard usage, then the special adaptation needed to handle megamodels and finally, the behaviour defined as an algorithm.

A. Operator map

Background: Standard Usage. The usual behaviour of a map operation is to traverse a collection (e.g., list, tree, etc.) and apply a function to the value at each node in the collection. The result is a collection with the same size and structure as the original with the function output value at each node. For example, given the list of integers $L = [10, 13, 4, 5]$ and the function Double that takes an integer and doubles it, applying map with Double to $L$ yields the list $[20, 26, 8, 10]$. If the function has more than one argument, the mapped version can take a collection (with the same size and structure) for each argument, and the function is applied at a given node in the collection using the value at that node in each argument in the collection.

Adaptation for Megamodels. Since a transformation input signature is an mgraph, applying it to each node of a megamodel is not possible. Instead, the map operator for megamodels applies the transformation for every possible binding of the input signature in the input megamodel(s). The collection of outputs from these applications forms the output megamodel.

When the transformation signature consists of a single input and output type and uses a single input megamodel which happens to be a set (i.e., no relationships) of instances of the input type, then our map produces the same result as a standard map operator applied to a set. However, in the general case, map is more complex and differs from the behaviour of the standard map. In particular,

1) The output megamodel may not have the same structure as the input megamodel since the structure is dependent on the output signature of the transformation.

2) The size of the output may not be equal to the size of the input. For example, if a transformation FF takes two models as input and produces one as its output, applying map to it on a megamodel with $n$ models will produce as many as $n \times (n - 1)$ output models since each pair of input models may be matched in a binding. At the other extreme, if no input models form a binding then the output will be the empty megamodel.

3) When there are multiple input megamodels, each binding of the input signature is split across the input megamodels in a user-definable way.

4) When the transformation is commutative, we (may) want to avoid replication in the output due to isomorphic bindings. For example, if the transformation FF is commutative, we will get each output model twice since there are two ways to apply FF to a pair of models.

In what follows, we propose an operator map for handling megamodels while avoiding the above problems.

Definition. map[$F$]($\{X_e | e \in I\}$) applies a model transformation $F$ with a signature $(I, O)$ to a set of input megamodels $\{X_e | e \in I\}$. Note that the megamodels $X_e$ need not be distinct; thus multiple input arguments can be taken from the same megamodel. map produces an output megamodel for each element of the output signature $O$. The behaviour is defined by the algorithm in Fig. 7.

We explain the algorithm using the illustration in Fig. 6(1) of applying map to the CDMatch transformation given in Fig. 5. The input signature consists of $\{a : \mathbb{CD}, b : \mathbb{CD}\}$ and the output signature is $\{r(a, b) : \mathbb{CDrel}\}$. The diagram at the top of Fig. 6 shows map(CDMatch) applied to megamodels X1 and X2 to produce an output megarel XR. Thus, the input megamodels are $X_a := X1$ and $X_b := X2$ and the one output, $Y_r$, corresponding to the output signature element $r$, produces the value for XR.

In line 1, the output megamodels are initialized to the empty megamodel. In our example, $Y_r = \emptyset$. Lines 2-5 iterate over all possible bindings of $I$ in the input megamodels. In line 2, a fresh binding (i.e., previously unmatched) for the input signature of $F$ is found in the input megamodels. Thus, in this example, a binding for $a$ is drawn from $X1$ and a binding for $b$ from $X2$. Assume this is $K := \{K_a := a, K_b := c\}$. Lines 3-4 check whether isomorphic bindings should be ignored because $F$ is commutative. Binding isomorphisms do not
occur in this example, so we illustrate them separately below. In line 5, the output of applying the transformation to the combined input binding is added to the output megamodels. Thus, in our example, CDMatch is applied to K and the resulting CDRel1 relationship R2 is added to Y_r. Line 6 returns the resulting output.

In our example, there are only two matches; thus, the resulting megarel contains two relationships. However, consider the alternative application of map to CDMatch shown in Fig. 6(2). Here both input elements are taken from the input megamodel X. Assume that X contains all three models \{A : CD, B : CD, C : CD\}. In that case, there are six possible ways to match the input signature. However, since CDMatch is designated as commutative, a binding \{K_a := m, K_b := n\} produces the same output as \{K_a := n, K_b := m\}; thus, only three matches are used to produce the output.

B. Operator reduce

Background: Standard Usage. There are different variants of the reduce (also called fold, aggregate, etc.) operator used in programming languages but it typically accepts a binary function F and applies it over values x_1, x_2, ..., x_n in a recursive collection (e.g., list, tree, etc.) by accumulating the intermediate values, e.g., F(x_n, F(..., F(x_3, F(x_2, x_1)))). For example, applying reduce with the “+” operator to the list [1, 3, 1, 9] produces the sum 14.

Adaptation for Megamodels. In a similar way, we expect the reduce operator to accept a transformation F and use this to combine the elements of the input megamodel. Our approach is to view F as a rewrite rule, by repeatedly applying F in-place and deleting the input elements until it can no longer be applied. First, we must consider several issues:

Algorithm: Apply map

Input: transformation F with signature \langle I, O \rangle, megamodels \{X_e | e \in I\}

Output: set of megamodels \{Y_e | e \in O\}

1: for (e \in O) { let Y_e := \emptyset }
2: for (fresh binding K in \{X_e | e \in I\}) {
3: if F is commutative then
4: if isomorphism of K already done then continue;
5: for (e \in O) { add element e of F(K) to Y_e } }
6: return \{Y_e | e \in O\}

Fig. 7. Algorithm defining behaviour of the map operator.

(1) What should be the criteria that F must satisfy for this process to terminate?

(2) Since a megamodel is not a recursively defined structure and has no well-defined ordering on its elements, we cannot rely on a specific traversal path. Thus, F must be confluent – the final result of reduce should be same regardless of the order in which we apply F to the megamodel.

(3) Since the input elements may have relationships to other neighbouring elements in the megamodel, we must be careful to preserve this information when the relationships are deleted.

We will address issues (1) and (2) in the definition of reduce below with appropriate assumptions on F. We address issue (3) by using relationship composition operators to construct new relationships to neighbouring elements as needed. As an illustration, assume we are using reduce with the CDMerge transformation (See Fig. 3) to merge a megamodel of class diagrams and CDRel1 relationships. Fig. 9 shows one iteration of the reduction. In step 1, CDMerge is applied to an arbitrarily chosen pair of models (in this case, B and C) to produce a new class diagram BC. In step 2, composition operators are invoked to connect BC to the neighbours of B and C. Finally, in step 3, the original models B and C are deleted together with all of their relationships.

Definition. We now define a new operator reduce[F](X) aimed to apply a transformation F to reduce the content of a megamodel X. We begin by making the following assumptions: (I) We assume availability of predefined relationship composition operators for all relationship combinations we encounter, together with a library function getComp0p that provides such an operator given a pair of relationship types.

(II) In order to achieve confluence, F is required to be commutative and associative with itself and with all relationship composition operators used in item (I).

(III) In order for the reduction process to terminate, we put the constraint on F that it must be strictly reducing in output types: for every model type in the input signature, there must be fewer models of that type in the output signature; and, for relationship type in the input signature, there must be fewer relationships of that type in the output signature that are connected to output models on both (or all, for n-ary) ends.

Fig. 8 gives the algorithm for defining the behaviour of reduce. In line 1, Y is initialized to the same value as the input. Lines 2-9 iterate for each binding of F in Y until no
Algorithm: Apply reduce
Input: transformation \( F \) with signature \((I,O)\), megamodel \( X \)
Output: megamodel \( Y \)

1. let \( Y := X \)
2. for (binding \( K \) in \( Y \)) {
3. apply \( F(K) \) generating output \( K' \);
4. for \((m \in K_{\text{mod}}, m' \in K'_{\text{mod}}, r(m, m') \in K'_{\text{rel}})\) {
5. for \((m'' \in Y_{\text{mod}}, r'(m'', m) \in Y_{\text{rel}})\) {
6. let \( \text{comp} := \text{getCompOp}(\text{type}(r'), \text{type}(r)) \);
7. let \( r''(m', m'') := \text{comp}(r', r) \);
8. add \( r'' \) to \( Y \) }
9. delete elements in \( K \) from \( Y \)
10. return \( Y \)

Fig. 8. Algorithm defining behaviour of the reduce operator.

more can be found and the algorithm terminates returning \( Y \) (line 10). In the loop, for a given binding \( K \) (line 2), \( F \) is first applied to get \( K' \) line 3. Then lines 4-9 perform the steps as described in Fig. 9 to connect the neighbours of input models in \( K \) to the output models in \( K' \) using composition operators and then deleting the input models in \( K \). For each output model \( m' \) with a relationship \( r \) to an input model \( m \) (line 4), and for each neighbour model \( m'' \) of input model \( m \) with relationship \( r' \) (line 5), a new relationship \( r'' \) is constructed directly from \( m'' \) to \( m' \) by composing \( r' \) and \( r \) (line 7). The operator to compose a relationship of \( \text{type}(r') \) with one of \( \text{type}(r) \) must be “looked up” using \( \text{getCompOp} \) (line 6).

C. Operator filter

Background: Standard Usage. Many languages provide a filtering operation to extract a portion of collection that satisfies some condition. For example, filtering the list \([2, 5, 6, 8, 9, 1]\) using the property \( \text{isEven} \) produces the list \([2, 6, 8]\).

Adaptation for Megamodels. The filter operator is similar and applies to megamodels. A property is given as the filtering condition, and the subset of elements that satisfy the property is used to produce the output. We distinguish between model and relationship properties and treat them independently. Thus, a model property filters only models and keeps all relationships between the remaining models. A relationship property filters only relationships and does not affect the models.

filter differs from map and reduce in that it does not create new models or relationships; it just creates new references to existing models and relationships. Thus, all elements of the output megamodel refer to artifacts that are already referred to by elements of the input megamodel. This aspect of filter makes it an inexpensive operation compared with map or reduce.

If a property \( P \), defined for a model or relationship type \( T \), is used for filter, then it selects all elements of type \( T \) (or its compatible types) that satisfy the constraints in \( P \) (See Defn. 8). It is also possible to give a type \( T \) as the property which is interpreted as the property true, satisfied by any instance of \( T \) (or its compatible types).

Definition. filter\( [P](X) \) filters megamodel \( X \) to produce the least sub-megamodel of \( X \) containing all the elements of \( X \) that satisfy property \( P \).

The behaviour of filter is given by the algorithm in Fig. 10. Line 1 initializes the output to the empty megamodel. Lines 2-5, iterate over the model elements in \( X \). If \( P \) is a model property then the model is only added to the output if passes the satisfaction check (line 4). If \( P \) is not a model property, all models are added to the output (line 5). A similar algorithm is followed in lines 6-9 that iterate over relationship elements. The only difference is that if \( P \) is not a relationship property (and so it must be model property), only those relationships are added to the output that already have their endpoints in the output due to the filtering in lines 2-5.

IV. APPLICATION SCENARIOS

In this section, we illustrate our collection-based megamodel management operators using several scenarios.

A. Experiment Driver

The goal of this scenario is to apply a transformation on a megamodel and perform some kind of experiment on the result of its application. Specifically, given a megamodel XCD containing a set of class diagrams, we wish to apply transformation CD2Java that translates a class diagram to its
equivalent Java code and produces a CD2JavaRel traceability relationship from the CD to the Java code. Then, we wish to apply evaluation transformation ECheck on each CD2JavaRel in the megarel resulting from the transformation application. ECheck computes the number of classes in each transformed class diagram that do not have Java counterparts. Finally, we would like to sum these up via a Sum operation to learn the total number of incidents where this occurs. If this is greater than zero, then we will identify a problem in the XCD signature applies only to the XCD diagram containing the sub-megamodel of X1 and X2.

(2) Apply map[CD2Java](XCD) to produce X1 which contains the Java code and XR which is the megarel containing all relations between XCD and X1.

(3) Apply reduce[Sum](X2) to produce the final result X3 containing a single value which is the sum of the results of map[ECheck](XR). A value is greater than zero indicates that there was a problem in the transformation application.

B. Mass Refactoring

We are given a megamodel XCD that contains unrelated class diagrams, a property PubAtt that represents models with public attributes and its negation NoPubAtt. We wish to find models satisfying PubAtt and refactor them so that public attributes become private attributes with public getter methods using refactoring transformation PubGet. Fig. 12 illustrates this scenario via the following steps:

(1) Apply filter[PubAtt](XCD) to produce a megamodel X1 containing the sub-megamodel of XCD with models where property PubAtt holds.

(2) Apply filter[NoPubAtt](XCD) to produce a megamodel X2 containing the sub-megamodel of XCD with models where property PubAtt does not hold.

(3) Apply map[AddGet](X1) to transform the models with the undesirable property using a refactoring transformation AddGet which produces a megamodel X3.

(4) Return a megamodel X4 = union(X2, X3) (see Sec. II) which represents the refactored version of the original s.t. the property PubAtt no longer holds on any of its models.

C. Megamodel Transformation

We are given an input megamodel XCD consisting of class diagrams (CDs) related by class diagram relations (CDrels), and we wish to transform it to a megamodel XER consisting of ER diagrams (ERs) related by ER diagram relations (ERrels). We are also given the transformations CD2ER and CDrel2ERrel (See signatures in Fig. 13) which transform CDs to ERs and CDrels to ERrels, respectively. We would like to use our operators to accomplish this.

The steps to perform this transformation are illustrated in Fig. 14 and involve the following steps:

(1) Apply map[CD2ER](XCD) which based on its signature applies only to the (CDs) in XCD and produces the megamodel X1 consisting of the ER versions of all the CDs in XCD as well as the megamodel relation XR1.

(2) Apply map[CDrel2ERrel](XCD) which based on its signature applies only to the CDrels in XCD and produces the megamodel relation XR2 consisting of a set of ERrels with endpoints in X1. Note that the other arguments come from the megamodel relation XR1 which contains the applications of the CD2ER transformation.

(3) Apply union(X1, X2) to produce the final megamodel XER which contains the corresponding ERs and the ERrels between them.

D. Motivating Example from Sec. I

Recall the motivating example in Sec. I: given a megamodel XCD which contains class diagrams and an undesirable property \( M_1 \) that represents class diagrams with multiple inheritance, we aim to identify all models that are of type class diagram and contain this property, refactor them using a predefined transformation to remove the property, and merge the modified class diagrams. Fig. 15 shows the chain of operators required to accomplish this scenario:

(1) Apply filter[M1](XCD) to produce a megamodel X1 containing the sub-megamodel of XCD with models where property \( M_1 \) holds.

(2) Based on the megamodel transformation pattern described in Scenario C: apply map[RemoveM1](X1) to pro-
reduce $X2$ which is the refactored version of $X1$ that no longer contains the undesirable property, and (3) apply map$\{\text{RemoveMiRel}\}$($X1$) to produce the megamodel $XR1$ containing the relations between the refactored models. (4) Apply union($X2$, $XR2$) to produce $X3$ which is the megamodel containing the refactored models and relations between them.

(5) Apply reduce$\{\text{CDMerge}\}$($X3$) which applies the CDMerge operation described in Sec. III on class diagrams with relation CDMrel between them and produces a megamodel $X4$ where all the related class diagrams are now combined. The final result can now be compared with the result of merging the pre-refactored models which can be achieved by using reduce$\{\text{CDMerge}\}$($XCD$).

Although the scenarios we have presented address specific types of megamodels, transformations and properties, they can be generalized as design patterns for similar reoccurring problems. For example, the mass refactoring scenario can be generalized for any problem that involves a megamodel which may contain elements with a certain property which should be removed. Similarly, the megamodel transformation scenario can be generalized for any problem that involves a transformation of one type of megamodel to another, given the appropriate transformations between source and target models and source and target relations. We have observed that in the case of the megamodel transformation pattern, the relation transformation can be induced from the model transformation; however, further analysis is outside the scope of this paper.

V. ANALYSIS

In this section, we analyze the worst case complexity of the three operators we propose – see the summary in Fig. 16 – and discuss the implications of this for scalability.

Complexity of map. For the algorithm in Fig. 7, the iteration in line 2 over possible bindings of input signature $I$ can execute up to $n^k$ times, where $n$ is the number of models input megamodels and $k$, the number of models in $I$. If $F$ is commutative with $q$ isomorphisms of $I$, the loop can execute $(n^k)/q$ times. Thus, the complexity is $O(n^k \times C_F(m))$ where $C_F(m)$ is the complexity of executing $F$ in terms of a size metric $m$ of the input binding to $I$. We assume that there is at most one relationship of each type between any given set of models in input megamodels.

Complexity of reduce. Line 2 of the algorithm in Fig. 8 iterates over all possible bindings of input signature $I$, but each time, the input models and relationships are deleted. Thus, each input element participates in at most one binding. Furthermore, due to the assumption that $F$ is strictly reducing, each iteration reduces the number of models and relationships. Thus, the number of iterations is bounded by $n$, the number of models in $X$ – as with map we assume there is at most one relationship of each type between a given set of models. The internal loops lines 4-8 iterate once for every neighbour of a model $M$ in $I$ and relationship of $M$ to a model in $O$. This can iterate up to $rn$ times where $r$ is the number of relationships between $O$ and $I$. Since $r$ is a constant for a given $F$, the complexity is $O(n^2 \times C_F(m))$.

Complexity of filter. For a property, the algorithm in Fig. 10 iterates $n$ times while for a relationship property over a $q$-ary relationship, it iterates $wn^q$ times, where $w$ is the number of models in $X$ and $w$ is the number of $q$-ary relationship types. Since we assume $w$ is a constant, the complexity is $O(n^q \times C_P(m))$ where $C_P(m)$ is the complexity of checking $P$ in terms of a size metric $m$ of the input relation.

Discussion. The analysis results in Fig. 16 show that the operators scale reasonably for certain classes of application scenarios. Specifically, the complexity is no worse than quadratic (modulo the transformation/property complexity) in the size of the input megamodel when map is applied to a transformation with two or fewer input models, in all cases for reduce and when filter is applied to either a model property or to a binary relationship property. Some scenarios exceed these limits (e.g., scenario C in Sec IV); we discuss future work for addressing scalability in Sec. VIII.

VI. TOOL SUPPORT

A. MMINT Overview

The megamodel collection operators described in this paper has been implemented on the MMINT (Model Management INTeractive) workbench. MMINT is implemented$^1$ in Java and extends the MMTF model management framework [10]. MMINT uses the Eclipse Modeling Framework (EMF) [12] to express models and the Eclipse Graphical Modeling Framework (GMF) to create custom editors for editing models and relationships. The overall architecture of MMINT is illustrated in Fig. 17.

MMINT uses a distinguished type megamodel in which model types, relationship types and transformations are regis-

$^1$Available at: http://github.com/adisandro/MMINT
Fig. 18. Type megamodel in MMINT used for the examples in this paper.

Fig. 19. Screenshot of megamodel for scenario B in Sec. IV being built in the MMINT megamodel editor.

| Experimental results running map[CDMatch] |
|------------------|---------|---------|-------------|
|                  | # CDs  | # rels | time (sec) | MID size (MB) |
| expr1            | 10     | 100    | 0.15       | 0.2          |
| expr2            | 100    | 10000  | 12.92      | 20.7         |
| expr3            | 250    | 62500  | 85.74      | 128.9        |
| expr4            | 500    | 250000 | 422.78     | 518.7        |

The algorithms in Fig. 7, 8 and 10 for the three operators (and union) are implemented in Java and plugged into the type support runtime layer as transformation definitions. At runtime, when an engineer selects one or more MID elements and right-clicks to see what transformations are available to apply, they see these operators and can select one to apply. If it is parameterized, then a second dialog appears showing the choices for the parameter. For example, Fig. 19 shows a screenshot of scenario B in Sec. IV being built in the megamodel editor. Currently, the engineer is on step 3 and is invoking the map operator.

C. Experiments

The MMINT implementation was used to express each of the four scenarios described in Sec. IV. Although these are “toy” experiments, they exercise the different aspects of the implementation. As a preliminary robustness test of the implementation, we ran an additional experiment in which we populated a megamodel with a varying number of class diagrams. The class diagrams were generated to contain 5 distinct random classes, picked from a pool of 50 available classes. Thus, many of the class diagrams share classes with the same name. We then measured the running time of map[CDMatch], given that map is the most complex of the operators, and the memory size of its output. The results are shown in Table I.

Since CDMatch has two input models, the complexity formula in Fig. 16 predicts quadratic time in the number of models of the input megamodel. The results in Table I are consistent with this prediction and additionally show that the space also increases quadratically. Although 422s (∼7min) does not seem excessive to process 500 models, we plan to improve scalability further (See Sec. VIII).

VII. RELATED WORK

Many model management approaches have been proposed. For example, Rondo [4] represents models as directed labeled graphs and supports traditional model management operations (e.g., match and merge) that work directly on models but
not on the megamodels containing them. Maudeling\(^2\) offers advanced query services; however, these are on the modeling artifacts themselves and not on megamodels. Epsilon \([11]\) provides a set of domain specific languages for specific model management operations such as match and merge; however, no special support is provided for megamodels.

The Atlas Model Management Architecture (AMMA) \([13]\) has a component AM3 for expressing megamodels and an OCL-based scripting language MoScript for general model management scripts including limited support for megamodel manipulation. Specifically, MoScript \([9]\) provides support for map by using the OCL ApplyTo and Collect operations and support for filter using the OCL Select operation; however, these versions of map and reduce are more limited than what we propose because MoScript does not treat relationships between models as first class citizens and the support for map and reduce is limited to sets of models rather than graph-like collections in megamodels. In addition, MoScript does not provide support for the reduce operation. Despite these weaknesses, we see MDE workflow languages such as MoScript, UniTI \([14]\), and TraCo \([15]\) as complementary to our approach and believe they can benefit from incorporating our megamodel manipulation operations into the language. We leave the investigation of such integration for future work.

Model search engines such as MOOGLE \([16]\) or IncQuery \([17]\) perform queries of model contents. Our filter operation does not limit which languages or engines can be used for defining model and relationship properties. Thus, model search engines are complementary to our approach.

Graph-based languages and frameworks that provide collection-based operations on graphs have been proposed. The map and fold (i.e., reduce) algorithms in \([18]\) generalize the classic list-based versions of these to graphs but the assumptions made by these algorithms make them inapplicable to the megamodel case. Specifically, the map algorithm does not allow for a “graph” of input arguments to the transformation as map does with transformation input signatures, and the fold algorithm only aggregates values on nodes and edges rather than collapsing the graph structure itself as reduce does. The MapReduce approaches of Google and others \([19]\) are intended for the efficient processing of big data; yet these operate differently from the map and reduce functions found in many programming languages \([20]\).

**VIII. CONCLUSION AND FUTURE WORK**

In this paper, we have proposed three new megamodel collection operators: map, reduce, and filter. These operators are inspired by similar collection manipulation operators found in many programming languages, but are adapted to address the special characteristics of megamodels and MDE environments. Specifically, the operators treat model relationships as first class entities and address the graph-like structure of megamodels and of the signatures for model transformations.

\(^2\)Maudeling:http://atenea.lcc.uma.es/index.php/Main_Page/Resources/Maudeling

Our future work will explore several issues. First, since our operators are currently standalone, we want to investigate how best to integrate them into an MDE workflow language. This includes approaches for validating workflows that use our operators. Second, we will consider how to extend our operators to take into account megamodel hierarchical structure. Finally, since the combinatorial nature of map limits its scalability, we intend to investigate ways to mitigate this problem. For example, it may be possible to adapt the highly parallelizable MapReduce framework used in big data scenarios. Our overall objective in these investigations is to produce a set of scalable megamodel manipulation operators that are needed in typical model management scenarios.
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