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Abstract. Measurement is a key aspect for Information Systems assessment in all its development phases. Different artefacts allow the application of different kinds of metrics. For instance, when the software system is already developed, test metrics such as benchmarks can be used. However, in the initial phases, metrics can only be applied over model artefacts and, then, structural metrics are especially useful because they allow measuring different properties by taking into account the structural elements of the model. In order to explore how these metrics can be defined and reused, in this paper we analyse several structural metrics over different kinds of models and we observe that they share similar characteristics. Based on them, we establish a metamodelling approach, which includes several guidelines for the definition of the structural metrics and their reuse. In order to exemplify the approach we define and reuse two different structural metrics over the $i^*$ framework.

1 Introduction

Measuring is crucial in many different disciplines and Software Engineering is not an exception. There are many quality characteristics that can be measured such as functionality, reliability, usability, efficiency, modularity, effectiveness, or safety, among others. These characteristics are usually measured once the Information System is built, but they can be estimated in earlier phases of the development process. Therefore, metrics can be applied over different artefacts, for instance, graphs representing the code workflow, conceptual models, or activity diagrams.

Metrics evaluation ranges from expert judgment qualification, to complex computational rules. However, as it is remarked in [19], despite formal estimation models have existed for many years, the dominant estimation method is based on expert judgment, which makes metrics evaluation subjective and time-consuming and hampers reuse of metrics. One of the kinds of metrics that is less based on expert judgment is structural metrics. On spite of their use, as far as we know, there is not a precise definition of structural metrics and, so, we may define them as those metrics that measure software quality characteristics based on some predefined criteria over the structure of a modelled software artefact. Structural metrics are very suitable for the early phases of the software development process because models play a prominent role during these phases. Thus, there are many approaches that propose
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structural metrics over different models, such as Class Diagrams [5], Statechart Diagrams [11], Use Cases [25], Workflow Diagrams [28], and i* models [18].

Despite the widespread use of structural metrics, it still does not exist a unified manner to define them, there is no general form for a generic adaptation of metrics across models, and their validation is often assumed. In our own experience in defining structural metrics over i* models [10], [8], [18], we have particularly remarked: 1) the lack of guidelines for defining the metrics; 2) the need of criteria for establishing when expert judgement has to be used and how; 3) the difficulty on validating the metrics; and, 4) the difficulty on reusing existing structural metrics.

Actually, other authors have also remarked that need of addressing the definition and reuse of metrics in a systematic way. For instance, the work presented in [22] discusses several issues related to model metrics, with particular emphasis on metrics for UML models, and identifies three levels of challenges for model metrics: 1) the technical challenge of defining, comparing and reusing metrics over different descriptions of the same software system; 2) the conceptual challenge of defining how to measure metrics from partial descriptions of models, and of the change in metrics between different representations of the software; and, 3) the practical challenge of gathering, comparing and interpreting new and existing metrics.

In order to address these issues we have analysed most of the existing structural metrics over different modelling languages, looking for their commonalities and differences. Based on this analysis, we have observed that all the studied modelling languages present a similar structure, being possible to establish two different metamodels, graph-based and sequence-based, where most of the studied modelling languages and their metrics fit. Using that metamodel approach we have established the guidelines for a question-based procedure that guides the definition of the metrics from scratch. On the other hand, we have observed that if two modelling languages share the same metamodel, it is then possible to reuse the metrics defined on one modelling language to the other and so, we have also defined the guidelines for doing it. In order to illustrate our approach, we have defined two metrics over i* models [29], one defined from scratch for measuring Data Accuracy, and the other one by reusing an existing metric for measuring the COSMIC Functional Size.

The remainder of the paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we provide an overview of some existing structural metrics. In Section 3 we present our metamodeling framework, which can be used for defining metrics from scratch using the guidelines in Section 4, or for reusing existing metrics using the guidelines in Section 5. Finally, in Section 6 we present validation issues, whilst in Section 7 we end with the conclusion and future work.

2 Overview of Existing Structural Metrics

Structural metrics are applied over different domain models for evaluating different quality attributes. The first software metrics were proposed to evaluate some qualities of the software code related with complexity and reuse, by measuring structural elements of the code such as lines of code or the maximum and mean of nested functions. However, as we are interested in applying metrics at the early phases of the
software development process, we focus on artefacts other than code, mainly: UML specifications; Business Process Models; i* models; and, Functional Size models. Due to the lack of space, we cannot present all the metrics analysed, or the details of the modelling languages used, therefore, for more information we refer to [14].

- **Metrics over UML specifications.** UML models have been the focus of many different structural metrics for evaluating quality factors such as complexity, modifiability and reusability of the modelled artefacts. Among the existing approaches we remark those metrics applied over Class Diagrams [5], [12], Component Models [13], Use Cases [25], and Statechart Diagrams [11]. In Table 1 we show the different kinds of metrics proposed, stating the evaluated UML model and the properties they measure.

- **Metrics over Business Process Models.** Business Process Modelling is related to the software domain because, nowadays, it usually considers the automation of some of the modelled process by means of an Information System. Business Processes are commonly represented as a set of nodes representing states and edges representing transitions between states. Among the existing proposals, we remark the following, which measure complexity over Process Charts [21]; coupling and cohesion over Workflow Models [28]; and complexity metrics over Process Graphs [4]. These proposals have in common that metrics are reused based on the analogy of their models with models on other fields. However, none of them provide a systematic method for doing it.

- **Metrics over i* Models.** There are a few proposals of structural metrics over i* models. Among them we remark the ones defined in the REACT method [10], [18] which count the different elements of Strategic Dependency (SD) models for obtaining different values. The work in [8] evaluates Strategic Rationale (SR) models by analysing the structure of their means-end and task-decompositions. Finally, in [3] the SR model is evaluated for the quality attribute Overall Plan Cost.

- **Metrics measuring the Functional Size.** Functional Size Measurement Methods aims at determining the size of a proposed software system yet to be built based on its requirements. It can be measured over the structure of a specific model, such as the Functional User Requirements [1], but also over other constructs such as UML Class Diagrams [24], or the software model of the process [26].

### Table 1. Overview of UML-based Structural Metrics, classified by the evaluated UML model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Property Measured</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Class Diagrams</td>
<td>Weighted Method per Class (WMC)</td>
<td>Complexity (effort)</td>
<td>[5]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Depth of Inheritance Tree (DIT)</td>
<td>Complexity (behaviour)</td>
<td>[5]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coupling between Object Classes (CBO)</td>
<td>Reusability</td>
<td>[5]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Response for a Class (RFC)</td>
<td>Complexity (testing)</td>
<td>[5]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of Associations</td>
<td>Maintainability</td>
<td>[12]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of Aggregations</td>
<td>Maintainability</td>
<td>[12]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use Cases</td>
<td>Number of Dependencies (NOD)</td>
<td>Modifiability</td>
<td>[25]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of Use Case Types</td>
<td>Modifiability</td>
<td>[25]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Component Model</td>
<td>Arguments per Procedure (APP)</td>
<td>Complexity</td>
<td>[13]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Distinct Arguments Count (DAC)</td>
<td>Complexity</td>
<td>[13]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statechart</td>
<td>Number of Activities (NA)</td>
<td>Understandability</td>
<td>[11]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>diagrams</td>
<td>Number of Transitions</td>
<td>Understandability</td>
<td>[11]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3 Adopting a Metamodelling Approach

From the analysis of related work, we observe that structural metrics are all based on counting or weighting the structural elements that conforms the modelling language over which they are defined. For instance, metrics over UML Class Diagrams are based on the number of associations, the number of attributes and combinations of them. We also observe that the modelling languages used also have a similar structure. More precisely, we distinguish among modelling languages that are analogous to a graph or to a sequence of actions. For instance, in UML Class diagrams the classes can be abstracted to nodes and the relationships to edges; in Workflow Processes the states are nodes and the transitions are the edges; and, in $i^*$ models, the actors are the nodes and the dependencies are the edges.

According to [22], defining model metrics is a metamodelling activity. This statement is based on the fact that for interpreting and understanding a metrics exact definition, it is necessary to model the entities being measured, and to define the metrics in terms of this model. Based on the analysis of the existing structural metrics that we have presented, we observe that they share the same concepts and, so, it is possible to apply a metamodelling approach. More precisely, some modelling languages are based on a graph structure [3], [5], [8], [10], [11], [12], [13], [25] and some others are based on a sequence-based structure [1], [4], [18], [21], [26], [28]. Therefore, it is possible to abstract a metamodel of these notations and get a more general view of the defined metrics. We remark that these generic metamodels can be transformed into specific metamodels, by applying the refactorings presented in [27].

Therefore, we can establish the three different layers presented in Fig. 1:

- **First Layer: Generic Modelling Language Metamodel.** At this first layer we found the two modelling languages metamodels identified: one for graph-based modelling languages, and the other for sequence-based modelling languages. However, if other metamodels were identified, our approach could host them. The metamodels can be obtained by applying a generalization process over the metamodels of the modelling languages.

- **Second Layer: Modelling Language Metamodel.** Structural metrics are defined over a certain modelling language, and so, this layer contains the metamodels of these modelling languages. The modelling language metamodels may be different from the generic metamodel in the sense that their modelling elements may have different names and slightly different model restrictions and so, they can be seen a refactoring of the metamodels of the layer above. They can also be considered as an abstraction of the specific domain modelling language.

- **Third Layer: Modelling Language Domain Model.** Each modelling language metamodel can be instantiated into many models, depending on its domain. For instance, an $i^*$ model can be instantiated for the domain of e-business systems or service-oriented systems, where models in the same domain share similar concepts.
3.1 The Generic Graph-based Metamodel

In Fig. 2, we show our Generic Graph-based Metamodel, which is adapted from the generic metamodel for gap typology definition presented in [7]. We have selected this metamodel because it is already generic, it is currently being used as a metamodel, and presents the main concepts to be shown in a Graph. The modifications we have done to the original metamodel are: 1) we have renamed the names of the classes Link and Not Link into Edge and Node, in order to adhere to a generic graph terminology, and, 2) in order to allow a more complete classification of the elements, in addition to the attribute Name, we add the attribute Type to the class Element.

As presented in Fig. 2, an Element is classified into two bundles. First, a distinction between Simple Element and Compound Element is made. Second, elements can be classified into Nodes or Edges. A Compound Element is decomposed into finer-grain elements, which can be Simple or, in turn, Compound Elements. Edge elements are connectors between pairs of elements. One of the connected elements plays the role of the Source and the other is the Target. For technical reasons, at least one Element has to be classified as Root. This allows indicating that the minimal content of a model is the Object class in a class hierarchy, the System Boundary in a use case diagram, etc. Finally, an element may have associated one or more Property.
3.2 Generic Sequence-Based Metamodel

In Fig. 3 we present our metamodel for the sequence-based modelling languages (i.e., scenarios, use cases, human activity models, or activity diagrams). In order to adhere to the several existing sequence-based notations, we have define a generic sequence-based metamodel based on the metamodel for Use Cases proposed in [23], and the conceptual model for Use Cases presented in [6]. In order not to enforce a particular notation we have named the classes according to the generic concepts they represent. The main concept is a Sequence of Actions, which can be a Simple Sequence of Actions or a Composite Sequence of Actions (for instance, a Use Case is a set of sequences representing a Scenario [6], and it is also possible to define composite Use Cases [23]). Relationships between Sequence of Actions also include inclusion and extension of other Sequence of Actions. Sequence of Actions are constrained by a certain number of Conditions, which can be a Goal, a Precondition, a Postcondition, or a Triggering Event specific of each condition. A Sequence of Actions has several Actions. An Action involves two Actors and manages one Resource.

4 Towards the Definition of Structural Metrics

As we have remarked in Section 2, current approaches using structural metrics do not provide precise guidelines on how to define them. In order to address this issue, we propose to use the two metamodels proposed (graph-based and sequence-based) as a basis for the definition and reuse of structural metrics. In Fig. 4 we present our
A metamodeling approach for the definition and reuse of structural metrics, which involves the following four activities. First, the metamodel of the modeling language is established and, second, based on the metamodel and the general knowledge on existing structural metrics, the structural elements of the modeling language are identified. Regarding the definition of the metrics, they can be defined from scratch by using the metamodel and the structural elements for constructing guidelines that assist its definition. On the other hand, reuse is possible when analogies between both fields can be found [4], [21], [22], [28], and, so, we propose to use the metamodels and the structural elements already identified to define new metrics based on reuse. As shown in Fig. 4, all the generated elements are stored and reused over time.

![Fig. 4. Process for Defining Structural Metrics](image)

Although it is not mentioned in this paper, we assume that metrics are defined following a metrics definition process such as the GQM approach [2]. The use of a metric definition process ensures that the measurement needs are established, that assumptions are stated before defining the metric, and that metrics are correctly validated and documented.

In order to exemplify our approach in the next sections we define two structural metrics over the i* framework [29]. There are two kinds of i* models, each one corresponding to a different abstraction level: the Strategic Dependency (SD) model represents the strategic level by means of the dependencies between the actors, whilst the Strategic Rationale (SR) model represents the rational level by means of showing the intentionality inside each of the represented actors. A SD model consists of a set of nodes that represent actors and a set of dependencies that represent the relationships among them, expressing that an actor (dependor) depends on some other (dependee) in order to obtain some objective (dependum). The dependum can belong to one of the following four types: goal, task, resource, and softgoal.

There are different modelling techniques for creating i* models, among which we use the PRiM method [18]. In PRiM, i* models are constructed in two steps in order to differentiate the operational process (Operational i* Model) from the strategic intentionality behind it (Intentional i* Model). In order to define the Operational i* Model, PRiM uses Detailed Interaction Script (DIS), a sequence-based notation over which it is possible to apply automatic transformation rules in order to obtain the i* constructs. We remark, then, that i* models created with PRiM may be compliant to both a graph-based metamodel and a sequence-based metamodel. PRiM also considers the evaluation of i* models by means of two kinds of metrics: actor-based and dependency-based. As in our examples we use dependency-based metrics, here
we present their general form. For more details about i* modelling with PRiM and actor-based metrics we refer to [18].

**Dependency-based metrics.** Given a property P and an i* SD model $M = (A, D)$, where $A$ is the set of actors and $D$ the dependencies among them, a dependency-based metric for $P$ over $M$ is of the form:

$$P(M) = \frac{\sum_{d \in D} \text{filter}_M(x) \times \text{correctionFactor}_M(a, b)}{\text{limit}_M(M)}$$

being $\text{filter}_M: D \rightarrow [0, 1]$ a function that assigns a weight to the every dependum (e.g., if the dependum is goal, resource, task, softgoal if it is from a specific type), and $\text{correctionFactor}_M: A \rightarrow [0, 1]$ a function that correct the weight accordingly to the type of actor that the depender and the dependee are, respectively. This correction factor is often decomposed into: $\text{correctionFactor}_{\text{st,de}}(a) \times \text{correctionFactor}_{\text{st,de}}(b)$, when the depender and the dependee have a mutually independent influence on the metrics.

### 4.1 Establish the Modelling Language Metamodel

The first step we propose is to define the metamodel of the modelling language over which the metrics will be defined. We remark that this is done only once for each modelling language. In our example, we want to define metrics over i* models and so, we establish the metamodel representing the i* SD constructs. We focus on the part we need for our example. We take into account the actor and the dependum, as presented in Fig. 5, where the Actor is a refactoring of the class Node (subtype of Element) and the Dependum is a refactoring of the class Edge (subtype of i* Element). Regarding the Name and Type attributes, an Actor can be software (SW), human (H), hardware (HW), or organization (Org); whilst a Dependum can be a goal (G), a task (T), a resource (R) or a softgoal (SG). In order to be compliant to the fact that in i* there is no dependum linking an actor with itself, we have to add an integrity constraint. In order to validate the correctness of the defined metamodel, we have checked it against other i* metamodels such as the one we propose in [9].

![Fig. 5. Excerpt of the Generic Graph Metamodel and its refactoring for i* SD models](image)

### 4.2 Identify the Structural Elements

The same analogy that allows establishing a common metamodel among the different modelling languages also provides an analogy on the structural elements used when defining the metrics. In order to facilitate the definition and reuse of the metrics, we
propose to identify common patterns on the use of the structural elements referring on how they can be counted, classified, and weighted when defining the metrics. In [9] we define and document several categories of structural patterns detected in structural metrics over i* models, we remark:

- **Discrimination Patterns.** We differentiate among *discriminators by type* (Node or Edge according to its particular Type) and *discriminators by name*, which provide a specific value to each element according to a particular characteristic. A typical example of discriminator by type in i* metrics focus on the type of the dependum (Goal, Task, Resource, Softgoal). Concerning discriminators by name, metrics over i* models often discriminate by *actor name* or by *dependency name*. It is also possible to discriminate a class by other elements such as other attributes (that have to be added to the metamodel), or the existence of relationships with a certain element (e.g., count the number of nodes with a certain value for a given property).

- **Aggregation Patterns.** Given a metric defined over a compound element, they combine the values of the same or another metric applied to its components. Examples are: to count the number of components that satisfy some condition (*count pattern*) or add the values of the component metrics (*sum pattern*). For instance, we have observed that many metrics count the number of elements of a class (number of children [5] in Class Diagrams, or number of states [11] in Statechart Diagrams). On the other hand, the metric *Arguments per procedure* [13] sum the number of arguments for each procedure and then divide by the number of procedures. Additionally, we can also add a discriminator when counting or adding the elements.

In [9] we present other categories of patterns that combine with structural ones, e.g. numerical patterns to normalize metrics' values, implicitly applied in the definition of the metric *Arguments per Procedure* as introduced above.

### 4.3 Defining Structural Metrics from Scratch

The definition of structural metrics from scratch can be difficult because it is usually done following intuitive procedures and there are no guidelines on how to systematize the process. In order to address this issue, we propose to use the structural elements identified in the previous section to create a set of guidelines for defining structural metrics. These guidelines take the form of a set of questions to be answered in order to customize the metric.

**Constructing a questionnaire for i* dependency-based metrics.** In order to construct the guidelines, we analyse the general form of the metric, where we observe that it has three differentiated parts: the filter $M(x)$, the correction factor $M,der(a)$ and the correction factor $M,dee(b)$. Analysing the structural elements related to the dependencies (see the metamodel in Fig. 5, right), we observe that the structural elements that give a value to the dependency according to its name or its kind (i.e., the Dependum node in the metamodel) correspond to the filter and the ones related with the actors that participate in the dependency correspond to the two correction factors (the relationships with the two actor nodes in the metamodel). It is possible to evaluate the correction factors by giving each one a value if they are independent (i.e., defining the
correctionFactor_{M,der}(a) and the correctionFactor_{M,dee}(b)), or by giving a value to a specific combination of the two (i.e., defining the correctionFactor_{M,a,b}).

Taking this classification as a starting point, we define the questionnaire presented in Table 2, which states a set of questions that help to identify the elements of each category. We remark that this first classification can be completed with a deeper analysis of the metamodel, but this first level has been sufficient for defining the metrics used in this paper. For defining the table we take into account:

- **filter\_M(x)**. As dependencies are represented as a Dependum class and its relationships in the metamodel, we apply a discriminator over it. Discriminator is expressed in terms of the attributes of the Dependum class: Type and Name. Therefore, in Table 2, for obtaining the value of filter\_M(x) we ask a question to discriminate if the type of the dependum or the name of a specific dependency actor affects the quality attribute. If none of them affects it, the filter has the neutral value 1.

- **correctionFactor\_M(a,b)**. The Dependum class has two relationships that state the depender and the dependee of the dependency. If the correction factor concerns a combination of both actors we apply a discriminator by type or by name of each of the actors.

- **correctionFactor\_M,der(a)** and **correctionFactor\_M,dee(b)**. If not the combination but the depender and/or the dependee type or name individually affects the quality attribute, we apply a discriminator by type or a discriminator by name in order to obtain the correction factor. As actors may be related with other Dependum classes, further discriminator of the related dependencies or actors can be applied. As these operations add complexity, they are not included in the example.

- **limit\_p(M)**. It is used to calculate the average and to normalize the result. Depending on the scale of the metric, the limit can be ignored (value 1).

Table 2. Guidelines for quantifying the dependency-based metric

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Example Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1. Dependency-based: filter_M(x)</td>
<td>Does the type of the dependum or the dependum itself affect the quality attribute?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Filter_M(x) = 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Yes, the type of the dependum affects the quality attribute (discriminator by type) | Filter\_M(x) = \begin{align*} w, & \text{ if } x.\text{Type} = \text{Goal} \\
x, & \text{ if } x.\text{Type} = \text{Resource} \\
y, & \text{ if } x.\text{Type} = \text{Task} \\
z, & \text{ if } x.\text{Type} = \text{Softgoal} \end{align*} | | |
| Yes, the name of the dependum affects the quality attribute (discriminator by name) | Filter\_M(x) = \begin{align*} m, & \text{ if } x.\text{Name} = \text{Dep}_A \\
n, & \text{ if } x.\text{Name} = \text{Dep}_B \\
idem & \text{ for other names} \end{align*} | | |
| Do the duplicated dependums affect the quality attribute? | | | |
| Yes, the number of dependencies affects the quality attribute (positively) | Filter\_M(x) = \#Dep(x) | | |
| Yes, the number of dependencies affects the quality attribute (negatively) | Filter\_M(x) = \begin{align*} \frac{1}{\#\text{Dep}(x)} \end{align*} | | |
### 2.2. Dependency-based: Correction Factor $(a,b)$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Does a certain combination of depender and dependee affect the quality attribute?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Yes, a certain depender and dependee type affects the quality attribute | CorrectionFactor$_{(a,b)} = x$, if $a$.Type = SW and $b$.Type = H  
|                                 | $y$, if $a$.Type = SW and $b$.Type = SW  
|                                 | $\text{idem for other combinations}$  
| Yes, a certain depender name and dependee name affects the quality attribute | CorrectionFactor$_{(a,b)} = x$, if $a$.Name = Act_A and $b$.Name = Act_B  
|                                 | $y$, if $a$.Name = Act_C and $b$.Name = Act_D  

### 2.3. Dependency-based: Correction Factor$_{der}(a)$ - Correction Factor$_{der}(b)$ is analogous

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Does the related depender affect the quality attribute?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, the depender type affects the QA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, the depender name affects the QA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2.5. Dependency-based: Limit $(M)$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Which is the scale of the metric?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Absolute between [0, infinite]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absolute, average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ratio [0,1]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Defining a Data Accuracy structural metric over $i^*$ models.** In order to exemplify the application of the guidelines, we define an $i^*$ structural metric for Data Accuracy. Data Accuracy is a quality attribute that measures the degree to which information sources are free from mistakes and errors. From this definition, we observe that data is related with information and so, it is concerned with the resources dependencies of the $i^*$ model. Because of that, we decide that a dependency-based metric is needed.

Before defining the metric, we need to establish certain factors in order to narrow its definition such as its scale and the assumptions over which the measure is done (see Table 3). Based on the assumptions we state that the higher the value of the metric is, the more accurate data is kept in the process. Then, we formalize the metric by applying one guideline of Table 2 for each of the factors of the dependency-based metric as follows (see resulting formalization in Table 3):

- **filter$_{(a)}$.** Data accuracy depends on the kind of the data, and so, we assume that only resource and task dependencies are important from the information point of view. Data accuracy also depends on the dependum name, because each particular data provides a different degree of accuracy on the process. Therefore, we weight the dependums according to their accuracy needs. As we are not working with a specific $i^*$ model it is not possible to establish a particular weighting, therefore we propose to classify the dependums according to four categories: critical, high, medium, and low. Each category generates a function over dependencies, e.g. high_accuracy$(x)$ yields true if $x$’s accuracy is high. In order to weight the filters and correction factors of the metrics, expert advice is strongly recommended.

- **correctionFactor$_{der}(a)$.** The assumptions state that some actors provide less accuracy than others do. However, when the actor is a depender, it is only receiving the data and thus, it cannot introduce mistakes and errors on it unless it becomes dependee of the same data. Therefore, the depender does not affect data accuracy and we state its neutral value to 1.
Table 3. Documentation of the Data Accuracy \(i^*\) metric

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Metric name:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Definition:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Scale:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Addresses:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Source:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Metamodel:</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Assumptions:**
- Data accuracy of an \(i^*\) model with no dependencies between its actors is 1.
- Data accuracy depends on the kind of data being manipulated, as for the correct achievement of the process, some data has to be highly accurate whilst other is not necessary.
- Data accuracy depends on the actors that manipulate the data, being human and organizational actors less accurate than software actors.

**Formalization:**

**Dependency-based metric:**

\[
DA(M) = \frac{\sum_{a,b,x} d(a,b,x) \in D; \text{filter}_a(x) \times \text{corrFactor}_{M,\text{der}}(a) \times \text{corrFactor}_{M,\text{dee}}(b)}{\text{limit}_p(M)}
\]

Where,

\[
\text{filter}_a(x) = \begin{cases} 
0.2, & \text{if critical\_accuracy}(x) \\
0.5, & \text{if high\_accuracy}(x) \\
0.8, & \text{if medium\_accuracy}(x) \\
1, & \text{if low\_accuracy}(x) \\
1, & \text{otherwise}
\end{cases}
\]

\[
\text{corrFactor}_{M,\text{der}}(a) = \begin{cases} 
1, & \text{if } a.\text{Type} = \text{Human} \\
0.7, & \text{if } b.\text{Type} = \text{Org} \\
0.9, & \text{if } b.\text{Type} = \text{Sw} \\
1, & \text{otherwise}
\end{cases}
\]

\[
\text{corrFactor}_{M,\text{dee}}(b) = \begin{cases} 
1, & \text{if } b.\text{Type} = \text{Human} \\
0.7, & \text{if } b.\text{Type} = \text{Org} \\
0.9, & \text{if } b.\text{Type} = \text{Sw} \\
1, & \text{otherwise}
\end{cases}
\]

\[
\text{limit}_p(M) = \| D \|
\]

**Interpretation:**
The higher Data Accuracy value is, the more accuracy, reliability and fault tolerance is provided in the process.

- **corrFactor\(_{M,\text{der}}(b)\).** On the other hand, the related dependee affects data accuracy because depending on its kind we can consider some actors to be more accurate than others. For instance, if we assume that software systems are correctly built and maintained, they are less prone to introduce mistakes and errors than humans are. Therefore, we weight the dependees according to their level of accuracy.
- **limit\(_p(M)\).** Finally, as the scale of the metric is ratio, we apply a normalization value, which can be the total amount of dependencies on the model.

### 4.4 Reusing Structural Metrics

There are structural metrics defined over different modelling languages that, due to the analogy on their metamodels, can be reused from one modelling language to another. Based on this analogy, we may think that general rules for transforming the structural metrics from one model to another can be defined. However, as [22] recognizes, to define a generic approach is not that easy because models can vary from each other and so, we need to examine the possibility of mapping the metrics definitions across different models. Because of that, we propose a manual mapping across the metamodels, which is preceded by the selection of the most appropriate
metric. In order to illustrate how reuse is done, we propose to evaluate functional size over $i^*$ models.

**Selecting a Functional Size metric.** Functional size measures the size of a future software system from the specification of its functional requirements. As $i^*$ models represent both functional and non-functional requirements, they are adequate for measuring the functional size. As the functional size measures the different number of inputs and outputs of the system, we make the assumptions: 1) the functional size of an $i^*$ without software system, is 0; and 2) the more functional dependencies streaming or going through the software system actors are, the higher is the functional size.

Based on these assumptions, among the different functional size metrics, we have selected COSMIC-FFP [1]. In COSMIC-FFP, the functional size is estimated based on the Functional User Requirements specification of software systems, which distinguishes three types of actors: Functional User (FU), Functional Process (FP), and Persistent Storage (PS). Depending on the actors involved, it distinguishes four types of data movement: an Entry moves a data group into the FP from a FU; an Exit moves a data group out of the FP to a FU; a Write moves a data group from the FP to a PS; and, a Read moves a data group from a PS to a FP. The COSMIC-FFP functional size is calculated by assigning to each data movement, a single unit of measure which is, by convention, equal to 1 CFU (Cosmic Functional Unit). The total size of the software being measured corresponds, therefore to the addition of all data movements as follows:

$$\text{Size} \ (\text{functional process}) = \sum \text{size(Entries)} + \sum \text{size(Exits)} + \sum \text{size(Reads)} + \sum \text{size(Writes)}$$

**Mapping of the metamodelling concepts.** Once a suitable metric is found, we have to check if the mapping between the two metamodels is possible and if there is some equivalence between the identified structural elements. Regarding the measurement of COSMIC over $i^*$, the COSMIC Functional User Specification metamodel is sequence-based and the operational $i^*$ model defined with PRiM (DIS diagrams, see Section 4) is also sequence-based. On the other hand, the structural elements identified in the COSMIC metric, follow the discrimination patterns and the aggregation patterns, which are also used in $i^*$ structural metrics. This check ensures a correct mapping of concepts, which is done following the process in Fig. 6.

![Fig. 6. Structural Metrics reuse process based on metamodels](image-url)
upon a Functional Process which has a Triggering Event and several Subprocesses associated to it. Each Subprocess has a Data Group that can be of the type: entry (E), exit (X), read (R) or write (W). In the DIS, each Functional Process is represented by an Activity; the Triggering Event is part of the Conditions associated to the Activity; and, each Subprocess is represented by the concept of an Action. There is a correspondence between the concepts of Data Group and Resource, although the distinction between the Data Group types is implicit in the DIS information because it depends on the Actors that participate in the action. As we have already mentioned, [18] proposes a set of automatic rules to transform DIS into i* Models, where Conditions are transformed into Goal Dependencies; Activities and Actions are represented into SR elements; and, Resource Dependencies are established between the different Actors. In order to help the evaluation of the i* Model with the COSMIC method, we have added an instance of the Property metaclass (see the graph-based metamodel in Fig. 2), “Type of Cosmic Actor”, to the Actor in order to allow its classification into FU, FP, and PS.

![Fig. 7. Reusing the COSMIC metric: Mapping across the different metamodels](image)

**Defining the COSMIC metric for i*.** Once the mappings are established, the metric can be defined by establishing the analogous concepts. The metric is documented in Table 4, and these are the criteria stated for its formalization:

- **filteru(x).** Data Groups are analogous to resources and, so, it indicates that only resource dependencies are taken into account with a value of 1 (equal to 1 CFU).
- **correctionFactoru(a, b).** Since COSMIC only takes into account data movements between certain pairs of actors, we do not split the correction factor into two (one for dependee and the other for depender). To define the correction factor, we use the “Type of Cosmic Actor” property (shortened as “CosmicType” in Table 4); we assign a value of 1 (equal to 1 CFU) when the dependency accomplishes the data movement restrictions between the predefined actor pairs, and 0 otherwise.
- **limitu(M).** Finally, as the scale of the metric is absolute, as the COSMIC formula does not require any normalization, limitu(M) gets its neutral value, 1.

Finally, the metric has been validated by replicating the case studies provided by the COSMIC method [1], and obtaining the same results (see [15], [17] for details).
Table 4. Documentation of a COSMIC metric over $i^*$ models

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric name</th>
<th>$i^*$-based COSMIC Functional Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Definition</strong></td>
<td>Metric that measures the Functional Size of a software product based on its $i^*$ model. The unit of measure for the COSMIC functional size is CFS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Scale</strong></td>
<td>Absolute. The only valid values are zero and positive integers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Addresses</strong></td>
<td>The functional size is an indicator for complexity, development effort, and maintainability of the specified software system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Source</strong></td>
<td>Adapted from the COSMIC method [1].</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Metamodel</strong></td>
<td>$i^*$ metamodel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assumptions</strong></td>
<td>- The functional size of an $i^*$ without software system, is 0. - The more functional dependencies streaming or going through the software system actors, the higher is the functional size.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Formalization</strong></td>
<td>$\text{Functional Size}(M) = \frac{\sum d: d(a, b, x) \in D: \text{filter}_d(x) \times \text{correctionFactor}_d(a,b)}{\text{limit}_d(D)}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Where,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\text{filter}_d(x) = \begin{cases} 1, &amp; \text{if } x.\text{Type} = \text{Resource} \ 0, &amp; \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\text{correctionFactor}_d(a,b) = \begin{cases} 1, &amp; \text{if } \text{CosmicType}(a) = \text{FP} \land \text{CosmicType}(b) = \text{FU} \ 1, &amp; \text{if } \text{CosmicType}(a) = \text{FU} \land \text{CosmicType}(b) = \text{FP} \ 1, &amp; \text{if } \text{CosmicType}(a) = \text{PS} \land \text{CosmicType}(b) = \text{FP} \ 0, &amp; \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\text{limit}_d(D) = 1$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interpretation</strong></td>
<td>The higher the Functional Size is, the larger the final software system will be.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 6 Validation Issues

The presented metamodeling approach for the definition and reuse of structural metrics is used as part of the step for the evaluation of several alternative $i^*$ models in the PR/M method [18]. In order to validate PR/M, in [14] we applied the method over three formative case studies and one industrial case study. As structural metrics are difficult to apply without tool support, the case studies were done using the tool support provided by J-PR/M [16], which supports the different phases of the PR/M method.

The formative validation was done using three common exemplars on the software engineering field, namely: the Meeting Scheduler, the Collaborative Exercise, and the Conference Management System. In order to validate the metrics, we defined a comparative hypothesis stating that the evaluation of the alternative $i^*$ models belonging to the different case studies had to be consistent with the properties of the generated alternatives. The properties defined were: Data Accuracy, Data Privacy, Ease of Communication, and Process Agility; and they were defined once for the Meeting Scheduler case study and reused across the other two exemplars. Regarding the stated hypothesis, the evaluation results were constant in the three exemplars, in the way that the obtained values where consistent with the assumptions taken during the definition of the metrics, even if the exemplars where different. Regarding the
time invested, the definition of the four metrics took a total amount of 58 minutes for the Meeting Scheduler case study (using J-PRiM); whilst the reuse of the metrics on the other two case studies took less: 35 minutes for the Collaborative exercise case study and 33 minutes for the Conference Management case study. The time of computing the metrics was not taken into account as it was done automatically by the tool, J-PRiM. The size of the i* models where the metrics were defined and applied was less than a 100 structural elements per model.

In the other hand, the proposed approach was also applied over an industrial reengineering case study, doing a replicated product design [2], which consists on comparing the results of using a new method against a company baseline. Therefore, the case study was applied on-line by a control team and we replicated the case study off-line in order to compare the results. As it was not possible to know what the other team was doing, the final results could not be compared because they applied a qualitative approach, whilst structural metrics are quantitative. However, we selected the same alternative even using different evaluation criteria. Regarding the time invested, the definition of the structural metrics took a total amount of 4 hours 52 minutes for defining seven structural metrics. Among them, three where reused from the case studies (Data Accuracy, Ease of Communication, and Process Agility) and four where defined from scratch (Average Actor Workload, Data Consistency, Data Truthfulness, and Uniformity of the User Interface). Again the time of computing the metrics is not taken into account as it is done automatically by the tool, J-PRiM. The size of the i* models for the industrial case studies was around 1000 elements per model. We refer to [14] for more details on the definition and execution of the case studies and for the catalogue of the structural metrics defined.

7 Conclusions and Future Work

There is an increasing use of structural metrics, and also, an increasing need of the reuse of existing metrics. However, most of the proposed structural metrics are defined in an intuitive way, without applying any metric definition process. In order to facilitate metrics definition and reuse, we have defined a set of systematic guidelines for: 1) defining metrics from scratch based on the structural elements of the modelling language and based on the knowledge of the existing ones; and, 2) facilitating metrics reuse based on applying a mapping process across the metamodels of the modelling languages over which the metrics are applied. The guidelines have been applied to define two metrics over i* models for evaluating Data Accuracy and the COSMIC Functional Size.

Regarding validation, the guidelines for the reuse of metrics are based upon the observation of existing structural metrics and, so, the detected structural factors are based on the existing structural metrics which provides a structural validity. However, metrics defined from scratch have to be validated in order to ensure reliability in the results, which can be done by applying techniques such as the ones used in [2], [24]. In our work, structural metrics are validated by applying them in different case studies and, then, checking that the results verify the stated assumptions and provides the expected results (see [14] for more details). On the other hand, we remark that the i*
metrics that are defined from reuse, benefit from the validation of the source reused metric. For instance, it is also possible to replicate the experiments or case studies on which the reused metric is applied, such as we have done in [15], [17].

Based on the results obtained, we provide different solutions for the use of structural metrics. First, we propose a set of guidelines that address the construction of a questionnaire for defining the metrics from scratch, including the statement of a certain criteria for applying expert judgement when needed. Second, in order to overcome the difficulty on validating the metrics, we propose guidelines for reusing existing structural metrics and, thus, benefit from previous validation. Therefore, we observe that reuse of structural metrics is very likely because they are all based on the structural elements of a modelling language that it is usually represented in a graph-based or sequence-based structure. This last point particularly addresses the issues raised in [22] as our approach allows: 1) defining, comparing and reusing metrics over different descriptions of the same software system; 2) defining how to measure metrics from partial descriptions of models, 3) changing the metrics between different representations of the software; and 4) the practical challenge of gathering, comparing and interpreting new and existing metrics.

As a future work, we aim at exploring the use and reuse of structural metrics over i* models by defining a complete catalogue of structural metrics and of structural patterns [9]. We will also define a collection of generic metrics and patterns over the metamodels, and explore the possibility of doing it over the MOF. Tool support will also be developed in order to improve the applicability of the approach.
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