

# CausalRCA: Causal Inference based Precise Fine-grained Root Cause Localization for Microservice Applications

Ruyue Xin

Multiscale Networked Systems (MNS)  
research group, University of Amsterdam  
Amsterdam, Netherland  
r.xin@uva.nl

Peng Chen

School of Computer and Software  
Engineering, Xihua University  
Chengdu, China  
p.chen2@uva.nl

Zhiming Zhao

Multiscale Networked Systems (MNS)  
research group, University of Amsterdam  
Amsterdam, Netherland  
z.zhao@uva.nl

**Abstract**—For microservice applications with detected performance anomalies, localizing root causes based on monitoring data is important to enabling rapid recovery and loss mitigation. Existing research mainly focuses on coarse-grained faulty service localization. However, the fine-grained root cause localization to identify not only faulty service but also the root cause metric in the service is more helpful for operators to fix application anomalies, which is also more challenging. Recently, causal inference (CI) based methods is becoming popular but currently used CI methods have limitations, such as linear causal relations assumption. Therefore, this paper provides a framework named CausalRCA to implement fine-grained, automated, and real-time root cause localization. The CausalRCA works with a gradient-based causal structure learning method to generate weighted causal graphs and a root cause inference method to localize root cause metrics. We conduct coarse-grained and fine-grained root cause localization to validate the localization performance of CausalRCA. Experimental results show that CausalRCA performs best localization accuracy compared with baseline methods, e.g., the average  $AC@3$  of the fine-grained root cause metric localization in the faulty service is 0.719, and the average improvement is 17% compared with baseline methods.

**Index Terms**—microservice applications, root cause localization, fine-grained, causal inference, monitoring metrics

## I. INTRODUCTION

Microservices architecture builds cloud applications by separating each of their functionalities into multiple independently deployable services, making applications more resilient, robust, and adaptable to dynamic cloud environments. The performance of a microservice application is important to guarantee the quality of user experience (QoE) and Service (QoS). With the aid of monitoring tools and anomaly detection, a large number of metrics can be observed, and unexpected performance anomalies can be detected in a microservice application. To enable rapid recovery and loss mitigation, localizing root causes of detected performance anomalies based on monitoring data has become increasingly important for microservice applications.

For performance anomalies, such as degraded response time, root cause localization can be explored at different granularities: coarse-grained and fine-grained. Coarse-grained

means that only the faulty service can be identified. Fine-grained is defined as identifying both the faulty service and the root cause metric of the service [1]. Localizing root causes at a fine granularity can help operators fix performance anomalies accurately and quickly. However, it's difficult to achieve fine-grained root cause localization because of the following challenges: 1) the root cause for a performance anomaly can vary significantly considering multiple services with complex dependency exist in microservice applications; 2) a large number of anomalous metrics will be introduced for a performance anomaly, which makes it hard to find out the root one.

To track the root cause localization problem of microservice applications, some research has been provided in recent years [2]. Metric-based research uses real-time monitoring data and requires no intervention of application source code compared with log and trace-based research [2]. However, most metric-based research is coarse-grained, as shown in table I, and few keep an eye on fine-grained root cause localization. As for localization methods in metric-based research, causal inference (CI) based research has been developing recently. For example, CauseInfer [3] applies the PC algorithm (named after its authors, Peter and Clark) [4], and MicroDiag [5] uses LiNGAM (Linear Non-Gaussian Acyclic Model) [6] to obtain causal graphs of metrics, which can be seen as anomaly propagation paths. However, these CI methods have limitations, such as uncertainty about some causal relations between metrics and linear assumptions for causal relations. Therefore, advanced CI methods can be considered for fine-grained root cause localization to discover anomaly propagation paths and improve localization performance.

In this paper, we provide a fine-grained root cause localization framework named CausalRCA for microservice applications. The framework works based on real-time monitoring data. Once an anomaly is detected, CausalRCA can perform automatic root cause localization, including modeling anomaly propagation paths with a causal graph and ranking metrics to localize the root cause by traversing along the graph. Our contributions can be summarized as below:

- We propose an automated fine-grained root cause localization framework named CausalRCA, which works based on monitoring data, requires no intervention of application source code, and returns root causes in real-time.
- We provide a gradient-based causal structure learning method in CausalRCA, which can capture both linear and non-linear causal relations between monitoring metrics.
- We conduct coarse-grained and fine-grained experiments to evaluate the localization performance of CausalRCA, and the results show that it has the best localization accuracy compared with baseline methods.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In section II, we review existing root cause localization research and CI methods. In section III, we provide a framework for root cause localization and a detailed introduction of each algorithm. In section IV, we design experiments from coarse-grained to fine-grained to evaluate the localization performance of our framework. Finally, discussion and conclusion are provided in section V and section VI.

## II. RELATED WORKS

In recent years, research has been developed for root cause localization in distributed system [7], clouds [8] [9]. Based on data resources, we can categorize these researches into three groups: log-based, trace-based, and metric-based [2]. Log-based research [10] mainly localizes root causes based on text logs parsing, which is hard to work in real-time. Trace-based research [8], [11] gathers information through complete tracing of the execution paths and then identifies root causes along those paths. However, trace information only focuses on service level, and it is time-consuming for developers to understand source code well enough to extract tracing information. In addition, metrics-based research uses monitoring data collected from applications and underlying infrastructures to construct causal graphs and infer root causes. Metric-based research can achieve automated, real-time root cause localization based on multi-dimensional information. Therefore, this section will mainly review metrics-based research and causal inference methods.

### A. Metric-based root cause localization research

Based on monitoring data, some researchers identify root causes of performance anomalies with statistical analysis, e.g., identifying anomalous monitoring metrics in parallel with detected anomalies. Want et al. [12] conduct correlation analysis based on mutual information to determine the root-cause metric for the anomalies they detect. However, given that correlation is not ensuring causation [13], statistical analysis can not pinpoint root causes. In addition, some researchers develop the topology graph-based analysis, which reconstructs the topology graph of a running application. For example, Wu et al. [9] generate a topology graph based on deployment information and extract weighted anomalous subgraph by parsing resource-level monitoring metrics. Brandón et al. [14] make snapshots of abnormal states of the application as

graphs and then identify the root cause of a new anomaly by graph matching. This kind of research uses a reconstructed application topology graph to determine root causes, which can only be used for coarse-grained root cause localization.

Various existing research identifies possible root causes for a detected anomaly by visiting a causal graph constructed based on monitoring data. We provide the causal inference based root cause localization research in table I. CauseInfer [3], [15] and Microscope [16], [17] collect information on service interactions and monitoring service latency and then process them based on PC and BFS(breadth first search) algorithms to determine possible faulty service of detected anomalies. CloudRanger [18], MS-Rank [19], [20], and AutoMAP [21] all exploit PC and random walk algorithms to build causal graphs and infer root causes. MS-Rank and AutoMAP use metrics not only service latency but throughput, power, and resource consumption, whereas AutoMAP develops novel operations to refine the causal graph. MicroCause [22] mainly focuses on the root cause metric localization in a faulty service. It provides a PC-based causal graph building method for time-series data and infers root causes with the random walk method. MicroDiag [5] focuses on fine-grained root cause localization and applies a DirectLiNGAM to build causal graphs and PageRank to infer root causes.

TABLE I: Classification of metric-based root cause localization research

Reference	Causal structure learning	Root cause inference	Input	Root cause	Granularity
CauseInfer [3], [15]	PC	BFS	Service latency	Faulty service	Coarse-grained
Microscope [16], [17]	Parallelized PC	BFS	Service latency	Faulty service	Coarse-grained
CloudRanger [18]	PC	Random walk	Service latency	Faulty service	Coarse-grained
MS-Rank [19], [20]	PC	Random walk	Multi metrics	Faulty service	Coarse-grained
AutoMAP [21]	PC	Random walk	Multi metrics	Faulty service	Coarse-grained
MicroCause [22]	PCTS	Random walk	Resource metrics	Root cause metric	Coarse-grained
MicroDiag [5]	DirectLiNGAM	PageRank	Service and resource metrics	Root cause metric	Fine-grained

In the table I, we can see that most research is coarse-grained, which localizes faulty service, while the exploration of fine-grained root cause localization is still in the preliminary stage. As for causal inference methods, we can see that causal structure learning methods like PC and LiNGAM are applied. At the same time, root cause inference methods, such as BFS and random walk, are popular. From these researches, it's clear that to improve localization accuracy, advanced CI methods to extract more useful information from data can be explored.

### B. Causal inference methods

Causal inference methods, especially causal structure learning, have been researched for several years, and they play a vital part in many areas, such as genetics [23], biology [24]. The causal structure learning problem can be formulated to learn a DAG(directed acyclic graph) from observational

data, and methods can be classified into constrained-based, score-based, function-based, and gradient-based. Constrained-based methods, such as PC and FCI [4], use conditional independence tests to learn the skeleton of the casual graph and then orient the edges based on pre-defined orientation rules. Score-based methods, like GES [25], assign scores to different causal graphs based on a pre-defined score function and then search over the space of DAGs to find the optimal one. Finally, function-based methods, like LiNGAM [6], [26], construct a linear SEM(Structural Equation Model) model based on linear and non-Gaussian assumptions and solve it to get the DAG. These traditional methods contribute a lot to causal structure learning, but they have limitations. PC usually has ambiguous causal relations in causal graphs. GES takes a long time to match graphs, which makes it unavailable to be applied to large-scale data. LiNGAM has strict linear and non-Gaussian assumptions, which makes it impractical.

With the development of deep neural networks, gradient-based methods are developed. Zheng et al. [27] propose an equality constraint to the linear SEM, which enables a suite of continuous optimization techniques such as gradient descent. After that, Yu et al. [28] provide a deep generative model and apply a variant of the structural constraint to learn the DAG. Gradient-based methods can deal with not only linear but also non-linear causal relations in data, and weighted DAG can be generated automatically. However, few studies have applied gradient-based methods to root cause localization of microservice applications.

Based on DAGs generated by causal structure learning methods, researchers apply graph methods, like BFS, random walk, or PageRank, for root cause inference. The BFS is to traverse the graph and determine the abnormal node without descendants or with no abnormal descendants as a root cause. A random walk is to walk through paths and choose neighbors randomly in a graph. It determines the node most visited as the root cause. PageRank improves the random walk by adding the possibility of jumping to a random node, which will be used in this paper.

In conclusion, metric-based research can realize automated and real-time root cause localization compared with log and trace-based research. However, most existing research is about coarse-grained faulty service localization, while fine-grained root cause metric localization can be more helpful for rapid recovery and loss mitigation. CI based methods are becoming popular, but most of them have their limitations. Therefore, this paper will mainly focus on fine-grained root cause localization and explore gradient-based methods to build causal graphs.

### III. ROOT CAUSE LOCALIZATION FRAMEWORK

Based on related works, we can see that causal inference based fine-grained root cause localization can be explored more. Therefore, in this section, we provide a root cause localization framework named CausalRCA, including causal structure learning and root cause inference, and we will introduce detailed algorithms in the framework.

#### A. Framework overview

For the fine-grained root cause localization problem, we propose a framework named CausalRCA, as shown in Figure 1. The CausalRCA can automatically localize root causes in real-time from observable metrics. In Figure 1, at first, we keep collecting monitoring data, including application level, such as service latency, and resource level, such as container CPU/MEM usage. We can use  $m_i^{s_j}$  to represent a monitoring metric in service  $s_j$ , and all monitoring data is time-series data as shown in Figure 1(a). Based on monitoring data, once a performance anomaly occurs, such as the high latency of user requests, we will first start the causal structure learning. The causal structure learning will automatically build a causal graph of metrics, which can be seen as anomaly propagation paths. We develop the causal structure learning with a gradient-based method, which will be introduced next, and it can output a weighted DAG as shown in Figure 1(b). Based on the DAG, we start root cause inference to localize root causes. We apply PageRank to visit the weighted DAG and output a ranked list of all metrics as shown in Figure 1(c). The CausalRCA can be used for both coarse-grained and fine-grained root cause localization. We evaluate its localization performance in experiments in section IV.

#### B. Causal structure learning

In causal structure learning, we aim to build a causal graph of monitoring metrics. The causal graphs can be seen as anomaly propagation paths between metrics. We can use a DAG to represent the causal graph, in which each node represents a metric, and each edge represents a cause-effect relationship. Based on related work, we know that traditional causal structure learning methods have limitations. Therefore, we implement the causal structure learning in CausalRCA with a gradient-based method, DAG-GNN [28]. DAG-GNN provides a deep generative model, which is a variational autoencoder parameterized by a novel graph neural network, and applies a variant of the structural constraint to learn DAGs. Unlike other causal structure learning methods, the gradient-based method can extract linear and non-linear causal relations between metrics and automatically output a weighted DAG.

To get a DAG from data  $X \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ , Zheng et al. [27] adopt a linear SEM as a data generation model, which is  $X = A^T X + Z$  ( $A$  is the weighted adjacency matrix,  $A \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times m}$ .  $Z$  is the noise matrix,  $Z \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ ). To ensure the acyclicity of the DAG, a constraint of  $A$  is proposed as:

$$h(A) = \text{tr}[(I + \alpha A \circ A)^m] - m = 0 \quad (1)$$

Based on the linear SEM, we can get  $X = (I - A^T)^{-1}Z$ , which can be written as  $X = f_A(Z)$ . This equation is a general form recognized as an abstraction of parameterized graph neural networks [29]. We can also see that  $X$  is generated from a latent representation  $Z$  by defining a probabilistic graphical model. We assume  $Z$  has a standard Gaussian distribution. Thus, the generative model can be developed based on VAE(Variational AutoEncoder) [30] as shown in




Fig. 1: CausalRCA: details of the root cause localization framework




Fig. 2: Architecture of the causal structure learning method

Figure 2. Based on latent representation  $Z$ , we can define the decoder to reconstruct  $X$  as:

$$X = f_2((I - A^T)^{-1} f_1(Z)) \quad (2)$$

Then, the corresponding encoder can be defined as:

$$Z = f_4((I - A^T) f_3(X)) \quad (3)$$

Combining with deep neural networks, we use MLP(Multilayer Perceptron) to simulate  $f_1$ ,  $f_2$ ,  $f_3$ , and  $f_4$ , which all are parameterized functions. Based on VAE, the output of encoder and decoder are data distributions, so we get  $Z$  by sampling from  $\mu_Z$  and  $\sigma_Z$ , and  $\hat{X}$  by sampling from  $\mu_X$  and  $\sigma_X$ .

For a VAE model, with a variational posterior  $q(Z|X)$  to approximate the actual posterior  $p(Z|X)$ , ELBO(Evidence Lower Bound) can be represented as:

$$\begin{aligned} L_{ELBO} &= E_{Z \sim q} [\log p(X|Z)] - KL(q(Z|X), p(Z)) \\ &= E_{Z \sim q} \left( -\frac{1}{2c} \|X - \hat{X}\| \right) - KL(q(Z|X), p(Z)) \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

Thus, the learning problem can be defined as:

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{A, \theta} f(A, \theta) &= -L_{ELBO} \\ \text{s.t. } h(A) &= 0 \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

where  $\theta$  is all the parameters of the VAE. For a non-linear equality-constrained problem, we can use augmented Lagrangian approach [31] to solve it.

$$L_c(A, \theta, \lambda) = f(A, \theta) + \lambda h(A) + \frac{c}{2} |h(A)|^2 \quad (6)$$

where  $\lambda$  is the Lagrange multiplier and  $c > 0$  is the penalty parameter. We have the following update rules:

$$\begin{aligned} A^k, \lambda^k &= \arg \min_{A, \theta} L_{c^k}(A, \theta, \lambda^k) \\ \lambda^{k+1} &= \lambda^k + c^k h(A^k) \\ c^{k+1} &= \begin{cases} \eta c^k, & \text{if } |h(A^k)| > \gamma |h(A^{k-1})| \\ c^k, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

Here,  $\eta > 1$  and  $\gamma < 1$  are tuning parameters. We set  $\eta = 10$  and  $\gamma = 0.25$  in our experiments.

We define  $X = [m_1^{s_1}, m_2^{s_1}, \dots, m_i^{s_j}, \dots]$ , which are monitoring metrics, and we assume monitoring data has Gaussian distribution. With this causal structure learning method, we can get a weighted DAG ( $G$ ) as shown in Figure 1(b). Each node in  $G$  represent a metric, for example,  $m_1^{s_1}$  means a metric in service  $s_1$ . Edge from  $m_1^{s_1}$  to  $m_2^{s_1}$  means that the change of  $m_1^{s_1}$  will cause the change of  $m_2^{s_1}$  with weights  $w$ . Weight  $w$  can be both negative or positive. Based on the weighted DAG, we then use a root cause inference method to pinpoint the root cause.

### C. Root cause inference

For the weighted DAG ( $G$ ), we can rank metrics with the PageRank algorithm. PageRank works according to the number of incoming edges and the probability of anomalies spreading through the graph. We define  $P_{ij}$  as the transition probability of node  $i$  to  $j$ :

$$P_{ij} = \begin{cases} \frac{w_{ij}}{\sum_j w_{ij}}, & \text{if } w_{ij} \neq 0 \\ 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (8)$$

Here,  $w_{ij}$  is the weight between node  $i$  and  $j$ . We define  $P$  as the transition probability matrix. Then, we can get the PageRank vector  $v$  as proposed by [32] as:

$$v = \alpha P v + \frac{1 - \alpha}{n} \quad (9)$$

Here,  $n$  is nodes number,  $a \in (0, 1)$  is the teleportation probability, and it means that the random walk will continue with probability  $\alpha$  and jump to a random node with probability  $1 - \alpha$ . We use  $\alpha = 0.85$  in this paper. Before using the root cause inference method, we first reverse edges in  $G$  and use the absolute value of all weights. After running the root cause inference method, we rank the PageRank scores of all nodes and get the ranked list as shown in Figure 1(c).

#### IV. EXPERIMENTS AND RESULTS

To validate the root cause localization framework CausalRCA, we conduct three different experiments, from coarse-grained to fine-grained. As for coarse-grained root cause localization, we design experiments to identify faulty services. As for fine-grained root cause localization, we first localize root cause metrics in the faulty service. In addition, taking into account the lack of understanding of services and underlying infrastructures of an application, we provide another fine-grained experiment to localize the root cause metric with all observational metrics in all services. In this section, we will mainly introduce experimental settings and experimental results.

##### A. Experimental settings

1) *Testbed*: We deploy the Sock-shop<sup>1</sup>, a microservice application, with Kubernetes on several VMs in the cloud, as shown in Figure 3. In the kubernetes cluster, we have one master node and three worker nodes. Their configurations are Ubuntu 18.04, 4vCPU, 16G RAM Memory, and 80G Disk. On the master node, we deploy monitoring tools, including Prometheus<sup>2</sup>, Grafana<sup>3</sup>, to keep monitoring the whole system and collecting both application-level and resource-level data. In addition, a load generation tool, Locust<sup>4</sup>, is deployed on the master node to simulate workloads for the microservice application. On worker nodes, we deploy 13 services of the Sock-shop application, and they are allocated to different VMs automatically by Kubernetes.

2) *Anomaly injection*: We inject three types of anomalies into the microservice application: CPU hog, memory leak, and network delay, which are commonly used [15] [33]. The CPU hog is the shortage of CPU resources. We inject CPU hog by consuming CPU resource of each service. For memory leak, we allocate memory continuously for each service. For network delay, we enable traffic control to delay the network packets. We implement anomaly injection with the tool pumba<sup>5</sup>, which can emulate network failures and stress-testing resources (CPU, memory) for docker containers. Each anomaly of each service lasts 5 minutes, and the application will cold down before another injection.

<sup>1</sup><https://github.com/microservices-demo/microservices-demo>

<sup>2</sup><https://github.com/prometheus/prometheus>

<sup>3</sup><https://github.com/grafana/grafana>

<sup>4</sup><https://locust.io/>

<sup>5</sup><https://github.com/alexei-led/pumba>




Fig. 3: The microservice application deployed on VMs with Kubernetes

3) *Data collection*: We deploy Prometheus to monitor the microservice application and collect monitoring data in real-time. Prometheus is configured to collect data every 5 seconds. We collect both service-level and resource-level data. At the service level, we collect the latency of each service. At the resource level, we collect container resource-related metrics, including CPU usage, memory usage, disk read and write, and network receive and transmit bytes total.

4) *Baseline methods*: From related work in section II, we can see that causal inference based root cause localization research uses different causal structure learning methods. Our CausalRCA is developed based on a gradient-based causal structure learning method. Therefore, to evaluate the localization performance of our CausalRCA, we design baseline methods by combining different causal structure learning methods with PageRank. We chose the constraint-based method PC, the score-based method GES, and the function-based method LiNGAM.

For these baseline structure learning methods, we use their default parameter settings in causal-learn<sup>6</sup>. In CausalRCA, we use 2-layers MLP in the encoder and decoder, respectively. We set the learning rate as  $1e - 3$ , and training epochs as 1000. In addition, we train the model with the Adam optimizer. We run CausalRCA 10 times and take the average as the result of each experiment.

5) *Evaluation metrics*: To evaluate localization accuracy, we use two performance metrics:  $AC@k$  and  $Avg@k$ , which are the most commonly used metrics to evaluate rank results.  $AC@k$  represents the probability that the top  $k$  results given by an algorithm include the real root cause. When the  $k$  is small, higher  $AC@k$  indicates the algorithm more accurately identifies the root cause. For each service and each anomaly type,  $AC@k$  is calculated as follows:

$$AC@k = \frac{\sum_{i < k} R[i] \in V_{rc}}{\min(k, |V_{rc}|)} \quad (10)$$

<sup>6</sup><https://github.com/cmu-phil/causal-learn>

where  $R[i]$  is the result after ranking all metrics.  $V_{rc}$  is the root cause set.  $Avg@k$  evaluates the overall performance of an algorithm by computing the average  $AC@k$ , which is defined as:

$$Avg@k = \frac{1}{k} \sum_{1 \leq j \leq k} AC@j \quad (11)$$

We mainly use  $AC@1$ ,  $AC@3$ , and  $Avg@5$  in our experiments.

### B. Experimental results

We provide results of three experiments: coarse-grained faulty service localization, fine-grained root cause metric localization in the faulty service, and fine-grained root cause metric localization with all observational metrics in all services. We compare the localization performance of CausalRCA with baseline methods and provide explanations of results.

1) *Coarse-grained faulty service localization*: We evaluate the performance of CausalRCA on localizing the faulty service that initiates performance anomalies. This localization is conducted based on service-level data: the latency of all services. Table II shows the localization accuracy compared with baseline methods for different anomalies. We can see that compared to baseline methods, CausalRCA mostly has the best localization accuracy in different anomalies in terms of  $AC@1$ ,  $AC@3$ , and  $Avg@5$ . For CausalRCA, we can see that the average  $AC@1$  is about 0.2, which means that there is an average 20% possibility that the top 1 metric on the ranked list can be identified as the root cause. In addition, for CPU hog,  $AC@3$  is 0.7175, which means that there is a 71.75% possibility that we can localize the root cause in the top 3 metrics on the ranked list. For memory leak, we have a 62.14% possibility of localizing the root cause in the top 3 metrics. For network delay,  $AC@3$  is not high, but  $Avg@5$  is higher than baseline methods. The average  $Avg@5$  of CausalRCA for the three anomalies is 0.5815, and the average improvement is 8.85% compared with baseline methods.

TABLE II: Localization accuracy of CI based methods on localizing faulty services for different anomalies

Methods	PC-based	GES-based	LiNGAM-based	CausalRCA
<b>CPU hog</b>				
AC@1	0.1429	0.1429	0.1429	<b>0.1873</b>
AC@3	0.2857	0.4286	0.7143	<b>0.7175</b>
Avg@5	0.4286	0.4	0.5714	<b>0.6244</b>
<b>Memory leak</b>				
AC@1	0	0	0.1429	<b>0.2429</b>
AC@3	0.4286	0.1429	0.5714	<b>0.6214</b>
Avg@5	0.4286	0.2286	0.5429	<b>0.6143</b>
<b>Network delay</b>				
AC@1	0.1429	0	0.1429	<b>0.1714</b>
AC@3	<b>0.5714</b>	0	0.4286	0.3857
Avg@5	0.4857	0.1714	0.4286	<b>0.5057</b>

We then provide a detailed performance of CausalRCA on localizing faulty services with different anomalies in Figure 4. For CPU hog in Figure 4(a), we can see that localization accuracy performs well on services except *payment*, which is because *payment* is not a CPU-intensive service. For memory leak in Figure 4(b), we can see that *front-end*, *user*, and




Fig. 4: Performance of CausalRCA on localizing faulty services with different anomalies


*catalogue* perform worse than other services. The memory leak issue in these services doesn't affect their service latency much, making it difficult to identify cause-effect relations between services. As for network delay in Figure 4(c), only service *payment* performs well, which explains the poor average localization performance of  $AC@3$  in table II. *Payment* service relies heavily on the network, making it easy to localize the network delay issue.

2) *Fine-grained root cause metric localization in the faulty service*: Given the faulty service, we apply CausalRCA to container resource metrics and evaluate its performance on localization accuracy for different anomalies. Table III shows the localization accuracy of CausalRCA on localizing root cause metric in faulty service compared with baseline methods. For different anomalies, we can see that CausalRCA has the best localization accuracy in terms of  $AC@1$ ,  $AC@3$ , and  $Avg@5$ . For CausalRCA, we can see that the average of  $AC@1$  is 0.2476, which means there is about a 25% possibility of determining the top 1 metric on the ranked list as the root cause. In addition, for the three anomalies, we can see that the average  $AC@3$  is 0.719, which means that there is a 71.9% possibility to localize the root cause metric in the top 3 metrics on the ranked list, and the average improvement is 17.8% compared with baseline methods. This is because resource metrics, such as CPU/MEM usage, affect each other, which makes it easier to identify anomaly propagation with CI methods.


We then provide the performance of CausalRCA on localizing root cause metrics in faulty services with the three anomalies in Figure 5. We can see that  $Ac@3$  and  $AC@5$  have consistent performance. For CPU hog, we can see that localization accuracy is low for *payment* and *shipping*

TABLE III: Localization accuracy of CI methods on localizing root cause metrics in faulty services for different anomalies

Methods	PC-based	GES-based	LiNGAM-based	CausalRCA
<b>CPU hog</b>				
AC@1	<b>0.4286</b>	0.1429	0	0.2286
AC@3	0.4286	0.5714	0.7143	<b>0.7286</b>
Avg@5	0.4286	0.6	0.5714	<b>0.67</b>
<b>Memory leak</b>				
AC@1	0	0	<b>0.4286</b>	0.2714
AC@3	0.1429	0.4286	0.5714	<b>0.7143</b>
Avg@5	0.3429	0.4	0.6286	<b>0.6771</b>
<b>Network delay</b>				
AC@1	0	0.1429	0.1429	<b>0.2429</b>
AC@3	0.2857	0.5714	0.4286	<b>0.7143</b>
Avg@5	0.2214	0.5143	0.5214	<b>0.6571</b>




(a) AC@3




(b) Avg@5

Fig. 5: Performance of CausalRCA on localizing root cause metrics in faulty services with different anomalies


service because they are insensitive to CPU resources. All services perform well for memory leak because memory leak issues manifest in multiple resource metrics. *Order* service has the best performance because it's highly related to memory usage. For network delay, we can see that *payment* and *shipping* have the best performance because they rely heavily on the network.



(a) CPU hog



(b) Memory leak



(c) Network delay

Fig. 6: Ranks of root cause metrics identified by CI based methods

### 3) Fine-grained root cause metric localization with all observational metrics:

Considering that we are unknown to services and underlying infrastructures of an application, we apply CausalRCA on all observational metrics to localize the root cause metric. We mainly show the ranks of comparison between the LiNGAM-based method and CausalRCA, because PC sometimes fails to extract causal relations between metrics, while GES takes too long to build a causal graph with many nodes. For this fine-grained root cause localization, it's hard to identify the root cause metric in the top 1 or top 3 metrics, so we use the rank of root cause metrics to evaluate localization performance as shown in Figure 6. We can see that the average rank of

CausalRCA is about 13, which is lower than the LiNGAM-based method. The result shows that CausalRCA has better localization performance than the LiNGAM-based method. However, it's still challenging to extract causal relations between metrics and pinpoint the root cause metric from multiple observable metrics.

In conclusion, CausalRCA has better localization accuracy than baseline methods for coarse-grained or fine-grained root cause localization. In addition, based on causal inference methods, we can see that anomaly propagation performs vary in different services; for example, the *payment* service is sensitive to the network delay issue but nonsensitive to the CPU hog issue. As for fine-grained root cause localization, it's still challenging to pinpoint the root cause metric in all observational metrics. Therefore, with prior service and infrastructure information, it's more practical to consider the drill-down localization, i.e., identify the faulty service first and then determine the root cause metric in the faulty service.

## V. DISCUSSION

This paper provides a framework, named CausalRCA, for root cause localization of microservice applications. The framework is developed with causal inference methods, including causal structure learning and root cause inference. We provide experiments from coarse-grained to fine-grained to evaluate the localization performance of the framework. Our experimental results show that the framework has the best localization accuracy compared with baseline methods. However, some aspects can still be improved.

From our experiments, we can see that CausalRCA performs well on localizing faulty services and root cause metrics in faulty services. However, localizing root cause metrics from all observational metrics is very hard. The average rank of root cause metrics is out of ten. We consider the improvement of localization accuracy can be researched more. First, data preprocessing, such as feature reduction, to reduce training time and improve localization accuracy can be considered. Next, we apply a gradient-based method to learn causal structures. The gradient-based method is applied to time-series monitoring data, which may ignore time lag in the original data. We consider time lag in data may be helpful to improve causal structure learning. For the root cause inference algorithm PageRank, a personalized PageRank [34] which considers the preferences of nodes can be applied.

In this research, we mainly focus on monitoring data to implement root cause localization. Monitoring data has multi-dimensional information, and it is easy to collect compared with trace and log data. However, we can think that trace data and log data contain accurate deployment information and service interactions, which can be used to calibrate the causal graph generated based on monitoring data. At the same time, the causal graph generated with CI methods can extract hidden relations between metrics. Therefore, we can consider combining different data resources to improve localization accuracy in the future.

This paper mainly focuses on improving localization accuracy in different granularities of microservices. Localization efficiency is also important for achieving fast recovery. For example, pinpointing root causes in two minutes can reduce a lot of economic losses compared to three minutes for a detected anomaly. For now, we mainly use data collected in five minutes after the anomaly is detected. In the future, we'll consider testing localization performance with different time ranges based on our CausalRCA.

## VI. CONCLUSION

In this paper, we focus on the root cause localization problem for detected anomalies in microservice applications. Root cause localization can be used to help operators achieve fast recovery of microservice applications. Therefore, it's important to guarantee localization accuracy at first. In addition, fine-grained root cause localization which means to identify both the faulty service and resource related metrics in a faulty service is necessary. With monitoring data, we provide a causal inference based framework, named CausalRCA, which can automate localize root causes with fine granularity and in real-time.

The CausalRCA works with causal structure learning and root cause inference components. For causal structure learning, we provide a GNN-based method, which use a deep generative model and apply a variant of the structural constraint to learn the weighted DAG. The GNN-based method can extract non-linear causal relations between metrics comparing with other CI methods. For root cause inference, we apply PageRank to visit the weighted DAG and return a ranked list of all metrics. We then provide experiments to evaluate the localization performance of CausalRCA.

In our experiments, we conduct three experiments: coarse-grained faulty service localization, fine-grained root cause metrics localization in faulty services, and fine-grained root cause metrics localization with all observational metrics. Our experimental results show that CausalRCA has better localization accuracy comparing with baseline methods. Based on CI methods, we can see that anomaly propagation perform vary in different services, which give operators more understanding of microservice applications. In addition, it's difficult for fine-grained root cause localization with all observational metrics, because anomalous metrics manifest diverse symptoms in different services. Therefore, fine-grained root cause localization with all observational metrics still need to be improved in the future. However, with prior service and underlying infrastructure information of a microservice application, we can consider the drill-down localization, first identifying the faulty service, then pinpointing the root cause metric in the faulty service, to pinpoint fine-grained causes.

In the future, we will continue improve localization performance of CausalRCA. The causal structure learning can consider time lag in monitoring data. The root cause inference can be improved by adding preferences of nodes. In addition, employing knowledge from trace and log data to calibrate causal graph may improve localization accuracy and make the



causal graph more reasonable. Finally, localization efficiency to achieve fast recovery need to be tested and improved.

## VII. ACKNOWLEDGE

This research is funded by the EU Horizon 2020 research and innovation program under grant agreements 825134 (ARTICONF project), 862409 (BlueCloud project), 824068 (ENVRIFAIR project). The research is also funded by Science and Technology Program of Sichuan Province under Grant 2020JDRC0067 and 2020YFG0326.

## REFERENCES

- [1] L. Wu, J. Tordsson, E. Elmroth, O. Kao, Causal inference techniques for microservice performance diagnosis: Evaluation and guiding recommendations, in: 2021 IEEE International Conference on Autonomic Computing and Self-Organizing Systems (ACSOS), IEEE, 2021, pp. 21–30.
- [2] J. Soldani, A. Brogi, Anomaly detection and failure root cause analysis in (micro) service-based cloud applications: A survey, *ACM Computing Surveys (CSUR)* 55 (3) (2022) 1–39.
- [3] P. Chen, Y. Qi, D. Hou, Causeinfer: Automated end-to-end performance diagnosis with hierarchical causality graph in cloud environment, *IEEE transactions on services computing* 12 (2) (2016) 214–230.
- [4] P. Spirtes, C. N. Glymour, R. Scheines, D. Heckerman, *Causation, prediction, and search*, MIT press, 2000.
- [5] L. Wu, J. Tordsson, J. Bogatinovski, E. Elmroth, O. Kao, Microdiag: Fine-grained performance diagnosis for microservice systems, in: 2021 IEEE/ACM International Workshop on Cloud Intelligence (CloudIntelligence), IEEE, 2021, pp. 31–36.
- [6] S. Shimizu, T. Inazumi, Y. Sogawa, A. Hyvärinen, Y. Kawahara, T. Washio, P. O. Hoyer, K. Bollen, Directlingam: A direct method for learning a linear non-gaussian structural equation model, *The Journal of Machine Learning Research* 12 (2011) 1225–1248.
- [7] A. Gholami, A. K. Srivastava, Comparative analysis of ml techniques for data-driven anomaly detection, classification and localization in distribution system, in: 2020 52nd North American Power Symposium (NAPS), IEEE, 2021, pp. 1–6.
- [8] J. Weng, J. H. Wang, J. Yang, Y. Yang, Root cause analysis of anomalies of multitier services in public clouds, *IEEE/ACM Transactions on Networking* 26 (4) (2018) 1646–1659.
- [9] L. Wu, J. Tordsson, E. Elmroth, O. Kao, Microrca: Root cause localization of performance issues in microservices, in: NOMS 2020-2020 IEEE/IFIP Network Operations and Management Symposium, IEEE, 2020, pp. 1–9.
- [10] P. Aggarwal, A. Gupta, P. Mohapatra, S. Nagar, A. Mandal, Q. Wang, A. Paradkar, Localization of operational faults in cloud applications by mining causal dependencies in logs using golden signals, in: International Conference on Service-Oriented Computing, Springer, 2020, pp. 137–149.
- [11] M. Kim, R. Sumbaly, S. Shah, Root cause detection in a service-oriented architecture, *ACM SIGMETRICS Performance Evaluation Review* 41 (1) (2013) 93–104.
- [12] L. Wang, N. Zhao, J. Chen, P. Li, W. Zhang, K. Sui, Root-cause metric location for microservice systems via log anomaly detection, in: 2020 IEEE International Conference on Web Services (ICWS), IEEE, 2020, pp. 142–150.
- [13] C. S. Calude, G. Longo, The deluge of spurious correlations in big data, *Foundations of science* 22 (3) (2017) 595–612.
- [14] Á. Brandón, M. Solé, A. Huélamo, D. Solans, M. S. Pérez, V. Muntés-Mulero, Graph-based root cause analysis for service-oriented and microservice architectures, *Journal of Systems and Software* 159 (2020) 110432.
- [15] P. Chen, Y. Qi, P. Zheng, D. Hou, Causeinfer: Automatic and distributed performance diagnosis with hierarchical causality graph in large distributed systems, in: IEEE INFOCOM 2014-IEEE Conference on Computer Communications, IEEE, 2014, pp. 1887–1895.
- [16] J. Lin, P. Chen, Z. Zheng, Microscope: Pinpoint performance issues with causal graphs in micro-service environments, in: International Conference on Service-Oriented Computing, Springer, 2018, pp. 3–20.
- [17] Z. Guan, J. Lin, P. Chen, On anomaly detection and root cause analysis of microservice systems, in: International Conference on Service-Oriented Computing, Springer, 2018, pp. 465–469.
- [18] P. Wang, J. Xu, M. Ma, W. Lin, D. Pan, Y. Wang, P. Chen, Cloudranger: Root cause identification for cloud native systems, in: 2018 18th IEEE/ACM International Symposium on Cluster, Cloud and Grid Computing (CCGRID), IEEE, 2018, pp. 492–502.
- [19] M. Ma, W. Lin, D. Pan, P. Wang, Ms-rank: Multi-metric and self-adaptive root cause diagnosis for microservice applications, in: 2019 IEEE International Conference on Web Services (ICWS), IEEE, 2019, pp. 60–67.
- [20] M. Ma, W. Lin, D. Pan, P. Wang, Self-adaptive root cause diagnosis for large-scale microservice architecture, *IEEE Transactions on Services Computing* (2020).
- [21] M. Ma, J. Xu, Y. Wang, P. Chen, Z. Zhang, P. Wang, Automap: Diagnose your microservice-based web applications automatically, in: Proceedings of The Web Conference 2020, 2020, pp. 246–258.
- [22] Y. Meng, S. Zhang, Y. Sun, R. Zhang, Z. Hu, Y. Zhang, C. Jia, Z. Wang, D. Pei, Localizing failure root causes in a microservice through causality inference, in: 2020 IEEE/ACM 28th International Symposium on Quality of Service (IWQoS), IEEE, 2020, pp. 1–10.
- [23] J. Peters, D. Janzing, B. Schölkopf, *Elements of causal inference: foundations and learning algorithms*, The MIT Press, 2017.
- [24] K. Sachs, O. Perez, D. Pe’er, D. A. Lauffenburger, G. P. Nolan, Causal protein-signaling networks derived from multiparameter single-cell data, *Science* 308 (5721) (2005) 523–529.
- [25] D. M. Chickering, Optimal structure identification with greedy search, *Journal of machine learning research* 3 (Nov) (2002) 507–554.
- [26] S. Shimizu, P. O. Hoyer, A. Hyvärinen, A. Kerminen, M. Jordan, A linear non-gaussian acyclic model for causal discovery., *Journal of Machine Learning Research* 7 (10) (2006).
- [27] X. Zheng, B. Aragam, P. K. Ravikumar, E. P. Xing, Dags with no tears: Continuous optimization for structure learning, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 31 (2018).
- [28] Y. Yu, J. Chen, T. Gao, M. Yu, Dag-gnn: Dag structure learning with graph neural networks, in: International Conference on Machine Learning, PMLR, 2019, pp. 7154–7163.
- [29] T. N. Kipf, M. Welling, Semi-supervised classification with graph convolutional networks, *arXiv preprint arXiv:1609.02907* (2016).
- [30] D. P. Kingma, M. Welling, Auto-encoding variational bayes, *arXiv preprint arXiv:1312.6114* (2013).
- [31] D. P. Bertsekas, *Nonlinear programming*, *Journal of the Operational Research Society* 48 (3) (1997) 334–334.
- [32] L. Page, S. Brin, R. Motwani, T. Winograd, *The pagerank citation ranking: Bringing order to the web.*, Tech. rep., Stanford InfoLab (1999).
- [33] L. Mariani, C. Monni, M. Pezzé, O. Riganelli, R. Xin, Localizing faults in cloud systems, in: 2018 IEEE 11th International Conference on Software Testing, Verification and Validation (ICST), IEEE, 2018, pp. 262–273.
- [34] G. Jeh, J. Widom, Scaling personalized web search, in: Proceedings of the 12th international conference on World Wide Web, 2003, pp. 271–279.