

Quantitative Assurance and Synthesis of Controllers from Activity Diagrams^{*}

Kangfeng Ye^{a,*}, Fang Yan^a, Simos Gerasimou^a

^a*Department of Computer Science, University of York, Deramore Lane, Heslington, YO10 5GH, York, United Kingdom*

Abstract

Probabilistic model checking is a widely used formal verification technique to automatically verify qualitative and quantitative Quality-of-Service (QoS) properties for probabilistic models, such as performance, reliability, and cost. However, capturing such systems in model checkers, writing corresponding properties, and verifying them require domain knowledge in probabilistic models, formal verification, and particular model checkers. This makes probabilistic model checking not accessible for researchers and engineers who may not have the required knowledge. Previous studies have extended UML activity diagrams with probability and time, along with quality annotations, developed transformations from activity diagrams to probabilistic models which model checkers support, and implemented accompanying tools for automation. The research, however, is in-comprehensive, informal, or not fully open, which makes them hard to be evaluated, extended, adapted, and accessed. In this paper, we propose a comprehensive verification framework for activity diagrams, including a new profile for probability, time, and quality annotations, a semantics interpretation of activity diagrams in three Markov models (DTMCs, MDPs, and CTMCs), and a set of transformation rules from activity diagrams to the PRISM language, a language supported by the probabilistic model checkers PRISM and Storm. Most importantly, we developed algorithms for transformation and implemented them in a tool, called QASCAD, using model-based techniques, for fully automated verification. We evaluated one case study where multiple robots are used for delivery in a hospital and their workflows are modelled as activity diagrams. We further evaluated six other examples from the literature. With all these together, this work makes noteworthy contributions to the verification of activity diagrams by improving evaluation, extensibility, adaptability, and accessibility.

Keywords: UML Activity Diagrams, Probabilistic model checking, Formal semantics, Markov models, Model transformation, Quantitative verification

1. Introduction

Probabilistic model checking is a powerful formal verification technique used to automatically establish the correctness of a probabilistic model with respect to a set of qualitative and quantitative properties [1, 2, 3]. The technique is widely used for the evaluation of Quality-of-Service (QoS) properties [4, 5, 6], such as the performance of randomised distributed algorithms [7, 8], dependability of communication protocols and networks [9, 10, 11, 12], security [13, 14], safety and reliability [15, 16, 17, 18], planning [19] and controller synthesis [4, 20]. The underlying probabilistic models for model checking are usually a variety of Markov models such as discrete-time Markov chains (DTMCs) [21], Markov decision processes (MDPs) [22, 23], and continuous-time Markov chains (CTMCs) [24]. These models can be represented as labelled state transition systems (LTS) or diagrams. To illustrate simple (that is, a few states and transitions) examples and case studies in these works [19, 25, 26], the transition diagrams are commonly used to represent such Markov models. To model larger and real systems with many states and transitions, it is not very convenient, even a challenge, to model them using such diagrams. Some notations, such as the PRISM language [27], are developed to capture systems in a modular style, which makes modelling easier and feasible for people with background knowledge of such formalisms. The PRISM language is also supported by several model checkers such as PRISM [27] and Storm [28]. These notations, however, limit its usage by engineers and researchers without knowledge of probabilistic models and formalisms. For this reason, researchers have shown their interest in modelling such systems based on well-engineered graphical notations.

UML or SysML activity diagrams (UADs or SADs) [29] are widely adapted in industry and academia to capture the behaviour of complex systems. They have been extended with probability and time to model systems that exhibit uncertainty and real-time, such as in robotics, cyber-physical systems, and business processes.

Related studies [30, 31, 25, 32, 33] have used UADs or SADs to model case studies in their work for illustration and evaluation of their approaches. In their workflow, activity diagrams (ADs) are loosely connected to the artefacts (formal models) for analysis. For example, probabilistic transition systems or probabilistic models are (manually) derived from ADs [31, 33]. Consequently, these works are not accessible for engineers for the same reason due to the desirable knowledge of formalisms.

^{*}This document presents results from the research project SESAME (www.sesame-project.org/) funded by EU Horizon 2020.

^{*}Corresponding author

Email addresses:

kangfeng.ye@york.ac.uk (Kangfeng Ye), fang.yan@york.ac.uk (Fang Yan), simos.gerasimou@york.ac.uk (Simos Gerasimou)

Other studies [34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44] have established links between ADs and formal models, and accompanying tools may also be developed to automate their processes. However, these studies used incomprehensive, informal, or proprietary tools to define, develop and deliver these benefits. For example, tools were developed for automation but the derivation from ADs to the PRISM models is briefly and informally described [40, 31, 35]. The link is informally described as a mapping algorithm and no tools were developed [34]. The link is formally established, but no tools were developed for automation or tools are not available [37, 42, 45]. These studies only evaluated one to two case studies, and so the correctness and performance cannot be established. Other research focused on non-probabilistic ADs and their analysis [44]. So quantitative properties cannot be evaluated. Most studies have only focused on one Markov model [37, 42, 45]. The properties to be verified for ADs in these studies are mostly written in the property languages supported by model checkers. So users have to read the generated code or model to find out the corresponding elements to their counterparts in ADs. This process is inefficient and error-prone. Furthermore, the ADs considered in these studies are generally non-parametric. So they cannot benefit from parametric model checking to explore the design space or even find the optimal designs using synthesis. Because of these problems, the studies and their tools cannot be (1) evaluated to establish their soundness of links, (2) extended to support a majority of features in ADs or even new features (e.g., rewards and reliability), (3) reused in other settings, and (4) accessible by engineers.

In this paper, we present QASCAD, a tool-supported approach to address these problems by delivering a comprehensive verification framework for ADs. We developed a new UML *profile* to introduce various stereotypes for the annotations of probability, reliability, duration, rate, rewards, and properties for activities, activity nodes and edges to capture the behaviours of complex systems in an “easy” way for engineers. Then we have based on their semantics interpretation in UML and extended them to provide *Markov semantics* in three different models (DTMC, MDP, and CTMC). Because we intend to use probabilistic model checking for verification, we consider the input language PRISM for model checkers. The probabilistic models captured in the PRISM language are then built into Markov models by these model checkers. We establish a *formal link* from ADs to the PRISM language by defining *transformation rules*, based on their Markov semantic interpretation. We take extensibility into account when developing the framework by using a modular approach (that is, the modular PRISM models), different from other work’s single module approach (that is, a single system module in PRISM models).

In addition to the extended features in the profile, our semantics and transformation rules also take input *parameters* of activities into account. So ADs capture *parametric models*, and their counterparts in PRISM are also parametric, which entitle us to use *parametric probabilistic model checking* to explore the design space of captured systems, and *synthesis* to find optimal designs. This is very useful to support design process for engineers to start with open models (many unspecified parameters) and work towards more concrete models (many specified parameters) that satisfy their requirements (or properties).

We have also *automated* the transformation process (the “hard” part for its accessibility for engineers) from ADs to PRISM code using proposed *algorithms* and implemented the process in the tool based on model-based techniques. In addition to a fully automatic implementation, it brings in other benefits such as automatic validation of ADs to enforce the assumptions and well-formedness conditions we make for the semantics, and automatic verification in various model checkers (e.g., PRISM and Storm) at the same time.

For *properties* to be verified, in general, they are written in the specification languages supported by model checkers. We, however, use a *controlled natural language* for specifying *atomic propositions* such as “an activity reaches at a particular child node”, “the activity terminates successfully”, or “the activity terminates on failure”. This entitles engineers to focus on modelling, specifications, and results, unlike other work where users have to read the generated code to find out the corresponding atomic propositions which are usually too detailed (e.g., boolean statements involving variables) and might be subject to changes (e.g., the name of variables) during the transformation.

In summary, our novel contributions are as follows: (1) a comprehensive verification framework for ADs with the particular support of parametric modelling to allow the design space to be explored by parametric model checking and synthesis, (2) an interpretation of AD semantics in three Markov models, (3) a set of transformation rules for establishing a formal link between ADs and the PRISM language, (4) algorithms used to transform ADs to PRISM models, (5) an open-source tool to automate the full workflow of our approach, and (6) a case study using multiple robots for delivery in hospital, and a thorough evaluation of other six examples from literature. With these contributions, our work QASCAD addresses the problems in other studies in terms of evaluation, extensibility, adaptability, and accessibility.

The remainder of this paper is organised as follows. Section 2 briefly introduces ADs, Markov models, and the PRISM language. In Section 3, we present a motivating example to use multiple robots for delivery in a logistics scenario within a hospital environment. Then we discuss our approach for verification and introduce the new UML profile in Section 4. The semantics interpretation of ADs and transformation rules to PRISM are defined in Section 5. The tool implementation and algorithms are discussed in Sect. 6 and the evaluation of various case studies is presented in Section 7. We review related work in Section 8. Finally, we conclude and discuss future work in Section 9.

2. Background

This section briefly introduces UML activity diagrams (Sect. 2.1), defines Markov models (Sect. 2.2), and describes the PRISM language and probabilistic model checkers (Sect. 2.3).




Figure 1: Activity diagram metamodel.




Figure 2: A subset of SysML activity notations.

2.1. UML Activity Diagrams

In this work, we consider activity diagrams that are compliant with UML Version 2.5.1.¹ We briefly describe the elements of the diagrams that are considered in this work, and the structure and relation of these elements. We refer to the UML specification [46] for a complete account of the notation.

The metamodel of the activity diagram is shown in Fig. 1. The elements explored in our approach are presented in this metamodel; other elements not used or to be supported are not included. The notations of the activity diagram elements are shown in Fig. 2.

An Activity is a kind of Behavior that is specified as a graph of ActivityNodes interconnected by ActivityEdges. Activities are essentially what are commonly called “control and data flow” models. Such models of computation are inherently concurrent, as any sequencing of activity node execution is modelled explicitly by ActivityEdges, and no ordering is mandated for any computation not explicitly sequenced [46].

A Behavior may have Parameters that provide the ability to pass values into and out of Behavior executions. Therefore, an Activity can have Parameters. When an Activity is invoked, Parameters with direction “in” may be provided. The default value of a Parameter can be set to a concrete value of a certain type (e.g., real type) or be left undefined. An Activity can also have Variables.

ActivityNodes are used to model the individual steps in the behavior specified by an Activity. An ActivityEdge is a directed connection between two ActivityNodes along which control or data may flow, from the source ActivityNode to the target ActivityNode. An ActivityEdge can be a ControlFlow or an ObjectFlow.

In this work, we implemented the ControlFlow. A ControlFlow is an ActivityEdge that only passes control. ControlFlows are used to explicitly dictate the sequence of execution for ActivityNodes, as the target ActivityNode cannot start execution until the source ActivityNode completes execution.

There are three kinds of ActivityNodes including ExecutableNodes, ControlNodes, and ObjectNodes. The ObjectNode is not yet supported in our approach and will be considered in the future. All concrete kinds of ExecutableNodes are Actions. Further, an OpaqueAction is an Action whose specification may be given in a textual concrete syntax. We

¹<https://www.omg.org/spec/UML/2.5.1/>.

use `OpaqueActions` to represent the actual behaviour of the system. An `Action` can also be a `CallBehaviorAction`, an `AcceptEventAction`, or a `SendSignalAction`. These are not included in our approach presented in this paper but are considered for future extension.

A **ControlNode** is used to manage the flow between other nodes in an `Activity`. `ControlNodes` includes `InitialNodes`, `FinalNodes`, `ForkNodes`, `JoinNodes`, `MergeNodes`, and `DecisionNodes`.

An **InitialNode** is a `ControlNode` that acts as a starting point for executing an `Activity`. An `Activity` may have more than one `InitialNode`. If an `Activity` has more than one `InitialNode`, then invoking the `Activity` starts multiple concurrent control flows, one for each `InitialNode`. An `InitialNode` shall not have any incoming `ActivityEdges`. The outgoing `ActivityEdges` of an `InitialNode` must all be `ControlFlows`.

A **FinalNode** is a `ControlNode` at which a flow in an `Activity` stops. A `FinalNode` shall not have outgoing `ActivityEdges`. A `FinalNode` accepts all flows to it on its incoming `ActivityEdges`. There are two kinds of `FinalNodes`:

- A `FlowFinalNode` terminates a flow. This does not affect other flows in the `Activity`.
- An `ActivityFinalNode` stops all flow in an `Activity`. If an `Activity` owns more than one `ActivityFinalNode`, then the first one to accept a flow (if any) terminates the execution of the `Activity`, including the execution of any other `ActivityFinalNodes`.

A **ForkNode** splits a flow into multiple concurrent flows. A `ForkNode` shall have exactly one incoming `ActivityEdge` and may have multiple outgoing `ActivityEdges`.

A **JoinNode** is a `ControlNode` that synchronizes multiple flows. A `JoinNode` shall have exactly one outgoing `ActivityEdge` but may have multiple incoming `ActivityEdges`.

A **MergeNode** brings together multiple flows without synchronization. A `MergeNode` shall have exactly one outgoing `ActivityEdge` but may have multiple incoming `ActivityEdges`.

A **DecisionNode** is a `ControlNode` that chooses between outgoing flows. A `DecisionNode` shall have at least one and at most two incoming `ActivityEdges`, and at least one outgoing `ActivityEdge`. If it has two incoming edges, then one shall be identified as the `decisionInputFlow`, the other being called the primary incoming edge. If the `DecisionNode` has only one incoming edge, then it is the primary incoming edge. If any of the outgoing edges of a `DecisionNode` have guards, then these are evaluated for each incoming flow.

2.2. Markov Chains and Markov Decision Processes

We consider three Markov models for activity diagrams: Discrete-time Markov Chains (DTMCs), Continuous-time Markov Chains (CTMCs), and Markov Decision Processes (MDPs). We define the *Markov Chains*, and these Markov models below.

Definition 2.1 (Markov chain and Markov property). Let S be a countable set (named *state space*), and let X be a sequence of random variables taking values from S . X is a *Markov chain* if

$$(X_{n+1} = s_{n+1} | X_0 = s_0, X_1 = s_1, \dots, X_n = s_n) = (X_{n+1} = s_{n+1} | X_n = s_n)$$

for all $n \geq 0$ and $s_0, s_1, \dots, s_{n+1} \in S$.

In other words, the probability of the future system states s_{n+1} depends only on its current state s_n , and is independent of all its past states. This is called the *Markov property*, signifying that a Markov model is *memoryless*.

A discrete-time Markov chain (DTMC) is a sequence of discrete random variables X_1, X_2, X_3, \dots with the Markov property. The possible values of the X_i s form a countable set S called the state space of the chain. The formal DTMC definition is given below.

Definition 2.2 (Discrete-Time Markov chains). A DTMC is a tuple (S, s_{init}, P, L) where

- S is a non-empty and countable set of states;
- $s_{init} \in S$ is an initial state;
- $P: S \times S \rightarrow [0, 1]$ is a transition probability matrix such that $\sum_{s' \in S} P(s, s') = 1$ for all $s \in S$;
- $L: S \rightarrow 2^{AP}$ is a labelling function where AP denotes a set of atomic propositions.

States and transitions of a DTMC can be associated with rewards or cost.

Definition 2.3 (Cost and rewards). A state reward function in DTMCs is given by $R_s: S \rightarrow \mathcal{R}_{\geq 0}$, associating a state with a non-negative real number reward. Similarly, a transition reward function $R_t: S \times S \rightarrow \mathcal{R}_{\geq 0}$ associates a transition with a reward. R_t is also called a transition reward matrix.

In DTMCs, each transition consumes one discrete time unit. Transitions in CTMCs, however, can occur at any real-valued time instant. The probability of a transition taken at time t is modelled by the exponential distribution $\lambda e^{-\lambda t}$ where λ is a rate parameter. The expected value of t is $\frac{1}{\lambda}$. We define CTMCs below.

Definition 2.4 (Continuous-Time Markov chains). A CTMC is a tuple (S, s_{init}, R, L) where

```

1 dtmc // model type: mdp, ctmc
2 // constant variables
3 const double p1;
4 const double p2;
5 const int N;
6 const int MaxBound;
7 // global variable
8 global b : [0..MaxBound] init 0;
9 // a module for the left-right controller
10 module LeftRight
11   x : [-N..N] init 0; // a local variable
12   [] (x=-N)&(b<MaxBound) -> (x'=x+1)&(b'=b+1);
13   [] (x= N)&(b<MaxBound) -> (x'=x-1)&(b'=b+1);
14   [move] (x>-N)&(x<N) -> p1:(x'=x-1)+(1-p1):(x'=x+1);
15   [] ((x=-N)|(x=N))&(b=MaxBound) -> true;
16 endmodule
17 // a module for the up-down controller
18 module UpDown
19   y : [-N..N] init 0;
20   [] (y=-N)&(b<MaxBound) -> (y'=y+1)&(b'=b+1);
21   [] (y= N)&(b<MaxBound) -> (y'=y-1)&(b'=b+1);
22   [move] (y>-N)&(y<N) -> p2:(y'=y-1)+(1-p2):(y'=y+1);
23   [] ((y=-N)|(y=N))&(b=MaxBound) -> true;
24 endmodule
25 // rewards
26 rewards "battery_consumption"
27   [move] true : 1;
28 endrewards

```

Figure 3: The PRISM model of a two-dimensional random walk: four constant variables, one global variable, two modules (one local variable and four commands for each module), and one transition reward.

- S is a non-empty and countable set of states;
- $s_{init} \in S$ is an initial states;
- $R: S \times S \rightarrow \mathcal{R}_{\geq 0}$ is a transition rate matrix.
- $L: S \rightarrow 2^{AP}$ is a labelling function.

In a CTMC, each state s can have multiple transitions leaving s with different rates. The exit rate of s , $E(s)$, is equal to $\sum_{s':S} R(s,s')$. Thus, the probability of leaving s within $[0,t]$ is the cumulative distribution function (CDF), $1 - e^{-E(s) \cdot t}$, of the exponential distribution with rate $E(s)$, and the expected time (also called the *mean duration*) in s is $1/E(s)$. A race condition [47] arises at s if there is more than one state $s':S$ such that $R(s,s') > 0$. But which transition is taken from s ? The choice is probabilistic and based on the probability, $R(s,t)/E(s)$, of the transition from s to t .

MDPs are an extension of DTMCs to allow nondeterministic choice. A formal definition of a MDP is given as follows.

Definition 2.5 (Markov decision processes). A MDP is a tuple $(S, s_{init}, Act, Steps, L)$ where

- S is a non-empty and countable set of states;
- $s_{init} \in S$ is an initial states;
- Act is a set of actions;
- $Steps: S \times Act \times S \rightarrow [0,1]$ is a transition probability function such that $\sum_{s' \in S} Steps(s, \alpha, s') \in \{0,1\}$ for all $s \in S$ and $\alpha \in Act$.
- $L: S \rightarrow 2^{AP}$ is a labelling function.

Unlike DTMCs where $P(s)$ for each state s is a distribution (the probabilities for all its target states sum to 1), $Steps(s)$ in an MDP is a set of distributions which is indexed by an action α . We note that every transition in a DTMC or MDP takes one unit of (discrete) time.

2.3. PRISM Language and Probabilistic Model Checkers

PRISM [27] is a probabilistic model checker for verifying various Markov models, including DTMCs, CTMCs, and MDPs. The input language of PRISM, called the PRISM language, is based on the formalism of reactive modules [48].

Figure 3 illustrates a PRISM example modelling a variation of a two-dimensional random walk within a restricted area. This walk decides its next destination by flipping two different coins at the same time: one coin for the left-right dimension with probability $p1$ moving towards left and one coin for the up-down dimension with probability $p2$ moving downwards. The restricted area is a $2N$ by $2N$ square. The initial position of the walk is at the centre of the area with coordinate $(0,0)$.

The PRISM example in Fig. 3 is a DTMC model, given by the model type `dtmc` on line #1. Other supported types include `mdp` and `ctmc`. The model declares four constant variables `p1`, `p2`, `N`, and `MaxBound` on lines #3-6. Among them, `p1` and `p2` are of type `double` for real numbers and they correspond to probabilities $p1$ and $p2$ for the controllers. `N` and `MaxBound` are of type `int` for integer numbers. `N` denotes the distance of the area border or boundary from its centre in each dimension. We use `MaxBound` to limit the maximum number of times that the walk reaches the boundary.

A global variable `b` is defined on line #8 over a range from 0 to `MaxBound` and initialised to 0. The variable is used to record the number of times that the walk reaches the boundary. This is useful to estimate battery consumption because we assume the walk will cost 2 units of battery levels to turn around and move back one cell towards the centre when it reaches the boundary.

Global variables in PRISM can be read and updated by any modules. This example contains two modules: `LeftRight` on lines #10-16 and `UpDown` on lines #18-24 to model the left-right controller and the up-down controller respectively. Each module has a *local* variable `x` on line #11 (or `y` on line #19) to record the current position of the walk in each dimension. The variables are defined over the range from $-N$ to N , corresponding to the area in each dimension. Local variables can be read by all modules but written only by the module where they have been defined. So `x` (or `y`) can only be updated in `LeftRight` (or `UpDown`).

The behaviour of each controller is modelled by the *commands* in the corresponding module: four commands in each module. A command in PRISM defines a collection of transitions from its source states to its destination states with augmented probabilities. It has a form:

```
[e] g -> p1:u1 + ... + pn:un;
```

The optional *action* `e` is used for synchronisation with other modules if these modules have commands with the same actions, such as commands on line #14 and on line #22 with the same action `move`. Therefore, the two commands must be executed at the same time. For other commands without an action, or with an action but no commands with the same action in other modules, called an *independent* action, they proceed independently.

A *state* is a valuation of all variables (global and local) in the model. The state space S of a model is all valuations of variables and contains all states. The guard condition `g` in a command identifies a subset S_g of S that satisfies `g`. S_g is also the source states of the transitions defined by the command. For example, the condition $(x=-N) \& (b < \text{MaxBound})$ in the command on line #12 characterises a subset of states in which `x` is equal to $-N$ and `b` is less than `MaxBound`.

A collection of updates is given on the right side of a command, such as n updates from `p1:u1` to `pn:un` where these probabilities must sum to 1. Each update is a pair of a probability `pi` and a set of assignments `ui`, and it defines the probability `pi` of the transition going from a source state s in S_g to a destination state s' which is specified by `ui` based on s . For example, the two updates $(p1:x'=x-1$ and $(1-p1):x'=x+1)$ on line #14 denote that the walk moves to its left ($x'=x-1$) with probability `p1` and to its right ($x'=x+1$) with probability $(1-p1)$, when x is between $-N$ and N .

If the probability of an update is omitted, this implies it is assumed to be 1. The updates in the commands on lines #12 and #13 are such examples. The `true` on lines #15 and #23 is a special update denoting a skip assignment (nothing changed) with probability 1. Since no state is changed, if these commands are enabled, they can be always taken, representing self-loop transitions.

With this PRISM model, we can specify quantitative properties² such as $P=? [F \leq 150 (b = \text{MaxBound})]$, denoting what is the probability ($P=?$) of finally (F) `b` equal to `MaxBound` within 150 units of (discrete) time (≤ 150).

A *reward* or *cost*, named `battery_consumption`, is defined on lines #26-28. It contains one transition reward on line #27, denoting every `move` action (for synchronisation between the commands on lines #14 and #22) costs one unit (1) of battery. This allows us to specify reward-based properties such as $R=? [F (b = \text{MaxBound})]$, denoting the expected cost of battery ($R=?$) when finally `b` equal to `MaxBound`. Because the walk costs 2 units of battery levels every time to move back from the boundary, the total expected cost of battery, in this case, should add $2 * \text{MaxBound}$ to the above result.

Using the PRISM or STORM [28] model checkers, we can automatically verify Markov models captured in the PRISM notation. For example, we verified that the results of properties $P=? [F \leq 150 (b = \text{MaxBound})]$ and $R=? [F (b = \text{MaxBound})]$ are 0.239 and 160.8 when the constants `p1`, `p2`, `N`, and `MaxBound` are set to 0.5, 0.6, 10 and 30 respectively.

One interesting question is how PRISM links Markov models captured in its language such as the model in Fig. 3 with the definitions of Markov models in Defs. 2.2, 2.4, and 2.5? This is implemented in PRISM as the model syntax construction and build, illustrated in Fig. 4. A PRISM model with multiple modules (MOD) is processed and combined syntactically into a PRISM model with only one system module (MSM), then the MSM is further processed (such as normalisation for DTMCs) to build corresponding Markov models (to the specified model type). This procedure is further discussed in the PRISM semantics.³

For the PRISM example in Fig. 3, the syntax construction stage in PRISM will produce a PRISM model with only one system module, as shown in Fig. 5 where we omit other parts of the model (because they are not changed) except that the two modules are now merged into one `system` module on lines #3-15. For the local variable (such as `x` and `y`), or the commands without an action label or with an independent action (such as the commands on lines #12 and #20 in Fig. 3) from the original modules, they will also be in the new `system` module (such as those on lines #4-9 and on lines #13-14). But for the commands with an action for synchronisation (such as the commands on lines #14 and #22) in Fig. 3, they are merged into one command whose action is the same action, whose guard

²<https://www.prismmodelchecker.org/manual/PropertySpecification/>.

³<https://www.prismmodelchecker.org/doc/semantics.pdf>.




Figure 4: Model construction and build in PRISM

```

1 dtmc
2 ...
3 module system
4   x : [-N..N] init 0;
5   y : [-N..N] init 0;
6   [] (x=-N)&(b<MaxBound) -> (x'=x+1)&(b'=b+1);
7   [] (x= N)&(b<MaxBound) -> (x'=x-1)&(b'=b+1);
8   [] (y=-N)&(b<MaxBound) -> (y'=y+1)&(b'=b+1);
9   [] (y= N)&(b<MaxBound) -> (y'=y-1)&(b'=b+1);
10  [move] (x>-N)&(x<N)&(y>-N)&(y<N) ->
11     p1*p2:(x'=x-1)&(y'=y-1) + (1-p1)*p2:(x'=x+1)&(y'=y-1) +
12     p1*(1-p2):(x'=x-1)&(y'=y+1) + (1-p1)*(1-p2):(x'=x+1)&(y'=y+1);
13  [] ((x=-N) | (x=N))&(b=MaxBound) -> true;
14  [] ((y=-N) | (y=N))&(b=MaxBound) -> true;
15 endmodule

```

Figure 5: The corresponding system module to the two-dimensional random walk in Fig. 3.

is the conjunction of the guards of all these commands, and whose updates are the combination of the updates from these commands (such as the command on lines #10-12).

After introducing the necessary information about activity diagrams and the PRISM notation, we describe a motivating example of using the activity diagram for modelling in the next section and using PRISM for verification in the later sections.

3. Motivating Hospital Intralogistics Scenario

We consider a logistics scenario within a hospital environment to use a Tiago robot (Fig. 6 left) and two Tiago base robots (Fig. 6 right) from PAL robotics⁴ for transporting goods, such as medicine. The Tiago is fixed at a location, namely the *service station*. It is able to grasp objects (medicine) and place them on the base robots which transport them from the *service station* to the requested destinations.

In this example, we consider a particular scenario where an urgent request has been received to require particular medicine to be delivered to Room D in 10 minutes. The base robots are working in a dynamic environment and subject to various kinds of uncertainty (such as a depleted battery, trapped behind an obstacle, increased traversal time due to obstacles or closed doors, or physical attacks on their sensors) which may result in a failed or delayed delivery. This urgent request demands a delivery with a very high success rate (or reliability) of 99.9%.

As shown in Fig. 7, there are two routes from the service station to Room D: Route I (the service station, Corridor A - CA, two doors - DAB, Corridor B - CB, then to Room D), and Route II (the service station, Corridor C - CC, then to Room D). Evidently, Route I is shorter than Route II. Route II is usually busy and potentially has more moving obstacles such as people and trolleys. Usually, it takes less time to Room D by following Route I than Route II. However, Route I is not as reliable as Route II because there are two doors between corridors A and B. In general, at least one door is normally open so base robots can pass through. Occasionally, both two doors might be accidentally closed. Then, no base robot can carry on its mission.

Based on statistical analysis of past deliveries, this request of high reliability cannot be achieved if we use one base robot for delivery by following either route. A delivery by two base robots is, therefore, planned. In this plan,

⁴<https://pal-robotics.com/>.



Figure 6: Tiago and Tiago base robots.




Figure 7: Hospital floorplan.




Figure 8: PAL use case.

each base robot transports the same medicine to Room D by following different routes to minimise the probability of a failed or delayed delivery and maximise its reliability (thus, offering enhanced quality of service).

We model the scenario as an activity diagram in Fig. 8. The diagram contains an activity named PAL which specifies the behaviour of this delivery scenario as a sequence of actions (or subtasks) with support for choice, iteration, and concurrency. The activity has 20 input parameters (of which five are displayed) which appear inside the parenthesis after the name PAL. For example, $r_prep:real=0.9998$ declares a parameter, named r_prep , of type real numbers, with a default value 0.9998. So the parameter, indeed, is *specified* like a constant. Another parameter $p_c_a:real$, without a default value, is a loosely specified or *unspecified* parameter whose value should be fixed during design through analysis. In this example, five parameters, including p_c_a , p_c_b , p_c_c , and p_d_1 , p_d_2 , are left unspecified when the activity diagram is initially built and should be fixed later on. Some other parameters, such as the duration of the preparation d_prep , whose values are affected by the environment, are assumed during design time and will be updated with real-time data during runtime.

The activity starts its execution from its InitialNode on the left of the diagram. Then, its control flows via a ControlEdge E1 to an action Prepare, denoting the preparation for the delivery, including picking and placing medicine (by the Tiago) on Base 1 and 2. On average, it takes d_prep minutes for the preparation where d_prep is an input parameter of the activity and is associated with the duration annotation of the action. The action is also subject to potential rare failures like the medicine shortage or the inability of the Tiago robot to pick and place the object to one of the delivery robots. We annotate the action with a very high reliability ($r_prep=0.9998$), in addition to the duration d_prep . These annotations are introduced in our work and will be presented in Sect. 4.1.

Remark 3.1. An activity, as a kind of Behavior in UML, can have input, output, input-output, and result parameters. Our work presented here only considers input parameters, such as d_prep . In UML, parameters are handled through ActivityParameterNode, a kind of ObjectNode. An ActivityParameterNode is associated with one parameter of the activity and appears on the border of the activity in the diagram. The ActivityParameterNode then is connected to the nodes that are contained in the activity via ObjectFlows. Such one node is DecisionNode. The ObjectFlow from the ActivityParameterNode is connected to the decisionInputFlow of the DecisionNode, so the parameter can be referred to, for example, in the guards of the ActivityEdges from the DecisionNode. This (UML) way to use parameters, however, is quite heavier for modelling and also transformation later because we need to create many ActivityParameterNodes

and ObjectFlows and connect them together. If a parameter is referred to many times within the activity, it is not easy to draw a well-placed and readable diagram (because of so many flows).

An alternative to ObjectFlows for passing data in UML is Variables which hold values and can be indirectly (in the sense of no explicit ObjectFlows) used in various VariableActions to read or write values to or from these variables. But similar to ActivityParameterNodes, there are more VariableActions and ObjectFlows to be created within the activity. It is also not convenient for modelling.

For this reason, our approach presented here simplifies the modelling of parameters through direct references (using RefToPara(p)) to parameters p in ValueSpecification (for specifying values in UML), specifically in Expressions. For example, the reliability annotation of the Prepare action is r_prep, which, indeed, is an expression RefToPara(r_prep) (but hidden) in our diagram. \square

After the preparation, we use a ForkNode F1 to create two concurrent flows: one for Base 1 to follow Route I and another for Base 2 to follow Route II.

For Base 1, it moves to CA, denoted as R1ToCorA with duration d_cor_a, passes through CA to DAB, denoted as R1ToDoorAB with a success probability p_c_a (annotated on E6 from a DecisionNode D1) to get to DAB and a potential failure of probability (1-p_c_a, annotated on E7) to a MergeNode M3 which is further to an action R1Stuck for the delivery failure of Base 1.

If a successful move to DAB, denoted as E6 to a MergeNode M1, the robot probabilistically (a DecisionNode D2) chooses DA (E11) with probability p_d_12 or DB (E12) with probability 1-p_d_12. If the robot chooses DA, then it may pass through DA successfully with probability p_d_1 (annotated on E18) or fail with probability 1-p_d_1 (annotated on E14). This attempt, denoted as R1ToCorBThrDoor1, takes on average d_cor_b_d1 units of time. If the robot chooses DB, it is similar but with success probability p_d_2 (on E17) and failure probability (on E16), and duration d_cor_b_d2. In case of a failure in either case, the robot keeps retrying the process through the control flow E14 or E16 back to M1. In case of a successful pass (E17 or E18), the robot moves to CB and tries to pass through CB, denoted as R1ToRoomD with duration d_r1_rd, with successful probability p_c_b on E22 to R1DeliveredRoomD or failure probability (1-p_c_b) on E21 to M3 (further to R1Stuck). Both a successful delivery (R1DeliveredRoomD) and a failed delivery (R1Stuck) will be merged by a MergeNode M4 and then the flow comes to a JoinNode J1.

The outgoing edges E13 and E15 from R1ToCorBThrDoor1 and R1ToCorBThrDoor2 are annotated with rewards respectively to record the attempts of passing DAB.

For Base 2, it moves to CC, denoted as R2ToCorC with duration d_cor_c, and passes through CC, denoted as R2ToDoorCD with duration d_door_cd and successful probability p_c_c (on E28) to R2DeliveredRoomD or failure probability 1-p_c_c (on E30) to R2Stuck. Similarly, both flows are merged by M5 and then the new flow reaches J1 for synchronisation with the flow for Base 1. After the synchronisation, the flow reaches the ActivityFinal AF and so the activity is terminated.

3.1. Properties

For this use case, we are interested in the service measurement or properties below.

P-1 The probability of successful delivery through either Route I or Route II within 10 minutes.

P-2 The probability of successful delivery through both Route I and Route II within 10 minutes.

P-3 The probability of failed delivery due to both robots being stuck within 10 minutes.

P-4 Termination probability: what is the probability of terminating at the ActivityFinal AF within 10 minutes?

P-5 The average attempts on passing DAB within 10 minutes.

P-6 Parametric model checking: the probability of successful delivery through either Route I or Route II.

These properties, as well as the type of Markov models to be analysed, are also annotated in the activity diagram (but not shown in Fig. 8), so they are part of the model. For example, **P-4** is captured in the diagram as P=? [F PAL reaches at PAL: :AF], denoting the probability of the activity PAL finally reaching its ActivityFinal AF. The syntax of properties is discussed in Sect. 5.3.

4. Overview of our approach

We illustrate our approach to verify annotated activity diagrams and their context in Fig. 9. It is composed of two parts: the upper part for the work presented in this paper to verify activity diagrams using parametric probabilistic model checking at the design time and the bottom part to monitor the Multi-Robot System (MRS) during mission execution at runtime.

We first model the system as activity diagrams. The activity diagram can be annotated with probability, reliability, duration, reward, parameter, properties for verification, and a Markov model type for the semantic interpretation of the diagrams based on a profile we build in this work. The profile is presented in Sect. 4.1.

Then, we use model transformation to automatically generate the corresponding semantics of the activity diagrams, which is captured in the PRISM language. For the annotated properties, their references to the elements in the




Figure 9: Our approach to (1) verify annotated (parametric) activity diagrams for safety requirements and QoS, based on its semantic interpretation in various Markov models (DTMCs, MDPs, and CTMCs) using probabilistic model checking (PMC), parametric model checking (pMC), and synthesis, shown in the upper part and presented in this paper; and (2) monitor the behaviour of a Multi-Robot System (MRS) by estimating parameters from simulations and evaluating algebraic expressions based on the estimated parameters to verify whether the desired properties are violated or not, shown in the bottom part and formed as part of our future work.




Figure 10: Profile and stereotypes

diagram, such as activities, activity nodes and edges, are resolved using mappings (between the elements in the diagram and their corresponding entities in the PRISM model) which are built during model transformation. The resolved properties are expressed in the PRISM Property Specification.⁵

The generated PRISM model is then verified using PRISM or Storm against the resolved properties. The verification results could be qualitative (true or false), quantitative (probabilities or rewards) for probabilistic model checking (PMC), or algebraic expressions (such as $p_1 + 3 * p_2$) for parametric model checking (pMC). We could also synthesise the model to get optimal designs in terms of optimisation objectives (or properties) using tools such as EvoChecker [4], after necessary adaption of the generated PRISM model and properties. If the results are not what we expect or are invalid, we can modify the diagram or its annotation and then verify it again till we get the valid results. Other work [35, 49] for the verification of activity diagrams that are annotated with probability information, do not support the annotations of rewards, parameters, and properties. They, therefore, are not able to use parametric model checking like what we do to verify parametric models.

After we get valid verification results, we will extract algebraic expressions (for safe and secure properties) from them. At the same time, we collect runtime data from physical robots or the simulations for MRS, estimate parameters using statistic analysis of the collected data, and then evaluate the algebraic expressions using the estimated parameters to decide if safe properties are violated.

4.1. New profile and stereotypes

We defined a profile including three stereotypes for ControlFlow, Action, and Activity, respectively, as shown in Figure 10.

An Activity can be annotated with properties through the stereotype “Properties” whose attributes are the properties of “Property” type and “toBeVerified” of String type. An activity can have multiple groups of properties. Each group is of “Property” type, which has three attributes including “name” of the property group, the type of the models

⁵<https://www.prismmodelchecker.org/manual/PropertySpecification>.

“modeltype”, which can be DTMC, MDP, CTMC, or PTA, and “prproperties”, which is a set of PRISM properties of “PRProperty” type. Each property of “PRProperty” type has a name and a value. The value is a string in restricted natural language to present the content of the property. For example, in the PAL use case, when defining the first property listed in Section 3.1, we annotate the activity diagram with the “Properties” stereotype by creating a group of properties. The type of the group is “Property”, the group’s name is “PAL_ctmc”, and its model type is CTMC. Then, for this group, we can first add a property of “PRProperty” type, whose name is “either success” and the value is “ $P=? [F <= t \text{ (PAL reaches at PAL::R1DeliveredRoomD) } | \text{ (PAL reaches at PAL::R2DeliveredRoomD) }]$ ”. Then, we can continue to add the rest of the properties of Section 3.1 into the “PAL_ctmc” group. Furthermore, we can add a second group of properties, named e.g., “PAL_dtmc”, and its model type is DTMC.

We allow an activity diagram to be transformed into PRISM models of DTMC, CTMC, or MDP types. This is determined by the attribute “toBeVerified” of the stereotype “Properties”. Before the activity diagram is transformed into PRISM models, we need to set the “toBeVerified” as the corresponding group of the properties that we aim to verify first, e.g., “PAL_ctmc”. By reading the “modeltype” of “PAL_ctmc”, which is CTMC, the PRISM models of a CTMC type are generated.

An Action can be annotated with reliability, duration, rate, and multiple rewards through the stereotype “ParameterizedNode”. For example, the Action Prepare in Fig. 8 is annotated with the reliability r_{prep} and the duration d_{prep} . The reliability, duration, and rate are of ValueSpecification type. The reward is of type “Reward”, which has the attributes of name of string type and value of ValueSpecification type.

Similarly, A ControlFlow can be annotated with probability, reliability, and multiple rewards through the stereotype “ParameterizedFlow”. For example in Fig. 8, the outgoing edges E11 and E12 of DecisionNode D2 are both annotated with the probabilities $p_{d_{12}}$ and $(1-p_{d_{12}})$. The edges E17 and E18 are annotated with the rewards. All the annotated nodes and edges are marked with “ParameterizedNode” and “ParameterizedFlow”, respectively, as shown in Fig. 8.

5. Semantics of activity diagrams

Our approach to verify activity diagrams using probabilistic model checking, as presented in Sect. 4, is based on the semantic interpretation of the diagrams in various Markov models. This section describes how to interpret the semantics in Markov models (Sect. 5.1) and how to transform activity diagrams to PRISM models based on this interpretation (Sect. 5.2).

We present the assumptions and well-formedness conditions for UADs in Sect. 5.1.1 in order to make our semantics applicable. Then we introduce the general (non-probabilistic and token-based) semantic interpretation of activity diagrams in UML in Sect. 5.1.2. Based on the interpretation, we give the probabilistic semantics of extended activity diagrams (with probability, rate or duration) in Markov models in Sect. 5.1.3. This includes how to map nodes and edges in an Activity to states and transitions in Markov models, along with the definitions of atomic propositions and labelling functions for each state. Then we describe a procedure to automatically generate Markov semantics from activity diagrams and its potential challenges. We propose an approach to use PRISM’s module approach (MOD) as the frontend for Markov models, so the semantics generation becomes the transformation from an activity to a PRISM model.

The transformation is defined in Sect. 5.2, including the transformation rules for the activity as a whole (Sect. 5.2.1), and for various ActivityNodes (Sects. 5.2.2-5.2.9), for input parameters (Sect. 5.2.10), for reliability (Sect. 5.2.11), and for duration or rate and CTMCs (Sect. 5.2.12).

Section 5.3 discusses how to specify properties for verification in our activity diagrams and their interpretation in the property specification language in PRISM, including the transformation of rewards.

5.1. Semantics of activity diagrams

5.1.1. Assumptions and well-formedness conditions

We list the conditions that need to be satisfied by a UAD for our approach to be applicable. A subset of these conditions is presented below.

- wfc-1 All nodes and edges must have their names, and their names are unique.
- wfc-2 There is exactly one incoming edge to an action. If there are more, we can use a MergeNode before the action to merge all incoming edges.
- wfc-3 There is exactly one outgoing edge to an action. If there are more, we can use a ForkNode after the action to fork all outgoing edges.
- wfc-4 The outgoing edges from a DecisionNode cannot have associated rewards.
- wfc-5 The reliability annotation of an OpaqueAction must be a type of \mathbb{R} with its value between 0 and 1.
- wfc-6 Each outgoing edge from a DecisionNode can be guarded or probabilistic, but not both.
- wfc-7 The outgoing edges from a DecisionNode are either all guarded or all probabilistic, but not mixed.
- wfc-8 The probability on any edge from a DecisionNode is a type of \mathbb{R} with its value between 0 and 1.
- wfc-9 The probabilities on the outgoing edges of any probabilistic DecisionNode sum to 1.
- wfc-10 If analysed as a CTMC model, any OpaqueAction must be annotated with a duration or rate, but not both.

5.1.2. General interpretation

The behaviour of an Activity is virtually and implicitly described by *tokens*. There are two types of tokens: *control* and *object*. A control token does not carry any data and only affects the execution of ActivityNodes, while an object token carries data. A control token can only flow over ControlFlow edges, pass through ControlNodes, and be accepted by ExecutableNodes while an object token can only flow over ObjectFlow edges and be accepted by ObjectNodes.

ControlNodes, with exceptions for InitialNodes and ForkNodes, do not hold tokens but just pass them through. An InitialNode will be placed with a single control token when its parent activity begins to execute. The token will be offered to all its outgoing edges. A ForkNode has exactly one incoming edge and the token offered to the node will be offered to all its outgoing edges, similar to the InitialNode. A JoinNode synchronises all its flows by waiting for a token available on each incoming edge. Then a token is offered to its only outgoing edge. A MergeNode also brings together multiple flows but without synchronisation. Every token offered to its incoming edge is offered to its outgoing edge. A FlowFinalNode simply destroys all the tokens offered in its incoming edge, while a ActivityFinalNode stops the execution of the parent activity (by destroying all tokens held in the activity) when a token is offered to its incoming edge. If a token reaches a DecisionNode, it is offered to one of the outgoing edges of the node. Which edge would be offered depends on its guard condition being evaluated to true, if the DecisionNode is guarded, or its probability (so the choice is probabilistic), if the DecisionNode is probabilistic.

Actions are the only kind of ExecutableNode. This work considers actions with only one incoming edge and one outgoing edge. An action accepts a token from its incoming edge, holds a token during its execution, and offers a token to its outgoing edge upon the completion of its execution.

Assumptions.. Our work presented in this paper considers the weight property of any ActivityEdge being 1, so there is only one token traversing the edge at the same time. Our semantics and transformation discussed later are dedicated to ControlNodes, ControlFlows, and ExecutableNodes. The support of ObjectNodes and ObjectFlows is part of our future work, but our approach has taken their support into account.

Example 1 (Token-based semantic interpretation of PAL use case). Consider the activity PAL in Fig. 8, its execution starts with placing a single token on the InitialNode I0. The token is passed through its outgoing flow E1 to the action Prepare. Then Prepare starts to execute and offers a token to its outgoing edge E2 to the ForkNode F1 after it completes the execution. F1 offers the token to the two outgoing edges E3 and E4 at the same time. In other words, two concurrent flows are created. The upper flow represents the behaviour of Base 1 and the lower flow is for that of Base 2.

The token in E3 controls the movement of Base 1 through actions R1ToCorA and R1ToDoorAB, and then to a DecisionNode D1 which is probabilistic. The token from E5 will have probability p_{c_a} (annotated on E6) or $1-p_{c_a}$ (implicit on E7) offered to E6 or E7 respectively. The token from E7 is used to execute R1Stuck (representing Base 1 gets stuck) via the MergeNode M3 (through E9). The token from E6 is passed to the DecisionNode D2 via the MergeNode M1 (through E8). D2 allows Base 1 to probabilistically choose R1ToCorBThrDoor1 (with probability p_{d_12}) or R1ToCorBThrDoor2 (with probability $1-p_{d_12}$). Both the actions could succeed or fail, which is modelled by the DecisionNodes D3 and D4. The successful probabilities are p_{d_1} (annotated on E18) and p_{d_2} (annotated on E17), and the failure probabilities are their complementary on E14 and E16. Either success takes the control flow to R1ToRoomD. Either failure takes the control flow back to M1, which represents an infinite loop for Base 1 to retry either door.

R1ToRoomD may succeed with probability p_{c_b} (on E22) to R1DeliveredRoomD or fail with $1-p_{c_b}$ (on E21) to R1Stuck via M3. Then the two alternative flows are merged in the MergeNode M4, which further offers a token to the JoinNode J1.

The token from F1 to E25 controls the movement of Base 2, and finally the control flow to J1 through E32. We omit the details of this concurrent flow here.

After both tokens on E24 and E32 are available to J1, the control flow moves to the ActivityFinal AF and the activity PAL is terminated here.

5.1.3. Semantics in Markov models

In this section, we present the semantics of activities in Markov models (DTMCs, MDPs, and CTMCs). Its interpretation is highly related to concurrent flows in activities.

Concurrent flows in an activity are control flows modelling concurrency like multiple threads of execution. Concurrent flows can be created by multiple outgoing edges from an InitialNode, a ForkNode, or an ExecutableNode, and they are destroyed by a JoinNode. They can also be interpreted as tokens being on different flows at the same time. We define the *state* of a flow as the current position of its token where positions refer to ActivityNodes.

A state in the semantics of a Markov model for an activity is a combination of the states of all the concurrent flows. The state of a concurrent flow is denoted by a program counter variable pc which takes a collection of values representing ActivityNodes along the flow. For example, if an activity has m concurrent flows, then one of its states in Markov models can be represented as (n_1, n_2, \dots, n_m) , denoting pc_i takes value n_i where n_i (for $i \in \{1..m\}$) is the current state (ActivityNode) of the i th flow. We use S to denote the state space of such a Markov model, that is, a set of all such states.

ControlFlow edges are interpreted as transitions in Markov models. If an edge e_i of ControlFlow is linked from an ActivityNode n_i to another node n'_i and can proceed independently in a concurrent flow i , then its semantics in Markov models is a transition from state $(n_1, \dots, n_i, \dots, n_m)$ to $(n_1, \dots, n'_i, \dots, n_m)$ with only the state of the i th flow being changed, as shown on the top of Fig. 11.

However, if the edge cannot proceed independently because multiple edges must be engaged at the same time, such as for edges from a ForkNode or edges to a JoinNode, then the semantics for these edges in Markov models are shown in Fig. 11 as *parallel edges* where we assume three edges in their corresponding i th, j th, and k th concurrent flows need to proceed simultaneously.

If multiple edges are enabled at the same time in their different concurrent flows and they are not required to be taken synchronously like parallel edges, they are called *interleaving edges*. But which edge will be taken and what is its associated probability depend on the Markov model that we choose to interpret its semantics, as shown in Fig. 11 for the DTMC model. Interleaving edges e_i , e_j , and e_k correspond to three transitions and the choice between them is random. For the MDP model, however, the choice between them is nondeterministic. For the CTMC model, it raises a race condition. For simplicity, we omit the illustration for the MDP and CTMC in Fig. 11.




Figure 11: Semantics of one edge, parallel edges, and interleaving edges in Markov models.

The atomic propositions (APs_a) of such a Markov model for an activity are defined below.

$$APs_a \hat{=} \bigcup \{i: 1..m \bullet \{nd: NDS_i \bullet pc_i = nd\}\} \quad (1)$$

where a set NDS_i denotes all the ActivityNodes along a concurrent flow i . An AP is a predicate, such as $pc_i = n_i$, describing the state of the i th flow being at a node n_i . APs for each flow i , specified as a set comprehension $\{nd: NDS_i \bullet pc_i = nd\}$, include the predicates describing pc_i being at all the possible value nd in NDS_i . Then APs_a includes such sets of predicates for all the concurrent flows ranging from 1 to m where we use a generalised union \bigcup to combine all such sets of predicates.

The labelling function L for each state is a set of APs, describing the current states of all concurrent flows. For example, $L((n_1, n_2, \dots, n_m)) = \{pc_1 = n_1, pc_2 = n_2, \dots, pc_m = n_m\}$, describing pc_i being at n_i for each concurrent flow i where i ranges from 1 to m . We also define a function L_s of type $2^{APs_a} \rightarrow \mathbb{P}S$ to identify a set of states whose APs contain a given set of APs. The function L_s is defined below.

$$L_s(aps) \hat{=} \{s: S \mid aps \subseteq L(s)\}$$

In the above definition, aps is a given set of APs. $L_s(\{pc_i = n_i, pc_j = n_j\})$, for example, identifies a set of states whose labelled APs include $pc_i = n_i$ and $pc_j = n_j$.

To (automatically) generate the Markov semantics for an activity diagram, we need to

- ST1** determine concurrent flows and all ActivityNodes along each flow (this defines the state space);
- ST2** determine possible outgoing transitions (corresponding to enabled edges in the activity diagram) for each state and their probability and rate information from annotations;
- ST3** use this information to (for DTMCs) calculate the exact probability distribution from this state by giving a uniform probability for each enabled transition and normalising the probabilities to get a distribution, or (for CTMCs) to calculate the rates accordingly, or (for MDPs) to make transitions that correspond to each concurrent flow be a distribution in the *steps* function.

If the activity diagram has many nodes and concurrent flows or even has embedded activities through CallBehaviourAction, the state space could be very large. Then it would be a challenge to efficiently explore the state space and perform **ST3**. As illustrated in Fig. 4, the PRISM model checker accepts inputs from MOD, MSM, or MM. The Markov semantics discussed in this section correspond to MM. Most work [50, 51, 49, 45] for verification of activity diagrams uses MSM as the input language for PRISM, and so an activity results in one module in PRISM.

We use a modular approach (MOD) as the input language for PRISM, and then PRISM will build the corresponding Markov model from it. This will make the generation of our Markov semantics for activity diagrams easier. In the rest of the paper, we give the semantics of activity diagrams directly in the PRISM language, and its interpretation is still a Markov model as discussed here. We choose MOD, instead of MSM, because we aim to support the analysis

```

1 dtmc // S1: model type: dtmc, mdp, ctmc
2 // S2: constant variables
3 const int INACTIVE = (-1);
4 ...
5 // S3: formulas
6 formula {activity.name}::to_be_terminated = ...;
7 ...
8 // S4: rewards
9 ...
10 // S5: The main module for the main concurrent flow
11 // S5.1: Constants (ActivityNodes along the flow)
12 // S5.2: module definition
13 module {activity.name}::{node.name}::{oe1.name}
14   {modname}::pc : [-1..{numnodes}] init 0;
15   {activity.name}::terminated : bool init false;
16   ...
17   [{activity.name}::terminate
18     ({activity.name}::to_be_terminated)&
19     (!({activity.name}::terminated)) ->
20     ({modname}::pc'=INACTIVE)&
21     ({activity.name}::terminated'=true);
22   [] ({modname}::pc=INACTIVE)&
23     ({activity.name}::terminated)&
24     (!{activity.name}::to_be_terminated) -> true;
25 endmodule
26 // S6: Other modules for other concurrent flows
27 // S6.1: Constant variables
28 // S6.2: module definition
29 module {activity.name}::{node.name}::{oe.name}
30   ...
31 endmodule
32 ...

```

Figure 12: Sketch of the PRISM model for an activity

of rich features in activity diagrams, such as event signals, call behaviour actions, and reliability. In our modular approach, each concurrent flow in activity diagrams becomes a module in PRISM, which makes our transformation easier to implement for automation because the transformation is now *local* to the concurrent flow. Here we use local to mean the transformation process for a concurrent flow does not depend on the processes for other concurrent flows (which is called *global* otherwise).

5.2. Transformation of Activity to PRISM

Our approach aims to verify an activity in activity diagrams. This activity is called the *root activity* though it may call other activities through `CallBehaviourAction`. We present the PRISM semantics, interpreted in discrete-time Markov models (DTMCs and MDPs) for the activity and `ActivityNodes` from Sect. 5.2.1 to Sect. 5.2.11, then its interpretation in CTMCs in Sect. 5.2.12.

5.2.1. Activity

The PRISM model for an activity is sketched in Fig. 12. In general, the model consists of six sections from S1 to S6.

S1 on line #1 gives the model type: dtmc, mdp, or ctmc.

S2 on lines #2-4 declares model-wide constant variables, such as `INACTIVE` whose value is -1. We may have other constant variables defined here such as a default mean duration `mean_duration` for a CTMC model.

S3 on lines #5-7 declares formulas. We illustrate one formula `{activity.name}::to_be_terminated` used to denote whether the activity is to be terminated by an `ActivityFinal` or not. Its definition will be shown later when discussing the transformation rule for `ActivityFinals` in Sect. 5.2.3. We note that `{activity.name}` is a placeholder and will be expanded to the name of the root activity during transformation. For the formula name, we use `::` to separate different segments in a qualified name and `::` will be replaced by `_` in the later stage of our transformation to get a valid name in the PRISM language.

S4 on lines #8-9 defines rewards.

S5 on lines #10-26 the main module containing **S5.1**, the definition of constant variables for this module, and **S5.2**, a module definition. Every root activity or corresponding PRISM model has a main module, which corresponds to the first concurrent flow created by the first outgoing edge `oe1` from the first `InitialNode` node. The name of the module on line #13, `{activity.name}::{node.name}::{oe1.name}`, reflects it. The `{modname}::pc` variable for the module is defined on line #14 where `{modname}` denotes the name of the module and `{numnodes}` denotes the number of nodes along the flow. The initial value of this variable is 0, instead of `INACTIVE` or -1, which means

the main module is active by default. The constants on **S5.1** correspond to the `ActivityNodes` along the concurrent flow and their values are set to ascend numbers starting from 0 (for the first node). These constants represent all possible values of the `pc` variable. The boolean `{activity.name}::terminated` variable on line #15 is used to denote whether the activity has been terminated or not (to enforce a terminated activity cannot be terminated again). The first segment of the variable name is `{activity.name}` to indicate this variable will be accessed by other modules, and so other modules can evaluate this variable by the activity name (they all know it) without checking its module name (they do not know it if we use `{modname}` here). The command on lines #17–21 has an action label which is used to synchronise the similar commands in other modules to terminate the activity by terminating all modules for all the concurrent flows of the activity when the activity is going to be terminated (on line #18) but not yet terminated (on line #19). The termination will make the module inactive (on line #20) and mark the activity terminated (on line #21). The command on lines #22–24 corresponds to an absorbing state, when the main module of the activity is inactive (on line #22) and the activity has terminated (on line #23) and is not going to be terminated (on line #24), whose only transition is a self-loop. This is simply to make the PRISM model stochastic, in other words, the transition probabilities for each row sum to 1 in the probability matrix.

S6 on lines #26–32 defines the modules for the other concurrent flows.

Example 2 (PAL use case). We show the corresponding (simplified) PRISM model in Fig. 13 where we consider the Markov model CTMC. The complete PRISM model can be found online.⁶ We omit a detailed explanation here because the model can be easily mapped to the general sketch in Fig. 12.

5.2.2. InitialNode

Consider there are n `InitialNodes` and each node has $oe(i)$ (for $i \in 1..n$) outgoing edges. Then $\sum_{i=1}^n oe(i)$ concurrent flows will be created. Hence the same number of new PRISM modules are created. One of them becomes the main module as illustrated in Fig. 12, but it does not matter which one is the main module. We show one of the other modules below whose name is identified by the `InitialNode` name `{node.name}` and one of its outgoing edge name `{oe.name}` followed after the activity name.

```

1 const int {modname}::{node.name} = 0;
2 module {activity.name}::{node.name}::{oe.name}
3   {modname}::pc : [-1..{numnodes}] init 0;
4   ...
5 endmodule

```

We also note that the initial value of the `pc` variable is also 0 which is just the value of the constant variable `{modname}::{node.name}` on line #1. This represents the flow (or the module) is active by default at its `InitialNode`.

Example 3 (PAL use case). The main module of the example is `PAL::I0::E1` on lines #33–40 in Fig. 13.

5.2.3. ActivityFinal

An activity can have more than one `ActivityFinal`. We show our PRISM semantics for the termination of the activity through any `ActivityFinal` in Fig. 14 where we assume m concurrent flows contain `ActivityFinals` and other n concurrent flows do not.

For the m flows, their corresponding modules on lines #17, #28, and #33 all have one local variable `{modname}::to_be_terminated` on lines #18, #29, and #34. This variable denotes that the corresponding flow to the owning module has arrived at an `ActivityFinal` (on line #21) and so it is going to be terminated (on line #21). Because the source node of the edge to this `ActivityFinal` is not important (for the illustration here), we omit the action label, the guard, and the probability on line #20 (denoted as `_`). The formula on lines #2–5 is a disjunction of all these variables. In other words, if any one of the variables is true or any concurrent flow arrives at its `ActivityFinal`, then the formula is true.

Each of the m modules on lines #17–36 contains a command like that on lines #23–26. Each of the other n modules on lines #38–48 (corresponding to the other n concurrent flows) contains a command like that on lines #40–42. The main module on lines #7–16 also has a command on lines #10–14 for termination. All these commands have the same action label `{activity.name}::terminate`, and so all modules need to synchronise on them to terminate at the same time. The termination is only allowed if the activity is not terminated yet (on line #12). On termination, all modules become inactive (on lines #13, #25, and #42), the activity is terminated (on line #14), and all local `to_be_terminated` variables are set to `false` (on line #26).

In Fig. 14, we assume the main module on lines #7–16 has no any `ActivityFinal` in its corresponding concurrent flow. If this is not the case, then the module will contain a local `to_be_terminated` variable like the one on line #18. Additionally, the command on lines #10–14 will contain another assignment like the one on line #26 to set the local `to_be_terminated` to `false`.

Example 4 (PAL use case). We show the termination part of the PRISM model (corresponding to the `ActivityFinal` AF) is shown in Fig. 15. We note that the PAL use case only has one `ActivityFinal`, but there are two `to_be_terminated` variables in both modules. The variable on line #3 is actually due to the reliability annotation of `Prepare`, which will be discussed in Sect. 5.2.11. The variable on line #14, indeed, is due to the termination by AF.

⁶https://github.com/RandallYe/QASCAD/blob/master/Examples/PAL_use_case/prism_models/p_ctmc/pal.prism.

```

1  ctmc
2  const int INACTIVE = (-1);
3  const double mean_duration = (0.001);
4  const int PAL::IO::E1::IO = (0);
5  const int PAL::IO::E1::Prepare = (1);
6  ...
7  const int PAL::IO::E1::J1 = (19);
8  const int PAL::F1::E25::R2ToCorC = (0);
9  const int PAL::F1::E25::R2ToDoorCD = (1);
10 ...
11 const int PAL::F1::E25::AF = (7);
12 const double p_c_a;
13 const double p_d_12;
14 ...
15 const double r_prep = (0.9998);
16 const double r1 = (1.0);
17 const double d_prep = (0.5);
18 const double d_cor_a = (0.2);
19 ...
20 formula PAL::to_be_terminated = (PAL::IO::E1::to_be_terminated) | (PAL::F1::E25::to_be_terminated);
21 formula PAL::to_be_failed = PAL::IO::E1::to_be_failed;
22 formula default_rate = ((1.0)/mean_duration);
23
24 rewards "rwd_door12_attempt"
25 [PAL::IO::E1::R1ToCorBThrDoor1
26   ((PAL::IO::E1::pc=PAL::IO::E1::R1ToCorBThrDoor1))
27   : r1;
28 [PAL::IO::E1::R1ToCorBThrDoor2
29   ((PAL::IO::E1::pc=PAL::IO::E1::R1ToCorBThrDoor2))
30   : r1;
31 endrewards
32
33 module PAL::IO::E1
34   PAL::IO::E1::pc : [-1..19] init 0;
35   PAL::IO::E1::to_be_terminated : bool init false;
36   PAL::IO::E1::to_be_failed : bool init false;
37   PAL::terminated : bool init false;
38   [PAL::IO::E1::IO] ((PAL::IO::E1::pc=PAL::IO::E1::IO)&
39     ↪ (!PAL::to_be_terminated) -> default_rate: (PAL::IO::E1::pc'=PAL::IO::E1::Prepare);
40   ...
41 endmodule
42
43 module PAL::F1::E25
44   PAL::F1::E25::pc : [-1..7] init INACTIVE;
45   PAL::F1::E25::to_be_terminated : bool init false;
46   [PAL::F1] ((PAL::F1::E25::pc=INACTIVE)&
47     ↪ (!PAL::to_be_terminated) -> default_rate: (PAL::F1::E25::pc'=PAL::F1::E25::R2ToCorC);
48   ...
49 endmodule

```

Figure 13: The corresponding PRISM model to PAL use case.

5.2.4. ForkNode

We consider a ForkNode with n outgoing edges and show its PRISM semantics in Fig. 16a. For its first outgoing edge oe_1 , its flow is regarded as the same flow as its incoming edge, and so the same PRISM module (`curmod` on line #3). A new constant variable $\{\text{modname}\}::\{oe_1.\text{target.name}\}$ is defined on line #2, corresponding to the target node of the outgoing edge oe_1 . The value of the constant is $?n+1$, denoting the current used largest number $?n$ plus 1, which is the next available number. The $\{\text{modname}\}$ here denotes the name of the corresponding module, `curmod` in this case. For the other $n-1$ outgoing edges from oe_2 to oe_n , we create $n-1$ new PRISM modules (on lines #11-31). The `pc` variables declared in these module on lines #14 and #25, have their initial values be `INACTIVE`, and so the new modules are initially inactive. These modules become active by the similar commands on lines #15-18 and on lines #26-29. These commands synchronise with the command on lines #5-8 (when the activity is not going to be terminated on lines #7, #17, and #28) on the action label $\{\text{activity.name}\}::\{\text{node.name}\}$ which represents the ForkNode. On synchronisation, these commands representing all the outgoing edges of the node are taken simultaneously. These edges take the concurrent flows to their target nodes (the constants on lines #2, #12, and #23) by the updates on lines #8, #18, and #29. Eventually, the n flows are active at the same time and among them $n-1$ are new concurrent flows.

Example 5 (PAL use case). We show part of the PRISM model that corresponds to the ForkNode F1 in Fig. 17.

5.2.5. JoinNode

We consider a JoinNode with n incoming edges and show its semantics in Fig. 16b. Different from the ForkNode which creates new concurrent flows (modules), a JoinNode destroys the concurrent flows on its n incoming edges, or makes

```

1 // Disjunctions of all local to_be_terminated variables
2 formula {activity.name}::to_be_terminated =
3   curmod_1::to_be_terminated |
4   curmod_2::to_be_terminated | ... |
5   curmod_m::to_be_terminated;
6 // The main module (assume no ActivityFinal in the flow)
7 module mainmod
8   {modname}::terminated : bool init false;
9   ...
10  [{activity.name}::terminate]
11    ({activity.name}::to_be_terminated) &
12    (!({activity.name}::terminated)) ->
13    ({modname}::pc'=INACTIVE) &
14    ({activity.name}::terminated'=true);
15  ...
16  endmodule
17  module curmod_1
18    {modname}::to_be_terminated : bool init false;
19    ...
20    [_] _ -> _:
21      ({modname}::pc'={modname}::{node.name}) &
22      ({modname}::to_be_terminated'=true);
23    [{activity.name}::terminate]
24      ({activity.name}::to_be_terminated) ->
25      ({modname}::pc'=INACTIVE) &
26      ({modname}::to_be_terminated'=false);
27  endmodule
28  module curmod_2
29    {modname}::to_be_terminated : bool init false;
30    ...
31  endmodule
32  ...
33  module curmod_m
34    {modname}::to_be_terminated : bool init false;
35    ...
36  endmodule
37 // For all other modules without ActivityFinals in their flows
38 module curmod_other_1
39   ...
40   [{activity.name}::terminate]
41     {activity.name}::to_be_terminated) ->
42     (modname::pc'=INACTIVE);
43   ...
44  endmodule
45  ...
46  module curmod_other_n
47    ...
48  endmodule

```

Figure 14: PRISM semantic for ActivityFinal.

```

1 module PAL::IO::E1
2   PAL::IO::E1::pc : [-1..19] init 0;
3   PAL::IO::E1::to_be_terminated : bool init false;
4   PAL::IO::E1::to_be_failed : bool init false;
5   PAL::terminated : bool init false;
6   ...
7   [PAL::J1] ((PAL::IO::E1::pc=PAL::IO::E1::J1))&
8     ↪ (! (PAL::to_be_terminated)) -> default_rate: (PAL::IO::E1::pc'=INACTIVE);
9   [PAL::terminate] (PAL::to_be_terminated)& (! (PAL::terminated)) ->
10     ↪ default_rate: (PAL::IO::E1::pc'=INACTIVE)& (PAL::terminated'=true)& (PAL::IO::E1::to_be_terminated'=false);
11  ...
12  endmodule
13 module PAL::F1::E25
14   PAL::F1::E25::pc : [-1..7] init INACTIVE;
15   PAL::F1::E25::to_be_terminated : bool init false;
16   ...
17   [PAL::J1] ((PAL::F1::E25::pc=PAL::F1::E25::J1))& (! (PAL::to_be_terminated))
18     ↪ -> default_rate: (PAL::F1::E25::pc'=PAL::F1::E25::AF)& (PAL::F1::E25::to_be_terminated'=true);
19   [PAL::terminate] PAL::to_be_terminated
20     ↪ -> default_rate: (PAL::F1::E25::pc'=INACTIVE)& (PAL::F1::E25::to_be_terminated'=false);
21  endmodule

```

Figure 15: Termination part of the PRISM model for PAL use case.

```

1 // The first outgoing edge: reuse the current module
2 const int {modname}::{oe1.target.name} = ?n+1;
3 module curmod // current module and not newly created
4 ...
5 [{activity.name}::{node.name}]
6   ({modname}::pc={modname}::{node.name})&
7   (!{activity.name}::to_be_terminate) ->
8   ({modname}::pc'={modname}::{oe1.target.name});
9 ...
10 endmodule
11 // For the 2nd to nth outgoing edges, (n-1) new modules
12 const int {modname}::{oe2.target.name} = 0;
13 module {activity.name}::{node.name}::{oe2.name} //new
14   {modname}::pc : [-1..{numnodes}] init INACTIVE;
15   [{activity.name}::{node.name}]
16     ({modname}::pc=INACTIVE) &
17     (!{activity.name}::to_be_terminate) ->
18     ({modname}::pc'={modname}::{oe2.target.name});
19 ...
20 endmodule
21 ...
22 // The nth outgoing edge
23 const int {modname}::{oen.target.name} = 0;
24 module {activity.name}::{node.name}::{oen.name} //new
25   {modname}::pc : [-1..{numnodes}] init INACTIVE;
26   [{activity.name}::{node.name}]
27     ({modname}::pc=INACTIVE) &
28     (!{activity.name}::to_be_terminate) ->
29     ({modname}::pc'={modname}::{oen.target.name});
30 ...
31 endmodule

```

(a) ForkNode with one incoming edge and n outgoing edges

```

1 // The current module for the 1st incoming edge
2 const int {modname}::{oe.target.name} = ?n+1;
3 module curmod_ie1
4 ...
5 [{activity.name}::{node.name}]
6   ({modname}::pc={modname}::{node.name})&
7   (!{activity.name}::to_be_terminate) ->
8   ({modname}::pc'={modname}::{oe.target.name});
9 ...
10 endmodule
11 // The current module for the 2nd incoming edge
12 module curmod_ie2
13 ...
14 [{activity.name}::{node.name}]
15   ({modname}::pc = {modname}::{node.name})&
16   (!{activity.name}::to_be_terminate) ->
17   ({modname}::pc'=INACTIVE);
18 ...
19 endmodule
20 ...
21 // The current module for the nth incoming edge
22 module curmod_ien
23 ...
24 [{activity.name}::{node.name}]
25   ({modname}::pc = {modname}::{node.name})&
26   (!{activity.name}::to_be_terminate) ->
27   ({modname}::pc'=INACTIVE);
28 ....
29 endmodule

```

(b) JoinNode with n incoming edges and one outgoing edge

```

1 const int {modname}::{oe1.target.name} = ?n+1;
2 const int {modname}::{oe2.target.name} = ?n+2;
3 ...
4 const int {modname}::{oen.target.name} = ?n+n;
5 module curmod
6 ...
7 [{modname}::{node.name}]
8   ({modname}::pc={modname}::{node.name})&<g1>&
9   (!{activity.name}::to_be_terminate) ->
10   ({modname}::pc'={modname}::{oe1.target.name});
11 [{modname}::{node.name}]
12   ({modname}::pc={modname}::{node.name})&<g2>&
13   (!{activity.name}::to_be_terminate) ->
14   ({modname}::pc'={modname}::{oe2.target.name});
15 ...
16 [{modname}::{node.name}]
17   ({modname}::pc={modname}::{node.name})&
18   !(<g1>|<g2>|...) &
19   (!{activity.name}::to_be_terminate) ->
20   ({modname}::pc'={modname}::{oen.target.name});
21 ...
22 endmodule

```

(c) DecisionNode with n guarded outgoing edges (including one else)

```

1 const int {modname}::{oe1.target.name} = ?n+1;
2 const int {modname}::{oe2.target.name} = ?n+2;
3 ...
4 const int {modname}::{oen.target.name} = ?n+n;
5 module curmod
6 ...
7 [{modname}::{node.name}]
8   ({modname}::pc={modname}::{node.name})&
9   (!{activity.name}::to_be_terminate) ->
10   <oe1.prob>: ({modname}::pc'
11     ↪ = {modname}::{oe1.target.name})+
12   <oe2.prob>: ({modname}::pc'
13     ↪ = {modname}::{oe2.target.name})+
14   ... +
15   <oen.prob>: ({modname}::pc'
16     ↪ = {modname}::{oen.target.name});
17 ...
18 endmodule

```

(d) DecisionNode with n probabilistic outgoing edges

```

1 module curmod
2 ...
3 [{activity.name}::{node.name}]
4   ({modname}::pc={modname}::{node.name})&
5   (!{activity.name}::to_be_terminate) ->
6   ({modname}::pc'=INACTIVE);
7 ...
8 endmodule

```

(e) FlowFinal

```

1 const int {modname}::{oe.target.name} = ?n+1;
2 module curmod
3 ...
4 [{activity.name}::{node.name}]
5   ({modname}::pc={modname}::{node.name})&
6   (!{activity.name}::to_be_terminate) ->
7   ({modname}::pc'={modname}::{oe.target.name});
8 ...
9 endmodule

```

(f) OpaqueAction with one incoming and one outgoing edge

Figure 16: PRISM semantic for ForkNode, JoinNode, DecisionNode, and MergeNode where $?n$ - the currently allocated maximum number for constants and so $?n+1$ is the next available number; $\langle \text{expr} \rangle$ - the translation of expressions in activity diagram to PRISM.

```

1 module PAL::IO::E1
2   ...
3   [PAL::F1] ((PAL::IO::E1::pc=PAL::IO::E1::F1))&
4     ↪ (! (PAL::to_be_terminated)) -> default_rate: (PAL::IO::E1::pc'=PAL::IO::E1::R1ToCorA);
5   ...
6 endmodule
7 module PAL::F1::E25
8   ...
9   [PAL::F1] ((PAL::F1::E25::pc=INACTIVE))&
10     ↪ (! (PAL::to_be_terminated)) -> default_rate: (PAL::F1::E25::pc'=PAL::F1::E25::R2ToCorC);
11   ...
12 endmodule

```

Figure 17: ForkNode part of the PRISM model for PAL use case.

```

1 module PAL::IO::E1
2   ...
3   [PAL::IO::E1::D1] ((PAL::IO::E1::pc=PAL::IO::E1::D1))& (! (PAL::to_be_terminated)) -> (default_rate*p_c_a):
4     ↪ (PAL::IO::E1::pc'=PAL::IO::E1::M1) + (default_rate*((1.0)-p_c_a)): (PAL::IO::E1::pc'=PAL::IO::E1::M3);
5   ...
6 endmodule

```

Figure 18: DecisionNode part of the PRISM model for PAL use case.

the corresponding modules inactive. Similar to the semantics of the ForkNode, we would not terminate the module `curmod_ie1` (on lines #3-10) on its first incoming edge and allow the outgoing edge of the JoinNode to reuse this module. All other modules (from `curmod_ie2` to `curmod_ien` on on lines #12-29) become inactive simultaneously through the synchronisation of the commands on lines #5, #14, and #24 on the action label `{activity.name}:::{node.name}`. At the same time, the outgoing edge of the JoinNode reaches its target node `{modname}:::{oe.target.name}` on line #8.

Example 6 (PAL use case). The part of the PRISM model that corresponds to the JoinNode J1 has been shown in the commands on lines #7 and #16 of Fig. 15.

5.2.6. DecisionNode

Different from the ForkNode and JoinNode, all outgoing edges of a DecisionNode are in a same concurrent flow, and so in a same module as illustrated in Fig. 16c for the *guarded* DecisionNode where all its outgoing edges have guards, and Fig. 16d for the *probabilistic* DecisionNode where all its outgoing edges have annotated probability values. In both cases, n new constant variables on lines #1-4 in both figures are defined to represent the n target nodes of the n outgoing edges from the DecisionNode.

If the node is guarded, then n commands on lines #7-16 in Fig. 16c are defined and each command corresponds to one outgoing edge. In particular, the guard of the command is a conjunction and one of the conjuncts, `<g1>`, corresponds to the guard of the edge `g1`, but it is the translation of `g1` in PRISM. If the guard of one outgoing edge is `else`, then the corresponding conjunct is `!(<g1>|<g2>|...)` on line #18, which is the negation of the disjunction of all other edge guards, and so no other guards are true.

If the node is probabilistic, its semantics is encoded in one command on lines #7-13 in Fig. 16d. In particular, there are n updates corresponding to the n outgoing edges. Each update has the probability `<oe.prob>` of the edge `oe` and its assignment updates the `pc` variable to the target of `oe`.

Example 7 (PAL use case). We show part of the PRISM model that corresponds to the DecisionNode D1 in Fig. 18 where `(default_rate*p_c_a)` is the proportional rate to the probability `p_c_a` (because this PRISM model is a CTMC model).

5.2.7. FlowFinal

The semantics of a FlowFinal, shown in Fig. 16e, is to make the module (or the flow) inactive by setting `pc` to `INACTIVE` on line #6.

5.2.8. OpaqueAction

We consider the OpaqueAction with one incoming edge and one outgoing edge and its semantics is shown in Fig. 16f. If there are multiple incoming edges, a MergeNode could be used to merge these incoming edges and then its outgoing edge is connected to the OpaqueAction. If there are multiple outgoing edges, they behave like those from a ForkNode and so we can manually add a ForkNode between the OpaqueAction and the outgoing edges. The semantics for the action is a command on lines #4-7 in the figure, which takes the flow (or the module) to its target node on line #7.

Example 8 (PAL use case). We show part of the PRISM model that corresponds to the OpaqueAction R1ToCorA in Fig. 19.

```

1 module PAL::IO::E1
2   ...
3   [PAL::IO::E1::R1ToCorA] ((PAL::IO::E1::pc=PAL::IO::E1::R1ToCorA))&
4   ↪ (! (PAL::to_be_terminated)) -> ((1.0)/d_cor_a) : (PAL::IO::E1::pc'=PAL::IO::E1::R1ToDoorAB);
5   ...
6 endmodule

```

Figure 19: OpaqueAction part of the PRISM model for PAL use case.

```

1 const int {modname}::{oe.target.name} = ?n+1;
2 module curmod
3   ...
4   [{activity.name}::{node.name}]
5   ({modname}::pc={modname}::{node.name})&
6   (!{activity.name}::to_be_terminate) ->
7   ({modname}::pc'={modname}::{oe.target.name});
8   ...
9 endmodule

```

(a) MergeNode with all its incoming edges in a same flow

```

1 module curmod_1
2   ...
3   [{activity.name}::{node.name}::{ie1.name}]
4   ({modname}::pc={modname}::{node.name})&
5   (!{activity.name}::to_be_terminate) ->
6   ({modname}::pc'=INACTIVE);
7   [{activity.name}::{node.name}::{ie2.name}]
8   ({modname}::pc={modname}::{node.name})&
9   (!{activity.name}::to_be_terminate) ->
10  ({modname}::pc'=INACTIVE);
11  ...
12 endmodule
13 ...
14 module curmod_m
15   ...
16   [{activity.name}::{node.name}::{ien.name}]
17   ({modname}::pc={modname}::{node.name})&
18   (!{activity.name}::to_be_terminate) ->
19   ({modname}::pc'=INACTIVE);
20   ...
21 endmodule
22 // A new module for its outgoing flow
23 module {activity.name}::{node.name}
24   {modname}::pc : [-1..{numnodes}] init INACTIVE;
25   [{activity.name}::{node.name}::{ie1.name}]
26   ({modname}::pc=INACTIVE) &
27   (!{activity.name}::to_be_terminate) ->
28   ({modname}::pc'={modname}::{oe.target.name});
29   ...
30   [{activity.name}::{node.name}::{ien.name}]
31   ({modname}::pc=INACTIVE) &
32   (!{activity.name}::to_be_terminate) ->
33   ({modname}::pc'={modname}::{oe.target.name});
34   ...
35 endmodule

```

(b) MergeNode with all its incoming edges not in a same flow

Figure 20: PRISM semantic for MergeNode.

5.2.9. MergeNode

A MergeNode combines multiple incoming alternate flows into one outgoing flow, but without synchronisation like the JoinNode. We require the incoming alternate flows are mutually exclusive, and so they are not active at the same time.

If all the incoming flows are in a same concurrent flow, then the semantics of the MergeNode is just a transition to the target of its outgoing edge, as shown on lines #4-7 in Fig. 20a.

If not all the incoming flows are from a same concurrent flow, we assume n incoming flows are in m concurrent flows where $n > m$. The m modules from curmod_1 on lines #1-12 to curmod_m on lines #14-21, as shown in Fig. 20b, correspond to m concurrent flows. Each incoming edge corresponds to one command in one of the m modules, such as the command on lines #3-6 for ie1, the command on lines #7-10 for ie2, and the command on lines #16-19 for ien.

We need a new module for the outgoing flow of the MergeNode, as shown on lines #23-35 in Fig. 20b. The

```

1 module PAL::IO::E1
2   ...
3   [PAL::IO::E1::D3] ((PAL::IO::E1::pc=PAL::IO::E1::D3)& (!PAL::to_be_terminated)) -> (default_rate*p_d_1):
4     ↪ (PAL::IO::E1::pc'=PAL::IO::E1::M2) + (default_rate*((1.0)-p_d_1)): (PAL::IO::E1::pc'=PAL::IO::E1::M1);
5   [PAL::IO::E1::D4] ((PAL::IO::E1::pc=PAL::IO::E1::D4)& (!PAL::to_be_terminated)) -> (default_rate*p_d_2):
6     ↪ (PAL::IO::E1::pc'=PAL::IO::E1::M2) + (default_rate*((1.0)-p_d_2)): (PAL::IO::E1::pc'=PAL::IO::E1::M1);
7   [PAL::IO::E1::M2] ((PAL::IO::E1::pc=PAL::IO::E1::M2)&
8     ↪ (!PAL::to_be_terminated)) -> default_rate: (PAL::IO::E1::pc'=PAL::IO::E1::R1ToRoomD);
9   ...
10  endmodule

```

Figure 21: MergeNode part of the PRISM model for PAL use case.

new module is initially inactive (on line #24). It becomes active only after one of its n commands on lines #25–33 synchronises with one of the n commands on lines #3–19 for each incoming edge on an action label which is based on the incoming edge name such as $\{\text{activity.name}\}::\{\text{node.name}\}::\{\text{ien.name}\}$ on lines #16 and #30. On synchronisation, the corresponding incoming concurrent module becomes inactive (such as on line #19 in `curmod_m`) and the new module becomes active (on line #33).

We note that the commands in the new module are only enabled when the module is inactive ($\{\text{modname}\}::\text{pc}=\text{INACTIVE}$). This means the module would not be able to accept another synchronisation on these action labels if the module is active after one synchronisation. Except the `curmod` that has been inactive after the synchronisation, other `curmod` modules can continue to execute until they reach the MergeNode. At that point, they stop at these incoming flows because it is not possible to have the new module ready for another synchronisation. Our assumption of mutually exclusive incoming flows can avoid this issue because there is only one flow active at the same time.

Example 9 (PAL use case). We show part of the PRISM model that corresponds to the MergeNode M2 in Fig. 21.

5.2.10. Input Parameters

An Activity can have parameters in UML, as illustrated in the diagram for the PAL use case in Fig. 8. We consider input parameters. They can be used in any expression in the activity, such as probability, duration, and rate annotations. In UML, ActivityParameterNodes are required to connect the parameters of an activity to other ActivityNodes through ObjectFlows. For example, an input parameter can be specified in an ActivityParameterNode, then a ObjectFlow is connected from the ActivityParameterNode to the decisionInputFlow of a DecisionNode. By this way, the value of the parameter is made available to the guards or the probabilities of the DecisionNode. If we need to use the parameter in several places, then several ObjectFlows are required by UML. This is not convenient for modelling practice. For this reason, we have simplified the reference to a parameter p by introducing a special construct `RefToPara(p)` in the expression syntax. Therefore, ActivityParameterNodes and ObjectFlows are not required.

For each parameter, a constant variable is declared in PRISM, as show below.

```

1  const <parameter.type> {parameter.name};

```

The constant is of type `<parameter.type>`, the corresponding PRISM type to the type `parameter.type` of the parameter, has the same name as the parameter name `{parameter.name}`.

If the parameter has a default value, the constant has also a default value `<parameter.defaultValue>`.

```

1  const <{parameter.type}> {parameter.name} = <parameter.defaultValue>;

```

Then in the expressions where the parameter is referred to by `RefToPara(parameter.name)`, its corresponding expression in PRISM is just the parameter name: `{parameter.name}`.

Example 10 (PAL use case). We have shown the part of the PRISM model that corresponds to the input parameters on lines #12–19 in Fig. 13.

5.2.11. Reliability

An action can be annotated with reliability p , a real value between 0 and 1, to denote the probability p of a successful execution of this service (represented by the action). So the failure probability of the service is $1-p$. There is an implicit DecisionNode here. In activity diagrams, we also do not explicitly show an ActivityNode for the failure to facilitate the modelling. *Semantically, if an action fails, the activity owning this action fails.* This is similar to the ActivityFinal. We show the semantics for actions annotated with reliability in Fig. 22.

In the PRISM semantics, we make the failure node explicit by introducing a local variable $\{\text{modname}\}::\text{to_be_failed}$ (such as on lines #15 and #31) to each module (like `curmod_1` on lines #13–27 and `curmod_m` on lines #29–33) that corresponds to a concurrent flow containing the actions annotated with reliability. We define a formula $\{\text{activity.name}\}::\text{to_be_failed}$ on lines #7–10 which is a disjunction of all these local `to_be_failed` variables. Each module also contains a `to_be_terminated` variable on lines #14 and #30 used to indicate a termination. A failure is regarded as a termination of the activity with $\{\text{activity.name}\}::\text{to_be_failed}$ being true.

```

1 // Disjunctions of all local to_be_failed variables
2 formula {activity.name}::to_be_terminated =
3   curmod_1::to_be_terminated |
4   curmod_2::to_be_terminated | ... |
5   curmod_m::to_be_terminated |
6   ... ;
7 formula {activity.name}::to_be_failed =
8   curmod_1::to_be_failed |
9   curmod_2::to_be_failed | ... |
10  curmod_m::to_be_failed;
11
12 const int {modname}::{oe.target.name} = ?n+1;
13 module curmod_1
14   {modname}::to_be_terminated : bool init false;
15   {modname}::to_be_failed : bool init false;
16
17   [{activity.name}::{node.name}]
18     ({modname}::pc={modname}::{node.name}) &
19     (!{activity.name}::to_be_terminated) ->
20     (<node.reliability>):
21     ({modname}::pc'={modname}::{oe.target.name}) +
22     (1 - <node.reliability>):
23     ({modname}::pc'=INACTIVE) &
24     ({modname}::to_be_failed'=true) &
25     ({modname}::to_be_terminated'=true);
26   ...
27 endmodule
28 ...
29 module curmod_m
30   {modname}::to_be_terminated : bool init false;
31   {modname}::to_be_failed : bool init false;
32   ...
33 endmodule

```

Figure 22: PRISM semantic for OpaqueAction annotated with reliability.

```

1 module PAL::IO::E1
2   ...
3   [PAL::IO::E1::Prepare] ((PAL::IO::E1::pc=PAL::IO::E1::Prepare) & (! (PAL::to_be_terminated))
4     ↪ -> (((1.0)/d_prep)*((1.0)-r_prep)): (PAL::IO::E1::pc'=INACTIVE) & (PAL::IO::E1::to_be_failed'=true) &
5     ↪ (PAL::IO::E1::to_be_terminated'=true) + (((1.0)/d_prep)*r_prep): (PAL::IO::E1::pc'=PAL::IO::E1::F1);
6   ...
7 endmodule

```

Figure 23: Reliability part of the PRISM model for PAL use case.

For an action with the annotation of reliability, its semantics are captured in the command on lines #17-25 where two updates denote a probabilistic choice between a successful execution of the service (pc updated to the target node of the outgoing edge of the action) with probability equal to the reliability `<node.reliability>` and a failure with probability $(1 - \text{<node.reliability>})$. The failure is encoded in three assignments. The first assignment on line #23 makes the module inactive. The second one on line #24 sets the local `to_be_failed` to true. The third one on line #25 sets `to_be_terminated` to true. As discussed in Sect. 5.2.3, all modules will be terminated after that. We note the local `to_be_failed` variable will not be set to false after the termination, and so the formula `{activity.name}::to_be_failed` is still true. This formula is not used in the PRISM model, but can be quantified in properties to indicate the occurrence of a failure.

Example 11 (PAL use case). We show part of the PRISM model that corresponds to the reliability annotation `r_prep` on Prepare on lines #12-19 in Fig. 23 where the first update corresponds to failure and the second update corresponds to success.

5.2.12. Duration and CTMCs

An action can be annotated with a duration d , or a rate r . Both duration and rate are real numbers. We require all actions must be annotated with either a duration or a rate if the activity diagram is to be analysed as a CTMC model. For other `ControlNodes`, we assume they are instantaneous. In other words, they will not take time. This corresponds to the rate is ∞ . However, this is not possible to have rate ∞ in PRISM or other model checkers because they require bounded integer numbers. For a CTMC model in PRISM, every update of a command has an associated rate. If the rate is omitted, then a default rate 1 is assumed. This rate, however, is not always what we want. For this reason, we introduce a constant variable `mean_duration` (whose value can be specified during model checking and here 0.0001 on line #1 is an example) and define a formula `default_rate` for a CTMC model, as illustrated on lines #1-2 in Fig. 24 where the semantics for actions with or without reliability annotations, and for other `ControlNodes` are illustrated.

```

1  const double mean_duration = 0.0001;
2  formula default_rate = 1/mean_duration;
3
4  module curmod
5    ...
6    // if an action is not annotated with reliability
7    [{activity.name}::{node.name}]
8      ({modname}::pc={modname}::{node.name})&
9      (!{activity.name}::to_be_terminate) ->
10     (1/<node.duration>): ({modname}::pc'={modname}::{oe.target.name});
11   // if an action is annotated with reliability
12   [{activity.name}::{node.name}]
13     ({modname}::pc={modname}::{node.name})&
14     (!{activity.name}::to_be_terminated) ->
15     (1/<node.duration>)*(<node.reliability>): ({modname}::pc'={modname}::{oe.target.name})+
16     (1/<node.duration>)*(1-<node.reliability>):
17     ↪ ({modname}::pc'=INACTIVE) & ({modname}::to_be_failed='true) & ({modname}::to_be_terminated='true);
18   // for ControlNodes
19   [{activity.name}::{node.name}]
20     ({modname}::pc={modname}::{node.name})&
21     (!{activity.name}::to_be_terminate) ->
22     default_rate: ({modname}::pc'={modname}::{oe.target.name});
23   // for probabilistic DecisionNode
24   [{modname}::{node.name}]
25     ({modname}::pc={modname}::{node.name})&
26     (!{activity.name}::to_be_terminate) ->
27     default_rate*<oe1.prob>: ({modname}::pc' = {modname}::{oe1.target.name})+
28     default_rate*<oe2.prob>: ({modname}::pc' = {modname}::{oe2.target.name})+
29     ... +
30     default_rate*<oen.prob>: ({modname}::pc' = {modname}::{oen.target.name});
31   // for guarded DecisionNode
32   [{modname}::{node.name}]
33     ({modname}::pc={modname}::{node.name})&<g1>&
34     (!{activity.name}::to_be_terminate) ->
35     default_rate: {modname}::pc'={modname}::{oe1.target.name});
36   ...
37 endmodule

```

Figure 24: PRISM semantic for Action annotated with duration and ActivityNodes analysed in CTMCs.

We show the semantics of an action without and with a reliability annotation on lines #7-10 and on lines #12-16 where each update has a rate $1/\langle \text{node.duration} \rangle$ on line #10 or rates proportional to its reliability on lines #15 and #16. For any ControlNode, it has a `default_rate`, shown on line #21. Similarly, the rates (on lines #26, #27, and #29) for the transitions from a probabilistic DecisionNode are proportional to `default_rate`.

Example 12 (PAL use case). We have shown the duration or rate for a CTMC in various places such as in Figs. 21 and 23.

5.3. Properties

As shown in Fig. 10, activities can be annotated with groups of properties. Each group specifies a Markov model type (DTMC, CTMC, or MDP) and a set of properties to be verified based on the model type. While the verification for the CTMC model takes all annotations into account, that for the DTMC and MDP, however, ignores the duration or rate annotations.

The specified properties are given in PCTL* [52, 53, 54], a combination of the probabilistic computation tree logic (PCTL) [55] and the linear temporal logic (LTL) [56], for DTMCs and MDPs, and in CSL [57, 58], an extension of PCTL for CTMCs. We use the PRISM Property Specification⁷ to specify PCTL* and CSL properties because we use the PRISM and storm model checkers for verification and both use the property specification.

The basic elements in both PCTL* and CSL are atomic propositions (AP). AP in the Markov models for activity diagrams is specified in (1). Then in Sect. 5.2.3 and 5.2.11, we introduce a `terminated` variable, a `to_be_failed` variable for each concurrent flow having actions annotated with reliability, and a `to_be_terminated` variable for each concurrent flow passing through ActivityFinals or the corresponding module having the `to_be_failed` variable. We assume there are r modules having `to_be_failed` and q modules having `to_be_terminated`. Then we define AP for activity diagrams in our PRISM semantics as follows, where $B = \{true, false\}$.

⁷<https://www.prismmodelchecker.org/manual/PropertySpecification>

$$APS \hat{=} \quad (2)$$

$$APS_a \cup \{b: B \bullet \text{terminated} = b\} \cup \quad (3)$$

$$\bigcup \{i: 1..q \bullet \{b: B \bullet \text{to_be_terminated}_i = b\}\} \cup \quad (4)$$

$$\bigcup \{i: 1..r \bullet \{b: B \bullet \text{to_be_failed}_i = b\}\} \quad (5)$$

We note that these variables (including pc) in PRISM models are introduced in our semantic and not in the original activity diagrams. It is inconvenient to specify properties in terms of these variables. For this reason, we introduce several ways to specify AP of properties in activity diagrams directly, as shown below.

```

1 {activity.name} reaches at {activity.name}::{node.name}
2 {activity.name} terminated successfully
3 {activity.name} terminated on fail
4 {activity.name} failed

```

APS_a containing pc variables are specified using a syntax, an activity **reaches at** its node. It will be transformed to $\{\text{modname}\}::\text{pc}=\{\text{modname}\}::\{\text{node.name}\}$ where $\{\text{modname}\}$ is the corresponding module name for the concurrent flow involving the node. An activity **terminated successfully** on line #2 specifies the activity has terminated without a failure. This is transformed to the conjunction of $\{\text{activity.name}\}::\text{terminated}$ and $!\{\text{activity.name}\}::\text{to_be_failed}$ where we use the formula defined on lines #7–10 in Fig. 22 to denote no failure occurs in any module. An activity **terminated on fail** on line #3 specifies the activity has terminated with a failure. This corresponds to the conjunction of $\{\text{activity.name}\}::\text{terminated}$ and $\{\text{activity.name}\}::\text{to_be_failed}$. An activity **failed** on line #4 specifies the activity has failed, and is transformed to $\{\text{activity.name}\}::\text{to_be_failed}$.

Example 13 (PAL use case). We show the corresponding PRISM property for the termination property discussed in Sect. 3.1 as

```
P=? [F PAL_F1_E25_pc = PAL_F1_E25_AF]
```

The complete PRISM properties can be found online.⁸

5.3.1. Rewards

ActivityEdges can be annotated with rewards except edges from a DecisionNode or a ForkNode. Each reward has a name and a real number value. It corresponds to a transition reward in PRISM.

```

1 rewards {reward.name}
2   [{modname}::{edge.source.name}]
3   ({modname}::pc={modname}::{edge.source.name})
4   : <reward.value>;
5 endrewards

```

The action label on line #2 and the guard on line #3 of the reward correspond to the source node of the edge, $\{\text{edge.source.name}\}$.

Example 14 (PAL use case). The PRISM rewards have been shown on lines #24–31 in Fig. 13.

Next, we present the implementation of a tool to automate the transformation and facilitate verification using PRISM.

6. Verification and tool support

6.1. Overview

The detailed workflow to implement our approach in an Eclipse-based tool, QASCAD,⁹ for automation is shown in Fig. 25. The tool uses the Eclipse Modeling Framework (EMF).¹⁰ The implementation exploits the development environments of Eclipse Papyrus¹¹ [59] for system modelling, the Eclipse Epsilon¹² [60] for PRISM code generation through model-to-model and model-to-text transformation, and the probabilistic model checkers (e.g., PRISM, STORM) for verifying the system properties.

As shown in Fig. 25, there are eight steps needed in the workflow to verify the UML models. These activities include *Step 0* - modelling of the activity diagrams with some parameters being kept unspecified, *Step 1* - validation of the activity diagrams, *Step 2* - the transformation of activity diagrams into PRISM models and generation of formal properties, *Step 3* - generation of PRISM code from PRISM models, *Step 4* - synthesis of models to obtain the optimal properties and the corresponding parameters which are not specified at *Step 0*, *Step 5* - update of the unspecified parameters in the activity diagram, *Step 6* - verification of the PRISM code in probabilistic model checker, e.g., PRISM, STORM, *Step 7* - model modification, if *Step 1* of validation or *Step 6* of verification fails, we need to modify the UML activity diagrams and rerun the process. We used Epsilon model management languages to implement the activities from *Step 1* to *Step 3*.

⁸https://github.com/RandallYe/QASCAD/blob/master/Examples/PAL_use_case/prism_models/p_ctmc/pal.props.

⁹Available at <https://github.com/RandallYe/QASCAD/>.

¹⁰www.eclipse.org/modeling/emf/.

¹¹<https://eclipse.dev/papyrus/>.

¹²<https://eclipse.dev/epsilon/>.




Figure 25: Implementation workflow

Step 0 - Modelling. In this work, we use Papyrus as the modelling tool for activity diagrams. Papyrus is a leading open-source UML modelling tool developed under the Eclipse Foundation and driven by the PolarSys Initiative and the Papyrus Industry Consortium. The reasons to use Papyrus are that the tool provides an integrated, user-consumable environment for supporting UML and related modeling languages such as SysML; it supports UML modelling as EMF models, and also offers advanced support for UML profiles. Other UML modelling tools that support EMF models and profiling can also be used in our workflow. During the modelling, we create activity diagrams to model systems and also properties the systems shall satisfy through property stereotypes in the profile.

Step 1 - Validation and modification. We use Epsilon Validation Language (EVL)¹³ to validate the activity diagrams against a set of predefined well-formedness conditions. A subset of these well-formedness conditions is listed in Sect. 5.1.1. There are three sources of the conditions: (1) the constraints for activity diagrams modelling, e.g., *wfc-1* “each edge shall have a name”; (2) the conditions imposed from Markov models, e.g., *wfc-9* “the probabilities of all the outgoing edges from a node shall sum to one”; and (3) the constraints on the content of the property, e.g., the name of the activity diagram used in the property should be correct. If the validation of an activity diagram reports a failure, we will need to modify the diagram accordingly based on the error messages provided.

Step 2 - ETL Transformation. After activity diagrams are validated, we use Epsilon Transformation Language (ETL)¹⁴ to implement the model-to-model transformation from the activity diagram models to PRISM models (*Step 2.1* in Fig. 25) according to the transformation rules defined in Sect. 5.2. Both the source and target models of the transformation are in the form of EMF models and are supported by their metamodels respectively. The UML 2.5 metamodel is provided by an Eclipse project UML2¹⁵ and the PRISM metamodel¹⁶ is an extension of the metamodel presented in [61] to deal with CTMCs. The algorithms of the ETL transformation for *Step 2.1* are given in Sect. 6.2. As the activity diagram is stereotyped with system properties to be verified, within the ETL transformation, these properties written in a controlled natural language are also resolved into formal assertions that can be parsed in the probability model checkers.

Step 3 - EGL Transformation. We use Epsilon Generation Language (EGL)¹⁷ to implement the model-to-text transformation from the PRISM models to PRISM code. As the generation of PRISM code from the PRISM models is straightforward, no corresponding algorithms are provided in this paper. Although we use Epsilon for transformation, other transformation languages like ATL [62] and QVT [63] can also be used as needed.

Step 4 - Synthesis of models. From *Step 2*, the properties are resolved as formal assertions from the activity diagram. On the other hand, the PRISM code from *Step 3* may contain parameters whose values are not specified. These parameters shall be fixed based on the design analysis and can be evolved during runtime. To satisfy the multiple properties, the designers need to verify probabilistic models for numerous instantiations of these parameters to identify a proper set of parameters. This is a tedious manual process and the obtained models are often suboptimal in terms of their trade-offs between properties [4]. In our approach, we use the synthesis tool EvoChecker [4] to automatically optimise the properties and identify the proper set of parameters. EvoChecker is a search-based synthesis approach that automates the multi-objective optimisation process. Through EvoChecker, we can obtain several sets of optimised properties as design targets and the corresponding values for the evolvable parameters. Then, the engineers shall select the proper set of properties and the constant values according to the specific design decisions. This will be further illustrated in Sect. 7.3.

Step 5 - Fix of the unspecified parameters. After the synthesis, we use the selected set of parameters to update the activity models. This is a manual process at the moment. Then, we re-run *Step 1* to *Step 3* to obtain the complete PRISM code which are ready for verification.

¹³www.eclipse.org/epsilon/doc/evl/.

¹⁴www.eclipse.org/epsilon/doc/etl/.

¹⁵<https://projects.eclipse.org/projects/modeling.mdt.uml2>.

¹⁶Available at https://github.com/RandallYe/QASCAD/blob/master/eclipse_workspace/AD2PRISM_Transfromation_workspace/SysML_ActivityDiagram2PRISM/metamodels/sesame_prism.ecore.

¹⁷www.eclipse.org/epsilon/doc/egl/.

Step 6 - Verification. In *Step 6*, the PRISM code is verified against the properties through probabilistic model checking. The verification results may be true or false of boolean type, or numerical numbers (probabilities or rewards). If parametric model checking is applied to the generated PRISM code, the verification results are algebraic expressions.

Step 7 - Modification. If the validation in *Step 1* or the verification in *Step 6* fails, we will need to modify the activity diagram and restart the process from *Step 1*.

6.2. Algorithms for ETL transformation

In this section, we provide algorithms to realise the ETL transformation of *Step 2* from an activity diagram to a PRISM model. The ETL transformation consists of two subsequent phases: the pre-processing of an activity diagrams and the transformation. The pre-processing phase is described in Sect. 6.2.1 through Algorithms 1 to 3. The transformation phase is described in Sect. 6.2.2 through Algorithm 4.

6.2.1. Algorithms for Pre-processing

In the pre-processing phase, we scan each node in an activity to determine which node is executed in which PRISM module (similar to which concurrent flow in the activity), starting from the `InitialNodes` of the top-level `Activity`, and then do a breadth-first traversal for the rest of the nodes. Algorithm 1 provides the main structure of the breadth-first traversal and scans each `InitialNodes`, then calls function `TRAVERSENDS` (Algorithm 2) for the traversal of the rest of the nodes in the activity. Further, Algorithm 2 calls function `MERGPROC` (Algorithm 3) when the `MergeNodes` are processed.

Algorithm 1 Pre-Processing of Activity Diagram

```

1: function PREPROCESS(act,modMaps)
2:   tbvisited ← ⟨⟩, visited ← ⟨⟩
3:   for all inode ∈ GETINITNODES(act) do
4:     for all oe ∈ GETOUTEDGS(inode) do
5:       mod ← MKMODULE(act,inode,oe)
6:       modMaps ← modMaps ∪ {(inode,oe),mod}
7:       modMaps ← modMaps ∪ {(oe.target,oe),mod}
8:       tbvisited ← tbvisited ∪ {oe.target}
9:     end for
10:    visited ← visited ∪ {inode}
11:  end for
12:  TRAVERSENDS(act,modMaps,tbvisited,visited) ▷ Alg. 2
13: end function

```

Algorithm 1 defines the pre-processing step for an activity. The main purpose is to create all the necessary PRISM modules for the activity and to group the nodes into the corresponding modules. The result will be the basis for the transformation phase.

The input parameter is denoted as *act* of type `Activity` (shown in Fig. 1) in the UML metamodel and the output parameter is *modMaps* (of type a set of tuples) for the mappings from the nodes of *act* to new PRISM modules (line 1). It initializes sequences *tbvisited* and *visited* (line 2), representing a sequence of all the nodes to be processed and already processed, to be empty.

The algorithm iterates over all initial nodes, retrieved through `GETINITNODES(act)`, in the activity diagram (line 3). For each initial node *inode*, the algorithm iterates over its outgoing edges (`GETOUTEDGS(inode)`) (line 4). For each outgoing edge *oe*, a PRISM module *mod* is created using the function `MKMODULE`. This initial node *inode* is associated with its outgoing edge *oe* as a tuple (*inode*,*oe*). This tuple and the PRISM module *mod* form another tuple (*inode*,*oe*),*mod*, denoting *inode* and *oe* is associated with *mod*, which is added (\cup) to the set *modMaps* (line 6). Similarly, the association of the target node *oe.target* of the edge *oe* and *oe* with *mod* is added to *modMaps* (line 7). The *oe.target* is also appended to *tbvisited* and so it will be explored next. The current node is marked as visited by appending it to *visited* (line 10).

After the initial nodes are processed to create the corresponding PRISM modules, the algorithm then calls the `TRAVERSENDS` function (line 12) to process the rest nodes in the activity diagram, and then preprocessing concludes. The algorithm is designed to be part of a larger workflow for model transformation and verification.

Algorithm 2 is called by the `PREPROCESS` function (Alg. 1) to traverse the remaining nodes in an activity (*act*) other than the initial nodes. Therefore, Algorithm 2 has the same purpose as Algorithm 1, which is to create all the necessary PRISM modules and to group the nodes into the corresponding modules.

The function takes several parameters, including the activity (*act*), the module map (*modMaps*), the sequence of nodes (*tbvisited*) to be visited in this function, and the sequence of visited nodes (*visited*).

Initially, a set *dumModMap* of tuples (mappings from a node to a module) is initialised to be empty on line 2. The traversal is performed using a while loop that continues until the node sequence *tbvisited* is empty (line 3). Within the loop, the algorithm dequeues a node *nd* from *tbvisited* (line 4). The algorithm then checks the type of the node and executes different actions accordingly. The function `GETOUTEDGS` on line 5 returns all outgoing edges (*outes*) of *nd* in *act*.

If the node type is *OpaqueAction*, a PRISM module (*mod*) associated with *nd* is retrieved from *modMaps* (line 7) through the function `GETMODULE`. According to the well-formedness condition `wfc-2`, there is only one incoming

Algorithm 2 Traversal of rest nodes in activity diagram

```
1: function TRAVERSE_NDS(act, modMaps, tbvisited, visited)
2:   dumModMap  $\leftarrow \emptyset$ 
3:   while  $\neg$ EMPTY(tbvisited) do
4:     nd  $\leftarrow$  tbvisited.REMOVEAT(0)
5:     outes  $\leftarrow$  GETOUTEDGS(act, nd)
6:     if nd.type = OpaqueAction then
7:       mod  $\leftarrow$  GETMODULE(modMaps, nd)
8:       oe  $\leftarrow$  GETOUTEDG(act, nd)
9:       ADDTGT(oe, mod, modMaps, tbvisited)
10:      visited  $\leftarrow$  visited  $\hat{\cup}$   $\langle nd \rangle$ 
11:    else if nd.type = ForkNode then
12:      mod  $\leftarrow$  GETMODULE(modMaps, nd)
13:      isFirstBranch  $\leftarrow$  true
14:      for all oe  $\in$  outes do
15:        if isFirstBranch then
16:          ADDTGT(oe, mod, modMaps, tbvisited)
17:          isFirstBranch  $\leftarrow$  false
18:        else
19:          newmod  $\leftarrow$  MKMODULE(act, nd, oe)
20:          ADDTGT(oe, newmod, modMaps, tbvisited)
21:        end if
22:      end for
23:      visited  $\leftarrow$  visited  $\hat{\cup}$   $\langle nd \rangle$ 
24:    else if nd.type = JoinNode then
25:      ie_ran  $\leftarrow$  GETRANDOMIE(act, nd)
26:      mod  $\leftarrow$  GETMODULE(modMaps, ie_ran.source)
27:      oe  $\leftarrow$  GETOUTEDG(act, nd)
28:      if mod.ISDEFINED() then
29:        ADDTGT(oe, mod, modMaps, tbvisited)
30:        visited  $\leftarrow$  visited  $\hat{\cup}$   $\langle nd \rangle$ 
31:        tbvisited.REMOVE(nd)
32:      else
33:        tbvisited  $\leftarrow$  tbvisited  $\hat{\cup}$   $\langle nd \rangle$ 
34:      end if
35:    else if nd.type = DecisionNode then
36:      mod  $\leftarrow$  GETMODULE(modMaps, nd)
37:      for all oe  $\in$  outes do
38:        ADDTGT(oe, mod, modMaps, tbvisited)
39:      end for
40:      visited  $\leftarrow$  visited  $\hat{\cup}$   $\langle nd \rangle$ 
41:    else if nd.type = MergeNode then
42:      MRGPROC(act, nd, modMaps, tbvisited, visited, dumModMap)
43:    else if (nd.type = FlowFinalNode | nd.type = ActivityFinalNode) & nd  $\notin$  visited then
44:      visited  $\leftarrow$  visited  $\hat{\cup}$   $\langle nd \rangle$ 
45:    end if
46:  end while
47:  RESOLVEDUMMODS(DUMMODMAP, MODMAPS)
48: end function
```

▷ Alg. 3

edge to an *OpaqueAction* and so there is only one PRISM module associated with the node. This is the module which *GETMODULE* will return. According to the well-formedness condition [wfc-3](#), there is exactly one outgoing edge to an action. So for the outgoing edge (*oe*), the *ADDTGT* function (line 9) added the new mapping from *oe* and its target node to *mod* to *modMaps* and the target node also to the sequence (*tbvisited*) for further processing. The implementation of *ADDTGT* is equal to two lines 7 and 8 in [Algorithm 1](#). Then, the processing of this node (*nd*) is completed and marked as visited (lines 10).

If the node type is *ForkNode*, the algorithm identifies its associated PRISM module. It traverses the outgoing edges (*oe*) and calls *ADDTGT* to add the new mapping from *oe* and its target node to *mod* to *modMaps* and add the target node of *oe* to *tbvisited*. For the first outgoing branch of the fork node, the current *mod* is reused in *ADDTGT*, while for subsequent branches, a new PRISM module *newmod* is used. At last, the current node is marked as visited (lines 23).

If the node type is *JoinNode*, the algorithm randomly retrieves an incoming edge (*ie_ran*), and then gets the associated PRISM module (*mod*) with the source node (*ie_ran.source*) of the edge. A *JoinNode* has multiple incoming edges and so probably there are multiple different modules (for different incoming edges) associated with it in *modMaps*. Therefore, we cannot use *GETMODULE*(*modMaps, nd*) to retrieve one module. That is why we randomly select one of its incoming edges and get a module associated with the source node of this incoming edge. If this associated PRISM module (*mod*) exists (line 28), this means the source node of this incoming edge of (*nd*) is processed and

so we can proceed with this node (nd). The processing includes calling `ADDTGT` to add the new mapping from oe and its target node to mod to $modMaps$ and add the target node of oe to $tbvisited$ for further processing, and marking the current node as visited; and also, we need to remove all nd from the sequence ($tbvisited$) (line 31) so that it won't be processed again. Otherwise, the node is added back to the sequence ($tbvisited$) for later processing (lines 30).

If the node type is *DecisionNode*, the associated PRISM module is retrieved. For each outgoing edge, the `ADDTGT` function is called again to add the new mapping from oe and its target node to mod to $modMaps$ and add the target node of oe to $tbvisited$ for further processing. The current node is marked as visited (lines 40).

If the node type is *MergeNode*, the processing of the node is complex and the details are given in `MRGPROC` function (Alg. 3), which handles the merge process.

If the node type is either *FlowFinalNode* or *ActivityFinalNode*, and the node has not been visited, it is marked as visited (line 44).

The algorithm continues this process until all nodes are visited. Then the function `RESOLVEDUMMODS` (line 47) is called to resolve dummy modules. The detail about the implementation of this function is omitted here, but we will illustrate its behaviour in Example 15.

The traversal provides the necessary information for further steps in the model transformation and verification workflow.

Algorithm 3 Processing of Merge Nodes

```

1: function MRGPROC(act, nd, modMaps, tbvisited, visited, dumModMap)
2:   mrgMods ← GETMODULESET(nd, modMaps)
3:   if mrgMods.SIZE() > 1 then
4:     oe ← GETOUTEDG(act, nd)
5:     newmod ← MKMODULE(act, nd)
6:     ADDTGT(oe, newmod, modMaps, tbvisited)
7:     visited ← visited ∪ {nd}
8:     tbvisited.REMOVE(nd)
9:   else if mrgMods.SIZE() = 1 & ALLSRCVISITED(act, nd) then
10:    oe ← GETOUTEDG(act, nd)
11:    existMod ← mrgMods.at(0)
12:    ADDTGT(oe, existMod, modMaps, tbvisited)
13:    visited ← visited ∪ {nd}
14:    tbvisited.REMOVE(nd)
15:   else
16:     if tbvisited.SIZE() = 0 then
17:       oe ← GETOUTEDG(act, nd)
18:       newmod ← MKMODULE(act, nd)
19:       ADDTGT(oe, newmod, modMaps, tbvisited)
20:       dumModMap ← dumModMap ∪ {(nd, newmod)}
21:       visited ← visited ∪ {nd}
22:     else
23:       MULLOOPSPROC(act, nd, modMaps, tbvisited, visited, dumModMap)
24:     end if
25:   end if
26: end function

```

Algorithm 3 is responsible for processing merge nodes in an activity (act). This algorithm is called by the `TRAVERSEENDS` function (Alg. 2) when visiting merge nodes.

The function takes several parameters, including the activity (act), the current merge node (nd), the node to module mappings ($modMaps$), the sequence of nodes ($tbvisited$), the set of visited nodes ($visited$), and the dummy module mapping ($dumModMap$).

Firstly, a set $mrgMods$ of modules that are associated with nd is retrieved by the function `GETMODULESET`. Secondly, the processing of merge nodes involves several conditional branches:

- If the set of modules associated with the merge node ($mrgMods$) has a size greater than 1, it indicates that the incoming edges of the merge node nd are from multiple modules. In this case, a new PRISM module ($newmod$) is created for nd . Similarly, the function `ADDTGT` is called. The merge node is marked as visited (line 7). Also, we need to remove nd in the sequence ($tbvisited$) so that it will not be processed again (line 8).
- If the size of $mrgMods$ is 1 and all source nodes are visited (line 9), it indicates that the incoming edges are from the same existing module, therefore we can proceed with this merge node.
- If the first two conditions in lines 3 and 9 are not met, i.e., not all the source nodes are visited, then if the size of $tbvisited$ is 0 (line 16), it means there are no more nodes to be visited at the moment. Because not all the source nodes of the incoming edges of the *MergeNode* are visited, it means at least one of the source nodes

<pre> 1 {(D1, E5), PAL::IO::E1}, 2 (D2, E8), PAL::IO::E1}, 3 (D3, E13), PAL::IO::E1}, 4 (D4, E15), PAL::IO::E1}, 5 (D5, E20), PAL::IO::E1}, 6 (F1, E2), PAL::IO::E1}, 7 (I0, E1), PAL::IO::E1}, 8 ((J1, E24), PAL::IO::E1}, 9 (M1, E14), PAL::IO::E1}, 10 (M1, E16), PAL::IO::E1}, 11 (M1, E6), PAL::IO::E1}, 12 ((M2, E17), PAL::IO::E1}, 13 (M2, E18), PAL::IO::E1}, 14 (M3, E21), PAL::IO::E1}, 15 (M3, E7), PAL::IO::E1}, 16 ((M4, E10), PAL::IO::E1}, 17 (M4, E23), PAL::IO::E1}, </pre>	<pre> 18 ((Prepare, E1), PAL::IO::E1), 19 {(R1DeliveredRoomD, E22), PAL::IO::E1}, 20 ((R1Stuck, E9), PAL::IO::E1}, 21 ((R1ToCorA, E3), PAL::IO::E1}, 22 ((R1ToCorBThrDoor1, E11), PAL::IO::E1}, 23 ((R1ToCorBThrDoor2, E12), PAL::IO::E1}, 24 ((R1ToDoorAB, E4), PAL::IO::E1}, 25 ((R1ToRoomD, E19), PAL::IO::E1}, 26 ((AF, E33), PAL::F1::E25}, 27 ((D6, E27), PAL::F1::E25}, 28 ((J1, E32), PAL::F1::E25}, 29 ((M5, E29), PAL::F1::E25}, 30 ((M5, E31), PAL::F1::E25}, 31 ((R2DeliveredRoomD, E28), PAL::F1::E25}, 32 ((R2Stuck, E30), PAL::F1::E25}, 33 ((R2ToCorC, E25), PAL::F1::E25}, 34 ((R2ToDoorCD, E26), PAL::F1::E25)} </pre>
---	--

Figure 26: The resulting mappings for the application of Algorithm 1 to PAL use case.

depends on this MergeNode. For example, one incoming edge forms a loop with the outgoing edge from the MergeNode. In this case, a new PRISM module *newmod* is created for the merge node. The mapping from *nd* to *newmod* is added to *dumModMap*. The merge node is marked as visited (line 21).

- If none of the above conditions are met, it means that there are other nodes in *tbvisited*. These nodes might be all MergeNodes. In this case, they might be mutually related to form multiple loops. These nodes might have nodes other than MergeNodes. In that case, the processing of this *nd* should be delayed to process those nodes first. We implement an algorithm to deal with both cases in the function MULLOOPSPROC (line 23), whose definition is omitted here for simplicity.

The processing of merge nodes is crucial for capturing the synchronisation points in the activity diagram, and the results contribute to the subsequent steps of the model transformation and verification workflow.

Algorithm 1 invokes Algorithm 2, which in turn invokes Algorithm 3. Therefore, we consider the complexity of the three algorithms together in Algorithm 1. The complexity of Algorithm 3 is $O(1)$ and has no impact on the overall complexity of Algorithm 1. The complexity of Algorithm 2 is $O(n^2)$ because there are at most two-level nested loops: a while loop to traverse all nodes of an activity on lines 3-47, and three nested for loops to traverse outgoing edges of a node on lines 8-10, 15-23, and 38-40 where n denotes the largest number among the number of nodes in *act* and the number of outgoing edges from all nodes in *act*. The complexity of Algorithm 1 is also $O(n^2)$, because there is a nested two-level loop on lines 3-11 whose complexity is $O(n^2)$ and an invoke of Algorithm 2 whose complexity is also $O(n^2)$.

Example 15 (Pre-processing of PAL use case). The application of Algorithm 1 to the PAL use case in Fig. 8 results in two PRISM modules. According to *modMaps* shown in Fig. 26, the nodes R2ToCorC, R2ToDoorCD, D6, R2DeliveredRoomD, R2Stuck, M5, J1, and AF (on lines #26-34) will be allocated to one module (PAL::F1::E25) and other nodes to another module (PAL::IO::E1). We also note that J1 is also associated with the module PAL::IO::E1.

The order of visited nodes, recorded in *visited*, is $\langle I0, Prepare, F1, R1ToCorA, R2ToCorC, R1ToDoorAB, R2ToDoorCD, D1, D6, R2DeliveredRoomD, R2Stuck, M5, J1, AF, M3, R1Stuck, M4, M1, D2, R1ToCorBThrDoor1, R1ToCorBThrDoor2, D3, D4, M2, R1ToRoomD, \text{ and } D5 \rangle$. We note that after D1 on the first concurrent flow (FCF) is visited, the algorithm visits all nodes (D6, R2DeliveredRoomD, R2Stuck, M5, J1, and AF) on the second concurrent flow (SCF) first before it revisits the nodes (starting from M3) on FCF. This is because the nodes after D1 on FCF are M1 and M3 of which both are MergeNode. Because only one of the incoming edges for both MergeNodes is visited, this case will be dealt with by the function MULLOOPSPROC (line 23) in Algorithm 3. In this case, visiting both MergeNodes is delayed till the other flow (SCF) is visited. After that, the set *visited* contains the two MergeNodes only. However, visiting both the nodes cannot make any progression because M3 has another incoming edge E21 to be visited but E21 is dependent on the flow from M1, and M1 has other two incoming edges E14 and E16 to be visited but they are also dependent on the flow from M1 (due to the two loops between M1 and D3 (and D4)). In our algorithm (specifically MULLOOPSPROC whose implementation detail is omitted for simplicity), we will create a dummy module (DMod3) for the outgoing edge of M3 to let the process continue. So the next visited nodes after M3 are R1Stuck and M4 (whose situation is the same as M3 and a dummy module DMod4 is created). Because J1 has been visited, the process completes the visit of this branch and continues to visit M1. Now the only node to be visited in *tbvisited* is M1.

According to the implementation starting from line 16 in Algorithm 3, a new dummy module DMod1 is created for the outgoing edge E8 of M1 to let the process continue. After both the edges E14 and E16 are visited where their source nodes D3 and D4 are associated with the same dummy module DMod1 because the nodes D2 and two OpaqueActions between M1 and D3 (or D4) will not create a new module. With the help of dummy modules, the algorithm visits all the nodes in the diagram but leaves three dummy modules (DMod3, DMod4, and DMod1, created when visiting M3, M4, and M1) in *dumMapSeq*. These dummy modules are resolved by the function SOLVEDUMMAPS in Algorithm 2. The basic idea of the resolution is to check how many different modules are from all the incoming

edges of a MergeNode. For M1, there are two: one (Mod1) corresponding to D1 and one dummy module (DMod1) corresponding to D3 and D4. In this case, we simply replace the dummy module (DMod1) with the module (Mod1) for D1 in *modMaps* because this module (Mod1) fulfils all pre-processing rules for these nodes.

For M3, the module for the source node D1 of its incoming edge E7 is Mod1 and that for the source node D5 of its incoming edge E21 is also Mod1 (was DMod1 but replaced with Mod1 when resolving M1, discussed previously). In this case, its outgoing dummy module (DMod3) is also replaced with Mod1 because there is only one module for all its incoming edges and its outgoing edge should use the same module. For M4, it is a similar case. Finally, all three dummy modules are replaced with Mod1. \square

6.2.2. Algorithms for Transformation

After the activity diagram is processed, the modules are created with corresponding nodes allocated to the modules. Then, we can start the second phase of the transformation from the activity elements to the PRISM elements as defined in Sect. 5.2. The implementation of this phase is described in **Algorithm 4**.

Algorithm 4 utilises the results obtained from the pre-processing phase, specifically the node and edge to module mappings (*modMaps*). It has other two parameters: *act* for an activity to be transformed, and *model* for a resultant PRISM model.

Algorithm 4 Transformation of PRISM models

```

1: function TRANSFORMATION(act,modMaps,model)
2:   nemMods  $\leftarrow$  SETOFNDMAPPERMOD(modMaps)
3:   for all nemMod  $\in$  nemMods do
4:     c  $\leftarrow$  0
5:     for all nem  $\in$  nemMod do
6:       nd  $\leftarrow$  nem.1.1, ie  $\leftarrow$  nem.1.2, mod  $\leftarrow$  nem.2
7:       outes  $\leftarrow$  GETOUTEDGS(act,nd)
8:       MKCONSTADDTOMODEL(nd,c,model)
9:       c  $\leftarrow$  c+1
10:      if nd.type = InitialNode then
11:        MKCOMMD(act,nd,mod,ie)
12:        CHECKMKEDGRWD(act,nd,mod)
13:      else if nd.type = OpaqueAction then
14:        oe  $\leftarrow$  GETOUTEDG(act,nd)
15:        if NDANNORELIABILITY(nd) then
16:          rel  $\leftarrow$  getRel(nd)
17:          MKRELCOMMD(act,nd,mod,oe,rel)
18:        else
19:          MKCOMMD(act,nd,mod,oe)
20:        end if
21:        CHECKMKNDREWARD(act,nd,mod)
22:      else if nd.type = ForkNode then
23:        oe1  $\leftarrow$  GETOUTEDG1(act,nd)
24:        MKSYNCCOMMD(act,nd,mod,oe1)
25:      else if nd.type = JoinNode then
26:        oe  $\leftarrow$  GETOUTEDG(act,nd)
27:        if ((oe.target,oe),mod)  $\in$  modMaps then
28:          MKSYNCCOMMD(act,nd,mod,oe)
29:        else
30:          MKSYNCCOMMD(act,nd,mod,"INACT")
31:      end if
32:      else if nd.type = DecisionNode then
33:        if BRANCHESPROB(act,nd) then
34:          MKPROBCOMMD(act,nd,mod,outes)
35:        else
36:          for all oute  $\in$  outes do
37:            MKCOMMD(act,nd,mod,oute)
38:          end for
39:        end if
40:      else if nd.type = MergeNode then
41:        oe  $\leftarrow$  GETOUTEDG(act,nd)
42:        if ((oe.target,oe),mod)  $\in$  modMaps then
43:          MKCOMMD(act,nd,mod,oe)
44:        else
45:          MKSYNCCOMMD(act,nd,mod,"INACT")
46:        end if
47:        CHECKMKEDGRWD(act,nd,mod)
48:      else if nd.type = FlowFinalNode then
49:        MKCOMMD(act,nd,mod,"INACT")
50:      else if nd.type = ActivityFinalNode then
51:        AF(act,nd,mod)
52:      end if
53:    end for
54:  end for
55:  model.modules  $\leftarrow$  {p | p  $\in$  modMaps  $\bullet$  p.2}
56:  MKPARAMETERS(act)
57:  MKPROPERTIES(act)
58: end function

```

A new variable, *nemMods*, is introduced. It is the result of applying the function SETOFNDMAPPERMOD to *modMaps* to group all mappings that share a same module into a set. So *nemMods* is a set of sets, each comprising mappings from *modMaps* that share the same module value (line 2).

The transformation involves iterating through the set *nemMods*. For each its set element (*nemMod*), a variable *c* is introduced to record the next available integer number for making a constant. Then the inner loop (line 3) iterates through *nemMod* for each its element *nem*, a mapping from a node and an edge to a module. For *nem*, the corresponding node (*nd*), the incoming edge of the node (*ie*), and the module are extracted using the tuple selection dot operator (lines 6). For example, *nem*.1.1 selects the first element *nd* in the first element (*nd,ie*) of *nem* if *nem* is ((*nd,ie*),*mod*). In this case, *nem*.2 gives *mod*. We also use GETOUTEDGS (line 7) to get all outgoing edges *outes* from *nd*.

On line 8, MKCONSTADDTOMODEL creates a new constant (corresponding to each node in the module *mod*) using the current value of *c* and adds it to the PRISM model. This variable *c* is increased by one (line 9) to make the integer number *c*+1 available for the next constant.

The algorithm then checks the type of the node and performs different actions according to the type:

- If the node type is *InitialNode*, a command is created by MKCOMMD and an edge reward (if exists) is created by CHECKMKEDGRWD (lines 11 - 12).

- If the node type is *OpaqueAction*, its only outgoing edge (see [wfc-3](#)) *oe* is retrieved through GETOUTEDG. As actions in an activity diagram can be annotated with reliability, if the annotation exists (NDANNORELIABILITY(nd)), a reliability-related command (using function MKRELCOMMD) will be created (line 17) with the reliability value *rel* retrieved by GETREL. Otherwise, a normal command is created. Additionally, edge rewards and node rewards are checked for existence and generated accordingly, respectively (line 21).
- If the node type is *ForkNode*, a synchronisation command is generated using the target node of the first outgoing edge (*oe1*) only (line 24) because the target node of *oe1* is in the same module as this fork node, while the target nodes of the sequent outgoing edges are associated with other separate modules as described in Algorithm 2.
- If the node type is *JoinNode*, a synchronisation command is generated (lines 25 - 30). If the target node *oe.target* of its outgoing edge *oe* is associated with the same module *mod* as this *JoinNode* (line 27), it means that the current module should continue transitions to *oe.target* and so a synchronisation command is created with *oe* (line 28). Otherwise, this module discontinues and a synchronisation command is created to update its state to “INACTIVE” (line 30).
- If the node type is *DecisionNode*, a probabilistic command is generated based on branch probabilities using MKPROBCOMMD, or a regular command for each its outgoing edge *oute* is generated (lines 32 - 38).
- If the node type is *MergeNode*, the transformation is similar to that for *JoinNode* except a regular command for the first case (instead of a synchronisation command) and a possible edge reward (lines 40 - 47).
- If the node type is *FlowFinalNode*, a command is generated to terminate this flow or make this module “INACTIVE” (line 49).
- If the node type is *ActivityFinalNode*, the AF function is called, which involves additional processing of the *ActivityFinalNode* to terminate the whole behavior of the activity diagram (line 51).

After processing all nodes and edges, the algorithm concludes by generating parameters and properties for the PRISM model (lines 56 - 57). Then, in *Step 3*, we can generate the PRISM code from the outcome of Algorithm 4, i.e., the PRISM models, for probabilistic model checking. An excerpt of the PRISM code generated from the transformed PRISM models is available in Fig 13.

The complexity of Algorithm 4 is $O(n^3)$, because there is a three-level nested for loops starting on lines 3, 5, and 36 where n is the largest number among the number of the modules, the maximum number of nodes in the modules, and the maximum number of the outgoing edges of all *DecisionNodes*. The for loop starting on line 36 aims to deal with guarded outgoing edges from a *DecisionNode*. If there are no such guarded edges in activity diagrams, such as the PAL use case, the complexity of Algorithm 4 then is $O(n^2)$.

6.3. Tool implementation

The open-source implementation of our approach, full experimental results summarised in the next section, the case studies used for its evaluation, and the tool setup instructions and requirements are available on our project webpage.¹⁸

7. Evaluation

7.1. Research Questions

We evaluated the effectiveness and validity of our approach through case studies to answer the following three research questions.

RQ1 (Correctness): Does our approach generate valid PRISM models from activity diagrams? We gave the semantics of activity diagrams in the PRISM language, as presented in Sects. 5.1 and 5.2, and implemented it using the corresponding algorithms shown in Section 6.2. Therefore, we evaluated the correctness of both the semantics and the implementation.

RQ2 (Efficiency): Can activity diagrams be verified in the probabilistic model checkers with acceptable overheads in terms of computational resources and time? We checked the time efficiency of the PRISM code generation from activity diagrams. Also, we analyse the state space size of the generated PRISM code and its impact on the model checking efficiency.

RQ3 (Decision Support): How does our approach support the design process and facilitate design decisions for users? This research question aims to explore the practical implications and benefits of our approach in supporting users to make design decisions based on verification results of the generated PRISM code.

Table 1: The use cases used for evaluation

Example	Configuration	ModelType	Note
Six-sided dice (SD) [64]	Fair coin	DTMC	
	Parametrised	DTMC	
Digital camera (DC) [49]	Parametrised	DTMC	Original PTA
	Parametrised	MDP	
	Duration	CTMC	
Fruit picking (FP) [26]	Parametrised-Reward	DTMC	Algebraic expression
Travel web (TW) [25]	Parametrised	CTMC	Default duration
IT support (IS) [25]	Parametrised	CTMC	Default duration
Travel management (TM) [35]	Reliability	DTMC	Default duration
	Reliability	MDP	
	Reliability-Duration	CTMC	
PAL	Reward	DTMC	Default duration
	Reward	MDP	
	Parametrised-Reward	CTMC	

7.2. Evaluated Examples

In this work, we used seven case studies (as shown in Table 1) from different application domains to evaluate the research questions. Each case study is used to evaluate different features of activity diagrams, but there is also overlap in terms of features among these case studies.

The six-sided dice (SD) [64] models the Knuth’s algorithm of simulating a die using a fair coin in an activity diagram. Imagine standing at the root vertex (state 0) of a horizontal tree-like structure whose six leaves are the values of the six sides of a dice. At this starting point, you initiate the process by tossing a fair coin. If the result is heads, you move along the upper branch; if tails, you take the lower branch. This process is iteratively repeated based on the outcome of each coin toss. The traversal continues until the final value of the die is determined, i.e., a leaf is reached. If the coin used is a fair coin, then the probabilities of getting heads and tails are the same, otherwise, the probability for each toss is parametrised. We experimented with both of these two configurations. The SD activity diagram has the features of reward, parametrised probability, and property annotations, and the decision-merge loop structure.

The digital camera (DC) case study [49] models the process of using a digital photo-camera device to take a picture in an activity diagram. The DC activity diagram has the features of duration, parametrised probability and property annotations, and the concurrent flow structure.

The fruit-picking (FP) case study [26] models the functionality of a fruit-picking robot from the autonomous farming domain. The robot performs three operations autonomously including: (1) to position itself in the right location for the fruit picking; (2) to use its arm to pick up the fruit; and (3) when operation 2 is unsuccessful, to decide whether to retry the fruit picking from operation 1 or to terminate the operation. The FP activity diagram has the features of parametrised probability, reward, and property annotations.

The travel web (TW) application case study [25] models a service-based system that is implemented using six real-world web services: two commercial web services provided by Thales Group, three free Bing web services provided by Microsoft, and a free web service X.Net. The TW application handles two types of user requests: (1) a plan to meet and entertain a visitor arriving by train; and (2) looking for a possible destination for a day trip by train for the user. The TW activity diagram has the features of parametrised duration and property annotations, and the decision-merge loop structure.

The IT support system (IS) case study [25] models a real-world IT support system deployed at the Federal Institute of Education, Science and Technology of Rio Grande de Norte (IFRN), Brazil. The system enables the IFRN IT support team to handle user tickets reporting problems with the institute’s computing systems. The IS activity diagram has the features of parametrised rate, parametrised probability, and property annotations, and the multiple decision-merge loop structure.

The travel management (TM) case study [35] models a travel management functionality that starts from a travel location, and offers booking services and notifications. The TM activity diagram has the features of parametrised duration, parametrised reliability, and property annotations, the concurrent flow structure and the decision-merge loop structure.

The PAL example presented in Sect. 3 is also used for evaluation in this section.

Among the seven case studies, SD and FP are verified as DTMC models in the experiment; TW and IT are verified as CTMC models; DC, TM and PAL are verified as DTMC, MDP, and CTMC models respectively.

¹⁸https://github.com/RandallYe/QASCAD/tree/master/eclipse_workspace/AD2PRISM_Transfromation_workspace

7.3. Evaluation methodology and results

We used the seven case studies listed in Table 1 to evaluate our approach. The activity diagram, the generated PRISM code and properties, and verification results for each case study can be found online.¹⁹

RQ1 (Correctness). To address the first question regarding correctness, we compare the verification results of our automatically generated PRISM models with those reported in the literature across five case studies, excluding the DC and PAL examples. The verified properties and the corresponding results, obtained using the PRISM model checker, are presented in Table 2. We note that all these examples are verified to be deadlock-free.

The verification results for DC and PAL are not used for the comparison, as we lack available referenced results for these cases. The literature source [49] for the DC example focuses on PTA models, while we generated DTMC, MDP, and CTMC models from the same DC example. Consequently, the verification results are not directly comparable for the DC case. Also, the PAL use case is not sourced from published literature so it has no available referenced results.

Table 2: The comparison of our verification (actual) results with the (expected) results from literature for evaluated use cases.

Use case	Property	Actual result	Exp Result	Delta
SD-DTMC	P=? [F Six_dice reaches at Six_dice::x] for x in {01,02,03,04,05,06}	0.167	0.167	0
	R{"reward_flip"}=?[F Six_dice reaches at Six_dice::F0]	3.67	3.67	0
SD-para	P=? [F Six_dice reaches at Six_dice::01]	$p^2/(p+1)$	the same	0
	P=? [F Six_dice reaches at Six_dice::02]	$p^2/(p+1)$	the same	0
	P=? [F Six_dice reaches at Six_dice::03]	$(p-p^2)/(p+1)$	the same	0
	P=? [F Six_dice reaches at Six_dice::04]	$(p^2-p^3)/(p^2-p+1)$	the same	0
	P=? [F Six_dice reaches at Six_dice::05]	$(p^3-2p^2+p)/(p^2-p+1)$	the same	0
	P=? [F Six_dice reaches at Six_dice::06]	$(3p^2-p^3-3p+1)/(p^2-p+1)$	the same	0
	R{"reward_flip"}=? [Six_dice reaches at Six_dice::F0]	$(p^4-5p^3+4p^2+p-3)/(p^4-p^3+p-1)$	the same	0
FP	P=? [F "picking success"]	$(\alpha p_1 \beta p_2 - \alpha p_1)/(\alpha p_1 \beta p_2 p_3 - 1)$	the same	0
	R{"time"}=? [F "done"]	$-(\alpha p_1 \beta p_2 t_3 + t_1 + \alpha p_1 t_2)/(\alpha p_1 \beta p_2 p_3 - 1)$	the same	0
	R{"energy"}=? [F "done"]	$-(\alpha p_1 \beta p_2 e_3 + e_1 + \alpha p_1 e_2)/(\alpha p_1 \beta p_2 p_3 - 1)$	the same	0
IS	P=? [F<=100 "complete"]	0.4394	0.4395	1e-4
	P=? [(!"reopen"& !"addInfo")U<=100 "complete"]	0.4296 (duration=0.01)	0.4297	1e-4
TW	P=? [F<=1 "complete"]	0.4147	0.4147	0
	P=? [!"arrival"U<=1 "complete"]/(1-p1)	0.3625	0.3625	0
	P=? [F<=1 "complete"] - 2*(1-P=? [F=3 "complete"])	0.2664 (duration=1e-8)	0.2664	0
TM-DTMC	P=? [F (TM terminated successfully)]	0.775	0.775	0
	filter(max, P=? [F (TM terminated successfully)], (TM reaches at TM::checkSchedule))	0.824	0.824	0
	filter(max, P=? [F (TM terminated successfully)], (TM reaches at TM::requestMeeting))	0.950	0.950	0
TM-MDP	filter(max, Pmax=? [F (TM terminated successfully)], (TM reaches at TM::makeCall))	0.932	0.932	0
	filter(min, Pmin=? [F (TM terminated successfully)], (TM reaches at TM::makeCall))	0.841	0.841	0
TM-CTMC	P=? [F=t (TM terminated successfully)] for (t ≥ 100)	0.775 (duration=0.1)	0.775	N/A
	P=? [F=t (TM terminated successfully)] for (t < 100)	Fig. 27 (duration=0.1)	Fig. 27	Fig. 27
DC-DTMC	A [F dc reaches at dc::AF]	true	true	N/A
	P=? [F dc reaches at dc::AF]	1.0	N/A	N/A
	P=? [F (dc terminated successfully)]	1.0	N/A	N/A
DC-MDP	A [F dc reaches at dc::AF]	true	true	N/A
	Pmin=? [F (dc terminated successfully)]	1.0	N/A	N/A
	Pmax=? [F (dc terminated successfully)]	1.0	N/A	N/A
DC-CTMC	P=? [F<=10 dc reaches at dc::AF]	0.86	N/A	N/A
	P=? [F<=10 ((dc reaches at dc::M1) (dc reaches at dc::AutoFocus))&(dc reaches at dc::TakePicture)]	0.232 (duration=0.1)	N/A	N/A
PAL-CTMC	P=? [F<=10 "Either delivered"]	0.999	N/A	N/A
	P=? [F<=10 "Both delivered"]	0.176	N/A	N/A
	P=? [F<=10 "Both stuck"]	6.51×1e-5	N/A	N/A
	P=? [F<=10 "terminate"]	0.968	N/A	N/A
	R{"rwd_door12_attempt"}=? [C<=10]	1.111 (duration=0.001)	N/A	N/A
PAL-para	P=? [F "Either delivered"]	$4.999 * \left(\frac{p_c_a * p_c_b + p_c_c - p_c_a * p_c_b * p_c_c}{p_c_a * p_c_b * p_c_c} \right) / 5$	the same	0
PAL-DTMC	P=? [F "Either delivered"]	0.9996	N/A	N/A
PAL-MDP	Pmax=? [F "Either delivered"]	0.9997	N/A	N/A
	Pmin=? [F "Either delivered"]	0.9997	N/A	N/A

¹⁹<https://github.com/RandallYe/QASCAD/tree/master/Examples>.

For SD, we compared the results of our approach with the results obtained from the PRISM code online.²⁰ Seven properties are verified, and we obtain the same results from our PRISM code as the ones online. For the parametrised variant of SD, we use a biased coin instead of a fair coin and changed the probability of getting a head from 0.5 to a parameter p of the activity. We also adapted the PRISM code from online manually to make it a parametric model and used PRISM for the parametric model checking. The results obtained from our tool are the same as those from the manual adaptation.

For FP, we compared our results with the ones from the literature. Three properties are verified, and the results are in the form of an algebraic expression. We obtain the same results as the ones in the literature.

For IS and TW, we obtained the PRISM code from the author and compared our results with the ones of the author’s PRISM code. The results for both IS and TW are consistent. However, for the IS use case, both our results and the ones from the PRISM code provided by the author are different from the results listed in the literature. The reason is that a different set of probability values was actually used to generate the figures of verification results in the literature. Both PRISM code of IS and TW are CTMC models, therefore in our models the control nodes (e.g., `DecisionNode`, `MergeNode`, etc.) are assigned a default duration of a small value. The control node duration for IS is 0.01 , and $1e-8$ for TW. The values are selected to closely match the results in the literature. As the PRISM code we compared with is manually created according to the transition system, there is a small discrepancy in the verification result of the time-based properties due to the duration of the control nodes. Since we set the default duration of the `ControlNodes` as small as possible, the discrepancy is neglectable, as shown in the “Delta” column of Table 2. When the numerical values are extended to four decimal places, the magnitude of the discrepancy is on the order of $1e-4$ for the IS use case, and 0 for TW use case.

For TM, three types of properties are verified including properties for DTMC, MDP, and CTMC. We first compared our results with the ones listed in the literature. Due to the missing probability that should be assigned to the outgoing edges of decision nodes in the activity diagram from the literature, we assumed that the decision nodes have the same probability for each outgoing edge. With this assumption, we obtained the same results as the ones in the literature for the properties of DTMC and MDP.

One exception in TM is the verification result of the properties for the CTMC models. The probability value for the “long run” in the literature is 0.775 , which is the same as our result. As the literature provides the graph of results for $0 \leq t \leq 70$, Fig. 27 compares our results with the literature’s for this time range and reveals a notable discrepancy. The maximum difference is 0.195 when time is 15 . The reason for the discrepancy may lie in the default duration assigned to the `ControlNodes`, e.g., `MergeNodes`, `DecisionNodes`. Since the lack of the prism code and the details in the literature, we could not know the default duration used to obtain the verification results in the literature.




Figure 27: Comparison of TM-CTMC verification results between literature and our approach.

To further evaluate the correctness of our transformation for TM (CTMC), we conducted three manual activities to compare with the results from the automatically generated code using our tool.

The first is to manually implement the transformation from the TM activity diagram to the PRISM CTMC code according to the semantics in Section 5. This is to ensure our implementation of the transformation is correct.

Secondly, we manually constructed the TM PRISM code following the approach in [49] which declares a set of boolean variables (one variable for each node in an AD) and uses MSM as the input language for PRISM so the transformation results in one module in PRISM. If a collection of nodes in the AD is active, then the corresponding variables are set to *true*, and others are set to *false*. In contrast, our automated transformation uses the MOD approach discussed in Fig. 4 to generate two modules for TM, and declare one `pc` variable for each module. As our automatic code includes multiple modules, additional states and transitions are introduced compared to the manual code, serving the purpose of module synchronization. The comparison of our approach (using automatically generated code) and the manual implementation

²⁰<https://www.prismmodelchecker.org/casestudies/dice.php>




Figure 28: Comparison of TM-CTMC verification results of approach in [49] and our approach.

by the approach [49] is shown in Fig. 28. There is a slight discrepancy due to the extra states and transitions which is within an acceptable range. When $t > 120$, the discrepancy is less than $1e-6$. When $t \leq 120$, the maximum value of the discrepancy is 0.009. Therefore, we claim that our transformation and implementation are correct.

Thirdly, we manually drew an LTS, computed the transition rate matrix, and calculated the bounded termination probability using MATLAB and a Python program (written by us and without using the model checking tools) based on the matrix exponential. The calculated results are consistent with the results from our QASCAD too. Therefore, we believe our approach and results for TM-CTMC are correct.

For DC, we annotated actions in the AD with mean duration instead of minimum and maximum execution time (interpreted in PTA) in the original literature [49] and verified three types of properties for DTMC, MDP, and CTMC. The default duration is set to 0.1 for the CTMC model. From the verification results for DTMC and MDP, we conclude that the activity diagram is always terminated (because the result is true), deterministic in term of termination (because the minimum and maximum termination probabilities are both 1.0).

For PAL, three types of properties are verified including properties for DTMC, MDP, and CTMC. We also conducted the parametric model checking for one property. Five properties are verified for the CTMC model. The default duration is set to 0.001. The property “the probability of successful delivery through either Route I or Route II” is checked also for both DTMC and MDP models. This property should be presented as $P=? [F (PAL \text{ reaches at } PAL::R1DeliveredRoomD) | (PAL \text{ reaches at } PAL::R2DeliveredRoomD)]$. To save space in the table, we use the label “Either delivered” to replace the path property $(PAL \text{ reaches at } PAL::R1DeliveredRoomD) | (PAL \text{ reaches at } PAL::R2DeliveredRoomD)$. The same is applied to the labels in other three properties for CTMC models. The PAL use case and the DC use case are used to demonstrate that the transformation can go through. We conducted a manual review of the PRISM code generated for these two use cases to assess the correctness of the transformation.

Because each case study carries different features in activity diagrams, we can conclude that our approach is capable of generating the correct PRISM code for activity diagrams through the evaluation of these case studies.

Table 3: The CPU time of PRISM code generation for use cases

Activity	Use Case CPU time (ms)										Mean (ms)
	SD	Para-SD	DC	FP	TW	IS	TM-DTMC	TM-MDP	TM-CTMC	PAL-CTMC	
AD validation	81.2	69.4	88.7	73.7	77.8	72.1	105.5	305.6	300.5	312.1	148.7
ETL transformation	214.1	166.7	375.9	242.6	364.6	303.4	275.5	216.7	191.5	240.9	259.2
EGL transformation	62.0	67.4	75.5	59.2	72.8	78.2	67.5	62.3	61.5	61.6	66.8
Total	357.2	303.4	540.0	375.4	515.2	453.7	448.4	584.5	553.5	614.5	474.6

RQ2 (Efficiency). To address the second research question, concerning the efficiency of activity diagram verification, we assess the time required for model transformation from activity diagrams to PRISM code. The focus here is on the efficiency of the transformation process, rather than the subsequent verification in probabilistic model checkers, as the latter reflects the performance of the model checking tools.

The case studies were conducted on a computer with a 1.6GHz Core i5 processor and 8GB of RAM. The times presented in Table 3 are averages derived from 10 individual runs. The table provides a breakdown of the duration for each use case and corresponding activities. Overall, the average CPU time needed to complete the entire process, excluding the verification by model checkers, is 474.6 ms across all case studies. The PAL use case exhibits the lengthiest execution time at 614.5 ms.

To evaluate the efficiency of our approach, we also took into account the size of the generated PRISM code. We compared the code size for the case studies TW, IS, and TM with our results. In the case study TW and IS, the PRISM code that we obtained from the author is manually generated according to the transition systems and therefore does not include any control nodes. In our experiments with TW and IS, we first converted these transition systems into activity diagrams, and then applied our approach to obtain the PRISM code. The activity diagrams have more nodes than the states in the original transition systems because we need extra `DecisionNodes` and `MergeNodes` (in addition to actions) in the diagrams to deal with probabilistic choice and multiple transitions into one state.

Table 4: The comparison of sizes of manual PRISM code and automatically generated code

Use case	#State		#Transition	
	Manual	Auto	Manual	Auto
TW	7	14	9	16
IS	8	16	13	21
TM	31	39	61	73

We use the numbers of states and transitions to measure the size difference as shown in Table 4. As both cases are on a small scale but involve several probabilistic transitions, the states of our PRISM code are twice the size of the manual ones, and the transitions are about 1.7 times larger than the manual size due to the introduction of extra control nodes. But, their scale is within the same order of magnitude.

For the case study TM, we compared the PRISM code that we manually created following the approach in [49] with our code. Because the approach in [49] also introduces the control node into the PRISM code, the numbers of states and transitions of the two versions, as shown in Table 4, are similar. The size of our code is slightly bigger because we use the MOD approach (which involves multiple modules) and so additional variables and transitions are required to deal with termination and failure.

The time complexity of our approach is discussed in Sect. 6.2. We mainly focus on the transformation by ETL from an activity diagram to a PRISM model. The validation by EVL and the generation by EGL are generally straightforward; therefore, we do not consider the complexity of their implementation. The maximum complexity of the ETL transformation is $O(n^3)$ or $O(n^2)$ if no guarded edges from `DecisionNodes` are in activity diagrams.

RQ3 (Insights). To address the third question of design decision support, we look at the benefit of our approach through the whole process in Fig. 25.

In the phase of activity diagram validation, the automated error-checking of activity diagrams can prevent errors from being passed to the next design phase, which may cause additional difficulties in error identification. The modelling errors to be reported include the ones related to the syntax of the activity diagram, e.g., the name of an `ActivityEdge` is not given, the errors related to the well-formedness of Markov models, e.g. all probabilistic edges from a `DecisionNode` shall have their values within $[0,1]$, and the errors in the properties, e.g., the name of the activity to be verified is not correct.

To facilitate probabilistic model checking, we allow activity diagrams to be annotated with properties written in the property specification languages for the model checking tools, e.g., the PRISM Property Specification.²¹ To specify APS (1) such as pc variables, termination, and failure (introduced in our semantics for activity diagrams), we introduce several controlled notations in the properties as shown in Sect. 5.3, e.g., `PAL reaches at PAL::R2Stuck`. Our approach translates them into formal assertions in PCTL* and CSL.

Our approach supports the analysis of properties of different types (e.g., DTMC, MDP, and CTMC) without changing the activity diagrams. In our approach, a valid activity diagram can be transformed into three types of Markov models, i.e., DTMC, MDP, and CTMC. By setting the attribute “toBeVerified” of the stereotype “Properties” as the name of the property group to be verified, the type of Markov models to be generated is selected accordingly, and the corresponding set of properties is parsed.

Another benefit of our approach to the design process is to get the result of system properties as algebraic expressions to derive the proper values of the system parameters at design time and to evaluate the satisfaction of the system properties at runtime. Our approach supports generating verification results as algebraic expressions through parametric model checking. We consider the parameters as two types: *controllable parameters*, whose values must be fixed during the design time to meet the system properties (e.g., the probability p_c_a in the PAL example), and the *observable parameters*, whose values are assumed during design time and are updated with real-time data collections during runtime (e.g., the duration `d_prep` of the preparation before the robot sets off).

For the controllable parameters, after assuming the observable parameters, engineers can obtain the optimised values of the controllable parameters for specified property constraints and optimisation objectives through synthesis. In our approach, we use the EvoChecker tool to derive the proper values of the controllable parameters and obtain optimised designs. Taking PAL as an example, if we desire the maximum possibility of either robot’s successful delivery within 10 minutes and the minimum cost of “`rwd_door12_attempt`”, we can obtain a set of design candidates of the probability and reward pairs as shown in Fig. 29, along with the corresponding set of the values of the controllable parameters, such

²¹<https://www.prismmodelchecker.org/manual/PropertySpecification>.




Figure 29: The example of optimal design options for PAL derived by EvoChecker.

as p_c_a and p_c_b . Then, engineers can choose the designs that fit their requirements better, e.g., the “interesting synthesised results” marked as red dots in Fig. 29. By then, the algebraic expressions for the properties are fully instantiated.

Furthermore, during runtime, the observable parameters are updated through statistical analysis of the data collected in real-time. Subsequently, algebraic expressions, serving as key elements during runtime operation, are continually re-evaluated to determine if system properties, especially the safety properties, are satisfied. In case of a violation, the values of controllable parameters need to be updated to meet the requirements of the properties.

7.4. Threats to Validity

Construct validity threats may be due to the assumptions made during the modeling of activity diagrams and the definition of probabilistic properties to be verified. To mitigate this threat, most of the activity diagrams and the corresponding properties used for evaluation (except for PAL) are taken from valid case studies in the literature.

Internal validity threats can arise from the definition of the transformation from activity diagrams to PRISM models and the implementation of the transformation. To mitigate these threats, we conducted a thorough evaluation using the case studies in Table 1 by comparing the verification results of our automatically generated PRISM code with the results in the literature and with the manual calculation results.

External Validity threats may arise due to the application of our approach to a limited set of systems or scenarios, limiting the generalisability of our approach to systems with significantly different characteristics or domains. Given that the primary goal of this work is to verify activity diagrams modeled for various systems, it is crucial to ensure coverage of the elements of activity diagrams and consider features from diverse systems and domains. To address these concerns, we carefully selected six representative use cases. Each use case’s activity diagram incorporates different features with some overlaps among them, collectively covering all the elements and features of the activity diagram semantics discussed in Section 5. In this study, we designed the semantics and transformation processes specifically for ControlNodes, ControlFlows, and ExecutableNodes. It is noteworthy that the inclusion of ObjectNodes and ObjectFlows is part of our future work.

8. Related work

The topic of using UML diagrams to model probabilistic systems and then applying formal verification techniques to evaluate the qualitative and quantitative properties of these systems is not new. This section discusses previous studies on modelling, verification, and tool automation. To the best of our knowledge, our work is the first comprehensive approach for modelling, verification, and automation with the support of various annotations and properties.

UML state machine diagrams, sequence diagrams, and activity diagrams are commonly used to specify systems behaviour. State machines are event-triggered and model reactive systems. Activity diagrams capture the workflow of activities, actions or tasks. The flow is controlled upon the completion of actions, instead of events in state machines. Sequence diagrams capture the interaction of processes in a manner of message sequences. Comparatively, state machines are more complex, and sequence and AD are less complex and can be easily understood and mastered by more stakeholders in addition to engineers. These diagrams are all extended to capture probabilistic behaviour and corresponding verification approaches are developed by several authors. This section discusses the relevant extensions of state machine diagrams and sequence diagrams briefly first, and then focuses on the comparison of the extensions of AD with our work.

8.1. State machine diagrams

Jansen et al.'s P-statecharts [65] is a conservative (so the semantics of existing elements are not changed) probabilistic extension of UML statecharts to allow nondeterministic choice, probabilistic choice, and a priority scheme to resolve nondeterministic choice between transitions in different hierarchies (composite states). The semantics of P-statecharts are given in MDPs, and the P-statecharts models can be verified using the PRISM model checker.

DAMRTS (Dependability Analysis Models for Real-Time Systems) [66, 67] is a UML profile that extends UML state machines with time and probability. Its semantics are given in probabilistic timed automata (PTA) in PRISM, which allows state machine models to be analysed using PRISM. The authors in [42] use a UML2 profile MARTE (Modeling and Analysis of Real-Time and Embedded systems)²² to annotate time and probability requirements in UML state machine diagrams. Similarly, its semantics are given in PTA and the annotated models can be analysed using PRISM.

DA-Charts (Dependability Assessment Charts) [68], is also a probabilistic extension of the UML statecharts for capturing dependability requirements such as reliability and safety. The author implemented a tool in ATOM³ [69] to automatically construct Markov chains and then developed an algorithm for analysis.

RoboChart [70, 61] is a timed and probabilistic domain-specific language for robotics. It is based on a subset of UML state machines but also has a component model with notions of platform, controller, and module to foster reuse for robotic applications. Its probabilistic semantics [61] is given in DTMCs and MDPs in PRISM and defined as transformation rules between RoboChart and PRISM. A property language is also designed for RoboChart to specify quantitative properties. An accompanying tool, RoboTool²³, is developed to automatically generate semantics for RoboChart models using model-based techniques, and automatically verify the models using PRISM. This work inspired the work presented in this paper. We also use transformation rules to PRISM to define semantics for AD and implement our tool based on the same Epsilon framework as RoboTool. The PRISM metamodel in our tool, indeed, reuses that in RoboTool with just a small modification for CTMCs.

8.2. Sequence diagrams

pSTAIRS [71, 72] extends STAIRS [73, 74], an approach for the use of UML sequence diagrams in step-wise and incremental system development, to allow specification of soft real-time constraints and probability. The formal semantics of pSTAIRS is given as a set of probability obligations and a refinement relation is defined for sequence diagrams for incremental development. Subjective sequence diagrams [75] extends UML sequence diagrams with probabilistic choice *palt* and further supports a notion of *trust*, a belief (subjective probability) of the trustor on the behaviour of the trustee, to model trust-dependent systems. The analysis includes subjective probability estimates and decisions based on such estimates.

The work in [76] extends UML sequence diagrams to capture timing (the delay) using a rate as a parameter for an exponential distribution. From the diagrams, PEPA [77] (short for Performance Evaluation Process Algebra, a stochastic timed process algebra) descriptions are automatically extracted by an implemented algorithm. PEPA descriptions can be interpreted in the Markovian semantics (CTMCs) or the continuous-state semantics (a system of ODEs).

8.3. Activity diagrams

We summarise related work for modelling and verification of AD in Table 5.

[34] extends SAD with time constraints to capture both probabilistic and timed requirements in activities. The semantics of an activity diagram is a DTMC where each module, corresponding to a concurrent flow, has a clock variable of type integer numbers to record the (discrete) time steps passed in actions on this flow. Particularly, the progression of all clock variables is synchronous through a *step* event. The approach then uses PRISM to verify the manually generated DTMC models by an algorithm. Our approach presented here supports the DTMC, MDP, and CTMC semantics where time requirements can be captured in the duration or rate annotations and analysed using CTMCs. Importantly, our approach is fully automatic.

In [37], the author designed a formal logic, Activity Calculus (AC), to capture the semantics of SAD. AC has operational semantics which is based on probabilistic transition systems (PTS). From a PTS, an MDP can be derived. The author also gives the PRISM (MDP) language the operation semantics. So the soundness of a translation from AD to PRISM can be established by their (AC and PRISM) operation semantics. SAD will be translated to PRISM models for analysis using PRISM. Then [49] extends this approach with time, and correspondingly defines Timing Activity Calculus (TAC), giving operational semantics to TAC and PRISM based on Probabilistic Timed Automata (PTA). A Java-based tool was implemented to automate the translation process from AD to PRISM. Another work [45] considers the reliability-driven software deployment using parametric probabilistic model checking for SAD that captures software behaviour, where one kind of such parameter is software component failure rate. However how these parameters are captured in SAD is not clear, while our approach uses input parameters of AD to model parameters. The work gives SAD semantics in a logic: Deployment Activity Calculus (DAC), which is mapped to DTMC models in PRISM. An Eclipse plugin is developed to automate the transformation and verification process. These studies support a large set of activity features (such as CallBehaviorAction, Events, ObjectNodes) in their AC and TAC, but how these features are mapped to PRISM are not clear (without examples illustrated). In our approach, we indeed take into account the support of these features (though they are not implemented). The time in [49] is real-time clocks and

²²<https://www.omg.org/spec/MARTE/>.

²³<https://robo-star.cs.york.ac.uk/robotool/>.

Table 5: Modelling and verification approaches for activity diagrams

Approach	Activity features					Modelling annotations					Verification				Auto
	Common	Param	CBA	Event	Obj	Prob	Relb	Rate	Rew	Prop	Markov	pMC	Syn	NoC	
STAD [34]	✓					✓					DTMC			1	
SEC [39]	✓		✓?	✓	✓	✓					MDP			1	
NuAC [41]	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓					MDP			2	
AC [37]	✓		✓?	✓?		✓					MDP			1	
TAC [49]	✓		✓?	✓?		✓					PTA			1	
DAC [45]	✓		✓?	✓?		✓					DTMC			1	
MIE [38]	✓					✓					MDP	✓		1	
ATOP [35]	✓					✓	✓	✓			DMC			1	
AD-CSP[44]	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓						CSP			1	
Our	✓	✓				✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	DMC	✓	✓	7	

Acronym: Auto: Automation; CBA: CallBehaviorAction; DMC: DTMC, MDP, and CTMC; Event: Event-based actions, such as `AcceptEventAction` and `SendSignalAction`; MDE: Model-driven engineering; N-MDE: Not model-driven engineering; NoC: Number of case studies; Obj: `ObjectNode` and `ObjectFlow`; Param: Parameter; pMC: Parametric model checking; Prob: Probability; Prop: Property; Relb: Reliability; Rate: Duration or rate; Rewd: Reward; Syn: Synthesis; ✓?: partially (supported in some stages but not in all stages), or claimed to support but no further details disclosed.

interpreted in PTAs, while the time in our approach is duration or rate and interpreted in CTMCs. They cannot support parameters, the annotations of reliability, reward, and property, and parametric verification and synthesis as we do.

The work in [38] gives MDP semantics to SAD and can capture multiple instances of executions (so each `ActivityNode` can hold more than one token at the same time) in the semantics. Algorithms have been designed for the translation of SAD to PRISM models, but the process is not automated. Comparatively, our approach tackles one instance of executions and allows only one token at most in each `ActivityNode` at the same time, and our approach is fully automatic.

AD is also used to capture security requirements for quantitative analysis using probabilistic model checking. [39] presents security attack patterns and scenarios in SAD. They are mapped to MDP models in PRISM. The security requirements are finally verified using PRISM. Interestingly, object nodes and flows are mapped to multiple modules in PRISM where one module simulates a one-place buffer for each `ObjectNode` (to support asynchronous communication). We aim to support object nodes and flows in the future. Our approach is similar to this work to have one PRISM module to simulate a buffer for each `ObjectNode`, but our approach requires two commands for sending data to the buffer and one command to read data from the buffer, instead of two commands for both reading and writing in [39]. Further, [41] designed a New Activity Calculus (NuAC) to capture the semantics of SAD. The operational semantics for both NuAC and PRISM MDP models are presented to establish the soundness of the translation from SAD to PRISM models. A tool is developed to automate the transformation and verification.

These studies [34, 37, 38, 39, 41, 49, 45] all use a similar approach to represent `ActivityNodes` in PRISM models. A node `nd`, for example, corresponds to one boolean variable in PRISM whose definition is (`nd: bool init false;`). That the variable is evaluated to be true (or false) denotes that the corresponding node is holding (or not holding) a token and executing (or not executing). If an AD has n nodes, n variables are declared in PRISM. So the state space is 2^n . For example, the PAL use case in Fig. 8 has 27 nodes so the corresponding state space would be $2^{27} = 134,217,728$. Our approach uses a `pc` variable for each concurrent flow to record its state. The PAL use case has two concurrent flows: 20 nodes in one flow and 8 nodes in another flow. We note that in our approach the `JoinNode J1` will appear in both flows so the total number of nodes in both flows is 28 instead of 27. An additional `INACTIVE`, whose value is -1, is required. Finally, the two `pc` variables for both concurrent flows could take 21 ($=20+1$) and 9 ($=8+1$) values respectively. We also need four boolean variables on lines #35-37 and on line #44 in Fig. 13 to deal with termination and failure. So the state space size in our approach is $21 * 9 * 2^4 = 3024$, much less than that in their studies. We, however, need to emphasise that the number of reachable states by our approach, which is the number reported in verification results by PRISM, is larger than theirs because of the additional boolean variables for termination and failures, as illustrated in Table 4. Their semantics support DTMCs, MDPs, or PTAs, but not CTMCs as we do. They have not supported the modelling and analysis of reliability, rewards, and parameters too.

ATOP [35] uses a subset of the MARTE profile to provide quality annotations to UAD for service compositions. The annotations include service reliability, execution time, probability, and invocation attempts. An annotated diagram then is automatically translated to a PRISM model according to the specified Markov model: a DTMC, MDP, or CTMC. Finally, the PRISM model is verified using PRISM. Our work is inspired by ATOP. We have similar annotations and support the same three Markov models as ATOP. But ATOP supports only one `InitialNode` and one `ActivityFinal`, while our approach can handle multiple `InitialNodes` and `ActivityFinals`. ATOP focuses on the engineering side (workflow, implementation, and evaluation) of the approach, but lacks the most important part: the semantics interpretation. Even no PRISM model is illustrated. The ATOP tool is also not available. Without these, we are not able to have an in-depth evaluation of the approach. Comparatively, our work provides a detailed semantics interpretation of UAD and transformation rules are defined in Sect. 5. Our tool is open-source and available online.

Our work additionally supports parameters and parametric model checking using PRISM, and the reward annotation to verify reward-related properties. These are not provided by ATOP.

UAD may have unexpected behaviours such as deadlock, for example, caused by all guards on the outgoing transitions of a `DecisionNode` evaluated to be false, or nondeterminism due to overlapped guards on these transitions. Lima et al. [44] present a compositional CSP [78, 79, 80] (Communicating Sequential Processes, a process algebra for modelling concurrent systems) semantics for AD. A plugin is implemented in the Astah modelling environment to automate the process from semantics generation to verification by FDR [81], a refinement model checker for CSP. The tool also supports traceability between AD and generated CSP specifications. This is used to highlight the problematic flows in the diagrams that cause deadlock or nondeterminism by mapping the counterexamples found by FDR back to the diagrams. This work supports a wide variety of `ActivityNodes` such as input and output parameters, `CallBehaviorAction`, `SendSignalAction`, `AcceptEventAction`, and `ObjectNode` and `ObjectFlow`, but not probability and rate extensions. It can only analyse qualitative properties, while our approach can analyse both qualitative and quantitative properties. For the detection of deadlock, we can implement it by checking the reachability of the final states or measuring the termination probability. For the detection of nondeterminism, we could check both the maximum and minimum probabilities of interesting properties. If they are not equal, this indicates nondeterminism in the diagrams.

9. Conclusion and future work

This work proposes a comprehensive verification framework for systems whose complex behaviours (including probability, reliability, and time) are captured in ADs to address problems, related to evaluation, extensibility, adaptability, and accessibility, in current practice and research.

In our framework, we developed a UML profile to annotate ADs with these advanced features along with cost or rewards associated with activity edges and properties to be verified. The transformation rules from ADs to PRISM, and the corresponding algorithms for transformation play a key role in our approach for automation. Underneath the transformation is our semantic interpretation of ADs as three Markov models.

To make our work able to be *evaluated*, we present our framework in details in this paper, evaluated seven case studies with different features using different Markov models, and make our tool open-source. To make it *extensible*, we use a modular approach to map each concurrent flow in ADs into a module in PRISM, which entitles us to further add more features such as `CallBehaviorAction`, event-based actions, object nodes and flows into our framework using a conservative way (without a change of behaviour for currently supported features). Our research is open and our tool is open-source, which could make our work *adaptable* for other researchers or engineers to apply in other domains or implement in other tools (instead of Eclipse and Epsilon), or use it as a front end to capture their labelled transition systems. To make it *accessible* by engineers, we automated the whole workflow and so users can focus on the modelling and verification result parts instead of intermediate steps.

Our approach presented in this paper cannot deal with all features in ADs, and our immediate future work is to extend it in order to overcome current limitations. The work discussed in this paper deals with only one activity, which limits its application to ADs with a hierarchical structure, for example, by using `CallBehaviorAction`. The first extension to our framework is to support `CallBehaviorAction` because this action is very useful in practice to model complex systems. Thanks to our modular approach for PRISM models, the called activity of an `CallBehaviorAction` is nothing different from the work discussed here for one activity except the pass of control from its caller when called and to the caller when terminated. Because a `CallBehaviorAction` action could also call other actions, this would be nested calls. We will use a staged start and termination for each call to allow appropriate interpretation of semantics in PRISM. `CallBehaviorAction` also allows its defined behaviour reused for multiple instances. Because PRISM does not support such “functional-level” (above module-level in PRISM) abstraction, if an activity is called in several instances, then each instance would be treated differently and must be mapped to PRISM individually.

To introduce and support object nodes and flows in our framework, we need synchronous communication in PRISM. Communication requires a way to exchange data on particular channels. PRISM uses action labels for synchronisation between modules to identify channels and variables for data exchange. In addition to a proper synchronous communication, asynchronous communication is also required to implement buffers to support object nodes such as `CentralBufferNodes`. We will use an extra module in PRISM to simulate a buffer for each `ObjectNode`. With synchronous and asynchronous communication, we can extend our framework to support object nodes and flows.

The support of event-based actions, specifically `SendSignalAction` and `AcceptEventAction`, also relies on synchronous communication.

In DTMCs and MDPs, time is discrete and encoded into transitions. In CTMCs, time is modelled by exponential distributions (parametrised with rates) for states. Probabilistic timed automata (PTAs) [82], another Markov model, extend MDPs with clocks to model real-time behaviour. PTAs supports discrete probabilities, continuous time, and nondeterminism. The choice between multiple transitions and the elapse of time are nondeterministic, and the choice between target states, after a transition is chosen, is probabilistic. We will extend our framework to support an annotation (similar to [42]) of real-time for Actions, interpret the semantics of ADs in PTAs, and define transformation rules from ADs to PTA models in PRISM.

We are also interested in other QoS annotations such as Service Invocations Attempts and Service Degradation Functions as discussed in [35]. They could be very useful, for example, in our PAL use case if we need to model the maximum number of attempts Base 1 can make to pass through two doors. In our current model shown in Fig. 8,

we assume an infinite number of attempts. This is not ideal in practice. With these annotations, we can improve the modelling. We will give a semantics interpretation of these annotations, and define transformation rules.

For all these extensions, we will implement them in our tool, evaluate case studies from literature, and continue to publish and open our research, the tool, and evaluation results for communities.

Acknowledgements

This work is supported by the European Union’s Horizon 2020 project: Secure and Safe Multi-Robot Systems (SESAME)²⁴, under grant agreement no. 101017258.

References

- [1] C. Baier, J. Katoen, Principles of model checking, The MIT Press Ser., The MIT Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts, 2008, description based on publisher supplied metadata and other sources.
- [2] J.-P. Katoen, [The probabilistic model checking landscape](#), in: Proceedings of the 31st Annual ACM/IEEE Symposium on Logic in Computer Science, LICS '16, Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 2016, p. 31–45. doi:10.1145/2933575.2934574. URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/2933575.2934574>
- [3] M. Kwiatkowska, G. Norman, D. Parker, [Probabilistic Model Checking: Advances and Applications](#), Springer International Publishing, Cham, 2018, pp. 73–121. doi:10.1007/978-3-319-57685-5_3. URL https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-57685-5_3
- [4] S. Gerasimou, G. Tamburrelli, R. Calinescu, Search-based synthesis of probabilistic models for quality-of-service software engineering (t), in: 2015 30th IEEE/ACM International Conference on Automated Software Engineering (ASE), IEEE, 2015, pp. 319–330.
- [5] G. Su, D. S. Rosenblum, G. Tamburrelli, Reliability of run-time quality-of-service evaluation using parametric model checking, in: Proceedings of the 38th International Conference on Software Engineering, 2016, pp. 73–84.
- [6] R. Calinescu, C. Ghezzi, K. Johnson, M. Pezzé, Y. Rafiq, G. Tamburrelli, Formal verification with confidence intervals to establish quality of service properties of software systems, IEEE Transactions on Reliability 65 (1) (2016) 107–125. doi:10.1109/TR.2015.2452931.
- [7] M. Kwiatkowska, G. Norman, R. Segala, Automated verification of a randomized distributed consensus protocol using cadence smv and prism?, in: Computer Aided Verification: 13th International Conference, CAV 2001 Paris, France, July 18–22, 2001 Proceedings 13, Springer, 2001, pp. 194–206.
- [8] M. Kwiatkowska, G. Norman, D. Parker, Probabilistic verification of herman’s self-stabilisation algorithm, Formal Aspects of Computing 24 (2012) 661–670.
- [9] M. Fruth, Formal methods for the analysis of wireless network protocols, Ph.D. thesis, University of Oxford (2011).
- [10] S. Petridou, S. Basagiannis, M. Roumeliotis, Survivability analysis using probabilistic model checking: A study on wireless sensor networks, IEEE Systems Journal 7 (1) (2013) 4–12. doi:10.1109/JSYST.2012.2224612.
- [11] C. Dombrowski, S. Junges, J.-P. Katoen, J. Gross, Model-checking assisted protocol design for ultra-reliable low-latency wireless networks, IEEE, Budapest, Hungary, 2016, pp. 307–316. doi:10.1109/SRDS.2016.048.
- [12] N. Mohammad, S. Muhammad, A. Bashar, M. A. Khan, Design and modeling of energy efficient wsn architecture for tactical applications, in: 2017 Military Communications and Information Systems Conference (MilCIS), 2017, pp. 1–6. doi:10.1109/MilCIS.2017.8190425.
- [13] S. Basagiannis, P. Katsaros, A. Pombortsis, N. Alexiou, Probabilistic model checking for the quantification of dos security threats, Computers & Security 28 (6) (2009) 450–465.
- [14] M. Elboukhari, M. Azizi, A. Azizi, Analysis of the security of bb84 by model checking, International journal of Network Security & Its Applications 2 (2) (2010) 87–98. doi:10.5121/ijnsa.2010.2207.
- [15] A. Gomes, A. Mota, A. Sampaio, F. Ferri, J. Buzzi, Systematic Model-Based Safety Assessment Via Probabilistic Model Checking, Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2010, pp. 625–639. doi:10.1007/978-3-642-16558-0_50.
- [16] S. Kikuchi, Y. Matsumoto, Performance modeling of concurrent live migration operations in cloud computing systems using prism probabilistic model checker, in: 2011 IEEE 4th International Conference on Cloud Computing, 2011, pp. 49–56. doi:10.1109/CLOUD.2011.48.
- [17] A. Baouya, O. Ait Mohamed, D. Bennouar, S. Ouchani, Safety analysis of train control system based on model-driven design methodology, Computers in Industry 105 (2019) 1–16. doi:10.1016/j.compind.2018.10.007.
- [18] M. Gleirscher, R. Calinescu, Safety controller synthesis for collaborative robots, in: 2020 25th International Conference on Engineering of Complex Computer Systems (ICECCS), IEEE, 2020. doi:10.1109/iceccs51672.2020.00017.
- [19] M. Lahijanian, J. Wasniewski, S. B. Andersson, C. Belta, Motion planning and control from temporal logic specifications with probabilistic satisfaction guarantees, in: 2010 IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation, IEEE, 2010. doi:10.1109/robot.2010.5509686.
- [20] L. Feng, C. Wiltsche, L. Humphrey, U. Topcu, Controller synthesis for autonomous systems interacting with human operators, in: Proceedings of the ACM/IEEE Sixth International Conference on Cyber-Physical Systems, ICCPS '15, ACM, 2015. doi:10.1145/2735960.2735973.
- [21] J. G. Kemeny, J. L. Snell, A. W. Knapp, Denumerable Markov Chains, Springer New York, 1976. doi:10.1007/978-1-4684-9455-6.
- [22] R. Howard, [Dynamic Probabilistic Systems: Semi-Markov and decision processes](#), Series in Decision and Control, Wiley, 1971. URL <https://books.google.co.uk/books?id=vuZQAAAAMAAJ>
- [23] M. L. Puterman, Markov Decision Processes: Discrete Stochastic Dynamic Programming, 1st Edition, John Wiley & Sons, Inc., USA, 1994.
- [24] W. J. Anderson, Continuous-Time Markov Chains, Springer New York, 1991. doi:10.1007/978-1-4612-3038-0.
- [25] C. Paterson, R. Calinescu, Observation-enhanced QoS analysis of component-based systems, IEEE Transactions on Software Engineering 46 (5) (2018) 526–548.
- [26] X. Fang, R. Calinescu, C. Paterson, J. Wilson, PRESTO: predicting system-level disruptions through parametric model checking, in: Proceedings of the 17th Symposium on Software Engineering for Adaptive and Self-Managing Systems, 2022, pp. 91–97.
- [27] M. Kwiatkowska, G. Norman, D. Parker, Prism 4.0: Verification of probabilistic real-time systems, in: Computer Aided Verification: 23rd International Conference, CAV 2011, Snowbird, UT, USA, July 14–20, 2011. Proceedings 23, Springer, 2011, pp. 585–591.
- [28] C. Hensel, S. Junges, J.-P. Katoen, T. Quatmann, M. Volk, [The probabilistic model checker storm](#), International Journal on Software Tools for Technology Transfer 24 (4) (2022) 589–610. doi:10.1007/s10009-021-00633-z. URL <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10009-021-00633-z>

²⁴The SESAME Project: www.sesame-project.org/.

- [29] S. Wolny, A. Mazak, C. Carpella, V. Geist, M. Wimmer, **Thirteen years of sysml: a systematic mapping study**, *Softw. Syst. Model.* 19 (1) (2020) 111–169. doi:10.1007/s10270-019-00735-y. URL <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10270-019-00735-y>
- [30] A. Morozov, K. Janschek, **Probabilistic error propagation model for mechatronic systems**, *Mechatronics* 24 (8) (2014) 1189–1202. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.mechatronics.2014.09.005>. URL <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0957415814001329>
- [31] C. E. da Silva, J. D. Saraiva da Silva, C. Paterson, R. Calinescu, **Self-adaptive role-based access control for business processes**, in: 2017 IEEE/ACM 12th International Symposium on Software Engineering for Adaptive and Self-Managing Systems (SEAMS), 2017, pp. 193–203. doi:10.1109/SEAMS.2017.13.
- [32] R. Calinescu, C. Paterson, K. Johnson, **Efficient parametric model checking using domain knowledge**, *IEEE Transactions on Software Engineering* 47 (6) (2021) 1114–1133. doi:10.1109/TSE.2019.2912958.
- [33] M. Gleirscher, A. E. Haxthausen, J. Peleska, **Probabilistic risk assessment of an obstacle detection system for goa 4 freight trains**, in: Proceedings of the 9th ACM SIGPLAN International Workshop on Formal Techniques for Safety-Critical Systems, FTSCS 2023, Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 2023, p. 26–36. doi:10.1145/3623503.3623533. URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/3623503.3623533>
- [34] Y. Jarraya, A. Soeanu, M. Debbabi, F. Hassaine, **Automatic verification and performance analysis of time-constrained sysml activity diagrams**, in: 14th Annual IEEE International Conference and Workshops on the Engineering of Computer-Based Systems (ECBS'07), 2007, pp. 515–522. doi:10.1109/ECBS.2007.22.
- [35] S. Gallotti, C. Ghezzi, R. Mirandola, G. Tamburrelli, **Quality prediction of service compositions through probabilistic model checking**, in: Quality of Software Architectures. Models and Architectures: 4th International Conference on the Quality of Software Architectures, QoSA 2008, Karlsruhe, Germany, October 14-17, 2008. Proceedings 4, Springer, 2008, pp. 119–134.
- [36] M. Debbabi, F. Hassaine, Y. Jarraya, A. Soeanu, L. Alawneh, **Verification and Validation in Systems Engineering: Assessing UML/SysML Design Models**, Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2010. doi:10.1007/978-3-642-15228-3. URL <https://link.springer.com/10.1007/978-3-642-15228-3>
- [37] Y. Jarraya, **Verification and validation of uml and sysml based systems engineering design models**, Ph.D. thesis, Concordia University, unpublished (2010). URL <https://spectrum.library.concordia.ca/id/eprint/979278/>
- [38] M. Debbabi, F. Hassaine, Y. Jarraya, A. Soeanu, L. Alawneh, **Probabilistic Model Checking of SysML Activity Diagrams**, in: M. Debbabi, F. Hassaine, Y. Jarraya, A. Soeanu, L. Alawneh (Eds.), *Verification and Validation in Systems Engineering: Assessing UML/SysML Design Models*, Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2010, pp. 153–166. doi:10.1007/978-3-642-15228-3_9. URL https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-15228-3_9
- [39] S. Ouchani, Y. Jarraya, O. Ait Mohamed, **Model-based systems security quantification**, in: 2011 Ninth Annual International Conference on Privacy, Security and Trust, 2011, pp. 142–149. doi:10.1109/PST.2011.5971976.
- [40] R. Calinescu, K. Johnson, Y. Rafiq, **Developing self-verifying service-based systems**, in: 2013 28th IEEE/ACM International Conference on Automated Software Engineering (ASE), IEEE, 2013. doi:10.1109/ase.2013.6693145.
- [41] S. Ouchani, **A Security Verification Framework for SysML Activity Diagrams**, Ph.D. thesis, Concordia University, unpublished (September 2013). URL <https://spectrum.library.concordia.ca/id/eprint/977746/>
- [42] A. Baouya, D. Bennouar, O. A. Mohamed, S. Ouchani, **A probabilistic and timed verification approach of sysml state machine diagram**, in: 2015 12th International Symposium on Programming and Systems (ISPS), 2015, pp. 1–9. doi:10.1109/ISPS.2015.7245001.
- [43] M. Steurer, A. Morozov, K. Janschek, K.-P. Neitzke, **Model-based dependability assessment of phased-mission unmanned aerial vehicles**, *IFAC-PapersOnLine* 53 (2) (2020) 8915–8922, 21st IFAC World Congress. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ifacol.2020.12.1416>. URL <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S2405896320318267>
- [44] L. Lima, A. Tavares, S. C. Nogueira, **A framework for verifying deadlock and nondeterminism in UML activity diagrams based on CSP**, *Science of Computer Programming* 197 (2020) 102497. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scico.2020.102497>. URL <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0167642320301064>
- [45] A. Baouya, O. A. Mohamed, S. Ouchani, D. Bennouar, **Reliability-driven Automotive Software Deployment based on a Parametrizable Probabilistic Model Checking**, *Expert Systems with Applications: An International Journal* 174 (C) (Jul. 2021). doi:10.1016/j.eswa.2021.114572. URL <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eswa.2021.114572>
- [46] OMG Unified Modeling Language Version 2.5.1, Tech. rep., OMG (2017).
- [47] M. Kwiatkowska, G. Norman, D. Parker, **Stochastic Model Checking**, in: M. Bernardo, J. Hillston (Eds.), *Formal Methods for Performance Evaluation: 7th International School on Formal Methods for the Design of Computer, Communication, and Software Systems, SFM 2007, Bertinoro, Italy, May 28-June 2, 2007, Advanced Lectures*, Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2007, pp. 220–270. doi:10.1007/978-3-540-72522-0_6. URL https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-540-72522-0_6
- [48] R. Alur, T. A. Henzinger, **Reactive modules**, *Formal Methods in System Design* 15 (1) (1999) 7–48.
- [49] A. Baouya, D. Bennouar, O. A. Mohamed, S. Ouchani, **A quantitative verification framework of SysML activity diagrams under time constraints**, *Expert Systems with Applications* 42 (21) (2015) 7493–7510. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eswa.2015.05.049>. URL <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0957417415003851>
- [50] M. Debbabi, F. Hassaine, Y. Jarraya, A. Soeanu, L. Alawneh, **Probabilistic Model Checking of SysML Activity Diagrams**, 2010, pp. 153–166. doi:10.1007/978-3-642-15228-3_9.
- [51] Y. Jarraya, M. Debbabi, **Quantitative and qualitative analysis of SysML activity diagrams**, *International Journal on Software Tools for Technology Transfer* 16 (4) (2014) 399–419. doi:10.1007/s10009-014-0305-6. URL <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10009-014-0305-6>
- [52] A. Aziz, V. Singhal, F. Balarin, R. K. Brayton, A. L. Sangiovanni-Vincentelli, **It usually works: The temporal logic of stochastic systems**, in: P. Wolper (Ed.), *Computer Aided Verification*, Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, Heidelberg, 1995, pp. 155–165.
- [53] A. Bianco, L. de Alfaro, **Model checking of probabilistic and nondeterministic systems**, in: P. S. Thiagarajan (Ed.), *Foundations of Software Technology and Theoretical Computer Science*, Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, Heidelberg, 1995, pp. 499–513.
- [54] C. Baier, **On algorithmic verification methods for probabilistic systems**, Ph.D. thesis, Habilitation thesis, Fakultät für Mathematik & Informatik, Universität Mannheim (1998).
- [55] H. Hansson, B. Jonsson, **A Logic for Reasoning about Time and Reliability**, *Formal Asp. Comput.* 6 (5) (1994) 512–535. doi:10.1007/BF01211866.
- [56] A. Pnueli, **The temporal logic of programs**, in: 18th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (sfcs 1977), 1977, pp. 46–57. doi:10.1109/SFCS.1977.32.
- [57] A. Aziz, K. Sanwal, V. Singhal, R. Brayton, **Verifying continuous time markov chains**, in: R. Alur, T. A. Henzinger (Eds.), *Computer Aided Verification*, Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, Heidelberg, 1996, pp. 269–276.
- [58] C. Baier, J.-P. Katoen, H. Hermanns, **Approximative symbolic model checking of continuous-time markov chains**, in: J. C. M. Baeten, S. Mauw (Eds.), *CONCUR'99 Concurrency Theory*, Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, Heidelberg, 1999, pp. 146–161.
- [59] A. Lanusse, Y. Tanguy, H. Espinoza, C. Mraidha, S. Gerard, P. Tessier, R. Schnekenburger, H. Dubois, F. Terrier, **Papyrus UML:**

- an open source toolset for MDA, in: Proc. of the Fifth European Conference on Model-Driven Architecture Foundations and Applications (ECMDA-FA 2009), Citeseer, 2009, pp. 1–4.
- [60] D. S. Kolovos, R. F. Paige, F. A. Polack, The Epsilon transformation language, in: International Conference on Theory and Practice of Model Transformations, Springer, 2008, pp. 46–60.
- [61] K. Ye, A. Cavalcanti, S. Foster, A. Miyazawa, J. Woodcock, [Probabilistic modelling and verification using RoboChart and PRISM](#), *Softw. Syst. Model.* 21 (2) (2022) 667–716. doi:10.1007/s10270-021-00916-8. URL <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10270-021-00916-8>
- [62] F. Jouault, F. Allilaire, J. Bézivin, I. Kurtev, ATL : A model transformation tool 72 (2008) 31–39. doi:10.1016/j.scico.2007.08.002.
- [63] OMG, [MOF Query/View/Transformation Version:1.3](#) (2016). URL <https://www.omg.org/spec/QVT/About-QVT/>
- [64] D. Knuth, The complexity of nonuniform random number generation, *Algorithm and Complexity, New Directions and Results* (1976).
- [65] D. N. Jansen, H. Hermanns, J. Katoen, A probabilistic extension of UML statecharts, in: W. Damm, E. Olderog (Eds.), *FTRTFT 2002: 7th International Symposium on Formal Techniques in Real-Time and Fault-Tolerant Systems*, Co-sponsored by IFIP WG 2.2, Oldenburg, 9–12 September 2002, Vol. 2469 of Lecture Notes in Computer Science, Springer, 2002, pp. 355–374.
- [66] N. Addouche, C. Antoine, J. Montmain, Uml models for dependability analysis of real-time systems, in: 2004 IEEE International Conference on Systems, Man and Cybernetics (IEEE Cat. No. 04CH37583), Vol. 6, IEEE, 2004, pp. 5209–5214.
- [67] N. Addouche, C. Antoine, J. Montmain, Combining extended uml models and formal methods to analyze real-time systems, in: R. Winther, B. A. Gran, G. Dahll (Eds.), *Computer Safety, Reliability, and Security*, Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2005, pp. 24–36.
- [68] S. Mustafiz, X. Sun, J. Kienzle, H. Vangheluwe, [Model-driven assessment of system dependability](#), *Software & Systems Modeling* 7 (4) (2008) 487–502. doi:10.1007/s10270-008-0084-1. URL <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10270-008-0084-1>
- [69] J. d. Lara, H. Vangheluwe, Atom3: A tool for multi-formalism and meta-modelling, in: R.-D. Kutsche, H. Weber (Eds.), *Fundamental Approaches to Software Engineering*, Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2002, pp. 174–188.
- [70] A. Miyazawa, P. Ribeiro, W. Li, A. Cavalcanti, J. Timmis, J. Woodcock, [RoboChart: Modelling and verification of the functional behaviour of robotic applications](#), *Software & Systems Modeling* (Jan 2019). doi:10.1007/s10270-018-00710-z. URL doi.org/10.1007/s10270-018-00710-z
- [71] A. Refsdal, K. E. Husa, K. Stølen, Specification and Refinement of Soft Real-Time Requirements Using Sequence Diagrams, in: P. Pettersson, W. Yi (Eds.), *Formal Modeling and Analysis of Timed Systems*, Lecture Notes in Computer Science, Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2005, pp. 32–48. doi:10.1007/11603009_4.
- [72] A. Refsdal, R. K. Runde, K. Stølen, [Stepwise refinement of sequence diagrams with soft real-time constraints](#), *Journal of Computer and System Sciences* 81 (7) (2015) 1221–1251. doi:10.1016/j.jcss.2015.03.003. URL <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0022000015000252>
- [73] O. Haugen, K. Stlen, STAIRS – Steps To Analyze Interactions with Refinement Semantics, in: P. Stevens, J. Whittle, G. Booch (Eds.), «UML» 2003 - The Unified Modeling Language. Modeling Languages and Applications, Lecture Notes in Computer Science, Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2003, pp. 388–402. doi:10.1007/978-3-540-45221-8_33.
- [74] O. Haugen, K. E. Husa, R. K. Runde, K. Stlen, [STAIRS towards formal design with sequence diagrams](#), *Software & Systems Modeling* 4 (4) (2005) 355–357. doi:10.1007/s10270-005-0087-0. URL <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10270-005-0087-0>
- [75] A. Refsdal, K. Stølen, [Extending UML sequence diagrams to model trust-dependent behavior with the aim to support risk analysis](#), *Science of Computer Programming* 74 (1) (2008) 34–42. doi:10.1016/j.scico.2008.09.003. URL <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0167642308001044>
- [76] M. Tribastone, S. Gilmore, [Automatic Translation of UML Sequence Diagrams into PEPA Models](#), in: 2008 Fifth International Conference on Quantitative Evaluation of Systems, 2008, pp. 205–214. doi:10.1109/QEST.2008.18. URL <https://ieeexplore.ieee.org/abstract/document/4634973>
- [77] J. Hillston, *A Compositional Approach to Performance Modelling*, Distinguished Dissertations in Computer Science, Cambridge University Press, 1996.
- [78] C. A. R. Hoare, *Communicating Sequential Processes*, Prentice-Hall Int., 1985.
- [79] A. W. Roscoe, *Understanding Concurrent Systems*, Texts in Computer Science, Springer, 2011.
- [80] A. L. C. Cavalcanti, J. C. P. Woodcock, [A Tutorial Introduction to CSP in Unifying Theories of Programming](#), in: *Refinement Techniques in Software Engineering*, Vol. 3167 of Lecture Notes in Computer Science, Springer-Verlag, 2006, pp. 220–268. doi:10.1007/11889229_6. URL www-users.cs.york.ac.uk/~alcc/publications/papers/CW06.pdf
- [81] T. Gibson-Robinson, P. Armstrong, A. Boulgakov, A. W. Roscoe, FDR3: A modern refinement checker for CSP, in: *Tools and Algorithms for the Construction and Analysis of Systems*, 2014, pp. 187–201.
- [82] G. Norman, D. Parker, J. Sproston, Model checking for probabilistic timed automata, *Formal Methods in System Design* 43 (2) (2012) 164–190. doi:10.1007/s10703-012-0177-x.