

# Validating Temporal Compliance Patterns: A Unified Approach with $MTL_f$ over various Data Models

Nesma M. Zaki<sup>a,\*</sup>, Iman M. A. Helal<sup>a</sup>, Ehab E. Hassanein<sup>a</sup>, Ahmed Awad<sup>a,b</sup>

<sup>a</sup>*Faculty of Computers and Artificial Intelligence, Cairo University, Egypt*  
<sup>b</sup>*The British University in Dubai, Dubai, The UAE*

---

## Abstract

Process mining extracts valuable insights from event data to help organizations improve their business processes, which is essential for their growth and success. By leveraging process mining techniques, organizations gain a comprehensive understanding of their processes' execution, enabling the discovery of process models, detection of deviations, identification of bottlenecks, and assessment of performance. Compliance checking, a specific area within conformance checking, ensures that the organizational activities adhere to prescribed process models and regulations. Linear Temporal Logic over finite traces ( $LTL_f$ ) is commonly used for conformance checking, but it may not capture all temporal aspects accurately. This paper proposes Metric Temporal Logic over finite traces ( $MTL_f$ ) to define explicit time-related constraints effectively in addition to the implicit time-ordering covered by  $LTL_f$ . Therefore, it provides a universal formal approach to capture compliance rules. Moreover, we define a minimal set of generic  $MTL_f$  formulas and show that they are capable of capturing all the common patterns for compliance rules.

As compliance validation is largely driven by the data model used to represent the event logs, we provide a mapping from  $MTL_f$  to the common data models we found in the literature to encode event logs, namely, the relational and the graph models. A comprehensive study comparing various data models and an empirical evaluation across real-life event logs demonstrates the effec-

---

\*Corresponding author

*Email addresses:* n.zaki@fci-cu.edu.eg (Nesma M. Zaki), i.helal@fci-cu.edu.eg (Iman M. A. Helal), e.ezat@fci-cu.edu.eg (Ehab E. Hassanein), ahmed.awad@buid.ac.ae (Ahmed Awad)

tiveness of the proposed approach.

*Keywords:* Anti Pattern Detection, Process mining, Graph-encoded event logs, Linear Temporal Logic, Metric Temporal Logic, Compliance Checking

---

## 1. Introduction

Improving business processes is crucial for achieving organizational success. Process mining analyzes event logs of organizations' information systems to provide actionable insights that can improve business processes. By leveraging process mining techniques [1], organizations gain a comprehensive understanding of how their processes are executed in reality. By analyzing event logs, organizations can make decisions to enhance process efficiency, reduce lead times, and improve compliance. Conformance checking [2], in particular, helps organizations to identify areas for improvement, enhance compliance, and drive improvements to ensure processes operate properly.

Compliance checking [3] is a specialization of conformance checking. It focuses on verifying whether organizational activities align with established regulations, standards, laws, or internal policies [3]. These rules serve to restrict the behaviour of processes concerning control flow, data, resources, and timing. The goal of compliance checking is to identify process instances that violate the rules. There have been several proposals to model business process compliance rules. Most proposals provide a visual representation that is very close to how business processes are modelled, e.g., [4, 5, 6, 7]. Nevertheless, they largely utilise temporal logic as a formal basis underpinning their notation and as a means to analyse the behaviour of the business processes. In the BPM community, it is commonly accepted to use,  $LTL_f$ , linear temporal logic on finite traces, to formalise compliance patterns [8, 9], define declarative process models [4], or conduct conformance checking of declarative business processes [10]. For example, in an order fulfilment process, the order has to be paid before the delivery is made. This can be easily captured in  $LTL_f$ <sup>1</sup>. However,  $LTL$  is expressively limited when it comes to modelling explicit time constraints in

---

<sup>1</sup>We use  $LTL$  and  $LTL_f$  interchangeably

compliance requirements [7, 11]. For instance, in the same delivery process, we might have a requirement that the order has to be paid within *24 hours* from order placement; otherwise, it will be cancelled. In the former example, the time-ordering constraint was implicit. In the latter, it is explicit with.

In this paper, we argue that  $LTL_f$  is insufficient to capture compliance rules that require explicit time constraints. We propose to use the metric time logic (MTL) as a more expressive formalism that is capable of capturing both implicit and explicit time-ordering rules. More specifically, we utilise  $MTL_f$  [12] for finite traces, as this fits the nature of compliance checking over event logs. Moreover, we provide a minimal set of compliance patterns that cover the common patterns for compliance rules and declarative conformance checking. The minimal set generalizes the common  $LTL_f$  patterns with explicit time constraints.

The validation of compliance rules, instances of compliance patterns, against event logs, is usually reduced to a model-checking problem, where logs are transformed into a labelled transition, an automaton, fitting the temporal logic used [13], or an alignment of the log with the automaton [14, 15, 16]. However, the construction time of the automaton is exponential to the size of  $LTL$  formulas [17].

To enable efficient conformance checking, several approaches were proposed to encode event logs using various data models, i.e., relational data model [18] or graph data model [19]. Selecting appropriate storage methods becomes crucial to ensure that the compliance checking process remains responsive, even when dealing with a large number of traces. The encoding of event logs in a certain data model entails the translation of compliance rules from the temporal logic formal specification to the query language of the data model, e.g. [18, 20, 21] for the relational encoding, and [19, 22] in the case of graph databases encoding. In this paper, we contribute translation algorithms from  $MTL_f$  formulas to the common event log encoding models that we found in the literature. Moreover, we conduct an empirical evaluation across the different encodings and compliance rule representations to assess the expressiveness and scalability of the encoding as log sizes increase. In summary, we make the following contributions:

- Propose the use of  $MTL_f$  as the formal basis for compliance rules, both with implicit and explicit time constraints,
- Establish a concise formulation for the common compliance patterns,
- Develop mappings from the  $MTL_f$  concise formulas to the different query languages, namely, *SQL*, *Match\_Recognize*, and *Cypher*,
- Conduct an empirical evaluation to compare the results with graph representation, relational data models, and Linear Temporal Logic with Declare Analyzer. The comparison is conducted across four real-life event logs.

The rest of this paper is organized as follows: Section 2 provides an overview of the background concepts and techniques that are used throughout the paper. Related work is discussed in Section 3. Section 4 presents how  $MTL_f$  can be used to formalize compliance patterns. The translation from  $MTL_f$ -based compliance patterns to the different data models is presented in Section 5. The empirical evaluation of the data different event log encoding for compliance checking is detailed in Section 6, before we conclude the paper with an outlook on future work in Section 7.

## 2. Preliminaries

This section lays the background concepts necessary to follow the content of the paper. Section 2.1 formalizes the definitions related to events representation. Section 2.2 introduce temporal logic:  $LTL$ ,  $LTL_f$ , and  $MTL_f$ . Section 2.3 reviews the conformance and compliance patterns common for process mining. Finally, Section 2.4 illustrates an exemplary business process and a set of compliance requirements that will be used to illustrate the contributions in the rest of the paper.

### 2.1. Events, Traces, and Logs

**Definition 1 (Event).** *An event  $e$  is a tuple  $(a_1, a_2, \dots, a_n)$  where  $a_i$  is an attribute value drawn from a respective domain  $a_i \in D_i$ . At least three domains and their respective values must be defined for each event  $e$ :  $D_c$ , the set of case*

identifiers,  $D_a$ , the set of activity identifiers, and  $D_t$ , the set of timestamps. We denote these properties as *e.c*, *e.a*, and *e.t* respectively. Other properties and domains are optional such as  $D_r$ , the resources who perform the tasks,  $D_l$ , the lifecycle phase of the activity.

We reserve the first three properties in the event tuple to reflect the case, the activity label, and the timestamp properties.

**Definition 2 (Trace).** *A trace is a finite sequence of events  $\sigma = \langle e_1, e_2, \dots, e_m \rangle$  where  $e_i$  is an event,  $1 \leq i \leq m$  is a unique position for the event that identifies the event  $e_i$  in  $\sigma$  and explicitly positions it, and for any  $e_i, e_j \in \sigma : e_i.c = e_j.c$*

**Definition 3 (Event log).** *An event log is a finite sequence of events  $\mathcal{L} = \langle e_1, e_2, \dots, e_m \rangle$  where events are ordered by their timestamps for any  $e_i$  and  $e_{i+1} : e_i.t \leq e_{i+1}.t$ .*

## 2.2. Temporal Logic

Temporal Logic has been widely utilized for specification and verification of reactive systems, as well as to validate compliance with regulations and constraints in a variety of fields. Linear Temporal Logic (LTL) and Metric Temporal Logic (MTL) are two specific temporal logic sub-types with different focuses and capabilities.

**Definition 4 (Linear-Time Temporal Logic (LTL)).** *LTL [23] is an extension of propositional Boolean logic that includes modalities for expressing temporal operators. LTL formulas are composed of a set of propositional variables  $P$ , temporal operators such as  $\mathcal{U}$  (Until),  $\square$  (also noted as  $\mathbf{G}$  for globally),  $\square^{-1}$  (also noted as  $\mathbf{G}$  for globally in the past),  $\diamond$  (means eventually),  $\diamond^{-1}$  (means eventually in the past),  $\bigcirc$  (means next state) and  $\bigcirc^{-1}$  (means previous state).*

The formal definition of the collection of LTL formulas over  $P$  is as follows:

- Each  $p \in P$  is an LTL formula.

- If  $\phi, \psi$  are LTL formulas then

$$\phi, \psi := \psi \mathcal{U} \phi \mid \bigcirc(\phi) \mid \bigcirc^{-1}(\phi) \mid \phi \vee \psi \mid \Box \phi \mid \Box^{-1} \phi \mid \Diamond \phi \mid \Diamond^{-1} \phi$$

are LTL formulas.

Linear Temporal Logic on finite traces ( $LTL_f$ ) [24, 25, 26] is a variant of  $LTL$  that restricts  $LTL$  formula semantics to finite traces. It allows for expressing temporal properties over sequences of events, where each event occurs exactly once.  $LTL_f$  formulas are evaluated on finite traces, which are partial orders of events. They are used in the context of reactive synthesis and runtime verification.  $LTL_f$  is widely used to formalize declarative business process models [10], declarative conformance checking [27], and compliance checking.

**Definition 5 (Metric Temporal Logic on finite traces ( $MTL_f$ )).**  $MTL_f$  is a generalization of  $LTL_f$  in which temporal operators are substituted by time-constrained counterparts, such as until ( $\mathcal{U}_I$ ), next ( $\bigcirc_I$ ), previous ( $\bigcirc_I^{-1}$ ), globally ( $\Box_I$ ), globally in the past ( $\Box_I^{-1}$ ), eventually ( $\Diamond_I$ ), and eventually in the past ( $\Diamond_I^{-1}$ ) operators, where  $I \subseteq [0, \infty)$  represents an interval of real numbers with endpoints in the set of natural numbers ( $N$ ) till  $\infty$ .

The construction of  $MTL_f$  [12] formulas is similar to that of  $LTL_f$ , with the exception that temporal operators are now constrained by an interval  $I$ .  $MTL_f$  well-formed equations are formed following the rule [28]:

$$\phi, \psi := p \mid \neg \phi \mid (\phi \wedge \psi) \mid \bigcirc_I \phi \mid (\phi \mathcal{U}_I \psi) \mid \Box_I \phi \mid \Box_I^{-1} \phi \mid \Diamond_I \phi \mid \Diamond_I^{-1} \phi$$

This expression  $\phi \mathcal{U}_I \psi$  defines behavior modeled expressed as timed words containing a sequence of  $\phi$  followed by  $\psi$  which occurs at within time interval  $I$ . For example,  $\phi \mathcal{U}_{\geq 3} \psi$  represents  $\phi \mathcal{U}_{[3, \infty)} \psi$ ,  $\phi \mathcal{U}_{\leq 3} \psi$  represents  $\phi \mathcal{U}_{[0, 3]} \psi$ ,  $\phi \mathcal{U}_3 \psi$  represents  $\phi \mathcal{U}_{[3, 3]} \psi$  and  $\phi \mathcal{U}_{2 \leq i \leq 3} \psi$  represents  $\phi \mathcal{U}_{[2, 3]} \psi$ . This notation allows for specifying different time intervals and constraints between  $\phi$  and  $\psi$ . It is important to note that Linear Temporal Logic ( $LTL_f$ ) is a subset of  $MTL_f$ , where only the interval  $[0, \infty)$  is permitted.




Figure 1: Compliance Patterns

### 2.3. Compliance Patterns

Conformance checking [2] provides an alignment between a trace and a process model to quantify the deviation between the required behavior (the model) and the observed behavior (the trace). In many situations, it is necessary to check deviations at a finer granularity, such as the level of activities, e.g., absence, existence, or pairs of activities, e.g., coexistence, mutual exclusion, along with time window constraints. Such finer granularity checks are referred to as compliance checking, and *compliance patterns* are used for categorizing the types of compliance requirements [3].

According to [9], the classification of patterns for business process compliance are *Occurrence patterns*, *Order patterns* and *Timed patterns*, cf. Figure 1. These patterns are also common for modeling, discovering, or checking conformance of declarative process models [29].

*Occurrence patterns* are concerned with activities having been executed (*Existence*) or not (*Absence*) within a process instance. *Order patterns* are con-

Table 1: Formalization of conformance patterns using  $LTL_f$  as common in literature

Pattern	$LTL_f$ Formula
Absence	$\neg\Diamond\phi$
Existence	$\Diamond\phi$
Last	$\Box(\phi \rightarrow \neg\bigcirc\neg\phi)$
Response	$\Box(\phi \rightarrow \Diamond\psi)$
Alter. Resp.	$\Box(\phi \rightarrow \bigcirc(\neg\phi\mathcal{U}\psi))$
Chain Resp.	$\Box(\phi \rightarrow \bigcirc(\psi))$
Precedence	$(\neg\psi\mathcal{U}\phi) \vee \Box(\neg\psi)$
Alter. Preced.	$\Box(\psi \rightarrow \bigcirc^{-1}(\neg\psi\mathcal{U}\phi))$
Chain Preced.	$\Box(\bigcirc(\psi) \rightarrow \phi)$
Choice	$\Diamond\phi \vee \Diamond\psi$
Resp. Exist.	$\Diamond\phi \rightarrow \Diamond\psi$
Co-Existence	$\Diamond\phi \leftrightarrow \Diamond\psi$

cerned with the execution order between pairs of activities, e.g., *Precedes*, *Response*. Besides the restriction on the execution order, the pattern can enforce further constraints. For example, it might define a time span (window) between the occurrence of the two activities and it might forbid other activities from occurring between the two events (see *With Absence*) in Figure 1. This latter restriction is also referred to as excluded activities.

The *Response* pattern between two activities  $A$  and  $B$  requires that when  $A$  occurs,  $B$  should subsequently happen after  $A$  in the same case before the process instance is terminated. Conversely, the *Precedes* pattern implies that activity  $B$  should occur only if  $A$  has already occurred before for the same trace.

*Alternate response* and *Alternate precedence* restrict the *Response* and *Precedes* patterns by requiring activities to alternate without repetitions. *Chain response* and *Chain precedence* patterns specify even stronger ordering relations. These patterns require that the occurrences of  $A$  and  $B$  be close together. Table 1 formalizes the compliance patterns using  $LTL_f$  as common in literature.

*Timed patterns* incorporate explicit time constraints into the compliance requirements in which an activity is expected to start/complete execution, e.g., *within* the time interval in which an event or activity must take place or be finished or *after* the time interval (*isBefore* property in Figure 1).






Figure 2: HR hiring process

As discussed earlier,  $LTL_f$  is incapable of capturing explicit timed patterns. On the other hand, MTL can capture these constraints. Following the *With Absence*, *Time Span*, and *isBefore* properties of *Ordered Patterns* in Figure 1, we can generalize, e.g., the response patterns to be further parameterized by  $Ex$ , the list of excluded activities,  $I$ , the time window (interval), and  $\theta$ , the comparison operator. Therefore, we can use the MTL formula

$$\Box_{\theta I}(a \rightarrow ((true \wedge \bigwedge_{e \in Ex} \neg e) \mathcal{U}_{\theta I} \Diamond b)) \quad (1)$$

This formula ensures that whenever activity  $a$  occurs, eventually activity  $b$  occurs with respect to time interval  $I$  according to  $\theta$ , meanwhile any activity  $e \in Ex$  is not observed in-between. Note that we get the non-time restricted form of this pattern by setting  $I = [0, \infty]$ ,  $Ex = \phi$ , and  $\theta = \geq$ . In this scenario, the formula is simplified to  $\Box(a \rightarrow true \mathcal{U} b)$ . Which can be simplified to  $\Box(a \rightarrow \Diamond b)$ , similar to the formalization in Table 1.


When checking for compliance, analysts are interested in identifying process instances, i.e., traces that contain a violation, rather than those that are compliant. Therefore, it is common in the literature about compliance checking to use the term “anti-pattern” [30] to refer to traces in which violations occur.

#### 2.4. A Running Example


An organization’s Human Resources (HR) department needs to have a clear set of criteria when hiring an employee. There are several factors that can affect these criteria. For example, the organization should carefully evaluate the qualifications, experience, and other activities to ensure they meet the required standards and expectations. Moreover, it is important to take into account how well they align with the organization’s culture and values.

Table 2: A sample event log for hiring process with additional attributes


Event	C.ID	Activity	StartTime	CompleteTime	Position
1	1	Start	10-03-2021 20:20	10-03-2021 20:20	0
2	1	Rec.C.R.	10-03-2021 20:26	13-03-2021 15:54	1
3	1	V.C.Q	14-03-2021 09:24	14-03-2021 15:50	2
4	2	Start	09-03-2021 09:05	09-03-2021 09:05	0
5	2	Rec.C.R.	09-03-2021 09:11	10-03-2021 13:53	1
6	1	C.I.	16-03-2021 13:00	16-03-2021 15:11	3
7	3	Start	31-03-2021 15:25	31-03-2021 15:25	0
8	3	Rec.C.R.	31-03-2021 15:30	02-04-2021 13:11	1
9	1	T.A.	18-03-2021 10:30	18-03-2021 12:30	4
10	2	V.C.Q.	15-03-2021 12:48	16-03-2021 17:08	2
11	2	T.A.	19-03-2021 12:22	19-03-2021 14:22	3
12	3	V.C.Q.	05-04-2021 13:34	07-04-2021 10:24	2
13	2	C.I.	22-03-2021 14:20	22-03-2021 16:36	4
14	2	O.C.	30-03-2021 12:58	30-03-2021 14:56	5
15	2	End	30-03-2021 15:00	30-03-2021 15:00	5
16	3	C.I.	09-04-2021 11:48	09-04-2021 13:19	3
17	4	Start	03-03-2021 14:10	03-03-2021 14:10	0
18	4	Rec.C.R.	03-03-2021 14:17	06-03-2021 10:39	1
19	1	O.C.	20-03-2021 13:33	20-03-2021 15:50	5
20	1	End	20-03-2021 15:55	20-03-2021 15:55	5
21	4	C.I.	10-03-2021 15:00	10-03-2021 16:41	2
22	3	T.A.	12-04-2021 12:39	12-04-2021 14:40	4
23	4	V.C.Q.	12-04-2021 14:05	14-04-2021 18:40	3
24	4	T.A.	18-04-2021 09:30	18-04-2021 11:30	4
25	3	T.A.	16-04-2021 10:32	16-04-2021 12:30	5
26	4	O.C.	20-04-2021 12:05	20-04-2021 12:19	5
27	4	End	20-04-2021 12:25	20-04-2021 12:25	5
28	3	Rej.C.Q.	18-04-2021 13:05	18-04-2021 13:15	6
29	3	S.F.	19-04-2021 15:31	19-04-2021 15:55	7
30	3	End	19-04-2021 16:05	19-04-2021 16:05	7
⋮	⋮	⋮	⋮	⋮	⋮



Minimum details



Optional details



Added detail

Figure 2 depicts the typical activities involved in hiring an employee and the order in which they should be executed as a BPMN process model. Table 2 shows a sample event log for such a hiring process. It has an event identification number (*Event*), here presented in serial numbers, a case identifier (*C.ID*) that presents a unique number per employment candidate, and *Activity* presents the action performed in the hiring process. “StartTime” and “CompleteTime” columns are considered optional details. Finally, the “Position” column specifies

Table 3: An Excerpt of the Compliance Requirements

ID	Compliance Requirements	$LTL_f$ formula
Req.1	Provide constructive feedback to candidates who were interviewed but not selected for the position	$\Box(Rej.C.Q \rightarrow \Diamond S.F.)$
Req.2	The HR must verify the candidate’s qualifications within 2 days of receiving the application.	—
Req.3	The candidate must successfully complete the interview before undergoing the technical assessment.	$(\neg T.A. \mathcal{U} C.I.) \vee \Box(\neg T.A.)$
Req.4	For any candidate who successfully passes the technical assessment will receive the job offer 3 days later.	—
Req.5	Upon the verification of candidate qualifications, the candidate is eligible to proceed to an interview before entering the technical assessment phase.	$\Box(V.C.Q. \rightarrow \bigcirc(\Diamond C.I. \mathcal{U} T.A.))$

the activity’s position per case.

Table 3 shows an excerpt of the compliance requirements enforced upon the process and that needs to be checked against the log (Table 2). Table 3 shows that the Linear Temporal Logic ( $LTL_f$ ) formula cannot express *Req.2* & *Req.4* due to temporal constraints.

### 3. Related Work

In recent years, an increasing number of researchers have focused on declarative conformance checking. In [31], the authors focus on ensuring compliance with business rules by translating constraints into Linear Temporal Logic (LTL) and subsequently assessing them through the use of automata.

In [32], the authors introduce an initial method for mining declarative process models using Declare constraints. This method has improved in [33], adopting a two-phase strategy. Initially, the first phase employs an apriori algorithm to detect frequent sets of interconnected activities. From these sets, a list of potential constraints is derived. Subsequently, in the second phase, these constraints are evaluated by replaying the log against specific automata, each designed to

accept traces adhering to a specific constraint. Constraints that satisfy a predefined threshold, determined by the percentage of traces, are then identified and considered as discovered constraints.

In another research, the authors introduce a method designed to assess the alignment of a log with a Declare model [15]. Their algorithm determines, for each trace, whether a Declare constraint is violated or satisfied. These methods focus on the control-flow perspective and do not consider the data nor time perspectives. In [34], the authors present a toolset to extract process-related data from operational logs (e.g., relational databases) using a metamodel. It can represent complex SQL queries involving nesting and joins.

Relational databases have also been used in declarative process mining for compliance verification. SQLMiner, as introduced in [18], simplifies this process by efficiently using SQL queries to extract compliance patterns from event data. Schönig et al. [35] present a framework developed to discover MP-Declare models using SQL queries. This framework can analyze processes from multiple viewpoints, including control flow, data attributes, organizational aspects, and time perspectives.

Compliance violations, i.e., anti-patterns, can be checked by *Match\_Recognize* (MR), the ANSI SQL operator. MR verifies patterns as regular expressions, where the tuples of a table are the symbols of the string to search for matches within. MR runs linearly through the number of tuples in the table. In our case, the tuples are the events in the log. In practice, the operational time can be enhanced by parallelizing the processing, e.g., partitioning the tuples by the case identifier. Still, this does not change the linearity of the match concerning the number of tuples in the table. A recent work speeds up MR by using indexes in relational databases for strict contiguity patterns, i.e., patterns where events are in strict sequence [36]. However, Order compliance patterns frequently refer to eventuality rather than strict order, limiting the use of indexes to accelerate the matching process.

Leveraging multi-perspective declarative process models and advanced conformance checking techniques add competitive advantages to organizations. Organizations can gain insights into process compliance, identify bottlenecks, im-

prove process efficiency, and ensure adherence to defined business rules and constraints across different dimensions of the process. In [29], the author design an approach to conduct conformance checking with declarative process models based on log replay. They developed a model interpreter to extract linear temporal logic *LTL* constraints from the input Declare model. Subsequently, the approach checks each trace to determine whether these constraints are violated or not. They support *Declare Analyzer* methods to detect constraints.

Storing and querying event logs using graph databases has also been investigated. Esser et al. [19] provide a rich, multidimensional model for event data using labelled property graphs realized on top of Neo4J. The authors show how their model supports several classes of queries on event data. All compliance patterns can be represented as queries against their model. To conclude, this area is still open for improvement due to the complexity of constraints in real-life processes and the need for risk management and control to minimize violations.

#### 4. Formalization of Compliance Patterns using *MTL<sub>f</sub>*

We have seen in Section 2.4 that *LTL<sub>f</sub>* falls short of capturing timed patterns, whereas *MTL<sub>f</sub>* easily captures the timed and untimed compliance patterns. In this section, we detail our first contribution where we provide a minimal set of *MTL<sub>f</sub>* formulas that we argue it covers all of the known occurrence, order, or timed patterns. The purpose of having this minimal set is to modularize the mapping from the temporal logic formalism to the different query languages suitable to access event logs stored in the respective data model (Section 5).

In general, we can extend most of the patterns discussed in Section 2.3 by defining the time interval  $I$  in which the constraint is required to hold. Therefore, using *MTL<sub>f</sub>* instead of *LTL<sub>f</sub>*. Moreover, we emphasize the use of the set of excluded activities as it will play a crucial role in simplifying the formulas and reducing their numbers while capturing the patterns. We will use the template *Pattern(condition, target, Excluded, Interval)* to parameterize the patterns. For instance, the *response* pattern is defined as *Response( $\phi, \psi, \Gamma, I$ )*. The *absence* pattern is defined as *Absence( $\perp, \perp, \{\gamma\}, I$ )*. We will elaborate more on this in the following subsections.

#### 4.1. Generalized $MTL_f$ Formulas

Formula 2 is a  $MTL_f$  template formula that covers future-looking compliance patterns.

$$\Box((S \vee \phi) \rightarrow \bigcirc((True \wedge \bigwedge_{\gamma \in \Gamma} \neg \gamma) \mathcal{U}_I(\psi \vee E))) \quad (2)$$

The template in Formula 2 is parameterized by activities  $\phi$ ,  $\psi$ , and  $\Gamma$ ; where  $\phi \in D_a$ ,  $\psi \in D_a$ , and  $\Gamma \subset D_a$ , c.f. Definition 1, and the time interval  $I$ .  $\phi$  is the condition for the implication,  $\psi$  is the consequent, whereas  $\Gamma$  is the set of excluded activities.  $\Gamma$  and  $I$  are optional. If they are not specified, the resulting formula reduces to an  $LTL_f$  formula. There are two special activities  $S, E \notin D_a$  that are used to indicate the start  $S$ , and the end  $E$  of a trace (case). This is a common preprocessing approach for event logs. Formula 2 also generalizes Formula 1, by adding the special events  $S$  and  $E$ .

Formula 2 guarantees that when the activation activity  $\phi$  is executed, the target activity  $\psi$  will hold at some future point within a specific time interval  $I$ . In between, no  $\gamma \in \Gamma$  shall be executed. Formula 2 uses future operators, i.e.  $\bigcirc$  and  $\mathcal{U}$ . Although such operators do not improve the expressive power of temporal logic [37], they still make temporal logic formulas more succinct. Therefore, Formula 3 is the past-looking template that is used to cover the precedence pattern variants. In Formula 3,  $\phi$  and  $\psi$  swap their roles for being the condition and the consequent.

$$\Box((E \vee \psi) \rightarrow \bigcirc^{-1}((True \wedge \bigwedge_{\gamma \in \Gamma} \neg \gamma) \mathcal{U}_I^{-1}(\phi \vee S))) \quad (3)$$

Table 4 shows the instantiation of Formulas 2 and 3 to model the different compliance patterns from Table 1 in  $MTL_f$ . For instance, to model the absence pattern  $Absence(\perp, \perp, \{\gamma\}, I)$ , Formula 2 is instantiated by defining the excluded events  $\Gamma = \{\gamma\}$ , dropping  $\phi$ ,  $\psi$ , and  $True$  to get  $\Box((S) \rightarrow \bigcirc((\neg \gamma) \mathcal{U}_I(E)))$ . The start event  $S$  holds in the first state, and from the next state, no  $\gamma$  shall be observed until the end activity  $E$  is reached.

Table 4: Generalization of  $LTL_f$ -based Conformance Patterns in  $MTL_f$  Formula

Pattern	General $MTL_f$ Formula
Absence( $\perp, \perp, \{\gamma\}, I$ )	$\Box(S \rightarrow \bigcirc(\neg\gamma \mathcal{U}_I E))$
Existence( $\perp, \psi, \{\}, I$ )	$\Box(S \rightarrow \bigcirc(T \mathcal{U}_I \psi))$
Last( $\phi, \perp, D_a, I$ )	$\Box(\phi \rightarrow \bigcirc(\bigwedge_{\gamma \in D_a \setminus \{\phi\}} \neg\gamma \mathcal{U}_I E))$
Response( $\phi, \psi, \Gamma, I$ )	$\Box(\phi \rightarrow \bigcirc((True \wedge \bigwedge_{\gamma \in \Gamma} \neg\gamma) \mathcal{U}_I \psi))$
Alter. Resp.( $\phi, \psi, \Gamma, I$ )	Response( $\phi, \psi, \Gamma \cup \{\phi\}, I$ )
Chain Resp.( $\phi, \psi, \{\}, I$ )	Response( $\phi, \psi, D_a \setminus \{\psi\}, I$ )
Precedence( $\psi, \phi, \Gamma, I$ )	$\Box(\psi \rightarrow \bigcirc^{-1}((T \wedge \bigwedge_{\gamma \in \Gamma} \neg\gamma) \mathcal{U}_I^{-1} \phi))$
Alter. Preced.( $\psi, \phi, \Gamma, I$ )	Precedence( $\psi, \phi, \Gamma \cup \{\psi\}, I$ )
Chain Preced.( $\psi, \phi, \{\}, I$ )	Precedence( $\psi, \phi, D_a \setminus \{\phi\}, I$ )
Choice( $\phi, \psi, \{\}, I$ )	$Existence(\perp, \phi, \{\}, I) \vee Existence(\perp, \psi, \{\}, I)$
Resp. Exist.( $\phi, \psi, \{\}, I$ )	$Existence(\perp, \phi, \{\}, I) \rightarrow Existence(\perp, \psi, \{\}, I)$
Co-Existence( $\phi, \psi, \{\}, I$ )	$Existence(\perp, \phi, \{\}, I) \leftrightarrow Existence(\perp, \psi, \{\}, I)$

The existence patterns  $Existence(\perp, \psi, \{\}, I)$  can be modeled as  $\psi$  is the consequent for observing  $S$ . To model the last pattern,  $Last(\phi, \perp, \Gamma, I)$ , we set  $\Gamma = D_a$ . We drop  $S$  from the formula as we want to check for the occurrence of  $\phi$  as a condition. Once  $\phi$  holds in some state, in all future states, no activity from  $D_a$  shall be observed. This effectively means that in the next state, only  $E$  should be observed for the trace to be compliant.

The  $Response(\phi, \psi, \Gamma, I)$  is straightforward. The alternating response is modeled as  $AltResp(\phi, \psi, \Gamma, I)$  using the response pattern by adding  $\phi$  to  $\Gamma$ , the set of excluded events.  $ChainResp$  uses the response pattern formula, where  $\Gamma = D_a \setminus \{\psi\}$ . This effectively means that once  $\phi$  is observed in some state, no other activity than  $\psi$  can be observed in the immediate next state.

Likewise, the precedence pattern variants can be built on the basic precedence pattern. The last three patterns in Table 4 are built on top of the *existence* pattern using different logical operators.

#### 4.2. Reflection on the Running Example

Table 5 shows how the compliance requirements from Section 2.4 are modeled following the pattern templates in Table 4. Table 2 can help to illustrate the

Table 5: Formalization of the Compliance Requirements using Formula 2

ID	$MTL_f$ Formula
Req.1	$\Box(\mathbf{C.I.} \rightarrow \bigcirc(\mathit{True} \mathcal{U}_{[0,\infty]} \mathbf{S.F.}))$
Req.2	$\Box(\mathbf{V.C.Q.} \rightarrow \bigcirc^{-1}(\mathit{True} \mathcal{U}_{[0,48]}^{-1} \mathbf{Rec.C.R.}))$
Req.3	$\Box(\mathbf{T.A.} \rightarrow \bigcirc^{-1}(\mathit{True} \wedge \neg \mathbf{V.C.Q.} \mathcal{U}_{[0,\infty]}^{-1} \mathbf{C.I.}))$
Req.4	$\Box(\mathbf{T.A.} \rightarrow \bigcirc(\mathit{True} \mathcal{U}_{[72,\infty]} \mathbf{O.C.}))$
Req.5	$\Box(\mathbf{V.C.Q.} \rightarrow \bigcirc(\mathit{True} \wedge \neg \mathbf{T.A.} \mathcal{U}_{[0,\infty]} \mathbf{C.I.}))$

above constraints. For instance, by examining the *Precedence* constraint, we can determine that case 2 did not conform to the time restriction provided in Req.2. Similarly, in Req.5 (*Response Constraint*), we must verify that activity *C.I.* follows activity *V.C.Q.* with no instances of activity *T.A.* in between. This requirement is not fulfilled in case 2. Additionally, in Req.3, case 4 does not satisfy the *Alternate Precedence* constraint due to the occurrence of the activity *V.C.Q.*, which violates the constraint.

Section 5 examines the compatibility of compliance patterns across various data models.

## 5. Mapping $MTL_f$ -based Compliance Patterns To the Different Data Models

In this section, we aim to present the conversion of Metric Temporal Logic ( $MTL_f$ ) compliance patterns into different data models, namely the Relational Data Model and Graph Data Model. This translation process entails representing the temporal constraints using the query language of each data model.

In the mapping, however, we care about mapping the anti-pattern. That is, the negation of the respective  $MTL_f$  pattern [38, 22]. That is because, we care about identifying the violation(s). Moreover, due to space limitations, we cover the anti patterns derived from the Formula 2. The anti-patterns derived from Formula 3 can be derived in a similar way but using the converse comparison operators.



### 5.1. Relational Data Model

The log representation in Table 2 maps directly to a table in an RDBMS. The columns for case identifier, event identifier, activity, etc. can be stored directly in the relational database. The SQL Miner [18] technique uses SQL operators like joins and nested queries to identify compliance violations.

The SQL standard defines the `Match_Recognize` (MR) pattern matching operator. The patterns finds matches a table’s records the same way a regular expression finds matches over a string. However, not all RDBMSs implement the MR operator. Nevertheless, we consider mapping  $MTL_f$  to MR over a relational table storing the event log.

Another method uses the analytical Match Recognize (MR) operator. Section 5.1.1 and Section 5.1.2 details the queries for each approach, respectively.

#### 5.1.1. Mapping using SQL Miner

The following queries show different variations of the response anti-pattern query using SQL Miner, either within time interval  $I$  (listing 1), after time interval  $I$  (listing 2), or without time interval (listing 3), respectively. For instance, the query in Listing 1 shows *Response* anti-pattern within specified time frame  $I$ . It reports violations that occur either due to the time frame was not met, in Line 4, or the absence of the target activity  $\psi$  as in Line 15. It also detects cases where excluded activities  $\Gamma$  are observed between activities  $\phi$  and  $\psi$ , as in Line 5. All other listings are working in the same way with different representation.

Listing 1: Response anti-pattern query within time interval (I) using SQL Miner

---

```
1| Select CID
2| From log as l, log as l1
3| Where l.CID = l1.CID and l.activity =  $\phi$  and l1.activity =  $\psi$ 
4| and l1.position > l.position and (l1.start-l.complete >= I
5| or EXISTS (select CID FROM log as l2
6|           WHERE l2.CID = l.CID
7|           AND l2.position > l.position
8|           AND l2.position < l1.position
9|           AND l2.activity IN ( $\Gamma$ )
10|          )
11| Union
12| Select CID
13| From log as l
14| Where l.activity =  $\phi$ 
15| and l.CID not in (Select l1.CID From log l1 Where l1.activity =  $\psi$ )
```

---

Listing 2: Response anti-pattern query after time interval (I) using SQL Miner

---

```

1| Select CID
2| From log as l, log as l1
3| Where l.CID = l1.CID and l.activity =  $\phi$  and l1.activity =  $\psi$ 
4| and l1.position > l.position and (l1.start-l.complete <= I
5| or EXISTS (select CID FROM log as l2
6|           WHERE l2.CID = l.CID
7|             AND l2.position > l.position
8|             AND l2.position < l1.position
9|             AND l2.activity IN ( $\Gamma$ )
10|          )
11|        )
12| Union
13| Select CID
14| From log as l
15| Where l.activity =  $\phi$ 
16| and l.CID not in (Select l1.CID From log l1 Where l1.activity =  $\psi$ )

```

---

Listing 3: Response anti-pattern query using SQL Miner

---

```

1| Select CID
2| From log as l, log as l1
3| Where l.CID = l1.CID and l.activity =  $\phi$  and l1.activity =  $\psi$ 
4| and l1.position < l.position
5| and EXISTS (select CID FROM log as l2
6|           WHERE l2.CID = l.CID
7|             AND l2.position > l.position
8|             AND l2.position < l1.position
9|             AND l2.activity IN ( $\Gamma$ )
10|          )
11| Union
12| Select CID
13| From log as l
14| Where l.activity =  $\phi$ 
15| and l.CID not in (Select l1.CID From log l1 Where l1.activity =  $\psi$ )

```

---

### 5.1.2. Mapping using Match Recognize

The following queries show different variations of the response anti-pattern query using Match Recognize, either within time interval  $I$  (listing 4), after time interval  $I$  (listing 5), or without time interval (listing 6), respectively. Let's explain how the query in listing 4 detects violations. Basically, it defines the pattern, in Line 7, where  $A$  defined as an activation activity  $\phi$ , in Line 9, and  $B$  as a target activity  $\psi$ , in Line 11 or  $E$  as an End activity, in Line 25. Additionally, the set  $S^*$  contains all excluded activities, as indicated in Line 10. The violations occurs under two conditions: first, when the time frame is not met, in Line 12, and second the absence of the target activity  $\psi$ , as in Line 24. The remaining listing queries work in the same manner with different representations.

Listing 4: Response anti-pattern query within time interval (I) using Match Recognize

---

```

1| select distinct CID
2| from log MATCH_RECOGNIZE(
3|   PARTITION BY CID
4|   ORDER BY Time_stamp
5|   ONE ROW PER MATCH
6|   AFTER MATCH SKIP TO NEXT ROW
7|   PATTERN (A S* B)
8|   DEFINE
9|     A AS Activity_ID =  $\phi$ ,
10|    S AS S.Activity_ID <>  $\phi$  AND S.Activity_ID <>  $\psi$  AND
11|    S.Activity_ID <>  $\Gamma$ ,
12|    B AS ((B.Activity_ID =  $\psi$ 
13|           AND (B.Time_stamp - A.time_stamp) > interval I))
14|   )
15| union
16| select distinct CID
17| from log MATCH_RECOGNIZE(
18|   PARTITION BY CID
19|   ORDER BY Time_stamp
20|   ONE ROW PER MATCH
21|   AFTER MATCH SKIP TO NEXT ROW
22|   PATTERN (A S* E )
23|   DEFINE
24|     A AS Activity_ID =  $\phi$ ,
25|     S AS S.Activity_ID <>  $\phi$  AND S.Activity_ID <>  $\psi$ ,
26|     E AS E.Activity_ID = 'END'
27|   );

```

---

Listing 5: Response anti-pattern query after time interval (I) using Match Recognize

---

```

1| select distinct CID
2| from log MATCH_RECOGNIZE(
3|   PARTITION BY CID
4|   ORDER BY Time_stamp
5|   ONE ROW PER MATCH
6|   AFTER MATCH SKIP TO NEXT ROW
7|   PATTERN (A S* B)
8|   DEFINE
9|     A AS Activity_ID =  $\phi$ ,
10|    S AS S.Activity_ID <>  $\phi$  AND S.Activity_ID <>  $\psi$  AND
11|    S.Activity_ID <>  $\Gamma$ ,
12|    B AS ((B.Activity_ID =  $\psi$ 
13|           AND (B.Time_stamp - A.time_stamp) < interval I))
14|   )
15| union
16| select distinct CID
17| from log MATCH_RECOGNIZE(
18|   PARTITION BY CID
19|   ORDER BY Time_stamp
20|   ONE ROW PER MATCH
21|   AFTER MATCH SKIP TO NEXT ROW
22|   PATTERN (A S* E )
23|   DEFINE
24|     A AS Activity_ID =  $\phi$ ,
25|     S AS S.Activity_ID <>  $\phi$  AND S.Activity_ID <>  $\psi$ ,
26|     E AS E.Activity_ID = 'END'
27|   );

```

---

Listing 6: Response anti-pattern query using Match Recognize

---

```

1| select distinct CID
2| from log MATCH_RECOGNIZE(
3|   PARTITION BY CID
4|   ORDER BY Time_stamp
5|   ONE ROW PER MATCH
6|   AFTER MATCH SKIP TO NEXT ROW
7|   PATTERN (A S* B)
8|   DEFINE
9|     A AS Activity_ID =  $\phi$ ,
10|    S AS S.Activity_ID <>  $\phi$  AND S.Activity_ID <>  $\psi$  AND S.Activity_ID =
     $\Gamma$ ,
11|    B AS B.Activity_ID =  $\psi$ 
12| )
13| union
14| select distinct CID
15| from log MATCH_RECOGNIZE(
16|   PARTITION BY CID
17|   ORDER BY Time_stamp
18|   ONE ROW PER MATCH
19|   AFTER MATCH SKIP TO NEXT ROW
20|   PATTERN (A S* E )
21|   DEFINE
22|     A AS Activity_ID =  $\phi$ ,
23|     S AS S.Activity_ID <>  $\phi$  AND S.Activity_ID <>  $\psi$ ,
24|     E AS E.Activity_ID = 'END'
25| );

```

---

## 5.2. Graph Data Model

Graph representation model of event logs is a potential way for analyzing event logs [39], particularly for compliance checking [19], due to the richness of the graph data model, mature database engines supporting it, e.g., Neo4J <sup>2</sup>, and the declarative query languages embraced by such engines, e.g., Cypher <sup>3</sup>. In this manner, compliance checking can be mapped to queries against the encoded log to detect violations. For instance, a *precedence* pattern of activity A over activity B within a specific time frame is expressed by identifying nodes corresponding to activities A and B. The verification process is checking the relationship between these nodes via directed edges to ensure that it meets the time constraints. There are two different encoding methods: *Multi-Dimensional method* [29] and *Unique Activities method* [22], outlined in Sections 5.2.1 and 5.2.2, respectively.

---

<sup>2</sup>Neo4J website <https://neo4j.com/>

<sup>3</sup>Cypher for Neo4J is like SQL for relational databases.

### 5.2.1. Mapping to Multi-Dimensional Encoding

This approach was one of the graph encoding methods. The disadvantage of this approach, especially when employing linear scan, is leading to performance issues. As the size or complexity of the graph increases, the linear scan method might lead to inefficiencies, significantly slowing down the query or analysis processes. Figure 3 depicts the graph produced by encoding the log excerpt in Table 2 using the Multi-Dimensional method.




Figure 3: Multi-Dimensional Encoding of Table 2

Listings {7,8,9} demonstrate the usage of *Cypher* queries to define compliance patterns under time constraints. The query in Listing 7 expresses *Response* anti-pattern within specific time frame. First, the query identifies the beginning of each trace (`start:Event{activity: $\phi$ }`). Then the sequence of nodes constituting a path from each node of activity End to the start activity  $\phi$ , in the same case, is constructed. The path is constructed by traversing the transitive closure of the `:Directly_follows` relation; it is represented as `path=(e1:Event{activity:End}<-[:Directly_follows*]- (start))`. If the path does not meet time frame, Line 5, or does not include any node whose activity property refers to  $\psi$ , line 7, a violation exists, and this case is reported. Furthermore, if the path includes excluded activities  $\Gamma$ , Line 6, the violation exists. The same applies for the other two listings with different representation of time interval inclusion or exclusion.

Listing 7: Response anti-pattern query within time interval (I) using the Mutli-Dimensional encoding

---

```

1| Match (c:Case) <-[:Event_to_case]- (start:Event{activity:φ})
2| Match (e1:Event{activity:ψ}<-[:Directly_follows*]- (start))
3| Match path = (e1:Event{activity:End}<-[:Directly_follows*]- (start))
4|   where exists (n in nodes(path) where n.activity=ψ
5|   and n.startTime- start.completeTime >= I)
6|   or (start)-[:Directly_follows*]->(Γ)-[:Directly_follows*]->(e1)
7|   or none (n in nodes(path) where n.activity=ψ)
8| return c.ID

```

---

Listing 8: Response anti-pattern query after time interval (I) using the Mutli-Dimensional encoding

---

```

1| Match (c:Case) <-[:Event_to_case]- (start:Event{activity:φ})
2| Match (e1:Event{activity:ψ}<-[:Directly_follows*]- (start))
3| Match path = (e1:Event{activity:End}<-[:Directly_follows*]- (start))
4|   where exists (n in nodes(path) where n.activity=ψ
5|   and n.startTime- start.completeTime <= I)
6|   or (start)-[:Directly_follows*]->(Γ)-[:Directly_follows*]->(e1)
7|   or none (n in nodes(path) where n.activity=ψ)
8| return c.ID

```

---

Listing 9: Response anti-pattern query using the Mutli-Dimensional encoding

---

```

1| Match (c:Case) <-[:Event_to_case]- (start:Event{activity:φ})
2| Match path = (e1:Event{activity:ψ}<-[:Directly_follows*]- (start))
3|   where (start)-[:Directly_follows*]->(Γ)-[:Directly_follows*]->(e1)
4|   or none (n in nodes(path) where n.activity=ψ)
5| return c.ID

```

---

### 5.2.2. Mapping to Unique Activities (UA) Encoding

The main purpose for this approach is to simplify the queries and speed up their evaluation by utilizing indexes and skipping the linear scan of the *:Directly\_follows* relation among events. It extends the Baseline approach by adding a *position* attribute to each event node. It creates a compact graph representation model of the event log, resulting in answer compliance queries faster. Table 2 has a highlighted column, tagged as *added detail* column, where we assign each event to a position in the case (trace). The utilization of the *position* property simplifies compliance query processing but inherits linear graph size growth concerning log size. This ensures a linear growth with the size of the set of activity labels by generating separate edges connecting a case node to its corresponding activity node. These edges including various properties like position, timestamp, and resource, representing activity executions within cases. This limits graph growth based on activity labels.

Figure 4 shows the graph generated by encoding the log excerpt in Table 2 using the unique activities method. Listings {10,11,12} demonstrate the usage of *UA encoding* queries to define compliance patterns under time constraints.




Figure 4: UA Encoding of Table 2

Listing 10: Response anti-pattern query using UA encoding

```

1| Match (c:Case)
2| where ((c:Case) <-[r1:Event_to_Case]-(a:Event{event:φ}) and
(c:case) <-[r2:Event_to_Case]-(b:Event{event:ψ}) and
(e:Event{event:Γ})-[r3:Event_to_Case]->(c:Case)) and (r2.position <
r1.position or r3.position > r1.position and r3.position < r2.position))
or not exists((c) <-[:Event_to_Case]-(Event{event:ψ}))
3| return c.ID

```

Listing 11: Response anti-pattern query within time interval (I) using UA encoding

```

1| Match
(a:Event{event:φ})-[r1:Event_to_Case]->(c:Case) <-[r2:Event_to_Case]-
(b:Event{event:ψ}), (e:Event{event:γ})-[r3:Event_to_Case]->(c:Case)
2| where r2.position > r1.position and ((r1.completeTime - r2.startTime) >=
I or r3.position > r1.position and r3.position < r2.position) or not
exists((c) <-[:Event_to_Case]-(Event{event:ψ}))
3| return c.ID

```

Listing 12: Response anti-pattern query after time interval (I) using UA encoding

```

1| Match
(a:Event{event:φ})-[r1:Event_to_Case]->(c:Case) <-[r2:Event_to_Case]-
(b:Event{event:ψ}), (e:Event{event:γ})-[r3:Event_to_Case]->(c:Case)
2| where r2.position > r1.position and ((r2.startTime - r1.completeTime) <=
I) or r3.position > r1.position and r3.position < r2.position) or not
exists((c) <-[:Event_to_Case]-(Event{event:ψ}))
3| return c.ID

```

## 6. Evaluation

This section assesses the proposed  $MTL_f$  mapping to the different data models. The purpose of the evaluation is two-fold. First, we empirically prove that the approach works for the different known log encodings to the best of our knowledge, second we compare the performance of the different encodings against varying log sizes. The metric we report is the execution time of the query(ies) generated to capture the violations, i.e., the anti pattern queries. The real life logs used for evaluation are discussed in Section 6.1. Evaluation setup and other implementation details are presented in Section 6.2 before we discuss the results in Section 6.3.

### 6.1. Data sets

Table 6: Logs Characteristics

Logs	BPIC'12	BPIC'14	BPIC'19	RTFMP
# Traces	13087	41353	220810	150370
# Events	262200	369485	979942	561470
# Unique Events	24	9	8	11

We chose four real-life logs: three obtained from the BPI challenges (BPIC'12 [40], BPIC'14[41], BPIC'19 [42]) and one additional log, RTFMP [43]. These logs were specifically chosen for their diverse features and distinct characteristics, as summarized in Table 6. The rationale behind selecting logs with varied attributes was to ensure a comprehensive evaluation across different data-sets, enabling a robust assessment of our approach in handling diverse real-life scenarios found in business process logs.

### 6.2. Implementation Details and Experimental Setup

The approach has been implemented using Python and has been applied across various encoding methods. Given the instantiated  $MTL_f$  formula, the event log, the target encoding, our approach generates the respective anti-pattern queries following the templates presented in Section 5.

To benchmark the different encoding methods, we have loaded the logs from Table 6 to the respective data model formats. That is, we stored copies of each



log in a relational table and stored the multi-dimensional and the unique activities encodings into separate instances of Neo4J. For the relational databases, we used MS SQL Server and Oracle. We added Oracle to our RDBMSs because MS SQL Server does not support the MR operator. Additionally, the evaluation incorporated the SQL Server Graph Database extension (SGD) version 15.0.2000.

All experiments have been performed using an Intel core i7 processor machine with 16 GB RAM. The UA encoding method was implemented utilizing Neo4j version 4.3.1 as the underlying graph database, and Cypher was employed for log querying. The instantiation of Neo4j utilized default settings, comprising a maximum heap size of 2 GB and a 512 MB page cache size. was utilized. Oracle and MS SQL Server were started with allocated 1 GB RAM and configured with default storage engine settings.

Our evaluation process involved testing our approach across different scenarios, each addressing various compliance patterns. These scenarios were carefully designed to integrate multiple perspectives, incorporating considerations of both data and time. Queries were developed to detect *Response*, *Responded Existence*, *Chain Precedence* and *Precedence* anti-patterns, resulting in the creation of four distinct variants for each pattern. Among these variants, two adhered to temporal constraints by defining upper and lower boundaries for the time window. The other two variants served different purposes: one aimed to exclude specific activities, while the other exclusively focused on the simplest variant of the pattern, e.g., response without exclusion and without a time window.

We have checked the correctness of the results by comparing the reported case identifiers with violations across the ground truth, where we know for each compliance rule what the violating cases are in a log. All the details for the patterns (queries) variants and run details of experiments are available on Github <sup>4</sup>.

---

<sup>4</sup><https://github.com/nemayoussef/CompliancePatterns/>

Table 7: Execution time (msec) for the variants of the four queries [No time window]

Log	BPI2019							
# of Cases	25000				220810			
Methods	Response	Precedence	Chain Precedence	Responded-Existence	Response	Precedence	Chain Precedence	Responded-Existence
Declare Analyzer	1725	2125	2370	2500	10975	18011	16150	14500
Match Recognize	1780	3171	1150	889	40369	25864	2557	16850
SQL Miner	897	906	391	153	15782	3222	984	1428
MultiDimensional-SGD	1593	2450	580	420	16200	4250	2106	3210
MultiDimensional-Neo4j	613	1760	95	30	—	—	—	—
UA-SGD	1105	1210	380	275	9760	3116	1656	2428
UA-Neo4j	583	154	78	40	144	145	450	354
Log	BPI2014							
# of cases	15000				41373			
Methods	Response	Precedence	Chain Precedence	Responded-Existence	Response	Precedence	Chain Precedence	Responded-Existence
Declare Analyzer	1590	1498	310	370	3084	2829	735	1200
Match Recognize	3612	3120	1755	545	3149	2930	1224	540
SQL-Miner	767	367	418	116	2249	1958	941	385
MultiDimensional-SGD	1411	2810	504	466	3520	3102	1260	870
MultiDimensional-Neo4j	166	1440	50	63	—	—	—	—
UA-SGD	1300	880	435	272	2320	1940	1199	750
UA-Neo4j	133	109	50	32	163	117	130	88

### 6.3. Results and Discussion

In the first experiment, we run four compliance anti-pattern queries without time condition or any excluded activities for *Response*, *Responded Existence*, *Chain Precedence* and *Precedence* against the respective logs. We have run the queries five times and report the average execution time of these queries for the different encoding methods in Table 7 and Table 8. Analyzing the comparative performance, it is evident that *UA-Neo4j* consistently demonstrates lower execution times across most patterns compared to other encoding methods. For instance, it shows that *SQL Miner* performed roughly 16x faster than *Declare Analyzer*<sup>5</sup>, indicating a significant speed advantage for *SQL Miner* in processing the logs. While *UA-Neo4j* emerges as the most efficient performer, it significantly outperforms *Declare Analyzer* and *SQL Miner*. This dataset highlights *UA*'s efficiency in processing these patterns within the specified Neo4j environment.

In the second experiment, anti-pattern queries were executed across vari-

<sup>5</sup>Declare Analyzer is a method for conformance checking that takes log and declare model as input and it generates an output model includes the total number of activations, fulfillments and violations of each constraint in each trace in log.

Table 8: Execution time (msec) for the variants of the four queries for BPI2012 [No time window]

Log	BPI2012			
# of Cases	13087			
Methods	Response	Precedence	Chain Precedence	Responded Existence
Declare Analyzer	1938	1697	407	385
Match Recognize	4780	2390	797	350
SQL Miner	1656	747	275	109
MultiDimensional-SGD	670	1180	230	138
MultiDimensional-Neo4j	203	1750	66	38
UA-SGD	402	712	184	124
UA-Neo4j	128	54	28	10

Table 9: Execution time (msec) for the variants of the Exclude queries [With time window]

Logs	BPI2019							
# of Cases	25000				220810			
Methods	Response	Precedence	Chain Precedence	Responded-Existence	Response	Precedence	Chain Precedence	Responded-Existence
Match Recognize	3810	2128	1560	2750	60320	20578	13524	22950
SQL Miner	2310	553	687	1624	20415	4885	6075	14341
MultiDimensional-Neo4j	289	182	230	420	—	—	—	—
MultiDimensional-SGD	725	1013	860	1226	6412	8947	7529	10950
UA-SGD	506	692	421	670	4480	6100	3711	5922
UA-Neo4j	162	96	119	193	1434	847	1047	1620
Log	BPI2014							
# of Cases	15000				41373			
Methods	Response	Precedence	Chain Precedence	Responded-Existence	Response	Precedence	Chain Precedence	Responded-Existence
Match Recognize	4320	1228	1445	2800	6520	2287	3641	5420
SQL Miner	1386	332	413	975	3825	915	1138	2587
MultiDimensional-Neo4j	174	110	138	252	—	—	—	—
MultiDimensional-SGD	435	608	516	736	1201	1676	1410	2052
UA-SGD	304	416	253	402	840	1143	696	1107
UA-Neo4j	98	58	72	116	269	159	197	305

ous encoding methods, excluding Declare Analyzer as it did not support the “exclude” operation. As illustrated in Table 9 and Table 10, the comparison highlights a noteworthy observation with the *UA-Neo4j* method exhibiting better performance, approximately 8 times quicker than *UA-SGD*. Moreover, *UA-Neo4j* is notably faster than *SQL Miner* by 14x because *SQL Miner* employs nested queries and self-joins. These queries are more expensive to evaluate, imposing extra tasks on the query engine during data retrieval.

Table 10: Execution time (msec) for the variants of the Exclude queries for BPI2012 [With time window]

Log	BPI2012			
# of Cases	13087			
Methods	Response	Precedence	Chain Preced.	Responded-Existence
Match Recognize	3514	1015	1152	2320
SQL Miner	1210	290	360	850
MultiDimensional-Neo4j	150	95	120	220
MultiDimensional-SGD	380	530	450	642
UA-SGD	265	362	220	351
UA-Neo4j	85	50	62	96

In a comprehensive assessment across various anti-pattern queries, the utilization of graph-based encoding for event logs consistently surpasses the performance of relational database encoding. This supports the current trend favoring graph databases for process analytics [19]. Furthermore, the *UA* encoding method demonstrates notable enhancements in both query time and storage space when compared to the multi-dimensional graph encoding method and other relational encoding methods.

## 7. Conclusion and Future Work

In this paper, we aim to provide a comprehensive approach to formally represent compliance rules. Our formalism is presented using Metric Temporal Logic over finite traces ( $MTL_f$ ); which generalizes Linear Temporal Logic over finite traces ( $LTL_f$ ) to cover compliance patterns with implicit and explicit time constraints.

To perform conformance checking, we map the negated  $MTL_f$  formulas, i.e. the anti-patterns, to various query languages supported by the target encoding of the event logs. In general, we cover relational and graph encodings. The purpose of these queries is to identify cases that exhibit violations of the compliance rules.

All mappings were evaluated over four real-life event logs. The results of mapping to Unique Activities (*UA*) show superior results in comparison to the other encoding approaches in terms of query execution time.

As a future work, we intend to extend the evaluation of our approach across a set of data-aware and resource-aware compliance patterns. Moreover, we intend

to stress-test the different encodings to get an understanding of the processing limits of each encoding.

## References

- [1] W. van der Aalst, *Process Mining*, Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2016.
- [2] J. Carmona, B. van Dongen, A. Solti, M. Weidlich, *Conformance Checking - Relating Processes and Models*, Springer, 2018.
- [3] S. Saralaya, V. Saralaya, R. D'Souza, *Compliance Management in Business Processes*, Springer International Publishing, Cham, 2019, Ch. 3, pp. 53–91.
- [4] M. Pesic, H. Schonenberg, W. M. P. van der Aalst, DECLARE: full support for loosely-structured processes, in: *EDOC*, IEEE, 2007, pp. 287–300.
- [5] A. Awad, M. Weidlich, M. Weske, Specification, verification and explanation of violation for data aware compliance rules, in: L. Baresi, C. Chi, J. Suzuki (Eds.), *Service-Oriented Computing, 7th International Joint Conference, ICSOC-ServiceWave 2009*, Stockholm, Sweden, November 24-27, 2009. *Proceedings*, Vol. 5900 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, 2009, pp. 500–515. doi:10.1007/978-3-642-10383-4\_37.  
URL [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-10383-4\\_37](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-10383-4_37)
- [6] T. T. Hildebrandt, R. R. Mukkamala, Declarative event-based workflow as distributed dynamic condition response graphs, in: K. Honda, A. Mycroft (Eds.), *Proceedings Third Workshop on Programming Language Approaches to Concurrency and communication-cEntric Software, PLACES 2010*, Paphos, Cyprus, 21st March 2010, Vol. 69 of *EPTCS*, 2010, pp. 59–73. doi:10.4204/EPTCS.69.5.  
URL <https://doi.org/10.4204/EPTCS.69.5>
- [7] D. Knuplesch, M. Reichert, L. T. Ly, A. Kumar, S. Rinderle-Ma, Visual modeling of business process compliance rules with the support of multiple perspectives (extended abstract), *EMISA Forum* 34 (1) (2014) 35. doi:

10.1007/BF03345913.

URL <https://doi.org/10.1007/bf03345913>

- [8] M. B. Dwyer, G. S. Avrunin, J. C. Corbett, Patterns in property specifications for finite-state verification, in: Proceedings of the 21st international conference on Software engineering, 1999, pp. 411–420.
- [9] A. Elgammal, O. Turetken, W. van den Heuvel, M. Papazoglou, Formalizing and applying compliance patterns for business process compliance, *SoSyM* 15 (1) (2016) 119–146.
- [10] F. M. Maggi, M. Westergaard, M. Montali, W. M. van der Aalst, Runtime verification of ltl-based declarative process models, in: Runtime Verification: Second International Conference, RV 2011, San Francisco, CA, USA, September 27-30, 2011, Revised Selected Papers 2, Springer, 2012, pp. 131–146.
- [11] M. Hashmi, et al., Are we done with business process compliance: state of the art and challenges ahead, *Knowl. Inf. Syst.* 57 (1) (2018) 79–133.
- [12] G. D. Giacomo, A. Murano, F. Patrizi, G. Perelli, Timed trace alignment with metric temporal logic over finite traces, in: M. Bienvenu, G. Lakemeyer, E. Erdem (Eds.), Proceedings of the 18th International Conference on Principles of Knowledge Representation and Reasoning, KR 2021, Online event, November 3-12, 2021, 2021, pp. 227–236. doi: 10.24963/KR.2021/22.  
URL <https://doi.org/10.24963/kr.2021/22>
- [13] M. A. Grando, W. M. P. van der Aalst, R. Mans, Reusing a declarative specification to check the conformance of different cigs, in: F. Daniel, K. Barkaoui, S. Dustdar (Eds.), Business Process Management Workshops - BPM 2011 International Workshops, Clermont-Ferrand, France, August 29, 2011, Revised Selected Papers, Part II, Vol. 100 of Lecture Notes in Business Information Processing, Springer, 2011, pp. 188–199. doi:10.1007/978-3-642-28115-0\_19.  
URL [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-28115-0\\_19](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-28115-0_19)

- [14] M. De Leoni, F. M. Maggi, W. M. van der Aalst, Aligning event logs and declarative process models for conformance checking, in: *Business Process Management: 10th International Conference, BPM 2012, Tallinn, Estonia, September 3-6, 2012. Proceedings 10*, Springer, 2012, pp. 82–97.
- [15] A. Burattin, F. M. Maggi, W. M. van der Aalst, A. Sperduti, Techniques for a posteriori analysis of declarative processes, in: *2012 IEEE 16th International Enterprise Distributed Object Computing Conference, IEEE, 2012*, pp. 41–50.
- [16] M. de Leoni, F. M. Maggi, W. M. P. van der Aalst, An alignment-based framework to check the conformance of declarative process models and to preprocess event-log data, *Inf. Syst.* 47 (2015) 258–277. doi:10.1016/J.IS.2013.12.005.  
URL <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.is.2013.12.005>
- [17] M. Montali, M. Pesic, W. M. P. van der Aalst, F. Chesani, P. Mello, S. Storari, Declarative specification and verification of service choreographies, *ACM Trans. Web* 4 (1) (2010) 3:1–3:62. doi:10.1145/1658373.1658376.  
URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/1658373.1658376>
- [18] S. Schönig, et al., Efficient and customisable declarative process mining with sql, in: *CAiSE*, Springer, 2016, pp. 290–305.
- [19] S. Esser, D. Fahland, Multi-dimensional event data in graph databases, *J. Data Semant.* 10 (1) (2021) 109–141.
- [20] R. M. Dijkman, J. Gao, A. Syamsiyah, B. F. van Dongen, P. Grefen, A. H. M. ter Hofstede, Enabling efficient process mining on large data sets: realizing an in-database process mining operator, *Distributed Parallel Databases* 38 (1) (2020) 227–253. doi:10.1007/s10619-019-07270-1.
- [21] F. Riva, D. Benvenuti, F. M. Maggi, A. Marrella, M. Montali, An sql-based declarative process mining framework for analyzing process data stored in relational databases, in: C. D. Francescomarino, A. Burattin, C. Janiesch,

- S. W. Sadiq (Eds.), Business Process Management Forum - BPM 2023 Forum, Utrecht, The Netherlands, September 11-15, 2023, Proceedings, Vol. 490 of Lecture Notes in Business Information Processing, Springer, 2023, pp. 214–231. doi:10.1007/978-3-031-41623-1\_13.  
URL [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-41623-1\\_13](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-41623-1_13)
- [22] N. M. Zaki, I. M. A. Helal, E. E. Hassanein, A. Awad, Efficient checking of timed ordered anti-patterns over graph-encoded event logs, in: P. Fournier-Viger, A. H. Yousef, L. Bellatreche (Eds.), Model and Data Engineering: 11th International Conference, MEDI 2022, Cairo, Egypt, November 21-24, 2022, Proceedings, Vol. 13761 of Lecture Notes in Computer Science, Springer, 2022, pp. 147–161. doi:10.1007/978-3-031-21595-7\_11.  
URL [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-21595-7\\_11](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-21595-7_11)
- [23] K. Y. Rozier, Linear temporal logic symbolic model checking, Computer Science Review 5 (2) (2011) 163–203.
- [24] J. Li, L. Zhang, G. Pu, M. Y. Vardi, J. He, Ltlf satisfiability checking, arXiv preprint arXiv:1403.1666 (2014).
- [25] V. Fionda, G. Greco, Ltl on finite and process traces: Complexity results and a practical reasoner, Journal of Artificial Intelligence Research 63 (2018) 557–623.
- [26] G. De Giacomo, M. Y. Vardi, Linear temporal logic and linear dynamic logic on finite traces, in: IJCAI’13 Proceedings of the Twenty-Third international joint conference on Artificial Intelligence, Association for Computing Machinery, 2013, pp. 854–860.
- [27] F. Chiariello, F. M. Maggi, F. Patrizi, Asp-based declarative process mining, in: Thirty-Sixth AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence, AAAI 2022, Thirty-Fourth Conference on Innovative Applications of Artificial Intelligence, IAAI 2022, The Twelveth Symposium on Educational Advances in Artificial Intelligence, EAAI 2022 Virtual Event, February 22 - March 1, 2022, AAAI Press, 2022, pp. 5539–5547. doi:10.1609/AAAI.V36I5.20493.  
URL <https://doi.org/10.1609/aaai.v36i5.20493>



- [28] P. Thati, G. Roşu, Monitoring algorithms for metric temporal logic specifications, *Electronic Notes in Theoretical Computer Science* 113 (2005) 145–162.
- [29] A. Burattin, F. Maggi, A. Sperduti, Conformance checking based on multi-perspective declarative process models, *Expert Syst. Appl.* 65 (2016) 194–211.
- [30] A. Koschmider, R. Laue, M. Fellmann, Business process model anti-patterns: a bibliography and taxonomy of published work, in: *ECIS*, 2019.
- [31] M. Montali, M. Pesic, W. M. v. d. Aalst, F. Chesani, P. Mello, S. Storari, Declarative specification and verification of service choreographies, *ACM Transactions on the Web (TWEB)* 4 (1) (2010) 1–62.
- [32] F. M. Maggi, A. J. Mooij, W. M. Van der Aalst, User-guided discovery of declarative process models, in: *2011 IEEE symposium on computational intelligence and data mining (CIDM)*, IEEE, 2011, pp. 192–199.
- [33] F. M. Maggi, R. J. C. Bose, W. M. van der Aalst, Efficient discovery of understandable declarative process models from event logs, in: *Advanced Information Systems Engineering: 24th International Conference, CAiSE 2012, Gdansk, Poland, June 25-29, 2012. Proceedings 24*, Springer, 2012, pp. 270–285.
- [34] E. González López de Murillas, H. Reijers, W. van der Aalst, Connecting databases with process mining: a meta model and toolset, *Softw. Syst. Model.* 18 (2) (2019) 1209–1247.
- [35] S. Schönig, C. Di Ciccio, F. M. Maggi, J. Mendling, Discovery of multi-perspective declarative process models, in: *Service-Oriented Computing: 14th International Conference, ICSOC 2016, Banff, AB, Canada, October 10-13, 2016, Proceedings 14*, Springer, 2016, pp. 87–103.
- [36] M. Körber, N. Glombiewski, B. Seeger, Index-accelerated pattern matching in event stores, in: *SIGMOD*, ACM, 2021, pp. 1023–1036.

- [37] D. M. Gabbay, A. Pnueli, S. Shelah, J. Stavi, On the temporal analysis of fairness, in: P. W. Abrahams, R. J. Lipton, S. R. Bourne (Eds.), Conference Record of the Seventh Annual ACM Symposium on Principles of Programming Languages, Las Vegas, Nevada, USA, January 1980, ACM Press, 1980, pp. 163–173. doi:10.1145/567446.567462.  
URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/567446.567462>
- [38] A. Awad, et al., Runtime detection of business process compliance violations: an approach based on anti patterns, in: ACM SAC, ACM, 2015, pp. 1203–1210.
- [39] A. Beheshti, B. Benatallah, H. R. Motahari-Nezhad, Processatlas: A scalable and extensible platform for business process analytics, *Softw. Pract. Exp.* 48 (4) (2018) 842–866.
- [40] B. van Dongen, BPI Challenge 2012 (4 2012). doi:10.4121/uuid:3926db30-f712-4394-aebc-75976070e91f.
- [41] B. B. van Dongen, BPI Challenge 2014 (Apr 2014). doi:10.4121/uuid:c3e5d162-0cfd-4bb0-bd82-af5268819c35.
- [42] D. Fahland, Event Graph of BPI Challenge 2019 (4 2021). doi:10.4121/14169614.v1.
- [43] D. Reissner, Public benchmark dataset for Conformance Checking in Process Mining (1 2022). doi:10.26188/5cd91d0d3adaa.