

A Survey on the Landscape of Self-adaptive Cloud Design and Operations Patterns: Goals, Strategies, Tooling, Evaluation and Dataset Perspectives

Apostolos Angelis^a, George Kousiouris^a

^aDept. of Informatics, Harokopio University Athens, El. Venizelou Ave. 70, Kallithea – Attica, 17676, Greece

ARTICLE INFO

Keywords:

self-adaptive systems
design patterns
performance optimization
performance management
cloud automation
resource management
application management

ABSTRACT

Cloud-native applications have significantly advanced the development and scalability of online services through the use of microservices and modular architectures. However, achieving adaptability, resilience, and efficient performance management within cloud environments remains a key challenge. This survey provides an overview of self-adaptive cloud design and operations patterns published over the last seven years, focusing on a taxonomy of their objectives, scope of control, decision-making mechanisms approach, automation level and validation methodologies. Overall, 96 papers have been taken under consideration, indicating a significant increase in the years since 2023 in the produced output. The analysis highlights the prevalence of feedback loop structures, with both reactive and proactive implementations, and underscores the increasing role of machine learning techniques in predictive management, especially when it comes to resource provisioning and management of the executed applications. On the other hand, adaptive application architectures through direct application-level pattern-based management seem significantly underrepresented in the current field of research, thus serving as an uninvestigated area for future research. Furthermore, the current work highlights practical aspects such as validation datasets per category (application, resource, network, etc.), tools, technologies and frameworks usage during the experimentation, in order to guide researchers in the validation process for comparative and robust experimentation.

1. Introduction

Cloud computing introduced new architectural approaches to application development; monolithic applications evolved to multiple smaller loosely coupled components or services [1]. This collection of independent services that communicate through lightweight APIs offers several benefits, including agility, adaptability, scalability and performance improvements. Following many big tech firms, the industry migrated to this new approach [2, 3].

This trend introduced several challenges, as cloud native applications depend upon complex distributed architectures as well as dynamic and multitenant infrastructure layers. This dynamicity and distributed nature in many cases increases the risk of failure and dictates the need for constant monitoring and adaptation mechanisms. Cloud native applications also brought several improvements to online services development, including high maintainability and scalability [4].


In order to aid in their creation, design and operation patterns and best practices have been documented by practitioners, setting the industry standard in how to mix and use multiple small and independent services [5, 6]. To define the concept of a pattern, one can follow the generic definition included in [7], which mentions that a pattern is “a proven series of activities which are supposed to overcome a recurring problem in a certain context, particular objective, and specific initial condition”. One key aspect of patterns is the fact that choosing their parameters can significantly

determine whether the pattern is beneficial or harmful. Thus, specific caution and automation must be applied in order to ensure that the former is achieved.

Patterns or strategies may be applied either at the application design or architecture level, regarding its structure, or even at the management level e.g. targeting at making decisions during runtime. The latter may involve decisions on the amount of resources assigned to an application, the location of its execution, the type of resources needed etc., thus being characterized as Cloud operations patterns aiming to enhance performance and cost. Others, such as the compute resource consolidation pattern [8] are dictated by the inherent multitenancy of the cloud computing model.

The aim of this survey is to systematically record and analyze the literature published in the last seven years concerning the aforementioned issues of Cloud design and operation patterns and strategies. More specifically, it studies the context (e.g. application, network, infrastructure), the intended problem (e.g. resource assignment, execution location etc.), the series of activities (types of mechanisms for automation) the initial condition (needed data and tools) as well as the overall objective (cost, performance, reliability etc). These are formulated as five research questions (detailed in Section 3) as well as a taxonomy of characteristics upon which related works are mapped to. Through this, we highlight the current status of the field and identify potential future directions.

From a practical point of view, a number of issues are examined, in terms of the usage of software (such as programming languages, frameworks, tools), platforms, and datasets in the examined pattern mechanisms. Especially

 aangelis@hua.gr (A. Angelis); gkousiou@hua.gr (G. Kousiouris)
ORCID(s): 0009-0002-7877-3081 (A. Angelis)

for datasets, an analysis of their contents is included, in order to aid future researchers in an easier selection of the appropriate source. Additionally, the experimental processes and the degree and method of validating the experimental results are examined.

The remainder of this paper is structured as follows: Section 2 introduces the background. Section 3 introduces the motivation, the research questions and compares this work with other surveys. Section 4 presents the research methodology and Section 5 includes the categorization and findings for the surveyed works. Finally, Section 6 provides a discussion on the research questions, concludes the paper and sketches future research directions.

2. Background

Cloud Design Patterns and Cloud Operations Patterns are architectural and operational solutions for reoccurring problems encountered when building and managing applications in cloud environments. Cloud Design Patterns address architectural concerns such as data distribution, service orchestration, and fault tolerance, while Cloud Operations Patterns focus on optimizing system operations through automation, monitoring, and incident response.

Cloud Design Patterns

The majority of cloud software and services relies on a modular microservice architecture, a proven choice for improved developer productivity and optimal selection of the most appropriate combination of technologies, but with the expense of increased complexity. This level of complexity of the cloud software and services architecture makes reusability and automation a prerequisite [9].

To facilitate the development of cloud native applications, seasoned practitioners have devised architectural patterns that encapsulate their expertise in resolving recurring issues [8]. Software and services design patterns are like blueprints for common design problems; they provide reusable solutions that can be adapted to different situations. Using these patterns, developers can create more efficient, reliable and maintainable solutions, learning from past successes and avoiding common pitfalls.

A range of microservices level architectural patterns have been investigated and proposed; these include Log Aggregator (aggregation of distributed logs in a central location and subsequent root cause analysis), Batch Request Aggregator [10] (based on model-driven consolidation of incoming requests to ease back-end stress), Service Registry, Service Discovery, Circuit Breaker (with intelligent and dynamic transition between the circuit states), API Gateway and Health Check among others [11]. One of the interesting aspects to be investigated in this case is how these mechanisms can be combined with intelligent approaches for dynamically adapting to the current conditions an application has to face, avoiding static configurations.

Cloud Operations Patterns

Cloud infrastructures due to their large scale, complexity, geographical distribution and heterogeneity require extensive configuration and fine-tuning by administrators; these laborious tasks have been investigated in order to be automated. The initial approach to tackle the complexity of administrative tasks was to employ methods such as benchmarking, statistical models, time-series analysis, threshold-based policies, and heuristics algorithms [12]. Subsequently, artificial neural networks (ANN) [13] optimized by genetic algorithms (GA) [14, 15] studied and applied to design rationale and predictive management procedures. Prior research explored multiple methods managers can utilize to reap the rewards of machine learning (ML) [16].

ML has shown potential to make proactive decisions in multiple parts of cloud computing infrastructures, such as energy consumption optimizations [17]. Container scheduling, server defragmenter/migration manager, power capping manager and server health manager are just a fragment of the extensive opportunities for ML-driven resource management [12]. Furthermore, strategies, that enhance the resilience of cloud systems against failures, have been highlighted in recent studies [18].

Key infrastructure level self-adaptive patterns are self-healing (automatically detect and repair faults or failures in infrastructure components), auto-scaling (dynamically adjust the number of resources based on demand.), resource optimization (efficiently allocate and utilize resources to minimize costs and maximize performance), placement optimization (selection of complementary applications as node neighbours), cloud-edge collaboration and workload distribution, predictive analysis (use historical data and machine learning to forecast future resource needs and proactively adjust capacity), security automation (automatically detect and respond to security threats, such as intrusion attempts or malware) and monitor and detection (proactively observe and identify issues within cloud environment) mechanisms.

3. Related Surveys, Motivation and Research Questions

A number of recent surveys exist that deal with self-adaptive approaches in specific fields of software and services development. Some of them focus on self-adaptive systems from the perspective of the technology used, such as ML-based automated systems, while others show interest in a specific field of application, such as IoT or Fog computing. More specifically, Gheibi et al. [19] documents more than a hundred studies with the emphasis on ML-powered automated systems with MAPE-K feedback loops that are supported by a machine learning mechanism. The study classifies the main problems that ML tries to solve and identifies the most common methods used for tasks like prediction, classification, and reinforced learning. Challenges and limitations when using ML in self-adaptive systems are also noted.

Cardellini et al. [20] focus on the algorithms used to control the adaptation of container-based applications on fog and cloud computing and more specifically on self-adaptation with respect to workload changes. Alfonso et al. [21] analyzes the adaptation strategies in response to dynamic events that impact the QoS of IoT systems. This survey reviewed 39 studies that mainly focus on optimizing resource consumption, QoS violation avoidance and software updates deployment patterns of IoT infrastructures.

Krupitzer et al. [22] identified 24 relevant papers on design patterns for Self Adaptive Systems. This work outlined seven categories (monitor, analyze, plan, execute, component structure and interaction, knowledge management, and coordination) and 55 design patterns that can be applied in IoT environments.

Kirti et al. [23] categorize various fault-tolerant techniques into four categories, reactive, proactive, adaptive and hybrid and analyzes the fault tolerance approaches. The survey also discusses the trade-off between lightweight predefined and heavy proactive self-adaptive techniques. Quin et al. [24] perform a study in research on decentralization of self-adaptation. The work analyzes the components and coordination mechanisms of decentralized self-adaptive systems, and identifies three coordination patterns used in the cases studied. The study concludes with the challenges for future work on decentralized self-adaptive systems. Chen and Bahsoon [25] provide an extensive taxonomy for Cloud Autoscaling Systems. This work offers in-depth analysis of intelligent autoscaling functionality in cloud environments and outlines future research directions in this field. The taxonomy provides a foundation for building more intelligent autoscaling systems.

Although many surveys have effectively covered areas of the research subject, this study aims to highlight recent research efforts on cloud-related automation across various domains, focusing on both design and operation patterns. It also aims to record pattern-related features such as the control scope, adaptation strategy, pattern's prime goal, validation methodology, automation level, decision-making approach and feedback loop characteristics, linking to the pattern definition described in Section 1. It also focuses specifically on practical issues of such mechanisms, identifying tools, methods and datasets that can prove useful for future comparative studies between mechanisms. We have attempted to follow the categorization levels of Chen and Bahsoon [25], as we believe it aligns closely with the focus of our current survey.

Thus, the overall research questions of this survey can be defined as follows:

- RQ1: Which are the patterns' objectives in cloud automation?
- RQ2: What are the scopes of control (i.e. target of regulation) of self-adaptive patterns?
- RQ3: What are the approaches used for decision-making?

- RQ4: Which software and tools were used to create the management mechanisms in the surveyed work?
- RQ5: Which methods, datasets and tools were used for experiments validation?

4. Research methodology and Defined Taxonomy

The research methodology included an initial search round to identify related works. Then, a top level taxonomy was created (Section 4.2) for mapping concepts to the generic pattern definition elements (context, problem, activities etc.). Following, details on each step are presented.

4.1. Search strategy

Initially, the research papers were retrieved through Google Scholar. The search term was "cloud computing" AND "self-adaptive" AND "pattern" and setting years range from 2018 to 2024. Papers that were not purely related to self-adaptive patterns were excluded. The articles included in this study, 96 in total, were published from 2018 and onward. Figures 1, 2 show the number and type of articles collected and surveyed, and the percentage of each type of document. A clear trend is depicted in recent years that indicates a very significant increase in the investigation of the related topics.

In order to detect the status in the previous years to this interval, a relevant search was conducted for the period from 2010 to 2017. In total, 34 according publications were discovered, indicating that there was activity on the topic in the period, although not in the volume and intensity observed over the recent years, especially from 2023 and on.




Figure 1: Paper count from 2010 to 2024.




Figure 2: Paper type breakdown from 2018 to 2024.

4.2. Top Level Taxonomy Fields and Mapping to Pattern Definition

In order to drive the selection of the top level taxonomy fields, one can start from the definition of a pattern, mentioned in Section 1. Starting from the objective, one needs to determine what is the primary goal of each pattern, i.e. what it tries to optimize from a non-functional perspective. Then the series of activities can refer to the relevant decision-making approach used in the context of the pattern. The specific mechanism is typically used to solve a specific recurring problem based on an adaptation strategy in order to control a given entity. How the mechanism is applied can be also considered as part of the initial conditions as well as the recurrence of the problematic situation, indicating its automation level as well as the necessary feedback loops applied. Finally, the mechanism needs to prove its usefulness, thus needing an according validation method concept. From the above analysis, the top level fields of the taxonomy are defined in Figure 3. The lower level ones are then populated in Section 5 from the grouping of the respective approaches identified in the surveyed works.

5. Categorization of Related Work and Definition of Lower Levels of the Taxonomy

In this section, the investigated works are classified in subcategories of each top level field based on our review process. It needs to be stressed that all 96 works are included in the first 6 tables of the top level goals. The follow-up tables of implementation details (e.g. used software, datasets etc.) may not include all of them, based on the information available in each work. The lower levels of the taxonomy also appear in Figure 3.

5.1. Pattern’s prime goal

Most studies tackle the issue of performance optimization (Table 1), while cost reduction is the second most popular category. Performance targets include system optimization, network performance, response time reduction,

Table 1
Classification of Pattern’s goal

Pattern’s goal	Used In Papers
Performance	[26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 90, 91, 91, 92, 93, 94, 95, 96, 97, 98]
Cost	[28, 33, 40, 45, 46, 55, 56, 57, 64, 65, 69, 71, 72, 73, 75, 76, 87, 88, 90, 91, 99, 100, 101, 102, 103, 104, 105]
Security	[46, 106, 107, 108, 109, 110, 111, 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, 117]
Availability/ Reliability/ Stability	[85, 95, 104, 113, 118, 119, 120, 121]

network bottleneck detection, SLO/QoS violation mitigation, QoS prediction and more.

The cost category includes energy consumption, deployment and operating costs, while security refers to security-centered resource provisioning, fault detection, cybersecurity risk assessment, data privacy, intrusion, DDOS and cyberattacks anomaly detection systems.

A few papers target availability, reliability and stability, typically referring to cloud monitoring combined with system anomaly detection, architectural stability, microservices circuit breaking, big services management, resilience enhancement and data privacy, workflow management and network traffic forecasting.

5.2. Feedback loops

A feedback loop is a cyclical process in which the output of a system is fed back as input, influencing the future behavior of the system. It is an essential part of a self-adaptive process and can be distinguished in two main categories, reactive and proactive. In the reactive case, the system collects real-time data about performance, security incidents, power usage, etc. to perform adaptation decisions that may or may not be based on a trained model, once an event that requires intervention is identified; in the proactive case, the approaches use real-time data to predict future trends and anticipate changes based on a historically trained model or agent.

About two thirds (58 cases) of the articles use the reactive approach to deal with state changes in the cloud application or system, an intuitive solution to system automation. Proactive approaches (37 cases) are in the general case computationally heavy and usually rely on machine learning technologies and time series analysis. The classified articles are listed according to this categorization in Table 2. One of the surveyed works ([53]) proposes both approaches, therefore it is classified as hybrid.

5.3. Adaptation strategy

A number of different solutions have been applied for the adaptation strategy (Table 3). The majority of these resort to techniques such as migration, resource allocation,




Figure 3: A taxonomy of Self-Adaptive Cloud Patterns (SACP) research.

Table 2
Classification of Feedback loop pattern

Feedback loop	Used In Papers
Reactive	[26, 28, 30, 33, 35, 37, 45, 47, 50, 52, 54, 55, 56, 57, 59, 60, 61, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 71, 72, 73, 75, 79, 80, 81, 82, 84, 85, 87, 88, 90, 91, 92, 93, 95, 96, 99, 100, 101, 105, 102, 103, 106, 107, 108, 110, 111, 114, 116, 118, 119, 120]
Proactive	[27, 29, 31, 32, 34, 36, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 46, 48, 49, 51, 58, 62, 70, 74, 76, 77, 78, 83, 86, 89, 94, 104, 109, 112, 113, 115, 121, 97, 98, 117]
Hybrid	[53]

scheduling, scaling, and balancing of resources, in either one or more locations. All of the above target primarily the resources size used by an application or the locality of these resources, based on examined workload, execution time or resource usage. On the contrary, only a few studies consider the reconfiguration of applications, i.e. actions that alter in a way the inner behavior or architecture of an application in order to better adapt to changing environmental conditions (e.g. batching requests together to be executed by a single thread in order to reduce excessive thread creation).

There are some interesting cases that appear to be using application-level context in order to drive the self-adaptive mechanism strategy. For example, in the e-health system of Karan Bajaj and Singh [72], the according scheduling or offloading of the request is based on an estimate of the criticality of a patient. Tasks from more critical patients are executed on the edge in order to reduce latency. Thus, the control mechanism digs into the application layer in order to aid in a more fine-grained performance management of the requests between the edge and the cloud. In a similar case, Tundo et al. [64] present an energy-aware approach for self-adaptive AI-based applications that can balance accuracy in object detection with energy consumption. In this case, the image analysis uses either CPU or GPU based resources based on each image’s complexity characteristics and needed accuracy of detection. One last case is the work in Yin et al.

Table 3
Classification of Adaptation strategy

Adaptation strategy	Used In Papers
Application architectural reconfiguration	[37, 44, 91, 119, 120]
Off-loading/placement based on application context	[54, 64, 72]
Generic Cloud/edge off-loading through scheduling/routing/ placement	[26, 49, 50, 51, 52, 55, 56, 57, 60, 61, 65, 67, 68, 69, 71, 73, 75, 77, 80, 84, 86, 87, 88, 90, 92, 93, 94, 95, 98, 105, 102, 103, 116]
Internal cloud scaling/ balancing	[27, 28, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 39, 40, 41, 42, 45, 46, 47, 53, 59, 61, 63, 66, 76, 78, 79, 81, 82, 83, 85, 95, 96, 97, 99, 100, 101, 104]
Monitoring and event detection (without adaptation action planning)	[29, 38, 39, 43, 48, 58, 62, 70, 74, 89, 106, 107, 108, 109, 110, 111, 112, 113, 114, 115, 117, 118, 121]

[54], which uses real-world mobile device trajectories in the form of time-stamped GPS information to feed mobility-aware off-and-downloading task algorithms in mobile edge computing environments. Thus, the resources used at the edge servers by a mobile application follow as closely as possible the respective user movement by offloading the needed computation tasks to the nearest edge server.

Moreover, there is a wide range of works that focus extensively on monitoring and event detection/prediction of operations, without dealing with the corrective action part of the process. They are, however, included in this classification since this part of the process is critical for a successful adaptation strategy.

5.4. Experiments validation methodology

Experiments require rigorous validation to ensure the reliability and reproducibility of the results. In the researched work, two approaches were employed; software simulation and real-world computing infrastructure. Each method offers distinct advantages and challenges.

Software simulation allows for precise control over experimental variables, minimizing external factors that could

Table 4
Classification of Experiments validation method

Validation method	Used In Papers
Software simulation	[28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 37, 38, 39, 39, 40, 41, 43, 45, 46, 48, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 56, 57, 58, 60, 61, 62, 63, 65, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 77, 78, 79, 80, 82, 83, 84, 86, 88, 90, 93, 94, 95, 96, 97, 98, 99, 100, 101, 105, 102, 103, 106, 107, 108, 110, 111, 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, 117, 120, 121]
Real-world observation	[26, 27, 34, 35, 36, 42, 44, 47, 49, 55, 59, 64, 66, 73, 76, 81, 85, 87, 89, 91, 92, 104, 109, 118, 119]
Hybrid	[73]

influence the results. It is cost-effective, enables rapid iteration and be easily scaled to handle varying system sizes. However, simulations often involve simplifying assumptions and abstractions of real-world systems, which may limit the accuracy and generalization of findings. Additionally, software simulations may not fully capture the physical limitations and constraints of real-world infrastructure, so validating the accuracy of simulations requires benchmarking against real-world experiments. However, this is alleviated by the fact that in most cases the simulated experiments utilized real-world datasets, as depicted in Section 5.8.

Real-world computing infrastructure provides insights into the actual performance and behavior of systems under realistic conditions. The results are more likely to be generalizable to real-world deployments. However, setting up and maintaining real-world infrastructure can be expensive and complex. Moreover, experiments are susceptible to external factors like neighboring cloud workloads fluctuation, which can introduce variability and noise to the data. In general, real-world computing experiments are often difficult to implement in relation to simulation, a fact that is recorded in the percentage they took part among the studied literature, as shown in Table 4.

Validating experiments using a hybrid approach that combines simulation and real-world infrastructure is the exception among the researched papers.

5.5. Runtime automation level

In relation to how the various mechanisms utilize the available data (i.e., for training) and the timing in which they are consulted by the overall system, three different categories may be identified (Table 5).

By a wide margin, mechanisms that repeat the training/analysis phase continuously and also use the predicted outcomes during run-time are the most popular category. Examples of such mechanisms include typically methods such as reinforcement learning, heuristic optimization based on changing runtime conditions, etc.

Although not many, there are papers that propose mechanisms that can be used after an initial training session. These mechanisms have an one-off training process and then are used continuously during runtime to have a more adaptive

Table 5
Classification of runtime automation level

Automation level	Used In Papers
Continuous analysis/ training continuous usage	[26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 39, 40, 41, 42, 44, 45, 46, 47, 49, 50, 51, 53, 54, 55, 57, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 90, 91, 92, 93, 95, 97, 98, 99, 100, 101, 105, 102, 104, 110, 111, 112, 113, 116, 117, 118, 119, 120]
One-off Training/ Continuous Usage	[31, 38, 39, 43, 48, 52, 56, 58, 72, 88, 89, 96, 106, 107, 108, 109, 114, 115, 121]
One-off Training/ One off usage	[94, 103]

system. These cases may be occasionally retrained; however, this retraining is not part of the runtime loop/process.

Lastly, there are a few cases in which training is applied in an one-off manner and decision-making is also performed in an one-off manner (i.e. during deployment time for the selection of provider or resources).

5.6. Pattern's decision-making approach

An overview of the decision-making approaches appears in Table 6. The specific low-level categorization was kept at a coarse-grained level, not delving into subcategories of each field. This was done primarily due to the fact that there are already exhaustive surveys [19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25] that deal with this issue, as mentioned in Section 3.

The prominent decision-making method used by the publications is that of machine learning. Machine learning offers the feature of the required intelligence to deal with new, unknown situations that are going to adversely affect the application or infrastructure. Function approximation approaches may be used to understand the needed size of resources (or any other corrective action applied), typically coupled in many cases with reinforcement learning for continuous improvement. Classification cases commonly apply to security-oriented approaches for detection of illegal traffic. Another usage scenario is for resource scheduling and allocation, based on the integration of graph neural networks and swarm optimization.

A typical decision-making approach also relates to time series analysis due to the user-centric cloud workload cyclic patterns. Time-series algorithms enable self-adaptive systems to learn from historical data and predict future trends, allowing them to proactively adjust their behavior to changing conditions. A common use case is a self-adaptive load-balancing (between locations) or auto-scaling strategy (within the same location), leveraging the temporal periodic patterns in user access to cloud services to improve performance. For this category, we have created two entries in Table 6, one relating to ML-driven approaches (e.g. LSTM architectures) and one relating to more classical time series methods (e.g. ARIMA).

In relation to probabilistic-based implementations, a typical one is a self-adaptive architecture to detect and manage

Table 6
Classification of Pattern’s decision-making approach

Decision-making approach	Used In Papers
AI/ML	[29, 38, 39, 39, 40, 56, 58, 62, 68, 70, 72, 76, 77, 82, 82, 84, 88, 90, 92, 93, 96, 98, 105, 104, 106, 107, 108, 109, 110, 111, 112, 113, 114, 117, 120]
ML-powered Time Series	[46, 48, 53, 74, 78, 89, 115, 121]
Classical Time Series	[27, 31, 32, 41, 42, 43, 49, 95]
Probabilistic	[28, 33, 35, 37, 44, 51, 63, 69, 88, 83, 94, 95, 99, 101, 102, 117]
Optimization	[37, 45, 61, 55, 73, 30, 75, 35, 39, 65, 80, 67, 52, 26, 118, 30, 47, 54, 57, 60, 66, 64, 79, 103, 116]
Analytical	[34, 36, 50, 59, 71, 85, 87, 91, 100, 102]
Other	[81, 82, 86, 97, 103, 119]

underutilized or overloaded virtual compute resources in response to workload changes while focusing on additional criteria like the performance of the consolidation procedure. Likewise, resource allocation algorithms, using probability formulas, may target at reducing power consumption and number of migrations.

Optimization algorithms are also widely used to provide a systematic approach to finding near-optimal solutions to complex problems, especially when exact solutions are computationally intractable. Common use cases refer to identifying optimized placement schemes (e.g. deployment plans for service to physical node mapping, selection of clusters etc.). Approaches such as genetic algorithms and swarm-colony optimization may be used to dynamically fine-tune systems behavior and optimize one or more features (e.g. cost and performance), while taking other parameters as constraints (e.g. resource utilization, user affinity requirements, legal requirements, network transmission overhead reduction, power consumption etc.).

Analytical algorithms include the definition of detailed mathematical equations that describe the underlying system, which are then solved using computational algorithms. They are particularly useful for tackling self-adaptive problems that target precision at the expense of efficiency. This is due to the fact that they need a large period of time to analyze the system as well as deep knowledge of the latter to describe it accurately.

There is also a more general category, that includes a variety of other approaches, including fuzzy-logic [82, 103], physics-inspired system modeling [81], control-based methods [119], PID controller algorithms [86] and Algorithmic Game Theory [97].

5.7. Software and Tools

Given that the practical approaches of an experimentation and validation process are in many cases the stage that is the most time-consuming, an effort was made to concentrate information that may prove to be helpful for researchers in future endeavors. To this end, we highlight the main elements of such a process, including the software

Table 7
Infrastructure Platforms and Software used in experiments

Name	Type	Freely available	Used In Papers
Alibaba	public cloud	No	[42, 104]
Amazon Web Services	public cloud	No	[26, 35, 42, 47, 66, 81, 87]
Azure	public cloud	No	[62, 87]
Docker	OS-level virtualization	Yes	[81]
Docker Swarm	Docker’s built-in orchestration system	Yes	[27]
Google Cloud	public cloud	No	[66, 76, 89]
Kubernetes	container orchestration system	Yes	[34, 36, 42, 47, 55, 59, 66, 85, 92, 104, 109]
NodeRED	flow-based visual programming tool	Yes	[87, 91]
OpenvSwitch	software network switch	Yes	[93]
OpenWhisk	serverless functions platform	Yes	[87, 91, 92]

and infrastructure used as well as other related tools in the investigated works.

5.7.1. Infrastructure Platforms and Software

In this section, we highlight the specific platforms and software (Table 7) used in the experimentation process of the investigated works that were involved in real-world experiments, as indicated in Table 4. About a quarter of the publications (26) use computing infrastructure for the needs of experiments’ implementation, either in a public or private cloud or a combination of both. 14 of these infrastructures refer to public Cloud environments (e.g. AWS, Alibaba etc.). 17 cases used some form of open source platform software, in many cases combined with public cloud resources such as VMs.

This hybrid combination gives some critical benefits. More specifically, it includes inherently the variability of the multitenant public cloud infrastructure, while on the other hand, it gives the ability to intervene more in the way decision making or configuration is performed at the platform level (e.g. to investigate placement or routing in Kubernetes clusters). The most prominent of these tools is Kubernetes, used as the main container orchestration system for the experiments.

5.7.2. Simulation Software Used

In this section, we highlight the software used for experiments simulation (Table 8). CloudSim was the software of choice for several researchers, while there is also a multitude of software that was used individually by various papers. There are many cases that based the experiments on custom solutions and are not included in the table. In addition, MATLAB is used in some cases as a simulation engine, but in most of them as a model creation environment. For this

Table 8
Simulation Engines Software

Name	Type	Used In Papers
CloudSim	toolkit for simulating cloud computing infrastructures and services	[30, 33, 39, 40, 45, 52, 56, 60, 68, 71, 73, 75, 79, 88, 95, 96, 102]
CloudSimDisk	CloudSim module for simulating energy-aware storage in cloud systems	[96]
ICan Cloud	platform aimed to model and simulate Cloud computing systems	[100]
iFogSim	resource management simulation toolkit for IoT, Edge and Fog Computing Environments	[82]
ns2	networking simulator tools	[97]
ns3	networking simulator tools	[51]
Mininet	network emulation and testing tool	[93]
OMNeT	C++ simulation library and framework, primarily for building network simulators	[100]
PureEdgeSim	simulation framework for performance evaluation of cloud, edge and mist computing environments	[50]
SimPy	Python library for event-driven simulations	[83]
WorkflowSim	workflow simulator supporting large-scale scheduling, clustering and provisioning	[94]

reason, it is included in the following subsection. In all cases, the simulation software that was used is freely available.

5.7.3. Programming Languages, Libraries and Frameworks Used

Table 9 depicts numerical, scientific and model creation frameworks and libraries used for implementing the proposed solution of each work. MATLAB was the software of choice for ten papers. Likewise, R is used in four papers. Python frameworks like Keras, Pytorch, Tensorflow and scikit appear also, although in a smaller scale than expected, given the domination of Python as an ML language. A number of other more specific packages and libraries are mentioned, typically with more limited appearance in the surveyed works.

In terms of general programming languages, although not listed in the table, the two most popular choices were Python and Java. Python was used in more than 20 measured cases, while Java was used in 6 papers, without counting the papers that use Java-based tools like CloudSim mentioned in the previous section. C, C++ and C# were also used in approximately 6 cases, usually combined with frameworks and libraries.

5.7.4. Benchmarking and Load Generation Tools

In this section, we highlight a suite of tools (Table 10), including extensions of existing benchmarks, load generation tools or elementary test applications that were used for benchmarking the performance and scalability of various

Table 9
Numerical and Modelling Frameworks and Libraries

Name	Type	Freely available	Used In Papers
ADTK	package ¹	Yes	[115]
cuDNN	CUDA-based development library	Yes	[55]
E-GraphSAGE	network intrusion detection solution ²	Yes	[107]
Imbalanced-learn	Imbalanced classes classification extension for scikit-learn	Yes	[108]
jMetalPy	optimization library	Yes	[55]
Keras	framework	Yes	[53, 70, 113, 114]
MAMLS	ML development environment ³	No	[62]
MATLAB	scientific computing and development environment	No	[29, 65, 69, 75, 80, 105, 103, 106, 111, 98]
NumPy	scientific computing library	Yes	[53]
Pandas	data analysis library	Yes	[53]
PyGMO	optimization library	Yes	[55]
PyTorch	deep learning framework	Yes	[74, 77, 107, 112]
River	ML library for streaming data	Yes	[70]
Ryu	component-based software defined networking framework	Yes	[93]
scikit-learn	ML library	Yes	[53]
scikit-multiflow	ML library for streaming data	Yes	[70]
Spark	big data and ML platform	Yes	[44]
TensorFlow	deep learning framework	Yes	[70, 84, 108, 113, 114]

¹ Anomaly Detection Toolkit (ADTK) is a Python package for unsupervised - rule-based time series anomaly detection.

² E-GraphSAGE is a solution that uses graph neural networks to detect network intrusions in IoT networks based on flow records. There is a PyTorch based implementation of E-GraphSAGE publicly available.

³ Azure Machine Learning Studio (MAMLS) is a GUI-based integrated development environment for constructing and operationalizing Machine Learning workflow on Azure.

cloud-based systems. In general load generation is a critical step in any performance analysis and a common source of errors in the experimentation process. Hence, significant effort needs to be given on the way a workload is designed, applied and validated on a given performance test. Existence and usage of helper tools for this purpose is therefore very significant. All benchmarking tools that were used are freely available.

5.8. Datasets

A large proportion of the papers used publicly available datasets, while others created synthetic datasets using appropriate tools. Tables 11, 12, 13, 14 and 15 summarize publicly available and synthetic datasets and their use in relevant research papers. Publicly available datasets have been organized into four categories: application data (as a real-world workload for the services) in Table 11, network

Table 10
Benchmarking tools

Name	Type	Used In Papers
Bench4Q	extension of benchmarking tool TPC-W supporting QoS-oriented tuning of e-commerce servers	[118]
DeathStar Bench	benchmark suite for cloud microservices	[47, 119]
JMeter	load testing Java tool	[59]
Locust	load testing Python tool	[55]
Online Boutique	microservices based application with load testing capabilities	[47, 119]

load and security data (Table 12), resource load (Table 13) and services workloads (including website and service request patterns) in Table 14. These are used typically to evaluate cases of simulations mentioned in Section 5.7.2 as well as inputs for the various validation strategies mentioned in Section 5.3.

Network load datasets are primarily used in network experiments focused on network traffic forecasting, and mainly contain traffic dumps, traffic logs and network devices telemetry data. Network security datasets are primarily used in network experiments focused on detecting network anomalies and recognizing network threats, and mainly contain labeled network activity, normal and malicious.

Resource load datasets are primarily intended to demonstrate realistic resource load, typically from traces of existing Cloud providers and services (Alibaba, Google, Azure etc). They commonly contain aspects such as number of VMs, cores used, CPU/Memory usage and more. While VM based workloads exist, potentially further datasets could be created that are more indicative of specific cloud-based services (e.g. cloud object storage services, messaging systems patterns etc). This is a current gap in the process that could help guide the creation of suitable extensions in these available data collections. An example of a workload trace for a very specific type of cloud service is the *Azure Cloud Functions* dataset [122], that captures the individual characteristics of serverless workloads and has helped drive research in FaaS systems in the previous years. Indicatively, it has been cited more than 700 times in the years from its publication in 2019 up to 2025.

In the case of web traffic data, datasets are primarily used in experiments focused on cloud services auto-scaling and workload forecasting technics, and contain web pages traffic traces, some from as far back as 1995. Further datasets could also be helpful that are tailored to usage patterns of applications more commonly met in cloud environments (e.g. AI training and inference, media streaming, IoT device feeds etc.). Capturing the specific usage patterns of more modern and cloud-oriented applications could be critical for optimizing the management schemes of the latter.

Tables 11–14 are populated with dataset details, such as content, download link, in which paper each dataset was used, as well as inner level of data details that may aid researchers in selecting the appropriate data source for their

Table 11
List of publicly accessible datasets used in papers for Application Level automation

Dataset	Used In Papers
Chicago Taxi Trips Used as application workload in examining the proposed microservice management framework	[55]
COCO [123] Images used in self-adaptive application considering image characteristics during analysis as part of the proposed power saving mechanism	[64]
COVID-XRay-5K Used as sample labeled storage data in proposed smart prefetching capabilities of a distributed file system	[98]
EUA [124] Cell base stations' location data used in proposed solution for application placement in an edge computing environment	[50]
LandSat8 satellite images [125] Sat images used as big data source in proposed adaptive data delivery method for solving data movement and processing bottlenecks in inter-site edge-fog-cloud systems.	[81]
LCTSC [126] Medical imagery dataset used in an edge-fog-cloud pipeline to measure and mitigate bottlenecks during offloading	[81]
MDT-NJUST Contains real-world mobile devices trajectories in form of time-stamped GPS information. Used as a benchmark procedure source data to justify the performance of a mobility-aware off-and-downloading task algorithms in mobile edge computing	[54]
New York City Taxi Trip Data (2010-2013) [127] Taxi trips location data used to generate data stream workload for evaluation of a fog stream processing autoscaler	[36]
The MIMIC-III clinical database (2017) Different IoT tasks (from sensor data collection up to cloud data ingestion) time-series data used as incoming load to evaluate the proposed adaptive IoT workflow management architecture	[27]
UCI Heart Disease Labeled medical data used to drive patient processing offloading based on patient criticality estimation	[72]

experimentation. The existence of these as well as their categorization can significantly speed up both the selection process by a researcher, based on the scope of their research, as well as the experimentation itself. Furthermore, it enables direct comparison between different management approaches that are based on the same dataset.

6. Discussion, Conclusions and Future Research Directions

This study focused on recent research work on both cloud design and cloud operation patterns, analyzing 96 works from the perspectives mentioned in the defined taxonomy (Pattern's prime goal, Feedback loops, Adaptation strategy, Experiments validation methodology, Runtime automation level, Pattern's decision-making approach, Software, Tools and Datasets). The answers to the posed research questions in Section 3, have been described across the subsections of Section 5 and are summarized and extended below.

Table 12

List of publicly accessible datasets used in papers for Network Load and Security automation

The majority of the datasets include Pcap capture files with malicious activities. Pcap format is an industry standard used to capture and share information about any threat or network event. A Pcap file includes a series of packet records; each record represents a packet captured from the network, along with a timestamp and the length of the packet.

Dataset	Used In Papers
Real mobile network traffic data Features data usage from a real mobile network cell in averages of 5 minute intervals. [128]	[121]
ToN-IoT Contains heterogeneous data sources collected from IoT and IIoT sensors and organized in four categories: raw datasets, processed labeled datasets, train test datasets (samples from the dataset with normal and malicious data), labelled hacking events, and statistics regarding the dataset. [129]	[107]
BoT-IoT [130] Raw network packets (Pcap files) created by tshark tool and incorporates a combination of labelled normal and abnormal traffic.	[107, 117]
CIC-IDS [131] Features statistics in forward/backward direction including total/min/max/average/standard deviation of packet size	[106, 114, 115]
IDE2012 [132] Contains 7 days of network activity, normal and malicious. Dataset consists of labeled network traces, including full packet payloads in Pcap format.	[111]
NSL-KDD Contains labelled normal and attack traffic intrusion detection data. Features: duration, protocol, service, src/dst bytes, num of failed logins, su attempts, num failed logins, and many more.	[106, 110, 117]
UNSW-NB15 Contains raw traffic Pcap and CSV files with nine types of attacks.	[110, 111]
X-IIoTID [133] Contains 68 features (including three security characterization label levels) extracted from network traffic, system logs, application logs, device's resources (CPU, input/output, Memory, and others), and commercial intrusion detection systems' logs.	[114]

RQ1: Which are the patterns' objectives in cloud automation?

As indicated in Section 5.1, performance seems to have an overwhelming dominance when it comes to patterns (71/96, 74%), followed by cost (28/96, 29%). Performance includes placement optimization, network performance, response time reduction or in general QoS, as well as network improvement (bottleneck detection and SLO/QoS violation mitigation), while cost includes energy consumption, deployment and operating costs. More than ten percent (12/96, 13%) of the surveyed works deals with security issues of cloud computing, such as security anomalies and DDOS detection. Aspects such as availability and fault tolerance (8/96, 8%) have not been sufficient investigated, areas that have a strong impact in complex and distributed cloud environments. Maintainability patterns could also aid in this direction, especially given that frequent changes needed in today's speedy development environments can result in errors.

Table 13

List of publicly accessible datasets used in papers for Resource Load automation

Dataset	Used In Papers
Alibaba cluster traces [134] Features: task id, job id, start time stamp, end stamp, machine id, container id, cpu avg max utilization, memory avg max utilization, cpu requested, memory requested and more.	[48, 74, 78, 88, 101]
ASD [135] Contains 12 different server logs, each of which has 19 metrics characterizing the status of the server (including CPU-related metrics, memory-related metrics, network metrics, virtual machine metrics, etc.)	[112]
Azure Cloud 2017 trace Features: timestamp VM created, VM deleted, count VMs created, VM id, cpu avg max utilization, VM category, VM memory, and more.	[74]
Bitbrains workload traces [136] Contains 7 performance metrics per VM, sampled every 5 minutes: number of cores provisioned, the provisioned CPU capacity, CPU usage, the provisioned memory capacity, actual memory usage, disk I/O throughput, and network I/O throughput.	[46, 67]
EMOS [137] Contains the status of 41 microservices, while faults were injected. Monitors four representative metrics, including CPU usage, RAM usage, Net out, and Net in.	[112]
GoCJ [138] Contains jobs in terms of Million Instructions (MI) derived from the workload behaviors witnessed in google cluster traces.	[30]
Google cluster workload traces Cluster workload data, consisting of cluster jobs and tasks data. Features: timestamp, job id, user id, CPU/memory/disk space/disk I/O time resources, machine ID and more. Includes details on machine capabilities (CPU, RAM etc.)	[39, 43, 46, 78, 89]
MBD [139] Workload from a big data 5-node cluster. Contains randomly injected faults for CPU, network, and application levels and observations of 26 monitored metrics (CPU, disk, memory, network, and process) for the reaction of the cluster in these faults.	[112]
NASA iPSC Contains three months worth of sanitized accounting records for the 128-node iPSC/860 hypercube. Features: User, Job, Number of nodes, Run time, Start date, Start time, special entries about system status, Duration and more.	[68, 73]
NEP real-world edge workload [140] Contains workloads traces of edge sites of China's largest public edge platform during June 2020. CPU, memory, storage, RTT, bandwidth traces at VM and physical node granularity.	[77]
PlanetLab 10-day Real workload data included in the CloudSim framework. Contains traces of mean CPU utilization measured every 5 minutes of more than 1000 VMs running on thousands of servers in about 500 different locations globally.	[56, 58, 89]
HPC2N workload 3.5 years of HPC log records (Maui format). Includes name of job, num of nodes and tasks requested, max allowed job duration, job completion state, timestamp for submitted job, job execution start, job completion and many more.	[73]

RQ2: What are the scopes of control (i.e. target of regulation) of self-adaptive patterns?

Regarding control scope, the major percentage of research work investigates some form of resource management (infrastructure resizing, offloading etc.) for an application as indicated in Section 5.3, in contrast to the minor percentage

Table 14

List of publicly accessible datasets used in papers for Web Traffic Workloads automation

Dataset	Used In Papers
World Cup 98 Web Server [141] Features: timestamp, clientID, objectID, size, method, status, type, server.	[41, 53, 95]
NASA Dataset (1995) Features: host, timestamp, request, HTTP reply code, reply bytes.	[29, 45, 53]
Wikipedia article pageviews Provides access to Wikipedia access data, including pageviews, unique devices, edited pages, editors, edits, registered users, bytes difference, media requests and more.	[42]
Workload traces of Saskatchewan server Features: host, timestamp, request, HTTP reply code, reply bytes.	[29, 38]

Table 15

List of synthetic datasets

Dataset type	Used In Papers
Pre-constructed synthetic data	[35, 45, 48, 52, 70, 76, 82, 94, 99, 102, 108, 113, 119, 120]
Synthetic data generated during the experiments	[26, 28, 34, 37, 47, 51, 57, 59, 60, 61, 65, 66, 69, 71, 75, 79, 80, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 90, 91, 92, 93, 96, 100, 105, 103, 104, 116, 97]

that investigates dynamic adaptation of application architectures. There are a few promising approaches that offer even more fine-grained management by delving into the context of a specific application request. Although these approaches are less generic, they could offer strategic advantages on the context understanding of resource management for a given application.

RQ3: What are the approaches used for decision-making?

As depicted in Section 5.6, machine learning constitutes the primary decision-making approach in the researched publications. Additionally, time series analysis and historical data processing are frequently employed, often in conjunction with machine learning techniques. Optimization and probabilistic algorithms are utilized in numerous instances, while some studies adopt simpler computational methods.

The majority of feedback loop processes rely on reactive category (60%), while the rest uses a proactive approach (Section 5.2). Reactive solutions are generally lightweight and react to current state changes. Whereas, proactive approaches have the benefit of predicting future anomalies, thus preparing a priori for anticipated changes, but on the other hand may exhibit error in these predictions. This error may accumulate with the error in the process of determining the corrective action.

Regarding patterns' automation level (section 5.5), in most of the cases "continuous analysis/training continues usage" category is preferred (73 cases), while "one-off training/continuous usage" category used in 19 cases. "one-off

training/one off usage" category is utilized in two cases. These findings depict the preference for fully dynamic mechanisms, both in training and in usage.

RQ4: Which software and tools were used to create the management mechanisms in the surveyed work?

CloudSim was the most popular solution for developing and validating the proposed management mechanisms, followed by MATLAB and ML libraries and frameworks for Python like Keras and TensorFlow, as it depicted in Sections 5.7.2 and 5.7.3. There are several other libraries, frameworks and tools, that were used in individual cases. Regarding general languages usage, Java and Python are the dominant cases.

RQ5: Which methods, datasets and tools were used for experiments validation?

In the majority of the papers, experiments have been based on simulations with tools like CloudSim or MATLAB, while in lesser extent real-world observations took place, as indicated in Section 5.4. Simulation software provides flexibility, cost reduction and minimizes external factors that could influence results. However, it may also miss parameters of real-world setups or the dynamic nature of distributed environments. Usage of real world datasets in the simulation can help alleviate this aspect.

Running experiments on actual private or public Cloud, seems to be the minority of the reviewed work, as recorded in Section 5.7.1. Kubernetes orchestration system was the preferred software for real-world experiments, running either in private or public Cloud like AWS, GCP, and Alibaba. In few cases of real-world experiments, specialized benchmarking and load testing software was used (section 5.7.4).

A large proportion of the papers used publicly available datasets, while others created synthetic ones (section 5.8). An effort was made to document these and group them based on their high level scope (application, network, resource, traffic). A significant amount of open data exists, however their usage for a given research goal is something that is difficult to evaluate. Thus, the documentation of their contents in this work can ease the effort for future researchers in order to identify the appropriate data source, as well as find similar works that have used them for comparison purposes.

The usage of different datasets (in the same category e.g. for resources) seems to be somewhat fragmented. Many different ones are used, with no single dataset to be considered as a kind of industry or domain standard. Traces released from public cloud providers could play this role in some of the cases. On the same topic, a very limited number of papers are using benchmarks, which could be a way to standardize the experimentation process. Finally, from a workload trend perspective, datasets could be more specialized with relation to specific cloud services types or more modern, cloud-based applications.

Additional conclusions

In addition to the research questions analysis, the following general conclusions were extracted from this survey.

There is a significant rise in the works of recent years, compared to the period before 2023. For years prior to those included in this survey (2018-2024), a brief search revealed 34 relevant research papers published between 2010 and 2017. Thus, the topic of cloud and application management automation is expected to continue being of interest, especially with the advent of more complex approaches like agentic AI.

Although close to a hundred papers were studied, only seven of them appear to be providing accessible source code. This limited availability hinders the reproducibility and further development or comparison of research findings. Furthermore, the number of papers mentioned in the tables in Section 5.7 (on used tools) is significantly lower than the total number of papers reviewed. This indicates a low number of papers mentioning explicitly the tools and libraries they use, which is another factor limiting reproducibility.

More than 70 percent of the researched work are journals, which can indicate the complexity of the given domain, as journal articles typically delve into specialized topics, and more in-depth analysis and experimentation. This level of complexity indicates the significant expertise and system-wide knowledge that is required and may span from system setup (typically from a systems engineer), to decision mechanism creation (typically from a data scientist) and experiment/validation organization (typically from a performance engineer). Given that this type of expertise combination is rare, it is imperative to work as a community towards more standardized experimentation means, including potential deployment and configuration templates.

Future Directions

The small amount of solutions at the application level points to a future research area in the field of cloud self-adaptive applications. Researchers and cloud-native application developers, exploiting the new capabilities offered by artificial intelligence [142], can pursue the creation of embedded and intelligent adaptation mechanisms within applications. These mechanisms can enable self-adaptive characteristics directly within the application structure. This adaptation may involve switching between parametric application architectures, as well as embedding the logic needed to decide on the transition between the available configurations. Such applications, that are more "liquid" and flexible, could lead to inherent and multimodal self-adaptive capabilities.

Declarations

Funding

Part of the research leading to the results presented in this paper has received funding from the European Union's funded Project HUMAINE under grant agreement No. 101120218.

Conflicts of Interest

None declared.

CRedit authorship contribution statement

Apostolos Angelis: Conceptualization of this study, Investigation, Data Curation, Writing - Original Draft, Methodology. **George Kousiouris:** Conceptualization of this study, Methodology, Writing - Review & Editing, Supervision.

References

- [1] O. Al-Debagy, P. Martinek, A comparative review of microservices and monolithic architectures, in: 2018 IEEE 18th International Symposium on Computational Intelligence and Informatics (CINTI), 2018, pp. 149–154. doi:10.1109/CINTI.2018.8928192.
- [2] F. Osse, G. Márquez, H. Astudillo, An exploratory study of academic architectural tactics and patterns in microservices: A systematic literature review (2019).
- [3] N. Alshuqayran, N. Ali, R. Evans, A systematic mapping study in microservice architecture, in: 2016 IEEE 9th International Conference on Service-Oriented Computing and Applications (SOCA), 2016, pp. 44–51. doi:10.1109/SOCA.2016.15.
- [4] G. J. Garcia, Past, present, and future of cloud computing: An innovation case study, 2021. doi:10.13140/RG.2.2.16826.93128.
- [5] C. Richardson, *Microservices Patterns: With examples in Java*, Manning, 2018.
- [6] M. Fowler, J. Lewis, *Microservices*, <https://martinfowler.com/articles/microservices.html>, 2014. Accessed: 2024-09-30.
- [7] A. Wahyudi, G. Kuk, M. Janssen, A process pattern model for tackling and improving big data quality, *Information Systems Frontiers* 20 (2018) 457–469.
- [8] Microsoft, *Microsoft Learn Azure - Compute Resource Consolidation pattern*, <https://learn.microsoft.com/en-us/azure/architecture/patterns/compute-resource-consolidation>, 2022. [Online; accessed 9-December-2024].
- [9] S. H. Oh, H. J. La, S. D. Kim, A reusability evaluation suite for cloud services, in: 2011 IEEE 8th International Conference on e-Business Engineering, 2011, pp. 111–118. doi:10.1109/ICEBE.2011.27.
- [10] G. Kousiouris, A self-adaptive batch request aggregation pattern for improving resource management, response time and costs in microservice and serverless environments, in: 2021 IEEE International Performance, Computing, and Communications Conference (IPCCC), 2021, pp. 1–10. doi:10.1109/IPCCC51483.2021.9679422.
- [11] S. Vergara, L. González, R. Ruggia, Towards formalizing microservices architectural patterns with event-b, in: 2020 IEEE International Conference on Software Architecture Companion (ICSA-C), 2020, pp. 71–74. doi:10.1109/ICSA-C50368.2020.00022.
- [12] R. Bianchini, M. Fontoura, E. Cortez, A. Bonde, A. Muzio, A.-M. Constantin, T. Moscibroda, G. Magalhaes, G. Bablani, M. Russinovich, Toward ml-centric cloud platforms, *Commun. ACM* 63 (2020) 50–59. doi:10.1145/3364684.
- [13] L. Zhu, X. Liu, Technical target setting in qfd for web service systems using an artificial neural network, *IEEE Transactions on Services Computing* 3 (2010) 338–352. doi:10.1109/TSC.2010.45.
- [14] G. Kousiouris, T. Cucinotta, T. Varvarigou, The effects of scheduling, workload type and consolidation scenarios on virtual machine performance and their prediction through optimized artificial neural networks, *Journal of Systems and Software* 84 (2011) 1270–1291. doi:10.1016/j.jss.2011.04.013.
- [15] G. Kousiouris, A. Menychtas, D. Kyriazis, S. Gogouvitis, T. Varvarigou, Dynamic, behavioral-based estimation of resource provisioning based on high-level application terms in cloud platforms, *Future Generation Computer Systems* 32 (2014) 27–40. doi:10.1016/j.future.2012.05.009, special Section: The Management of Cloud Systems, Special Section: Cyber-Physical Society and Special Section: Special Issue on Exploiting Semantic Technologies with Particularization on Linked Data over Grid and Cloud Architectures.
- [16] E. Cortez, A. Bonde, A. Muzio, M. Russinovich, M. Fontoura, R. Bianchini, Resource central: Understanding and predicting

- workloads for improved resource management in large cloud platforms, in: *Proceedings of the 26th Symposium on Operating Systems Principles, SOSP '17*, Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 2017, p. 153–167. doi:10.1145/3132747.3132772.
- [17] J. Gao, Machine learning applications for data center optimization, 2014.
- [18] A. U. Rehman, R. L. Aguiar, J. P. Barraca, Fault-tolerance in the scope of cloud computing, *IEEE Access* 10 (2022) 63422–63441. doi:10.1109/ACCESS.2022.3182211.
- [19] O. Gheibi, D. Weyns, F. Quin, Applying machine learning in self-adaptive systems: A systematic literature review, *ACM Trans. Auton. Adapt. Syst.* 15 (2021). doi:10.1145/3469440.
- [20] V. Cardellini, F. Lo Presti, M. Nardelli, F. Rossi, Self-adaptive container deployment in the fog: A survey, in: I. Brandic, T. A. L. Genez, I. Pietri, R. Sakellariou (Eds.), *Algorithmic Aspects of Cloud Computing*, Springer International Publishing, Cham, 2020, pp. 77–102.
- [21] I. Alfonso, K. Garcés, H. Castro, J. Cabot, Self-adaptive architectures in iot systems: a systematic literature review, *Journal of Internet Services and Applications* 12 (2021) 14. doi:10.1186/s13174-021-00145-8.
- [22] C. Krupitzer, T. Temizer, T. Prantl, C. Raibulet, An overview of design patterns for self-adaptive systems in the context of the internet of things, *IEEE Access* 8 (2020) 187384–187399. doi:10.1109/ACCESS.2020.3031189.
- [23] M. Kirti, A. K. Maurya, R. S. Yadav, Fault-tolerance approaches for distributed and cloud computing environments: A systematic review, taxonomy and future directions, *Concurrency and Computation: Practice and Experience* 36 (2024) e8081. doi:https://doi.org/10.1002/cpe.8081. arXiv:https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/pdf/10.1002/cpe.8081.
- [24] F. Quin, D. Weyns, O. Gheibi, Decentralized self-adaptive systems: A mapping study, in: *2021 International Symposium on Software Engineering for Adaptive and Self-Managing Systems (SEAMS)*, IEEE, 2021, p. 18–29. doi:10.1109/seams51251.2021.00014.
- [25] T. Chen, R. Bahsoon, A survey and taxonomy of self-aware and self-adaptive autoscaling systems in the cloud, *CoRR abs/1609.03590* (2016). doi:10.1145/3190507. arXiv:1609.03590.
- [26] F. Nakahara, D. Beder, A context-aware and self-adaptive offloading decision support model for mobile cloud computing system, *J Ambient Intell Human Comput* 9 (2018) 1561–1572. doi:10.1007/s12652-018-0790-7.
- [27] M. Adel Serhani, H. T. El-Kassabi, K. Shuaib, A. N. Navaz, B. Benattallah, A. Beheshti, Self-adapting cloud services orchestration for fulfilling intensive sensory data-driven iot workflows, *Future Generation Computer Systems* 108 (2020) 583–597. doi:10.1016/j.future.2020.02.066.
- [28] R. Mohammadi Bahram Abadi, A. M. Rahmani, S. Hossein Alizadeh, Self-adaptive architecture for virtual machines consolidation based on probabilistic model evaluation of data centers in cloud computing, *Cluster Computing* 21 (2018) 1711–1733. doi:10.1007/s10586-018-2806-7.
- [29] M. A. Attia, M. Arafa, E. A. Sallam, M. M. Fahmy, Application of an enhanced self-adapting differential evolution algorithm to workload prediction in cloud computing, *IJ. Information Technology and Computer Science* 8 (2019) 33–40. doi:10.5815/ijitcs.2019.08.05.
- [30] B. R. Parida, A. K. Rath, H. Mohapatra, Binary self-adaptive salp swarm optimization-based dynamic load balancing in cloud computing, *International Journal of Information Technology and Web Engineering (IJITWE)* 17 (2022) 1–25. doi:10.4018/IJITWE.295964.
- [31] V. Podolskiy, A. Jindal, M. Gerndt, Y. Oleynik, Forecasting models for self-adaptive cloud applications: A comparative study, in: *2018 IEEE 12th International Conference on Self-Adaptive and Self-Organizing Systems (SASO)*, 2018, pp. 40–49. doi:10.1109/SASO.2018.00015.
- [32] R. Li, G. Dong, J. Jiang, H. Wu, N. Yang, W. Chen, Self-adaptive load-balancing strategy based on a time series pattern for concurrent user access on web map service, *Computers & Geosciences* 131 (2019) 60–69. doi:10.1016/j.cageo.2019.06.015.
- [33] E. Ataie, R. Entezari-Maleki, S. E. Etesami, B. Egger, D. Ardagna, A. Movaghar, Power-aware performance analysis of self-adaptive resource management in iaas clouds, *Future Generation Computer Systems* 86 (2018) 134–144. doi:10.1016/j.future.2018.02.042.
- [34] P. Chindanonda, V. Podolskiy, M. Gerndt, Self-adaptive data processing to improve slo for dynamic iot workloads, *Computers* 9 (2020). doi:10.3390/computers9010012.
- [35] E. F. Boza, X. Andrade, J. Cedeno, J. Murillo, H. Aragon, C. L. Abad, A. G. Abad, On implementing autonomic systems with a serverless computing approach: The case of self-partitioning cloud caches, *Computers* 9 (2020). doi:10.3390/computers9010014.
- [36] H. Arkian, G. Pierre, J. Tordsson, E. Elmroth, Model-based stream processing auto-scaling in geo-distributed environments, in: *2021 International Conference on Computer Communications and Networks (ICCCN)*, 2021, pp. 1–10. doi:10.1109/ICCCN52240.2021.9522236.
- [37] A. Mousa, J. Bentahar, O. Alam, Multi-objective self-adaptive composite saas using feature model, in: *2018 IEEE 6th International Conference on Future Internet of Things and Cloud (FiCloud)*, 2018, pp. 77–84. doi:10.1109/FiCloud.2018.00019.
- [38] D. Saxena, A. K. Singh, Auto-adaptive learning-based workload forecasting in dynamic cloud environment, *International Journal of Computers and Applications* 44 (2022) 541–551. doi:10.1080/1206212X.2020.1830245.
- [39] S. Simaiya, U. K. Lilhore, K. B. V. Yogesh Kumar Sharma, Brahma Rao, V. V. R. Maheswara Rao, A. Baliyan, A. Bijalwan, R. Alroobaea, A hybrid cloud load balancing and host utilization prediction method using deep learning and optimization techniques, *Scientific Reports* 14 (2024). doi:10.1038/s41598-024-51466-0.
- [40] K. Dinesh Kumar, E. Umamaheswari, An efficient proactive vm consolidation technique with improved lstm network in a cloud environment, *Computing* 106 (2024) 1–28. doi:10.1007/s00607-023-01214-5.
- [41] J. Dogani, F. Khunjush, Proactive auto-scaling technique for web applications in container-based edge computing using federated learning model, *Journal of Parallel and Distributed Computing* 187 (2024) 104837. doi:10.1016/j.jpdc.2024.104837.
- [42] C. Meng, H. Tong, T. Wu, M. Pan, Y. Yu, Multi-level ml based burst-aware autoscaling for slo assurance and cost efficiency, 2024. doi:10.48550/arXiv.2402.12962.
- [43] J. Bi, H. Yuan, S. Li, K. Zhang, J. Zhang, M. Zhou, Arima-based and multiapplication workload prediction with wavelet decomposition and savitzky-golay filter in clouds, *IEEE Transactions on Systems, Man, and Cybernetics: Systems* 54 (2024) 2495–2506. doi:10.1109/TSMC.2023.3343925.
- [44] M. Ananthi, A. Gopal, K. Ramalakshmi, P. Mohan Kumar, Gaussian adapted markov model with overhauled fluctuation analysis-based big data streaming model in cloud, *Big Data* 12 (2024) 1–18. doi:10.1089/big.2023.0035.
- [45] M. Kumar, J. K. Samriya, K. Dubey, S. S. Gill, Qos-aware resource scheduling using whale optimization algorithm for microservice applications, *Software: Practice and Experience* 54 (2023) 546–565. doi:10.1002/spe.3211.
- [46] D. Saxena, A. K. Singh, A high up-time and security centered resource provisioning model towards sustainable cloud service management, *IEEE Transactions on Green Communications and Networking* (2024) 1–1. doi:10.1109/TGCN.2024.3356065.
- [47] H. Ahmad, C. Treude, M. Wagner, C. Szabo, Smart hpa: A resource-efficient horizontal pod auto-scaler for microservice architectures, in: *2024 IEEE 21st International Conference on Software Architecture (ICSA)*, IEEE, 2024. doi:10.1109/icsa59870.2024.00013.
- [48] W. R. Santos, A. R. Sampaio Jr., N. S. Rosa, G. D. Cavalcanti, Microservices performance forecast using dynamic multiple predictor systems, *Engineering Applications of Artificial Intelligence* 129 (2024) 107649. doi:10.1016/j.engappai.2023.107649.

- [49] H. Sfaxi, I. Lahyani, S. Yangui, M. Torjmen, Latency-aware and proactive service placement for edge computing, *IEEE Transactions on Network and Service Management* 21 (2024) 4243–4254. doi:10.1109/TNSM.2024.3375970.
- [50] L. Ferrucci, M. Mordacchini, P. Dazzi, Decentralized replica management in latency-bound edge environments for resource usage minimization, *IEEE Access* 12 (2024) 19229–19249. doi:10.1109/ACCESS.2024.3359749.
- [51] I. Chakour, C. Daoui, M. Baslam, B. Sainz-De-Abajo, B. Garcia-Zapirain, Strategic bandwidth allocation for qos in iot gateway: Predicting future needs based on iot device habits, *IEEE Access* 12 (2024) 6590–6603. doi:10.1109/ACCESS.2024.3351111.
- [52] A. Asghari, M. K. Sohrabi, Bi-objective cloud resource management for dependent tasks using q-learning and nsga-3, *Journal of Ambient Intelligence and Humanized Computing* 15 (2024) 197–217. doi:10.1007/s12652-022-03885-y.
- [53] A. Bali, Y. E. Houm, A. Gherbi, M. Cheriet, Automatic data featurization for enhanced proactive service auto-scaling: Boosting forecasting accuracy and mitigating oscillation, *Journal of King Saud University - Computer and Information Sciences* 36 (2024) 101924. doi:10.1016/j.jksuci.2024.101924.
- [54] L. Yin, J. Sun, Z. Wu, An evolutionary computation framework for task off-and-downloading scheduling in mobile edge computing, *IEEE Internet of Things Journal* 11 (2024) 22399–22412. doi:10.1109/JIOT.2024.3381187.
- [55] Q.-H. Chen, C.-Y. Wen, Optimal resource allocation using genetic algorithm in container-based heterogeneous cloud, *IEEE Access* 12 (2024) 7413–7429. doi:10.1109/ACCESS.2024.3351944.
- [56] M. Rezakhani, N. Sarrafzadeh-Ghadimi, R. Entezari-Maleki, L. Sousa, A. Movaghar, Energy-aware qos-based dynamic virtual machine consolidation approach based on rl and ann, *Cluster Computing* 27 (2024) 827–843. doi:10.1007/s10586-023-03983-2.
- [57] M. Zambianco, S. Cretti, D. Siracusa, Cost minimization in multi-cloud systems with runtime microservice re-orchestration, in: *2024 27th Conference on Innovation in Clouds, Internet and Networks (ICIN)*, IEEE, 2024. doi:10.1109/icin60470.2024.10494463.
- [58] K. Borna, R. Ghanbari, A self-adaptive deep learning-based model to predict cloud workload, *Neural Network World* 33 (2023) 161–169. doi:10.14311/NNW.2023.33.010.
- [59] O. Pozdniakova, A. Cholomskis, D. Mažeika, Self-adaptive autoscaling algorithm for sla-sensitive applications running on the kubernetes clusters, *Cluster Computing* 27 (2024) 2399–2426. doi:10.1007/s10586-023-04082-y.
- [60] A. Roy, S. Midya, K. Majumder, S. Phadikar, Distributed resource management in dew based edge to cloud computing ecosystem: A hybrid adaptive evolutionary approach, *Transactions on Emerging Telecommunications Technologies* 31 (2020). doi:10.1002/ett.4018.
- [61] D. Rambabu, A. Govardhan, Task scheduling and data replication in cloud with improved correlation strategy, *International Journal of Computers and Applications* 45 (2023) 697–708. doi:10.1080/1206212X.2023.2267840.
- [62] P. Nawrocki, P. Osypanka, B. Posluszn, Data-driven adaptive prediction of cloud resource usage, *Journal of Grid Computing* 21 (2023) 6. doi:10.1007/s10723-022-09641-y.
- [63] A. Amiri, U. Zdun, Cost-aware multifaceted reconfiguration of service-and cloud-based dynamic routing applications, in: *2023 IEEE 16th International Conference on Cloud Computing (CLOUD)*, 2023, pp. 428–438. doi:10.1109/CLOUD60044.2023.00058.
- [64] A. Tundo, M. Mobilio, S. Ilager, I. Brandić, E. Bartocci, L. Mariani, An energy-aware approach to design self-adaptive ai-based applications on the edge, in: *2023 38th IEEE/ACM International Conference on Automated Software Engineering (ASE)*, 2023, pp. 281–293. doi:10.1109/ASE56229.2023.00046.
- [65] M. Qin, M. Li, R. Othman Yahya, Dynamic iot service placement based on shared parallel architecture in fog-cloud computing, *Internet of Things* 23 (2023) 100856. doi:10.1016/j.iot.2023.100856.
- [66] D. Landau, N. Saurabh, X. Andrade, J. G. Barbosa, Multi-objective optimization of consumer group autoscaling in message broker systems, 2024. doi:10.48550/arXiv.2402.06085.
- [67] K. K. Gola, B. M. Singh, B. Gupta, N. Chaurasia, S. Arya, Multi-objective hybrid capuchin search with genetic algorithm based hierarchical resource allocation scheme with clustering model in cloud computing environment, *Concurrency and Computation: Practice and Experience* 35 (2023). doi:10.1002/cpe.7606.
- [68] S. D. S. Mustapha, P. Gupta, Dbscan inspired task scheduling algorithm for cloud infrastructure, *Internet of Things and Cyber-Physical Systems* 4 (2024) 32–39. doi:10.1016/j.iotcps.2023.07.001.
- [69] Y. Chen, S. Ye, J. Wu, B. Wang, H. Wang, W. Li, Fast multi-type resource allocation in local-edge-cloud computing for energy-efficient service provision, *Information Sciences* 668 (2024) 120502. doi:10.1016/j.ins.2024.120502.
- [70] L. Kidane, P. Townend, T. Metsch, E. Elmroth, Automated hyperparameter tuning for adaptive cloud workload prediction, in: *Proceedings of the IEEE/ACM 16th International Conference on Utility and Cloud Computing, UCC '23*, Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 2024. doi:10.1145/3603166.3632244.
- [71] S. Rabaoui, H. Hachicha, E. Zagrouba, Mobile agents-based framework for dynamic resource allocation in cloud computing, in: *Proceedings of the 16th International Conference on Agents and Artificial Intelligence - Volume 3: ICAART, INSTICC, SciTePress*, 2024, pp. 766–773. doi:10.5220/0012390200003636.
- [72] S. J. Karan Bajaj, R. Singh, Context-aware offloading for iot application using fog-cloud computing, *I. J. of Electrical & Electronics Research* 11 (2023) 69–83. doi:10.37391/IJEER.110110.
- [73] S. Mangalampalli, S. K. Swain, T. Chakrabarti, P. Chakrabarti, G. R. Karri, M. Margala, B. Unhelkar, S. B. Krishnan, Prioritized task-scheduling algorithm in cloud computing using cat swarm optimization, *Sensors* 23 (2023). doi:10.3390/s23136155.
- [74] B. Wang, X. Shi, M. Shang, A self-decoupled interpretable prediction framework for highly-variable cloud workloads, in: X. Wang, M. L. Sapino, W.-S. Han, A. E. Abbadi, G. Dobbie, Z. Feng, Y. Shao, H. Yin (Eds.), *Database Systems for Advanced Applications*, Springer Nature Switzerland, Cham, 2023, pp. 588–603. doi:10.1007/978-3-031-30637-2_39.
- [75] M. Kumar, K. Dubey, S. Singh, J. K. Samriya, S. S. Gill, Experimental performance analysis of cloud resource allocation framework using spider monkey optimization algorithm, *Concurrency and Computation: Practice and Experience* 35 (2022). doi:10.1002/cpe.7469.
- [76] S. Chouliaras, S. Sotiriadis, An adaptive auto-scaling framework for cloud resource provisioning, *Future Generation Computer Systems* 148 (2023) 173–183. doi:10.1016/j.future.2023.05.017.
- [77] Y. Li, H. Yuan, Z. Fu, X. Ma, M. Xu, S. Wang, Elastic: Edge workload forecasting based on collaborative cloud-edge deep learning, in: *Proceedings of the ACM Web Conference 2023, WWW '23*, Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 2023, p. 3056–3066. doi:10.1145/3543507.3583436.
- [78] H. Yuan, J. Bi, S. Li, J. Zhang, M. Zhou, An improved lstm-based prediction approach for resources and workload in large-scale data centers, *IEEE Internet of Things Journal* 11 (2024) 22816–22829. doi:10.1109/JIOT.2024.3383512.
- [79] P. B. K., C. Naikodi, S. L., Hybrid meta-heuristic technique load balancing for cloud-based virtual machines, *International Journal of Intelligent Systems and Applications in Engineering* 11 (2023) 132–139.
- [80] K. Zhang, Y. Zhou, C. Wang, H. Hong, J. Chen, Q. Gao, M. Ghobaei-Arani, Towards an automatic deployment model of iot services in fog computing using an adaptive differential evolution algorithm, *Internet of Things* 24 (2023) 100918. doi:10.1016/j.iot.2023.100918.
- [81] D. D. Sanchez-Gallegos, J. L. Gonzalez-Compean, J. Carretero, H. Marin-Castro, A data science pipeline synchronisation method for edge-fog-cloud continuum, in: *Proceedings of the SC '23 Workshops of The International Conference on High Performance Computing, Network, Storage, and Analysis, SC-W '23*, Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 2023, p.

- 2053–2064. doi:10.1145/3624062.3624284.
- [82] M. Faraji-Mehmandar, S. Jabbehdari, H. H. S. Javadi, Fuzzy q-learning approach for autonomic resource provisioning of iot applications in fog computing environments, *Journal of Ambient Intelligence and Humanized Computing* 14 (2023) 4237–4255. doi:10.1007/s12652-023-04527-7.
- [83] T. P. Silva, T. V. Batista, A. L. Battisti, A. Saraiva, A. A. Rocha, F. C. Delicato, I. V. Bastos, E. L. C. Macedo, A. C. B. de Oliveira, P. F. Pires, A mape-k and queuing theory approach for vnf auto-scaling in edge computing, in: 2023 IEEE 12th International Conference on Cloud Networking (CloudNet), 2023, pp. 144–152. doi:10.1109/CloudNet59005.2023.10490065.
- [84] L. Tang, H. Qin, Divisible task offloading for multiuser multiserver mobile edge computing systems based on deep reinforcement learning, *IEEE Access* 11 (2023) 83507–83522. doi:10.1109/ACCESS.2023.3302528.
- [85] C. Shan, C. Wu, Y. Xia, Z. Guo, D. Liu, J. Zhang, Adaptive resource allocation for workflow containerization on kubernetes, *Journal of Systems Engineering and Electronics* 34 (2023) 723–743. doi:10.23919/JSEE.2023.000073.
- [86] W. Tärneberg, P. Skarin, Constructive dissonance in the cloud: Adaptive out-of-phase scheduling for periodic tasks, in: 2023 IEEE 12th International Conference on Cloud Networking (CloudNet), 2023, pp. 103–111. doi:10.1109/CloudNet59005.2023.10490059.
- [87] G. Fatouros, G. Kousiouris, G. Makridis, J. Soldatos, M. Filippakis, D. Kyriazis, Enhanced runtime-adaptable routing for serverless functions based on performance and cost tradeoffs in hybrid cloud settings, in: 2023 IEEE International Conference on Cloud Computing Technology and Science (CloudCom), 2023, pp. 177–184. doi:10.1109/CloudCom59040.2023.00038.
- [88] Z. Zhang, C. Xu, S. Xu, L. Huang, J. Zhang, Towards optimized scheduling and allocation of heterogeneous resource via graph-enhanced epso algorithm, *Journal of Cloud Computing* 13 (2024) 108–108. doi:10.1186/s13677-024-00670-4.
- [89] S. Verma, A. Bala, Etsa-lp: Ensemble time-series approach for load prediction in cloud, *Computing and Informatics* 43 (2024). doi:10.31577/cai_2024_1_64.
- [90] Z. Yang, J. Zhang, Y. Jiang, Y. Jin, An energy-efficient convolution-based partitioned collaborative perception algorithm for large-scale iot services, *IEEE Transactions on Industrial Informatics* 20 (2024) 7404–7413. doi:10.1109/TII.2024.3353853.
- [91] G. Fatouros, G. Kousiouris, T. Lohier, G. Makridis, A. Polyviou, J. Soldatos, D. Kyriazis, Enhancing smart agriculture scenarios with low-code, pattern-oriented functionalities for cloud/edge collaboration, in: 2023 19th International Conference on Distributed Computing in Smart Systems and the Internet of Things (DCOSS-IoT), 2023, pp. 285–292. doi:10.1109/DCOSS-IoT58021.2023.00055.
- [92] V. Katevas, G. Fatouros, D. Kyriazis, G. Kousiouris, Embedding automated function performance benchmarking, profiling and resource usage categorization in function as a service devops pipelines, *Future Generation Computer Systems* 160 (2024) 223–237. doi:10.1016/j.future.2024.05.051.
- [93] T. Theodoropoulos, D. Kafetzis, J. Violos, A. Makris, K. Tserpes, Multi-agent deep reinforcement learning for weighted multi-path routing, in: Proceedings of the 3rd Workshop on Flexible Resource and Application Management on the Edge, FRAME '23, Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 2023, p. 7–11. doi:10.1145/3589010.3594888.
- [94] H. Li, L. Tian, G. Xu, J. R. Cañizares Abreu, S. Huang, S. Chai, Y. Xia, Co-evolutionary and elite learning-based bi-objective poor and rich optimization algorithm for scheduling multiple workflows in the cloud, *Future Generation Computer Systems* 152 (2024) 99–111. doi:10.1016/j.future.2023.10.015.
- [95] M. Salama, R. Bahsoon, R. Buyya, Architectural stability reasoning using self-awareness principles: Case of self-adaptive cloud architectures, 2019. doi:10.48550/arXiv.1912.06469.
- [96] Z. Yuan, X. Lv, P. Xie, H. Ge, X. You, CSEA: A Fine-Grained Framework of Climate-Season-Based Energy-Aware in Cloud Storage Systems, *The Computer Journal* 67 (2022) 423–436. doi:10.1093/comjnl/bxac184.
- [97] B. Jafari, P. Bayat, Performance improvement of distributed cache using middleware session, *The Journal of Supercomputing* 80 (2024) 10818–10862. doi:10.1007/s11227-023-05823-x.
- [98] U. Soundharya, G. Vadivu, File fetching in distributed file system via optimization assisted hybrid deep learning model, *Multimedia Tools and Applications* 83 (2004) 65077–65097. doi:10.1007/s11042-023-17938-7.
- [99] H.-P. Jiang, W.-M. Chen, Self-adaptive resource allocation for energy-aware virtual machine placement in dynamic computing cloud, *Journal of Network and Computer Applications* 120 (2018) 119–129. doi:10.1016/j.jnca.2018.07.011.
- [100] M. Soltane, Y. Cardinale, R. Angarita, P. Rosse, M. Rukoz, D. Makhlof, K. Okba, A self-adaptive agent-based system for cloud platforms, in: 2018 3rd International Conference on Pattern Analysis and Intelligent Systems (PAIS), 2018, pp. 1–8. doi:10.1109/PAIS.2018.8598507.
- [101] S. Song, L. Pan, S. Liu, A q-learning based auto-scaling approach for provisioning big data analysis services in cloud environments, *Future Generation Computer Systems* 154 (2024) 140–150. doi:10.1016/j.future.2024.01.003.
- [102] S. Manam, K. Moessner, S. Vural, Deadline-constrained cost minimisation for cloud computing environments, *IEEE Access* 11 (2023) 38514–38522. doi:10.1109/ACCESS.2023.3258682.
- [103] Y. Wang, L. Zhu, Qos and energy-aware resource allocation in cloud computing data centers using particle swarm optimization algorithm and fuzzy logic system, *International Journal of Advanced Computer Science and Applications* 14 (2023). doi:10.14569/IJACSA.2023.0141095.
- [104] C. Meng, S. Song, H. Tong, M. Pan, Y. Yu, Deepscaler: Holistic autoscaling for microservices based on spatiotemporal gnn with adaptive graph learning, in: 2023 38th IEEE/ACM International Conference on Automated Software Engineering (ASE), 2023, pp. 53–65. doi:10.1109/ASE56229.2023.00038.
- [105] P. Wei, Y. Zeng, B. Yan, J. Zhou, E. Nikougoftar, Vmp-a3c: Virtual machines placement in cloud computing based on asynchronous advantage actor-critic algorithm, *Journal of King Saud University - Computer and Information Sciences* 35 (2023) 101549. doi:10.1016/j.jksuci.2023.04.002.
- [106] Y. E. Tadesse, Y.-J. Choi, Pattern augmented lightweight convolutional neural network for intrusion detection system, *Electronics* 13 (2024). URL: <https://www.mdpi.com/2079-9292/13/5/932>. doi:10.3390/electronics13050932.
- [107] L. Wu, S. Lei, F. Liao, Y. Zheng, Y. Liu, W. Fu, H. Song, J. Zhou, Egonmix: An intrusion detection method based on graph contrastive learning, 2024. doi:10.48550/arXiv.2403.17980. arXiv:2403.17980.
- [108] B. Bolat-Akça, E. Bozkaya-Aras, Digital twin-assisted intelligent anomaly detection system for internet of things, *Ad Hoc Networks* 158 (2024) 103484. doi:10.1016/j.adhoc.2024.103484.
- [109] M. Abdulsatar, H. Ahmad, D. Goel, F. Ullah, Towards deep learning enabled cybersecurity risk assessment for microservice architectures, 2024. doi:10.48550/arXiv.2403.15169.
- [110] I. Priyadarshini, Anomaly detection of iot cyberattacks in smart cities using federated learning and split learning, *Big Data and Cognitive Computing* 8 (2024). doi:10.3390/bdcc8030021.
- [111] S. S. A. Naqvi, Y. Li, M. Uzair, Ddos attack detection in smart grid network using reconstructive machine learning models, *PeerJ Computer Science* (2024). doi:10.7717/peerj-cs.1784.
- [112] G. Zhong, F. Liu, J. Jiang, B. Wang, X. Yao, C. L. P. Chen, Detecting cloud anomaly via broad network-based contrastive autoencoder, *IEEE Transactions on Network and Service Management* 21 (2024) 3249–3263. doi:10.1109/TNSM.2024.3353772.
- [113] N. Azeri, O. Hioual, O. Hioual, A distributed intelligence framework for enhancing resilience and data privacy in dynamic cyber-physical systems, *Cluster Computing* 27 (2024) 6289–6304. doi:10.1007/

s10586-024-04349-y.

- [114] D. Attique, W. Hao, W. Ping, D. Javeed, P. Kumar, Explainable and data-efficient deep learning for enhanced attack detection in iiot ecosystem, *IEEE Internet of Things Journal* (2024) 1–1. doi:10.1109/JIOT.2024.3384374.
- [115] A.-R. Al-Ghuwairi, Y. Sharrab, D. Al-Fraihat, M. AlElaimat, A. Al-sarhan, A. Algarni, Intrusion detection in cloud computing based on time series anomalies utilizing machine learning, *Journal of Cloud Computing* 12 (2023) 127–127. doi:10.1186/s13677-023-00491-x.
- [116] S. M. Eljack, M. Jemmali, M. Denden, M. A. Sadig, A. M. Algashami, S. Turki, Intelligent solution system for cloud security based on equity distribution: Model and algorithms, *Computers, Materials & Continua* 78 (2024) 1461–1479. doi:10.32604/cmc.2023.040919.
- [117] M. G. Raj, S. K. Pani, Hybrid feature selection and bwtdo enabled deepcnn-tl for intrusion detection in fuzzy cloud computing, *Soft Computing* (2023). doi:10.1007/s00500-023-08573-3.
- [118] T. Wang, J. Xu, W. Zhang, Z. Gu, H. Zhong, Self-adaptive cloud monitoring with online anomaly detection, *Future Generation Computer Systems* 80 (2018) 89–101. doi:10.1016/j.future.2017.09.067.
- [119] M. R. Saleh Sedghpour, D. Garlan, B. Schmerl, C. Klein, J. Tordsson, Breaking the vicious circle: Self-adaptive microservice circuit breaking and retry, in: *2023 IEEE International Conference on Cloud Engineering (IC2E)*, 2023, pp. 32–42. doi:10.1109/IC2E59103.2023.00012.
- [120] F. Ghedass, F. B. Charrada, Autonomic computing and incremental learning for the management of big services, *Software: Practice and Experience* 53 (2023). doi:10.1002/spe.3204.
- [121] P. Dong, Y. Zuo, L. Chen, S. Li, L. Zhang, Vsnt: Adaptive network traffic forecasting via vmd and deep learning with sci-block and attention mechanism, in: *2023 IEEE Intl Conf on Parallel & Distributed Processing with Applications, Big Data & Cloud Computing, Sustainable Computing & Communications, Social Computing & Networking (ISPA/BDCLOUD/SocialCom/SustainCom)*, 2023, pp. 104–109. doi:10.1109/ISPA-BDCLOUD-SocialCom-SustainCom59178.2023.00046.
- [122] M. Shahrad, R. Fonseca, I. Goiri, G. Chaudhry, P. Batum, J. Cooke, E. Laureano, C. Tresness, M. Russinovich, R. Bianchini, Serverless in the wild: Characterizing and optimizing the serverless workload at a large cloud provider, in: *2020 USENIX Annual Technical Conference (USENIX ATC 20)*, USENIX Association, 2020, pp. 205–218. URL: <https://www.usenix.org/conference/atc20/presentation/shahrad>.
- [123] T.-Y. Lin, M. Maire, S. Belongie, L. Bourdev, R. Girshick, J. Hays, P. Perona, D. Ramanan, C. L. Zitnick, P. Dollár, Microsoft coco: Common objects in context, 2015. arXiv:1405.0312.
- [124] P. Lai, Q. He, M. Abdelrazek, F. Chen, J. Hosking, J. Grundy, Y. Yang, Optimal Edge User Allocation in Edge Computing with Variable Sized Vector Bin Packing, Springer International Publishing, 2018, p. 230–245. doi:10.1007/978-3-030-03596-9_15.
- [125] N. Young, R. Anderson, S. Chignell, A. Vorster, R. Lawrence, P. Evangelista, A survival guide to landsat preprocessing, *Ecology* 98 (2017) 920–932. doi:10.1002/ecy.1730.
- [126] J. Yang, H. Veeraraghavan, W. van Elmpt, A. Dekker, M. Gooding, G. Sharp, Ct images with expert manual contours of thoracic cancer for benchmarking auto-segmentation accuracy, *Medical physics* 47 (2020) 3250–3255. doi:10.1002/mp.14107.
- [127] B. Donovan, D. B. Work, New york city taxi trip data (2010-2013), 2016.
- [128] J. Huang, M. Xiao, Mobile network traffic prediction based on seasonal adjacent windows sampling and conditional probability estimation, *IEEE Transactions on Big Data* 8 (2022) 1155–1168. doi:10.1109/TBDATA.2020.3014049.
- [129] A. Alsaedi, N. Moustafa, Z. Tari, A. Mahmood, A. Anwar, Ton_iiot telemetry dataset: A new generation dataset of iiot and iiot for data-driven intrusion detection systems, *IEEE Access* 8 (2020) 165130–165150. doi:10.1109/ACCESS.2020.3022862.
- [130] N. Koroniotis, N. Moustafa, E. Sitnikova, B. Turnbull, Towards the development of realistic botnet dataset in the internet of things for network forensic analytics: Bot-iiot dataset, *Future Generation Computer Systems* 100 (2019) 779–796. doi:10.1016/j.future.2019.05.041.
- [131] I. Sharafaldin, A. H. Lashkari, A. A. Ghorbani, Toward generating a new intrusion detection dataset and intrusion traffic characterization, in: *International Conference on Information Systems Security and Privacy*, 2018.
- [132] S. Ali, Y. Li, Learning multilevel auto-encoders for ddos attack detection in smart grid network, *IEEE Access* 7 (2019) 108647–108659.
- [133] M. Al-Hawawreh, E. Sitnikova, N. Aboutorab, X-iiotid: A connectivity- and device-agnostic intrusion dataset for industrial internet of things, 2021. doi:10.21227/mpb6-py55.
- [134] J. Guo, Z. Chang, S. Wang, H. Ding, Y. Feng, L. Mao, Y. Bao, Who limits the resource efficiency of my datacenter: An analysis of alibaba datacenter traces, in: *2019 IEEE/ACM 27th International Symposium on Quality of Service (IWQoS)*, 2019, pp. 1–10. doi:10.1145/3326285.3329074.
- [135] Z. Li, Y. Zhao, J. Han, Y. Su, R. Jiao, X. Wen, D. Pei, Multivariate time series anomaly detection and interpretation using hierarchical inter-metric and temporal embedding, in: *Proceedings of the 27th ACM SIGKDD Conference on Knowledge Discovery & Data Mining, KDD '21*, Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 2021, p. 3220–3230. doi:10.1145/3447548.3467075.
- [136] S. Shen, V. V. Beek, A. Iosup, Statistical characterization of business-critical workloads hosted in cloud datacenters, in: *Proc. 15th IEEE/ACM Int. Sympo. Cluster Cloud Grid Comput.*, 2015.
- [137] Y. Su, Y. Zhao, C. Niu, R. Liu, W. Sun, D. Pei, Robust anomaly detection for multivariate time series through stochastic recurrent neural network, in: *Proceedings of the 25th ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery & Data Mining, KDD '19*, Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 2019, p. 2828–2837. doi:10.1145/3292500.3330672.
- [138] A. Hussain, M. Aleem, Gocj: Google cloud jobs dataset for distributed and cloud computing infrastructures, *Data* 3 (2018). doi:10.3390/data3040038.
- [139] Z. He, P. Chen, X. Li, Y. Wang, G. Yu, C. Chen, X. Li, Z. Zheng, A spatiotemporal deep learning approach for unsupervised anomaly detection in cloud systems, *IEEE Transactions on Neural Networks and Learning Systems* 34 (2023) 1705–1719. doi:10.1109/TNNLS.2020.3027736.
- [140] M. Xu, Z. Fu, X. Ma, L. Zhang, Y. Li, F. Qian, S. Wang, K. Li, J. Yang, X. Liu, From cloud to edge: A first look at public edge platforms, *CoRR abs/2109.03395* (2021). arXiv:2109.03395.
- [141] M. Arlitt, T. Jin, A workload characterization study of the 1998 world cup web site, *IEEE Network* 14 (2000) 30–37. doi:10.1109/65.844498.
- [142] M. Tufano, A. Agarwal, J. Jang, R. Z. Moghaddam, N. Sundaresan, Autodev: Automated ai-driven development, 2024. URL: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2403.08299>. arXiv:2403.08299.