













ARTICLE

Validity Constraints for Data Analysis Workflows

Florian Schintke¹, Ninon De Mecquenem², David Frantz³,
Vanessa Emanuela Guarino^{2,4}, Marcus Hilbrich², Fabian Lehmann²,
Rebecca Sattler², Jan Arne Sparka², Daniel Speckhard^{2,5}, Hermann Stolte²,
Anh Duc Vu², Ulf Leser²

¹Zuse Institute Berlin, Berlin; ²Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin, Berlin; ³Trier University;
⁴Max-Delbrück Center for Molecular Medicine, Berlin; ⁵Fritz-Haber-Institut der
Max-Planck-Gesellschaft, Berlin

ABSTRACT

Porting a scientific data analysis workflow (DAW) to a cluster infrastructure, a new software stack, or even only a new dataset with some notably different properties is often challenging. Despite the structured definition of the steps (tasks) and their interdependencies during a complex data analysis in the DAW specification, relevant assumptions may remain unspecified and implicit. Such hidden assumptions often lead to crashing tasks without a reasonable error message, poor performance in general, non-terminating executions, or silent wrong results of the DAW, to name only a few possible consequences. Searching for the causes of such errors and drawbacks in a distributed compute cluster managed by a complex infrastructure stack, where DAWs for large datasets typically are executed, can be tedious and time-consuming.

We propose validity constraints (VCs) as a new concept for DAW languages to alleviate this situation. A VC is a constraint specifying some logical conditions that must be fulfilled at certain times for DAW executions to be valid. When defined together with a DAW, VCs help to improve the portability, adaptability, and reusability of DAWs by making implicit assumptions explicit. Once specified, VC can be controlled automatically by the DAW infrastructure, and violations can lead to meaningful error messages and graceful behaviour (e.g., termination or invocation of repair mechanisms). We provide a broad list of possible VCs, classify them along multiple dimensions, and compare them to similar concepts one can find in related fields. We also provide a first sketch for VCs' implementation into existing DAW infrastructures.

KEYWORDS

scientific workflow systems; workflow specification languages; validity constraints; dependability; integrity and conformance checking

1. Introduction

Data analysis workflows (DAWs, or scientific workflows) are structured descriptions for scientific datasets' scientific analysis [17, 47]. DAWs' usage becomes increasingly popular in all scientific domains as datasets grow in size, analyses grow in complexity, and demands grow in terms of speed of development, the throughput of analyses, reusability by others, and reproducibility of results [9, 38, 68]. A DAW essentially is a program consisting of individual tasks (programs themselves) with their specific inputs and outputs and a specification of the dependencies between tasks. Executing a DAW means scheduling its tasks on the available computational infrastructure in an order compatible with the data dependencies under some optimization constraints, such as minimal time-to-finish [63, 69, 70]. When DAWs are applied for the analysis of large datasets

and are executed on clusters of distributed compute nodes, managing their execution also involves resource management, coordination of distributed computations, and file handling [36]. Such distributed executions typically rely on the availability of an infrastructure stack consisting of several components such as (distributed) file systems, resource managers, container managers, and runtime monitoring tools [16].

The interfaces and functionality of these components are not standardized and vary substantially between different systems [16]. Therefore, DAW developers often optimize their code to the used infrastructure (e.g., to the number and memory sizes of available compute nodes) and to the particular datasets they wish to analyze (e.g., by hard-coding the number of data partitions for concurrent execution). Furthermore, many tasks of typical DAWs have been written by third parties, providing their specific functionality in a highly optimized manner, while others provide merely ‘glue’ code for data transformation and filtering between original tasks [53, 57]. As a result, real-life DAWs are rather brittle artifacts. They are tightly bound to the infrastructure used during development, suffer from intricacies of the programs they embrace, and only work flawless for a narrow range of inputs. Changes in any of these aspects that violate hard-coded, undocumented design choices quickly lead to unforeseen situations such as: unnecessarily slow DAW executions, underutilized resources, sudden runtime errors, straggler processes, meaningless log entries, non-terminating executions, overflows of buffers (memory, disk, log-space), etc. or, in the worst case, undetected faulty results [40]. The execution often stops with an arbitrary, undocumented, low-level error (‘file not found’, ‘core dumped’, ‘timeout’); even meaningful error messages are often difficult to trace back to the broken task as execution happens on multiple nodes and logs are distributed and created at different levels, ranging from OS to resource managers, workflow engine, and task implementations. While some of these problems also occur in other software-related situations, they are aggravated in DAWs due to their heavy reliance on external programs, generally very high resource requirements, long run times, and the complexity of coordinating distributed executions. Accordingly, reusing a DAW on another infrastructure or for input data with differing properties often requires time-consuming adaptations [46, 60].

In this work, we propose validity constraints (VCs) as a new primitive for DAW languages that help to improve this situation. A VC is a constraint that specifies a logical condition for a particular state or component of a DAW execution. When a VC evaluates to false (i.e., if the VC is ‘broken’), the DAW engine can issue a defined error message at a defined place. VCs may, for instance, control properties of the input and intermediate data files (e.g., minimal or maximal file sizes), of the runtime environment (e.g., minimal available memory or threads), or of the individual task executions (e.g., maximal execution time). We propose to specify VCs within the DAW specification, i.e., as first-class objects of the DAW program itself.

In the following, we first introduce a model for DAWs (§3) and then use this model to formally define general validity constraints (§4). We present a broad list of different concrete types of VCs (§5) and classify these along multiple dimensions, namely the time points when they need checking, the objects they affect, the actions they may trigger, and the infrastructure component that should handle them (§5.1). We relate VCs to similar concepts in other fields, such as integrity constraints in databases or pre-/post-conditions in programming languages, and discuss previous works in the workflow community (§6). Furthermore, we sketch a prototypical implementation of explicit VCs in the state-of-the-art workflow engine Nextflow (§7).

Throughout this work, we focus on simple DAWs performing batch processing and leave an extension to data analysis over streams (e.g., [1]) or to DAWs including cycles or conditionals for future work.

2. User Stories

We collected a small set of typical problems users from different application domains ran into when using and porting DAWs to another platform. Often, they stumbled over and had to solve validity constraints that were implicit and not explicit.

2.1. *Bioinformatics*

In bioinformatics research, we often modify or rewrite workflows, which requires developing short workflows performing RNAseq data treatment. We have to check the overall results for their quality and reasonability, but we are also interested in the effects our modifications may cause on different infrastructures performance-wise.

Workflow Development—Empty and Faulty Files: During the development phase, errors can occur, and faulty files may be written. Such a situation does not necessarily interrupt the workflow directly because output files may exist. Workflow engines typically do not assess a task’s success by using the content of the output files. Identifying the wrongly behaving task in a distributed execution environment can become tedious and time-consuming for the user. For example, we once wanted to sort a file in the middle of a workflow but made a syntax error, which caused an empty output file. In this case, it would have been wonderful if we had a language with validity constraints that would help develop workflows and throw an error when an output file is empty, under a certain size, or does not contain specific characters. For such checks, the addition of monitoring tasks is necessary.

Porting Workflows to New Infrastructures: We recently studied the impact of applying map-reduce on specific bioinformatics tools. While porting a workflow on a heterogeneous distributed infrastructure, we observed a severely reduced workflow runtime. It turned out that only a few nodes could run tasks that should all run in parallel. We found the memory of most of the nodes too small to run these tasks. As a result, we changed the biological model to one with smaller input references and recomputed several experiments. Fortunately, that was possible in this case. But it may not be an option for biologists studying a specific specie, for example. If their reference genome file is too big for the memory of the nodes of a cluster, they would need to set up their workflow on another infrastructure. As such experiments can take a long time (up to 40 hours for treating only one sample), a way to know beforehand that the workflow cannot run (with the full degree of parallelism) on this infrastructure can save a lot of time and shared resources. Instead of executing a workflow by checking tasks’ resource demands only late, when the execution reaches them, a basic overall resource check to stop the workflow from the beginning (before it arrives at the task that breaks the workflow) would be preferable.

“It would be wonderful if I had a language with validity constraints that would help me develop workflows or port them to a new infrastructure. I would have needed constraints that throw an error when an output file is empty, is under a certain size or does not contain specific characters such as those contained in a specific header. Additionally, some constraints that would stop the workflow from the beginning, before it arrives at the task that requires too much resources, would be very helpful.” – Ninon De Mecquenem

2.2. Materials Science

The novel materials database laboratory (NOMAD) is a database that hosts hundreds of millions of material science simulation results, specifically density functional theory (DFT) simulations [22]. These results can be expensive to generate, sometimes taking several hundred GPU hours to compute [24]. As such, the community realized it is vital to share the results to avoid recomputation and to allow for the creation of large datasets for machine learning and data analysis applications [3, 59].

Users can upload data (input/output files) from different density functional theory simulation programs (e.g., VASP, **exciting** FHI-aims) via the terminal or their browser [8, 33, 34]. The upload process data workflow has a clear need for validity constraints. Each simulation program has an associated parser to parse the simulation input/output files that the user uploads [66]. A common pain point is that these simulation programs get updated frequently, and the output files’ format changes or new data fields are added. The NOMAD developers implemented VCs in the upload DAW to check for the existence of specific file names, extension types, and some properties of the input/output files our parser expects [33]. For the DFT code **exciting** for example, we expect files named `INFO.out` and `input.xml` files and particular key-value pairs, such as the ‘total energy’ key and its associated floating point value. This means our DAW first runs a validity constraint at the setup of the upload process to check that required files exist. If these simulation files do not exist the DAW returns an error message to the user that the upload failed since no files that could be parsed were found. The upload process also triggers a resource availability validity constraint that checks whether the user has used up the amount of storage space allocated to every user of NOMAD.

If however, the uploaded files do contain simulation files that can be parsed the DAW then runs a resource check validity constraint. The parsing process can take considerable resources depending on the simulation settings and the DAW only executes the parsing once Kubernetes can allocate sufficient computing resources on the server. After parsing raw values from the uploaded files, a routine called the ‘normalizer’ is applied, which converts parsed values and simulation settings to standard units and standardized terms. For instance, two simulation programs might use different words for the same parameter and NOMAD needs to standardize this (e.g., two different names for the same DFT functional). The normalizer also implements validity constraints on these parsed values to ensure they are reasonable. For instance, the normalizer checks that categorical property to be from a list of expected values or that a floating point value is within a reasonable range (e.g., the band gap of the material must be non-negative). The DAW for NOMAD can be seen in Figure 1.




Figure 1. Overview of the NOMAD upload workflow. Users upload data from a specific DFT simulation code that is then parsed and normalized to make results from different DFT codes comparable.

When we have too many atoms in a unit cell of an input geometry, we observe another weakness of the DAW regarding the crystal structure classification, which is performed in the normalizer step. Large input files with many atoms in the unit cell are common in studies that investigate the effect of impurities on the electronic structure of crystalline materials [12]. Such a situation causes the crystal structure classifier to take a very large amount of computational resources. Currently, we use a timeout validity constraint that stops the classification if the classification takes too long. What might help, however, is to implement a validity constraint that, based on the number of atoms in the unit cell, decides whether to skip the crystal structure classification for unit cells where the number of atoms exceeds a certain threshold. This could help avoid wasting resources on trying to classify systems that are very likely to trigger the timeout validity constraint during classification. Such a threshold could be determined using a logistic regression model trained on previous uploads and workflow executions. Alternatively, the threshold could be dependent on the resources available for computation. In this case, we envisage VCs that are chained together. Meaning, first we check if resources are somewhat limited and if so, we call a VC that checks if the number of atoms in the unit cell is too large. If this is true, it avoids the crystal structure classification all together.

A further valuable addition to the NOMAD upload DAW would be a check for a metamorphic relation between input settings of the simulation and output results of the simulation to predict data quality [66]. Simulations uploaded to NOMAD usually come from different applications. They could be, for instance, super high precision ground state calculations (e.g., using very large basis set sizes) or simulations to find heat and transport properties using cheap calculations (small basis set size), resulting in data of varying precision [10]. Current research has been on using machine learning models to add prediction intervals that act as error bars to the data results parsed by NOMAD [61]. Such annotations would help users better understand how precise and, therefore, how qualified results from NOMAD are for a particular use-case. For example, a formation energy calculated with high precision settings would have small prediction intervals. It shows the NOMAD end user (e.g., an experimentalist) that this result does not need a recalculation.

There are currently many VCs already integrated into the NOMAD DAW and some that we would like to add as discussed above. What would be useful is to have a language that can clearly present the VCs of the DAW in a graphical form in a visual format. We believe this would help end-users and developers better understand the DAW especially when the process fails due to one of these constraints.

2.3. Earth Observation

In the field of Earth Observation (EO), we typically work with large volumes of satellite images, often over large areas (from federal states to continents, sometimes even global) and across long time series (up to 40 years). Our workflows often consist of a preprocessing step to convert the ‘raw’ data into a more analysis-ready form. This preparation typically includes the detection of clouds and their shadows, eliminating atmospheric and other radiometric distortions, and often rearranging the data into so-called data cubes for improved data management and efficiency. This processing step usually runs on each individual satellite image separately, allowing image-based parallelism. Subsequently, workflows generally use map/reduce operations on spatial partitions of the data cube, or even sub-partitions that need specific parts of the images. Typically, all available data for some time period is reduced (averaged in the simplest case) to gen-

erate gap-free predictive features. The feature vectors at the locations of reference data are extracted, a machine learning model trained with some response variable (e.g., land cover labels or tree height values), and the model applied to the feature images to generate a wall-to-wall prediction of the respective response variable (i.e., generating a map). A validation procedure typically follows.

Different IT resources, such as CPUs, RAM, and I/O bandwidth, typically constrain various components of this generic workflow. Depending on the particular workflow, the analyzed data, user parameterization, as well as characteristics of the hardware, the limiting factor might be different each time. For example, a workflow that efficiently runs with Landsat data might fail when switching to Sentinel-2 data (more RAM needed) even when executed with the same parameterization on the same system. Another example would be a workflow that efficiently reads data but would quickly become input-limited when switching from an SSD- to an HDD-based platform, or another RAID configuration. In a noteworthy instance, we encountered an extreme worst-case scenario in which processes would sporadically become defunct while unzipping files from tape storage. As a result, our job would come to a complete halt after a certain period. Resolving this issue required a specific modification of our workflow, including the addition of a hard-coded timeout. Moreover, we had to first copy data from tape to warm storage before executing the workflow again.

Consequently, a one-fits-all default parameterization is usually not feasible, and many user parameters may exist that can tweak the behavior of the workflow. For example, the FORCE software [28] includes parameters to fine-tune partition sizes, reduce the number of parallel processes, or to increase the multithreading to multiprocessing ratio when RAM becomes an issue. However, achieving optimal parameterization needs a deep understanding of the workflow, the underlying data, and their effects on system resources. Additionally, a solid understanding of the platform is essential for effective parameterization. Therefore, the presence of validity constraints capable of identifying common patterns of excessive resource usage, such as idle CPUs or high network latency in I/O-limited scenarios, or memory swapping leading to generic ‘killed’ messages in RAM-limited situations, would significantly aid in transferring workflows from one system to another. Additionally, it would facilitate a smoother onboarding process for new users, reducing the learning curve required.

3. Fundamentals

In this section, we formally define a DAW and its execution steps, sketch an abstract infrastructure for executing DAWs in a distributed system, and introduce scheduling as the process of executing a DAW on an infrastructure. Based on these models, we then define two types of general validity constraints (static and dynamic) as new first-class primitives for DAW specification languages, and use them to derive the concept of valid and correct DAW execution.

Our DAW semantic is simple by intention; its purpose is to lay the grounds for the following sections, which will precisely define the connection between elements of a DAW and VCs and the impact that VCs may have on DAW execution. Conceptually, our semantics is similar to Petri-Nets [21] and dataflow languages [39]. Elaborated semantics of real workflow systems have been described elsewhere (e.g., [62, 73]); [45] gives a nice overview of different formal models in distributed computation.

3.1. A Formal Model of DAWs

We define a logical DAW (see below for the distinction to physical DAWs) as follows.

Definition 3.1 (*Logical DAW*). A logical DAW W is a directed acyclic graph

$$W = (T, D, L, \varphi, t_s, t_e) \quad (1)$$

where T is the set of tasks, $D = \{(t', t) \in T^2\}$ is the set of dependencies between pairs of tasks, L is a set of labels, $\varphi : D \rightarrow L$ is a function assigning labels to dependencies, $t_s \in T : \nexists(t', t_s) \in D$ is the start task, and $t_e \in T : \nexists(t_e, t') \in D$ is the end task. Intuitively, tasks are the programs to be executed for performing individual analysis steps, while dependencies model the data flow between tasks. The dependencies' label is an abstract representation of the specific data that is exchanged between two tasks. The start task t_s does not depend on any other task and initiates the first steps of the analysis by sending the DAW's input data to its dependent tasks. Similarly, the end task t_e has no dependent tasks, and the labels of its incoming dependencies represent the results of the DAW. Figure 2 (upper part) shows a graphical representation of an example DAW consisting of six tasks plus start and end tasks; arcs represent dependencies.

DAWs are executed by running their tasks in an order in which at all times all dependencies are satisfied. To formally define this semantics, we introduce the notation of the state of a DAW and, later, that of valid states.

Definition 3.2 (*State of a DAW*). The state S^W of a DAW W is a function that assigns each task in the set T to one of three possible states:

$$S^W : T \rightarrow \{F, R, O\} \quad (2)$$

Here, F means 'finished', R means 'ready' and O means 'open'.

Definition 3.3 (*Valid States*). The state S^W of a DAW W is *valid*, iff the following conditions hold:

- $S(t_s) = F$,
- $\forall (t', t) \in D \forall t \in T$ with $(t', t) \in D$: if $S(t) = R$, then $S(t') = F$,
- $\forall (t', t) \in D \forall t \in T$: If $\forall t'$ with $(t', t) \in D$: $S(t') = F$, then $S(t) = R$, and
- for all other $t \in T : S(t) = O$.

The initial state S_0 of a DAW W is the state in which (1) the start task is finished: $S_0(t_s) = F$, (2) all tasks t' depending on t_s are ready: $S_0(t') = R$, and (3) all other tasks have state 'open'.

Intuitively, these rules guarantee that: (a) the start task is always in the 'finished' state; (b) a task is 'ready' only when all its predecessors are 'finished'; (c) any task with all its predecessors 'finished' has state 'ready'; and (d) all tasks not fulfilling any of the previous three conditions (a)–(c) are in the 'open' state. The initial state of a DAW is the state before its execution.

3.2. DAW Infrastructure and Execution Semantics

Based on a DAW's state, we next define the semantics of a DAW execution.




Figure 2. A logical (upper part) DAW and its physical counterpart (lower part).

Definition 3.4 (*Execution of a DAW*). An execution E of DAW W is a sequence of states $E = \langle S_0, \dots, S_n \rangle$ such that (a) S_0 is the DAW's initial state, (b) all $S_i, i \in \{0, \dots, n\}$, are valid, and (c) for all steps S_i, S_j with $j = i + 1$, it holds that

- If $S_i(t) = \text{F}$, then $S_j(t) = \text{F}$
- If $S_i(t) = \text{R}$, then $S_j(t) \in \{\text{F}, \text{R}\}$
- If $S_i(t) = \text{O}$, then $S_j(t) \in \{\text{O}, \text{R}\}$
- There exists at least one $t \in T$ where $S_i(t) \neq S_j(t)$.

We say that an execution E of a DAW W has executed W when $S_n(t_e) = \text{F}$.

Intuitively, the execution of a DAW progresses by iteratively executing tasks that are ready to run. After execution, their state switches to **F**; tasks in state **O** must first proceed to state **R** before they can run. We make no assumptions regarding the order in which tasks that are ready to run at the same state are executed, nor do we assume only one task executes per execution step. But we do require at least one task to change its state between successive DAW states. Note that this change may be purely logical, by switching some task's state from **O** to **R**.

Logical DAWs are abstract objects. However, in real life, a DAW execution requires the start of programs representing a workflow task on a particular node of the available cluster and the management of the inputs and outputs of these programs. Figure 3 depicts a light architecture of the components involved in such a DAW execution. It encompasses the DAW specification in a proper DAW language and its compiler (*comp.*), the DAW engine steering the DAW execution (EE), a scheduler performing the task-to-node assignments (S), a resource manager and monitoring system controlling the resource assignment and task execution at the global and local level (RM, M), the individual nodes for executing tasks, and a distributed file system for data exchange




Figure 3. A simple DAW infrastructure architecture.

between tasks (DFS)¹. Clearly, many other architectures are possible, but for the sake of this work, such an idealized architecture suffices and allows later determining the responsible component to control a particular type of VC. With such an architecture in mind, we can now define a physical DAW.

Definition 3.5 (Physical DAW). Given a logical DAW W and a set C of compute nodes interconnected by a network, the physical DAW $W' = (W, M)$ augments W with a function $M : T \rightarrow C$ that maps every task to a compute node.

C is an abstract representation of a compute cluster, whereas M is an assignment (schedule) that maps tasks to nodes. The definition of a *DAW execution* E can be naturally extended from logical DAWs to physical DAWs. Here, assignment M determines where a task whose state switches from **R** to **F** is executed.

Figure 2 shows an example of the transition of a logical DAW to a physical DAW. In the physical DAW, each logical task is assigned to a node for execution, and each dependency is implemented as communication between nodes.

4. A Formal Definition of VCs for DAWs

Having introduced logical and physical DAWs and their execution semantics, we can now define validity constraints (VCs) as logical formulas over the components of a DAW infrastructure and of a DAW execution, i.e., tasks, dependencies, executions, and schedules. Different VCs will address various properties of these components (see §5).

Definition 4.1 (Properties). Let $W = (T, D, L, \varphi, t_s, t_e)$ be a DAW and C be a cluster, i.e., a set of compute nodes. We model arbitrary properties of elements of T , D , and C as property functions:

- P_T is a function that assigns properties to tasks from T ,
- P_D is a function that assigns properties to labels of dependencies from D , and
- P_C is a function that assigns properties to nodes from C .

We make no assumptions on the specific nature of such properties, such as data type

¹Of course, other means of data exchange, such as in-memory channels, or mounting of remote file systems are possible as well.

or number of parameters they take. In §5, we will give a diverse list of concrete (static or dynamic) properties that we consider particularly useful for DAW management.

4.1. Validity Constraints

We discern two types of validity constraints: Static VCs address static properties, i.e., properties which always have the same value for a given property of a task/node/label, or while dynamic VCs address dynamic properties, i.e., properties whose value may change during a DAW execution.

Definition 4.2 (*Static VC*). Let $W = (T, D, L, \varphi, t_s, t_e)$ be a DAW and C be a cluster. Let P_T , P_D , and P_C be their respective property functions. A static validity constraint v is a formula of any of the following forms (with \mathcal{C} being an arbitrary constant and $\square \in \{=, <, >, \leq, \geq\}$):

- $P_T(t) \square \mathcal{C}$ for any task t from T ,
- $P_D(\varphi(d)) \square \mathcal{C}$ for the label $\varphi(d)$ of any dependency d from D , and
- $P_C(c) \square \mathcal{C}$ for any node c from C ,

We call VCs of these three forms *static* because they are independent of a DAW’s execution. Intuitively, this implies that they must evaluate to the same value all the time before, during, and after a workflow’s execution. An example of a static VC would be the minimum size of main memory that must be available on a node on which a given task is about to be scheduled, or the availability of at least one node with a given minimum memory size within the cluster.

The second class of VCs are *dynamic* VCs, which constrain properties of tasks, dependencies, or nodes that may change during a DAW’s execution. For instance, executing a particular task in the middle of a DAW may require the existence (or minimal size of a certain format) of a file that is created by previous steps in the very same DAW execution. Introducing such dynamic VCs requires first defining the scope of a step within an execution.

Definition 4.3 (*Scope of execution steps*). Let $W = (T, D, L, \varphi, t_s, t_e)$ be a DAW, E an execution of W , and M a schedule for W over a cluster C . Let P_T , P_D , and P_C be their respective property functions. Furthermore, for a step s from E , let $X(s) \subset T$ be the set of tasks of W that are executed in this step, i.e., whose state changes from R to F; let $Y^i(s) \subset D$ be the set of dependencies from which tasks in $X(s)$ depend (incoming edges of all tasks executed in this step, each representing an input for a task); let $Y^o(s) \subset D$ be the set of dependencies outgoing from tasks in $X(s)$ (outgoing edges, each representing an output of a task); and let $C(s, t) \in C$ be the node on which M schedules task $t \in X(s)$ for execution. We call the tuple $scope(s) = (X(s), Y^i(s), Y^o(s), C(s, t))$ the scope of step s .

Definition 4.4 (*Dynamic VC*). A dynamic validity constraint V over the scope $scope(s) = (X(s), Y^i(s), Y^o(s), C(s, t))$ of a step s of a valid execution of a DAW W is a formula of any of the following forms (with \mathcal{C} being an arbitrary constant and $\square \in \{=, <, >, \leq, \geq\}$):

- $P_T(s) \square \mathcal{C}$ for a property of any task $t \in X(s)$,
- $P_C(s, t) \square \mathcal{C}$ for a property of node $c = C(s, t)$,
- $P_D^i(s) \square \mathcal{C}$ for a property of a label $\varphi(d)$ with $d \in Y^i(s)$, and
- $P_D^o(s) \square \mathcal{C}$ for a property of a label $\varphi(d)$ with $d \in Y^o(s)$.

4.2. Correct DAWs and Correct DAW Executions

We defined VCs as logical rules over the components (static) or steps (dynamic) of a DAW that evaluate to either true or false. However, we so far did not describe what consequences the evaluation of a such a rule should have. Intuitively, VCs are intended as sensors, where an evaluation to ‘true’ implies that no issue was detected, while an evaluation to ‘false’ points to a concrete problem. To formally define this intuition, we next introduce the notion of correct DAW setups, where a DAW setup is a combination of a concrete DAW and a concrete cluster on which it should be executed, and correct DAW executions. Recall that we discerned static VCs, whose evaluation always returns the same result for a given combination of DAW and cluster, from dynamic VCs, which are defined over *executions* of DAWs.

Definition 4.5 (*Correct DAW setup*). Let $W = (T, D, L, \varphi, t_s, t_e)$ be a DAW, C a cluster, i.e., a set of interconnected compute nodes, and V a set of static VCs over P_T , P_D , and P_C . We say that the tuple (W, C) is correct with respect to V when all constraints in V evaluate to true.

We will omit C when it is clear from the context and simply say that W is correct for V .

Definition 4.6 (*Correct DAW execution*). Let $W = (T, D, L, \varphi, t_s, t_e)$ be a DAW, E an execution of W , M a schedule for W over a cluster C , V^s be a set of static VCs over W and C , and V^d be a set of dynamic VCs over W , E and C . We say that E is correct if and only if:

- (W, C) is a correct setup for V^s , and
- All $v \in V^d$ evaluate to true in all steps $s \in E$.

Accordingly, an execution is not correct whenever either one of the static constraints is hurt or one of the dynamic VCs in at least one step of the execution. We call a step $s \in E$ for which all $v \in V^d$ hold a *correct step*; all other steps are called *erroneous*. Naturally, the first erroneous step is of particular importance, as usually (but not necessarily) DAW execution will stop at this point.

Our notion of VCs clearly has limitations in terms of expressiveness, and we can envision several extensions. For instance, we only introduced VCs that affect only single steps, single tasks, single dependencies, and single nodes. Thus, we have no notion for expressing constraints that, for instance, ensure (1) that two consecutive tasks in a workflow are scheduled on the same node (because we know of side effects not modelled in the DAW), or (2) that the total size of all intermediate files may not exceed a certain threshold (because there is a quota on available disk space). We leave such types of VCs for future work.

5. Concrete Validity Constraints for DAWs

After having defined DAWs, their components, VCs, and the formal relationships between DAWs and VCs in an abstract manner, we shall now introduce a broad collection of different concrete VCs. We do not aim for completeness but for a representative set that illustrates the spectrum of functionalities that can be covered when using VCs as first-class primitives for DAW languages. Naturally, one can envision further constraints up to arbitrary user-defined VCs, provided a proper specification language for them is

defined. Note that none of the VCs we discuss is completely new; instead, many of them can be found either implicitly or explicitly in other research fields, such as integrity constraints in databases or pre-/post conditions in programming languages; we shall discuss these related lines of research in §6.

We shall present VCs in three steps. We shall first list them grouped by the component of a DAW system they address, namely swetup, task, or file, accompanied by an intuitive explanation and a classification into ‘static’ or ‘dynamic’. In §5.1, we distinguish several properties of VCs to enable a more fine-grained distinction. These properties will allow to systematically characterize VCs in §5.2.

Based on related ideas in other fields and own experience in DAW development, we consider the following VCs as particularly important. We group them according to the part of a DAW / infrastructure they primarily affect. Note that not all of them have the same level of abstractions; in some cases, we rather describe a type of VC than a concrete VC. For instance, we introduce a general VC for file properties instead of one distinct VC for every such property.

Setup-related VCs

This set of VCs are related to the particular combination of a DAW and the cluster it should be executed on. Two of them are intended to be controlled before the DAW execution starts and are thus static. The third is inherently dynamic.

resource availability: The nodes within a cluster must fulfill certain requirements in terms of available resources, such as minimal main memory, minimal number of allocated CPU hours, or availability of a GPU of a certain type. This VC could be defined with two different semantics: In *at-least one node*, at least one node of the cluster must fulfill the constraints; in *all nodes*, all nodes must do so.

file must exist: File must exist and must be accessible. Thus may, for instance, affect certain reference or metadata files, but can also be used to ensure availability of input files of the DAW. This VC could also be defined either in *at-least one node* or *all nodes* semantics; however, the latter is more common.

infrastructure health: A node respond to request from the DAW engine prior or during a DAW execution. Such constraints are often implemented with the help of a heartbeat-style infrastructure.

Task-related VCs

Task-related VCs describe properties of a concrete task of a DAW. Many of them can be defined either statically or dynamically.

executable must exist: During execution, any concrete task must be scheduled on some node in the cluster. The program executing this task must be available on this node. Can be defined statically, which requires that all nodes in the cluster maintain executables of all tasks in the DAW, or dynamically, which allows for temporary installation (and subsequent deletion) of executables of tasks as part of their scheduling.

resource availability: Before starting a task on a given node, certain requirements in terms of available resources must be fulfilled, such as minimal main memory, minimal number of allocated CPU hours, or availability of a GPU of a certain type.

configuration parameters: Parameters for execution of a task within a DAW must be valid, e.g., have a value within a certain range or of a certain format. Is typically

defined dynamically as many arguments of tasks are created only at runtime, such as the names of input / output files.

licence valid: Some tasks might require a valid licence to start. Can be defined statically (test for general availability of a valid license for all tasks in a DAW) or dynamically (test for concrete availability of a valid license as part of task scheduling). The latter is important then the number of possible concurrently running tasks is constrained by a volume contract.

metamorphic relations: The input/output-relationship of a task can be characterized by a reversible function. After executing a task, the concrete pair of input/output must have this relationship.

tasks end within limits: The runtime of a particular tasks can be constrained by a VC on its maximal runtime. Such a constraint can help to identify stragglers.

task ends correctly: Execution of a particular task must end with a predefined state or output message.

File-related VCs

File-related VCs control the management of files within the infrastructure. Using our definitions from §3, this also encompasses dependencies and hence data exchange between tasks.

file must exist: File must exist and must be accessible before starting a task on a node.

file properties: A file must fulfill certain criteria, such as file size, format, checksum over content, or creation time. Can be defined statically (properties of metadata files) or dynamically (properties of files generated during DAW execution).

folder exists: Certain folders must exist and must be readable before/after execution of a DAW/task.

5.1. Properties of VCs

We so-far classified VCs only very broadly into two classes based on the point in time when they can be checked in principle. However, there are many more dimensions by which VCs can be characterized. For instance, violations of VCs can have different levels of severity; while some must result in an immediate stop of the DAW execution, such as in the case when a task in the DAW requires an amount of main memory that none of the nodes of a cluster can provide, others might be interpreted rather as a warning, such as an improbable yet not impossible file size. Some VCs must be checked before a task starts, such as the available resources on the node it is scheduled on, some after a task ends, such as its result status, and a third class of VCs requires continuous control during task execution, for instance to ensure termination within a runtime limit.

Table 1 provides six different properties (or dimensions) by which VCs can be characterized. These dimensions are mostly independent of each other and all have their own importance. For example, knowing whether a constraint is ‘hard’ or ‘soft’ is equivalent to knowing whether it expresses a mandatory requirement or not. The ‘affected object’ informs how to track the constraint and what might be affected if it is violated.

Such a more fine-grained classification for VCs enables differentiating techniques and therefore enables a common shared understanding and objective discussion about VCs. Newly found VCs can be contrasted and grouped with other validity constraints using a given classification. Classifications can also help identifying new VCs, by looking for a VC that fulfills a certain combination of properties.

Table 1. Dimensions by which Validity Constraints can be characterized.

Dimension	Description and possible values
Severity	Describes whether a VC must be fulfilled or not; non-mandatory VCs implement plausibility checks. Possible values: <i>hard</i> implies immediate stop of DAW execution; <i>soft</i> : issues a warning, for instance in the DAW log.
Affected object	Describes the type of object addressed by a VC. This dimension was used to group VC in the previous text. Possible values: <i>setup</i> , <i>task</i> , and <i>file</i> .
Type	Describes the type of a VC. Possible values: <i>static</i> ; <i>dynamic</i> . See also §4.1.
Time of check	Describes the point in time when a VC should be checked. Possible values: <i>before</i> , \rightarrow : check before task starts on a given node; <i>after</i> , \leftarrow : check after a task has finished; <i>during</i> , \sim : check periodically during task execution.
Component	Describes the component in the DAW architecture (see §3.2 and Figure 3) which is responsible for controlling a VC. Possible values: <i>execution engine</i> EE; <i>scheduler</i> S; <i>resource manager</i> RM; <i>monitoring</i> M.
Recoverable	Describes whether the DAW system can try to recover from the error automatically. Possible values: <i>yes</i> (+), <i>no</i> (-), <i>maybe</i> (\pm).

5.2. Formal Characterization of VCs

In this section, we introduce a classification for Validity Constraints for DAWs. First, we will explain why a classification is helpful in this context. Then, we present the properties alias dimensions we deem relevant to classify VCs and then classify the introduced VCs in §5 accordingly.

Using the properties and dimensions of Table 1, we classify the selected VCs from §5 in Table 2 and observe the following general trends and traits for the selected VCs. Most VCs are either hard constraints or can be both hard and soft constraints. This characteristic is most likely because there is less value in a VC that never indicates an error. There are two big groups regarding the time a VC is checked: many VCs are checkable either ‘before’ or ‘during’ the execution; few VCs are checkable ‘after’ the execution. This deviation is most likely caused by preconditions and invariants being more common than means to check postconditions. The most predominant component for checking VCs is the EE, which is tightly coupled to almost all of the dynamic VCs, as the EE is inherent to the execution. The time of check also correlates with the discreteness of the checks. If a VCs’ time of check is ‘before’ or ‘after’, it is usually ‘discrete’. If the time of check is ‘during’, the VC is usually ‘continuous’. As we do not have enough examples of ‘triggered’ constraints, we cannot point out similar correlations for those. Many VCs are not limited to workflows but are also applicable in related fields, i.e., they represent more general constraints. Many constraint violations are ‘recoverable’ as violating them can be caused by spurious problems.

6. Validity Constraints in Related Fields

In the following, we first look at implicitly and explicitly defined VCs one can find in research fields related to workflow technology. Technologies similar to VCs are commonly used throughout different subjects, yet usually under different names and often not in an explicit manner. Many of the VCs we detected have already been covered in §5. Others do not apply to scientific workflows, are highly domain-specific, or go technically beyond the expressiveness of our underlying model. In §6.2, we discuss prior work in VC-related concepts in scientific workflow research and conclude this section in §6.3 with a survey of validity checking mechanisms in selected current workflow languages or systems, namely CWL, Nextflow, Snakemake, Airflow, Spark, and Flink.

Table 2. Validity Constraints for workflows.

Constraint	$h(\text{ard})/s(\text{oft})/b(\text{oth})$	affected object	time of check	responsible component	$s(\text{tatic})/d(\text{ynamic})/p(\text{osthoc})$	recoverable?
<i>setup-related:</i>						
resource availability	h	$P_C(c)$ or $P_T(s)$	$\rightarrow\{ \sim\}$	S,M	d	+
file must exist	h	$P_D^i(s), P_D^o(s)$	$\rightarrow\{ \}\leftarrow$	EE	d/p	\pm
infrastructure health	b	$P_C(c), P_C(s, t)$	$\{ \sim\}$	M	d	+
<i>task-related:</i>						
executable must exist	h	$P_T(s)$	$\rightarrow\{ \}$	EE	d	-
resource availability	h	$P_C(c)$ or $P_T(s)$	$\rightarrow\{ \sim\}$	S,M	d	+
configuration parameters	b	$P_T(t)$	$\rightarrow\{ \}$	EE	d	-
licence valid	h	$P_T(t)$	$\rightarrow\{ \}$	EE	d	\pm
metamorphic relations	b	$P_T(t)$	$\}\leftarrow$	EE	d/p	\pm
tasks end within limits	h	$P_T(s)$	$\{ \sim\}$	S,EE	d/p	\pm
task ends correctly	b	$P_T(s)$	$\}\leftarrow$	EE	d	\pm
<i>file-related:</i>						
file properties	b	$P_D^i(s), P_D^o(s)$	$\rightarrow\{ \}\leftarrow$	EE,RM	d	\pm
file must exist	h	$P_D^i(s), P_D^o(s)$	$\rightarrow\{ \}\leftarrow$	EE	d/p	\pm
folder exists	h	$P_D^o(s)$	$\rightarrow\{ \}$	EE	d	\pm

6.1. VCs in Other Fields of Research

First, we look at VCs in other fields of research.

Database Management Systems: Relational databases store data in the tabular format following the relational data model, essentially consisting of tables, attributes, and values of some basic data type. This data can be queried by declarative languages like SQL [29], which computes a result relation from algebraic expressions of selection, project, and join operations over base tables. Since the early days of the relational model, it was enriched by so-called integrity constraints (ICs) [32], which are logical formulas describing some property of the values of an attribute that must always be true. Typical systems differentiate between different types of constraints:

- Constraints on individual values, such as value range constraints, enumerations of allowed values, or ‘not null’ constraints.
- Constraints referring to all values of an attribute, especially the ‘unique’ constraint demanding that all values of an attribute are pair-wise different.
- Constraints that relate values of one attribute to values of another attribute. The most prominent constraint of such kind is the ‘foreign key’ constraint, demanding that every value of a dependent attribute is also present as value of another attribute in a different table.

On top of these, many database engines also allow the programming of user-defined constraints by using ‘trigger’ operations, which are executed upon specific actions performed on some value in the database, such as insertion or deletion of a tuple.

ICs for databases apparently are highly similar to VCs for workflows. However, there are also important differences. The most important one is that integrity constraints are defined over a given and persistent database. Once defined, they are enforced on each change request of the data in the database. As a consequence, the change is accepted or refuted. Databases thus can never be in an inconsistent state regarding a defined set of active ICs. In contrast, VCs for workflows are defined over a transient process of computations and must be controlled alongside the DAW’s execution progress. Some VCs aim to prevent inconsistent states, especially those checking the pre-conditions of a task, while some can only react after an inconsistent state occurs, such as post-conditions of tasks. Furthermore, current database systems are monolithic systems that incorporate IC control in their code base at defined places, while DAWs are executed over infrastructures composed of multiple independent components, which makes implementation of a VC control machinery more challenging (see §7).

Model Checking is a technique for automatic formal verification of finite state systems. The model checking process can be divided into three main tasks [13]:

- *Modeling*: Convert a design (software, hardware, DAW) into a formalism accepted by a model-checking tool.
- *Specification*: State the properties a design must satisfy (i.e., some logical formalism, such as modal or temporal logics).
- *Verification*: Check if the model satisfies the specification (ideally completely automatic).

Especially the second task (specification) and the first task (modeling) are related to VCs. During modeling, the DAW is translated into a Kripke transition system [13, Ch. 3], an automaton with states (tasks) and transitions. Each valid path in the Kripke transition represents a valid execution path in the DAW, thus ensuring that the necessary task execution order is respected. Temporal logic [13, Ch. 2] is used, for example, to define VCs locally or globally in the specification. In other words, the constraints can be on the state (task) level, which can indicate that there exists a task along the path that fulfills a given condition or constraint. Furthermore, constraints can also be defined on the path-level, meaning that there exists a path generated from a state that holds true for a given condition [6].

Business Process Management (BPM) studies workflow processes in business-related areas to improve business process performance. There are different relevant perspectives to consider. The *control-flow perspective* models the ordering of activities and is often the backbone of BPM models. Organizational units, roles, authorizations, IT systems, and equipment are summarized and defined in the *resource perspective*. Furthermore, the *data or artifact perspective* deals with modeling decisions, data creation, forms, etc. The *time perspective* addresses task durations but also takes fixed task deadlines into account. Lastly, the *function perspective* describes activities and related applications [65]. Process models can use conditional events to define business rules. A conditional event allows a process instance to start or progress only when the corresponding business rule evaluates to true. When handling exceptions in BPM, validity constraints can be internal (caused inside the task) or external (caused by an external

event) exceptions. Another constraint is the activity timeout, where an activity exceeds the predefined time for execution [23].

Software Engineering and Programming Languages: Software engineering is concerned with the design, implementation, and maintenance of software systems. Data types are one of the tools to help in this process, as type specifications define the interface of how different components in a system are allowed to interact. Using inappropriate data types will lead to unspecified and likely invalid behavior. Thus, enforcing type constraints of the processed data is critical for ensuring the validity of software systems.

Fortunately, most programming languages these days support a kind of type checking. Dynamically typed languages such as Python do this at runtime, whereas statically typed ones such as Java check the type constraints already at compile time. If a type constraint is violated, an appropriate error message is usually returned, so the developer knows there is a conflict of mismatching types.

Assertions and exceptions are other constructs provided by many programming languages to check user-defined validity constraints at runtime, for example, to check for the existence of a particular file. Assertions are also commonly used to specify the correct behavior in a software test. Bertrand Meyer [49] designed the Eiffel programming language to increase the quality and reliability of software systems. Meyer coined the term Design-by-Contract, a central concept of the Eiffel language, which is a methodology to design correct and reliable systems using assertions, preconditions, postconditions, and class invariants. Design-by-Contract has its roots in Hoare Logic [55] for proving program correctness.

Wasserman and Blum [67] proposed result checking, where a system has a separate program whose only purpose is to check the correctness of the results. The difference from software testing is that the checker needs to satisfy stringent properties regarding its reliability and running time.

The Rust programming language² [41] recently emerged as a language designed with safety in mind, especially for concurrent programs. Rust programs can be guaranteed memory safe by using the borrow checker that validates references to memory. Through its ownership system, Rust controls who has what access to memory locations, avoiding situations where multiple threads have mutable access to the same variable concurrently.

Service Composition and Interface Constraints: The topic of automatic service composition is also the main focus of the book by Tan and Zhou [64]. It discusses, for example, the verification of service-based workflows, quality-of-service (QoS) aspects, deadlock detection, and dead path elimination. Based on interface descriptions they verify the automatic composability of workflows. As a foundation to analyze properties (e.g., deadlock detection) of DAWs Petri nets [21], π -calculus [50], process algebra [26], or automata (linear temporal logic) [4] can be used. When services or tasks are not directly composable, one can look for mediator tasks that make interfaces compatible. In terms of validity constraints, the work mainly focuses on the validity of interfaces and data formats between tasks, which may be overcome with mediators.

Machine Learning Operations (MLOps) encompasses the end-to-end process of employing machine learning models and pipelines in application contexts. For instance, a video streaming service may utilize a machine learning model to recommend content

²<https://www.rust-lang.org/>

to users or to place relevant advertisements on its platform. Typically, the model is embedded in an end-to-end pipeline designed, developed, and continually integrated into application contexts. This integration involves reoccurring tasks, such as the curation, filtering, and preprocessing of datasets, plus the design, training, and validation of models [5].

Validity constraints for models in the context of MLOps address the robustness and prediction quality of models. While it is usually hard to comprehensively model correctness throughout entire machine learning pipelines, error cases can be anticipated and checked in the pipeline input and output. For instance,

- Quality metrics may cross-check a pipeline output to detect performance deterioration.
- Checks for changes in the distributions of input data features may detect drifts that could lead to a decreased predictive performance. More specifically, a feature may be assumed to always lie in a particular value range or have a specific value distribution.
- Checking that infrastructure requirements are satisfied (e.g., available GPU memory to load and execute a model checkpoint) can prevent exceptions or application crashes.

Machine learning pipelines are often designed for diverse infrastructures and complex, custom technology stacks. While research on platforms to support the MLOps process exists (e.g., TFX [5], MLFlow [71], or Kubeflow [7]), there exists no widely accepted standard platform for end-to-end machine learning operations. Also, automated and comprehensive validity checking is not part of their functionality. Yet, pipelines undergo continuous changes, driven by trends in real-world input data, conformance regulations, AI fairness issues, or AI safety concerns. Each change has the potential to introduce errors to the pipeline. Hence, the need for standardized quality assurance solutions in the MLOps process is apparent.

6.2. Previous Work on VCs for Scientific Workflows

Scientific Workflows are DAWs in the scientific data analysis domain (§1). Typically, they build on a Scientific Workflow Management System, which encompass workflow languages, execution engines, a form of resource management, and a form of data exchange; the later two components are often delegated to infrastructure components like shared file systems or resource managers. Over the years, many such systems were developed with differing features and capabilities [19]. Validity constraints—although they are a vital ingredient for portability, adaptability, and dependability as discussed in §1—often remain implicit and unchecked in these systems [9]. Some research addresses only very specialized aspects, such as Rynge et al. who focus solely on detecting low-level data corruption (as hard VCs), for instance, after caused by network or hardware errors [58]. In the following, we discuss some prominent systems or perspectives from the viewpoint of validity constraints.

Semantic Workflows: Semantic workflows denotes a class of workflow languages that build on an elaborated, often domain-specific type system or ontology [31]. With this ontology, data that is to be exchanged between tasks are assigned a specialized type (such as “genomic reads from machine X” instead of the basic “set of strings”), tasks are assigned a type (such as “read mapper for genomic reads”), and the IO channels of tasks

are assigned types. Types are arranged in a specialization hierarchy which allows inference regarding type compatibility or workflow planning [43]. For instance, Lamprecht introduced a workflow language that allows for the definition of semantic constraints, leading to methodologies for model-guarded and model-driven workflow design [44]. Another example is the semantics-based ‘Wings’ approach to workflow development and workflow planning [30].

Types, i.e., semantically defined concepts, together with compatibility checking are a form of validity constraints. They are usually defined statically and can be checked before workflow execution based on annotation of the workflow components. They operate on a different level than the VCs we defined. However, such systems are (yet) rarely used in practise because they require all data files and all tasks to be used in a workflow to be annotated with concepts from a consistent ontology. In quickly changing fields like scientific research where DAWs are often explorative, this requirement makes development cumbersome and inflexible. It also requires significant effort in community-driven ontology design and maintenance [37].

AWDL Based Workflows and Data Constraints: Qin and Fahringer [56] use the abstract workflow description language (AWDL), an XML-based language expressing workflows. AWDL allows describing the directed acyclic graph (DAG) of tasks with their conditions and execution properties (parallel, sequential, alternative paths), etc. Further, it allows specifying constraints for the runtime environment, optimization, and execution steering. The approach follows a UML-based workflow modeling and modularization. The specification of data representations and activity types with ontologies aims for automatic semantic workflow composition and automatic data conversion.

AWDL supports simple properties and constraints per data port and task, such as read-only or read-write data, expected output size, memory usage, required CPU architecture, etc. It also supports constraints on the data distribution like “a task only needs the first index”, “a task can work on single items”, “a task needs a window of x items”, etc. The typed data sources and sinks help the automatic composability of workflows and necessary data conversion tasks.

Temporal Constraints: Liu, Yang, and Chen discuss temporal constraints in scientific workflow systems [48]. They argue that fixed time constraints are often too strict, and their violation not necessarily indicates a failing (or otherwise wrong) workflow execution. Instead, they introduce the concept of probabilistic temporal constraints, e.g., 90% of tasks of class ‘A’ finish within 60 minutes. They distinguish the components of *setting* temporal constraints, *monitoring* temporal consistency, and *handling* temporal violations. Checkpoints can be used for re-execution and temporal checks. To overcome constraint violations they distinguish *statistically recoverable* temporal violations and *statistically non-recoverable* temporal violations. The former can be handled by doing nothing, or re-scheduling, and the latter by adding resources, stopping and restarting tasks or workflows, or workflow restructuring. Table 3 (copied from [48, p. 57]) lists several scientific workflow systems and their capabilities to handle temporal constraints. In essence, (statistical) temporal constraints can be defined for (sub-)DAWs to check the validity of executions.

Provenance and Reproducibility Constraints: In their high-level vision paper [18], Deelman et al. state (emphasis added): “During and after the workflow execution, the capture of provenance information and its use *to validate performance and*

Table 3. Overview on the support of temporal QoS constraints [48]

Scientific Workflow Systems	Modelling Language	Modelling Tool	Temporal Constraint Specification	Temporal Constraint Management	Temporal Constraint Verification
ASKALON	AGWL	Language based Graph based	Supported	N/A	N/A
CROWN	GPEL	Language based	N/A	N/A	N/A
DAGMan	DAG	Language based	Supported	N/A	N/A
GridBus	xWFL	Language based Graph based	Supported	N/A	N/A
JOpera	JVCL	Language based Graph based	Supported	N/A	N/A
Kepler	SDF	Graph based	Supported	N/A	N/A
SwinDeW-G	XPDL/ BPEL	Graph based	Supported	Supported	Supported
Taverna	SCUFL	Language based Graph based	Supported	N/A	N/A
Triana	WSFL	Language based Graph based	N/A	N/A	N/A
UNICORE	BPEL	Language based Graph based	N/A	N/A	N/A

correctness and to *support data reuse and reproducibility* are areas where *much research is needed.*” The overview paper identifies a bunch of relevant challenges. Unfortunately, concrete solutions are still missing for most of them. The mentioned provenance data could help to check reproducibility and predictable performance, for example. Another important aspect the paper discusses is the accuracy and similarity of results to guarantee scientific reproducibility. A DAW’s re-execution in another execution environment raises the question: When are result deviations significant and become unacceptable? Typically, we cannot expect byte-level equivalence of results, especially when dealing with floating-point arithmetic. Although, the results for the same inputs should resemble each other to a certain degree for sound workflows.

Related to the issue of reproducibility is the topic of consistency checking for provenance. For instance, the PROV model for provenance defines several constraints on concrete instances of the model [52]. Specifically, four types of constraints are defined: uniqueness constraints, event ordering constraints, impossibility constraints, and type constraints. From a workflow perspective, especially event ordering constraints are relevant, which are similar to our notion of (valid) executions introduced in §3.2. However, PROV is a model for storing provenance information and not for executing workflows. Actually, a workflow executed by a valid schedule should, by definition, always produce provenance information with valid event ordering. PROV-Wf [14] and provONE [51] are two different extensions to PROV, compared in [54], that can also model workflows directly (called prospective provenance in this community), but neither elaborates on validity constraints.

6.3. VCs in Current Workflow Systems

After this overview of validity constraints of different fields, we next describe the state-of-the-art in validity constraint definition and checking in actual systems. To this end, we look at a selection of current popular state-of-the-art workflow systems and examine

if and how they support the application of validity constraints.

Common Workflow Language (CWL) is an open standard that facilitates the description of command-line tool execution and workflow creation. It is still under active development [2]. The ways to define validity constraints are currently limited but subject to extension. So far, CWL supports a dynamic definition of resource requirements enabling the optimization of task scheduling and resource usage without manual intervention. Additionally, it allows the specification of software requirements. Both the resource and software requirements are expressed as hints. Workflow engines may consider or ignore these annotations as CWL is merely a workflow language and standard but does not provide a full-fledged execution engine other than a simple proof-of-concept runner. For better validation of workflow connections, it is recommended to use file format identifiers [15]. An extension currently under discussion is the addition of input value restrictions.³

Nextflow is a workflow system that provides its own domain-specific language to compose user-provided tasks into workflows [20]. Although it is mainly used in the bioinformatics domain, Nextflow can be used to build workflows in any domain. Recently, the Nextflow developer team introduced their new language ‘DSL2’ to build Nextflow workflows. They point out that the next focus is to take advantage of the improved modularization capabilities of DSL2 to support the testing and validation of process modules. We are not aware of any built-in functionality to define or check validity constraints of the workflows currently, though. Note that in §7 we will describe a prototype implementation of VC for Nextflow.

Snakemake is a workflow management system that uses a Python-based language to define and execute workflows. Each rule in Snakemake specifies input and output files, along with any parameters or commands needed to produce the output from the input. The rules can be chained together to form a directed acyclic graph that represents the dependencies between the rules [42]. While Snakemake ensures that each rule is well-defined and the workflow is reproducible, it does not, as far as we know, provide a formal mechanism for specifying validity constraints or checking the correctness of the workflow at runtime. Although, Snakemake supports a dry-run with the command line option ‘-n’ that can be used to check whether the workflow is defined properly and can also provide a rough estimate of the required computational time necessary to execute it. Furthermore, Snakemake checks for the existence of a task’s defined output files after its execution. For further checks, such as checking for them to be non-empty, users are advised to implement that by shell commands manually to provoke a non-zero exit status of the task.⁴

Apache Airflow is a workflow management system created in 2014 by Airbnb [35]. Workflows in Airflow are created using the Python API. Airflow does not explicitly provide functionality targeted at checking the validity of workflows. Instead, they provide a best practices section in their documentation with a description of testing of airflow workflows. In this description, the authors suggest manually inserting customized checks into the workflow to ensure results are as expected. However, such a check is simply an-

³<https://github.com/common-workflow-language/common-workflow-language/issues/764>

⁴https://snakemake.readthedocs.io/en/v7.25.0/project_info/faq.html

other user-defined task inside the workflow, and there are no specific airflow constructs to help build such checks or to react when checks fails.

Apache Spark, started in 2009 at UC Berkeley, is a workflow engine for large-scale data analysis [72]. Spark workflows are defined via APIs in Java, Scala, Python, or R. Apache Spark does not seem to support validity constraints for their workflows. Therefore, users need to come up with their own validation schemes.

Apache Flink is a data analytics engine unifying batch and stream processing [11]. Akin to Spark, Apache Flink workflows are created using Java, Scala, or Python APIs. In a document for the nightly build of Apache v1.15, the Apache Flink team introduces a new non-stable minimum viable product named “Fine-Grained Resource Management”. This new feature will allow workflow developers to specify the resource requirements manually for each task. While this feature’s primary objective is to improve resource utilization, this may provide the possibility for resource-based validity constraints. Aside from that, Flink offers extensive support for local testing and validating workflows with constructs such as test harnesses and mini clusters.

7. Implementing VCs for DAWs as Contracts in Nextflow

We implemented a prototype of VCs in the popular workflow system Nextflow to validate our conceptual model in practice. Details of the implementation and its evaluation are beyond the scope of this paper and will be published elsewhere. In brief, we added two new directives called ‘**require**’ and ‘**promise**’ into the Nextflow specification language, which allow us to insert code for validity constraints into task definitions. By incorporating VCs into the workflow definition language, we can leverage the existing language tools available in Nextflow, such as Groovy. This approach eliminates the need for a new VC language with a separate syntax and interpretation infrastructure. As a result, VC writers benefit from the familiar language tools and do not have to learn a new specification language [25]. The two newly added primitives are part of an extension to the DAW model borrowing the concept of contracts from software engineering, described in §6.1.

This contract-based approach allows adding a contract to each task in a workflow. Such contracts manifest as sets of requirements and promises checked immediately before ($\rightarrow\{$) and after ($\}\leftarrow$) the task execution to ensure that the task runs in the appropriate environment and produces valid results. The new primitives ‘**require**’ and ‘**promise**’ that we added to the workflow definition language in Nextflow, enables the insertion of code for these contracts directly into the task definition. These contracts are then executed alongside the tasks on the cluster as arbitrary bash scripts, thanks to Nextflow’s nature of compiling each task into a bash command script. To facilitate the creation of these contracts, we introduced auxiliary constructs with an internal domain-specific language (DSL) [27] to Nextflow’s workflow definition language. The following example shows how to define VCs in the form of a contract for a Nextflow process:

```

1 process x {
2   input:
3   [...]
4
5   require([
6     FOR_ALL("f", ITER("*.fa"), // for all FASTA files (extension .fa)
7     { f -> IF_THEN(
8       COND("grep -Ev '^[>ACTGUN;]' $f"), // check lines' first char
9       "exit 1") // exit if first char is not one of ">ACTGUN;"
10    }
11  ])
12
13  promise([
14    COMMAND_LOGGED_NO_ERROR(), // auxiliary function checking stderr
15    INPUTS_NOT_CHANGED() // auxiliary function checking inputs
16  ])
17
18  ""
19
20  DATA PROCESSING CODE
21  ""
22 }

```

When Nextflow generates the command bash script for a process, it now places the code from the `require` block before the process code and the code from the `promise` block after the process code. The resulting program can be sent for execution on the cluster nodes. In this specific example, the process requires that all FASTA⁵ files should have lines that start with certain characters, such as $\{>, A, C, T, G, U, N, ;\}$. This is a simple check to verify the file format before data processing. After processing the data, the task ensures that the process execution command did not encounter any errors and that the input files remain unmodified. These contracts are categorized as *dynamic validity constraints* because they are code that runs alongside the task they are defined in. In terms of categorizing VCs as described in §5, these implemented contracts belong to the task-related VCs. The task contracts can dynamically check node- and file-level properties, such as verifying that the current node has sufficient resources. However, they cannot check properties for all nodes.

We enhanced various real-world DAWs in the field of bioinformatics with contracts to test the effectiveness and comprehensiveness of our contract-based approach to implementing validity constraints. This allowed us to identify common problems that arise during their execution and demonstrated how the specific notifications provided by broken contracts aid in debugging the DAWs. Our investigation focused on three main areas: (1) the impact of runtime overhead on each task, (2) the amount of computation time that could be saved by aborting the DAW early, and (3) how contracts enhance issue localization and explanation. Our experiments confirmed that the specification even of simple contracts are very effective in supporting the identification of issues in real-world DAWs, that they can save substantial compute time due to early aborts, and that the runtime overhead often is negligible, depending on the type of checks performed.

8. Conclusions

In this article, we introduced VCs as a means to make implicit assumptions in data analysis workflows explicit, allowing a workflow engine automatically check their status and take proper action if needed. We defined a formal model connecting VCs to the core

⁵<https://blast.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/doc/blast-topics/>

elements of DAWs, namely tasks for computations, files for data exchanges, and nodes for execution. Based on this formal model, we introduced different types of VCs and classified them according to six dimensions. We extensively discussed similar concepts in various fields of research to show that (a) VCs indeed are a vital and ubiquitous concept, but at the same time, (b) a unifying theory was missing, and (c) support for VCs should be considered as partial at best in production or research systems. We hope our work will help to improve this situation by making VCs an integral part of future DAW languages and systems. VCs can support debugging, save energy and time by an early failure of workflow executions, provide traceable warnings or error messages, and raise confidence in analysis results as they help making DAWs more reliable.

Several extensions to our work are possible. In certain situations, e.g., IoT, DAWs are increasingly often used to analyze data streams, which would pose specific requirements to validity checking and require fundamentally changing their semantics; for instance, the notion of failure would need to be revisited. One could also increase the expressiveness of VCs by allowing constraints that affect groups of tasks (e.g., the total memory of a group of tasks scheduled on a node may not exceed the overall memory of the node) or groups of files (e.g., the files sent to different downstream tasks must be identical). VC checking could directly link to counter actions; for instance, breaking a constraint about necessary memory on a node could result in feedback to the scheduler and trigger a re-scheduling of affected tasks. We leave such ideas for future work.

Acknowledgements

This work was supported by the German Research Foundation (DFG) as CRC 1404, project 414984028.

References

- [1] Lorenzo Affetti, Alessandro Margara, and Gianpaolo Cugola. Flowdb: Integrating stream processing and consistent state management. In *Proceedings of the 11th ACM International Conference on Distributed and Event-based Systems, DEBS 2017, Barcelona, Spain, June 19-23, 2017*, pages 134–145. ACM, 2017.
- [2] Peter Amstutz, Michael R. Crusoe, Nebojša Tijanić, Brad Chapman, John Chilton, Michael Heuer, Andrey Kartashov, Dan Leehr, Hervé Ménager, Maya Nedeljkovich, Matt Scales, Stian Soiland-Reyes, and Luka Stojanovic. Common Workflow Language, v1.0, July 2016.
- [3] Casper W. Andersen, Rickard Armiento, Evgeny Blokhin, Gareth J. Conduit, Shyam Dwaraknath, Matthew L. Evans, Ádám Fekete, Abhijith Gopakumar, Saulius Gražulis, Andrius Merkys, et al. OPTIMADE, an API for exchanging materials data. *Scientific Data*, 8(1):217, 2021.
- [4] Christel Baier and Joost-Pieter Katoen. *Principles of model checking*. MIT Press, 2008.
- [5] Denis Baylor et al. TFX: A tensorflow-based production-scale machine learning platform. In *Proceedings of the 23rd ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining, Halifax, NS, Canada, August 13 - 17, 2017*, pages 1387–1395. ACM, 2017.
- [6] Dirk Beyer, Sumit Gulwani, and David A. Schmidt. Combining model checking and data-flow analysis. In Edmund M. Clarke, Thomas A. Henzinger, Helmut Veith, and Roderick Bloem, editors, *Handbook of Model Checking*, pages 493–540. Springer, 2018.
- [7] Ekaba Bisong. Kubeflow and Kubeflow pipelines. In *Building Machine Learning and*

- Deep Learning Models on Google Cloud Platform*, pages 671–685. Apress Berkeley, CA, 2019.
- [8] Volker Blum, Mariana Rossi, Sebastian Kokott, and Matthias Scheffler. The FHI-aims code: All-electron, ab initio materials simulations towards the exascale. *CoRR*, abs/2208.12335, 2022.
 - [9] Sarah Cohen Boulakia et al. Scientific workflows for computational reproducibility in the life sciences: Status, challenges and opportunities. *Future Gener. Comput. Syst.*, 75:284–298, 2017.
 - [10] Christian Carbogno, Kristian Sommer Thygesen, Björn Bieniek, Claudia Draxl, Luca M Ghiringhelli, Andris Gulans, Oliver T Hofmann, Karsten W Jacobsen, Sven Lubeck, Jens Jørgen Mortensen, et al. Numerical quality control for DFT-based materials databases. *npj Computational Materials*, 8(1):1–8, 2022.
 - [11] Paris Carbone, Asterios Katsifodimos, Stephan Ewen, Volker Markl, Seif Haridi, and Kostas Tzoumas. Apache Flink™: Stream and batch processing in a single engine. *IEEE Data Eng. Bull.*, 38(4):28–38, 2015.
 - [12] Fabio Caruso, Dino Novko, and Claudia Draxl. Photoemission signatures of nonequilibrium carrier dynamics from first principles. *Physical Review B*, 101(3):035128, 2020.
 - [13] Edmund M. Clarke, Thomas A. Henzinger, and Helmut Veith. Introduction to model checking. In Edmund M. Clarke, Thomas A. Henzinger, Helmut Veith, and Roderick Bloem, editors, *Handbook of Model Checking*, pages 1–26. Springer, 2018.
 - [14] Flavio Costa, Vitor Silva, Daniel de Oliveira, Kary A. C. S. Ocaña, Eduardo S. Ogasawara, Jonas Dias, and Marta Mattoso. Capturing and querying workflow runtime provenance with PROV: a practical approach. In Giovanna Guerrini, editor, *Joint 2013 EDBT/ICDT Conferences, EDBT/ICDT '13, Genoa, Italy, March 22, 2013, Workshop Proceedings*, pages 282–289. ACM, 2013.
 - [15] Michael R. Crusoe, Sanne Abeln, Alexandru Iosup, Peter Amstutz, John Chilton, Nebojša Tijanić, Hervé Ménager, Stian Soiland-Reyes, Bogdan Gavrilović, Carole Goble, et al. Methods included: Standardizing computational reuse and portability with the common workflow language. *Communications of the ACM*, 65(6):54–63, 2022.
 - [16] Rafael Ferreira da Silva et al. A community roadmap for scientific workflows research and development. In *2021 IEEE Workshop on Workflows in Support of Large-Scale Science (WORKS), St. Louis, MO, USA, November 15, 2021*, pages 81–90. IEEE, 2021.
 - [17] Rafael Ferreira da Silva, Rosa Filgueira, Ilija Pietri, Ming Jiang, Rizos Sakellariou, and Ewa Deelman. A characterization of workflow management systems for extreme-scale applications. *Future Gener. Comput. Syst.*, 75:228–238, 2017.
 - [18] Ewa Deelman et al. The future of scientific workflows. *Int. J. High Perform. Comput. Appl.*, 32(1):159–175, 2018.
 - [19] Ewa Deelman, Dennis Gannon, Matthew S. Shields, and Ian J. Taylor. Workflows and e-science: An overview of workflow system features and capabilities. *Future Gener. Comput. Syst.*, 25(5):528–540, 2009.
 - [20] Paolo Di Tommaso, Maria Chatzou, Evan W. Floden, Paloma P. Barja, Emilio Palumbo, and Cedric Notredame. Nextflow enables reproducible computational workflows. *Nature Biotechnology*, 35(4):316–319, 2017.
 - [21] Michel Diaz. *Petri nets: fundamental models, verification and applications*. John Wiley & Sons, 2009.
 - [22] Claudia Draxl and Matthias Scheffler. The NOMAD laboratory: from data sharing to artificial intelligence. *Journal of Physics: Materials*, 2(3):036001, 2019.
 - [23] Marlon Dumas, Marcello La Rosa, Jan Mendling, and Hajo A. Reijers. *Advanced Process Modeling*, pages 97–153. Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2013.
 - [24] Eberhard Engel and Reiner M. Dreizler. Density functional theory. *Theoretical and Mathematical Physics*, pages 351–399, 2011.
 - [25] Manuel Fähndrich, Michael Barnett, and Francesco Logozzo. Embedded contract languages. In *Proceedings of the 2010 ACM Symposium on Applied Computing*, pages 2103–2110, 2010.

- [26] Wan J. Fokkink. *Introduction to Process Algebra*. Texts in Theoretical Computer Science. An EATCS Series. Springer, 2000.
- [27] Martin Fowler. *Domain-Specific Languages*. Addison-Wesley Professional, 2010.
- [28] David Frantz. Force—landsat + sentinel-2 analysis ready data and beyond. *Remote Sensing*, 11(9):1124, 2019.
- [29] Hector Garcia-Molina. *Database Systems: The Complete Book*. Pearson Education, 2014.
- [30] Yolanda Gil, Varun Ratnakar, Jihie Kim, Pedro A. González-Calero, Paul Groth, Joshua Moody, and Ewa Deelman. Wings: Intelligent workflow-based design of computational experiments. *IEEE Intell. Syst.*, 26(1):62–72, 2011.
- [31] Yolanda Gil, Pedro A. Szekely, Sandra Villamizar, Thomas C. Harmon, Varun Ratnakar, Shubham Gupta, Maria Muslea, Fabio Silva, and Craig A. Knoblock. Mind your metadata: Exploiting semantics for configuration, adaptation, and provenance in scientific workflows. In Lora Aroyo, Chris Welty, Harith Alani, Jamie Taylor, Abraham Bernstein, Lalana Kagal, Natasha Fridman Noy, and Eva Blomqvist, editors, *The Semantic Web - ISWC 2011 - 10th International Semantic Web Conference, Bonn, Germany, October 23-27, 2011, Proceedings, Part II*, volume 7032 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 65–80. Springer, 2011.
- [32] Paul W. P. J. Grefen and Peter M. G. Apers. Integrity control in relational database systems - an overview. *Data Knowl. Eng.*, 10:187–223, 1993.
- [33] Andris Gulans, Stefan Kontur, Christian Meisenbichler, Dmitrii Nabok, Pasquale Pavone, Santiago Rigamonti, Stephan Sagmeister, Ute Werner, and Claudia Draxl. Exciting: a full-potential all-electron package implementing density-functional theory and many-body perturbation theory. *Journal of Physics: Condensed Matter*, 26(36):363202, 2014.
- [34] Jürgen Hafner. Ab-initio simulations of materials using VASP: Density-functional theory and beyond. *Journal of computational chemistry*, 29(13):2044–2078, 2008.
- [35] Bas P. Harenslak and Julian de Ruiter. *Data Pipelines With Apache Airflow*. Simon and Schuster, 2021.
- [36] Marcus Hilbrich, Sebastian Müller, Svetlana Kulagina, Christopher Lazik, Ninon De Mequenem, and Lars Grunske. A consolidated view on specification languages for data analysis workflows. In Tiziana Margaria and Bernhard Steffen, editors, *Leveraging Applications of Formal Methods, Verification and Validation. Software Engineering - 11th International Symposium, ISoLA 2022, Rhodes, Greece, October 22-30, 2022, Proceedings, Part II*, volume 13702 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 201–215. Springer, 2022.
- [37] Jon C. Ison, Matús Kalas, Inge Jonassen, Dan M. Bolser, Mahmut Uludag, Hamish McWilliam, James Malone, Rodrigo Lopez, Steve Pettifer, and Peter M. Rice. EDAM: an ontology of bioinformatics operations, types of data and identifiers, topics and formats. *Bioinform.*, 29(10):1325–1332, 2013.
- [38] Jan Janssen, Sudarsan Surendralal, Yury Lysogorskiy, Mira Todorova, Tilmann Hickel, Ralf Drautz, and Jörg Neugebauer. pyiron: An integrated development environment for computational materials science. *Computational Materials Science*, 163:24–36, 2019.
- [39] Wesley M. Johnston, J. R. Paul Hanna, and Richard J. Millar. Advances in dataflow programming languages. *ACM Comput. Surv.*, 36(1):1–34, 2004.
- [40] Sehrish Kanwal, Farah Zaib Khan, Andrew Lonie, and Richard O. Sinnott. Investigating reproducibility and tracking provenance - A genomic workflow case study. *BMC Bioinform.*, 18(1):337, 2017.
- [41] Steve Klabnik and Carol Nichols. *The Rust Programming Language (Covers Rust 2018)*. No Starch Press, 2019.
- [42] Johannes Köster and Sven Rahmann. Snakemake – a scalable bioinformatics workflow engine. *Bioinform.*, 34(20):3600, 2018.
- [43] A. L. Lamprecht, M. Palmblad, J. Ison, V. Schwämmle, M. S. Al Manir, I. Altintas, C. J. O. Baker, et al. Perspectives on automated composition of workflows in the life sciences. *F1000Research*, 10(897), 2021.
- [44] Anna-Lena Lamprecht. *User-Level Workflow Design - A Bioinformatics Perspective*, vol-

- ume 8311 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*. Springer, 2013.
- [45] Edward A. Lee and Alberto L. Sangiovanni-Vincentelli. A framework for comparing models of computation. *IEEE Trans. Comput. Aided Des. Integr. Circuits Syst.*, 17(12):1217–1229, 1998.
 - [46] Fabian Lehmann, David Frantz, Sören Becker, Ulf Leser, and Patrick Hostert. FORCE on Nextflow: Scalable analysis of earth observation data on commodity clusters. In Gao Cong and Maya Ramanath, editors, *1st Int. Workshop on Complex Data Challenges in Earth Observation*, volume 3052 of *CEUR Workshop Proceedings*. CEUR-WS.org, 2021.
 - [47] Chee Sun Liew, Malcolm P. Atkinson, Michelle Galea, Tan Fong Ang, Paul Martin, and Jano I. van Hemert. Scientific workflows: Moving across paradigms. *ACM Comput. Surv.*, 49(4):66:1–66:39, 2017.
 - [48] Xiao Liu, Yun Yang, and Jinjun Chen. *Temporal QoS Management in Scientific Cloud Workflow Systems*. Elsevier, 2012.
 - [49] Bertrand Meyer. Eiffel: A language and environment for software engineering. *Journal of Systems and Software*, 8(3):199–246, 1988.
 - [50] Robin Milner. *Communicating and mobile systems - the Pi-calculus*. Cambridge University Press, 1999.
 - [51] Paolo Missier, Saumen C. Dey, Khalid Belhajjame, Víctor Cuevas-Vicenttín, and Bertram Ludäscher. D-PROV: extending the PROV provenance model with workflow structure. In Alexandra Meliou and Val Tannen, editors, *5th Workshop on the Theory and Practice of Provenance, TaPP’13, Lombard, IL, USA, April 2-3, 2013*. USENIX Association, 2013.
 - [52] Luc Moreau and Paul Groth. *Provenance: An Introduction to PROV*. Synthesis Lectures on the Semantic Web: Theory and Technology. Morgan & Claypool Publishers, 2013.
 - [53] Thomas M. Oinn, Robert Mark Greenwood, Matthew Addis, M. Nedim Alpdemir, Justin Ferris, Kevin Glover, Carole A. Goble, Antoon Goderis, Duncan Hull, Darren Marvin, Peter Li, Phillip W. Lord, Matthew R. Pocock, Martin Senger, Robert Stevens, Anil Wipat, and Chris Wroe. Taverna: lessons in creating a workflow environment for the life sciences. *Concurr. Comput. Pract. Exp.*, 18(10):1067–1100, 2006.
 - [54] Wellington Oliveira, Paolo Missier, Daniel de Oliveira, and Vanessa Braganholo. Comparing provenance data models for scientific workflows: an analysis of PROV-Wf and ProvOne. In *Anais do X Brazilian e-Science Workshop*, pages 237–244. SBC, 2018.
 - [55] Vaughan R Pratt. Semantical considerations on Floyd-Hoare logic. In *17th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (sfcs 1976)*, pages 109–121. IEEE, 1976.
 - [56] Jun Qin and Thomas Fahringer. *Scientific Workflows - Programming, Optimization, and Synthesis with ASKALON and AWDL*. Springer, 2012.
 - [57] U. Radetzki, U. Leser, S. C. Schulze-Rauschenbach, J. Zimmermann, J. Lüsse, T. Bode, and A. B. Cremers. Adapters, shims, and glue - service interoperability for in silico experiments. *Bioinformatics*, 22(9):1137–1143, February 2006.
 - [58] Mats Rynge et al. Integrity protection for scientific workflow data: Motivation and initial experiences. In Thomas R. Furlani, editor, *Proceedings of the Practice and Experience in Advanced Research Computing on Rise of the Machines (learning), PEARC 2019, Chicago, IL, USA, July 28 - August 01, 2019*, pages 17:1–17:8. ACM, 2019.
 - [59] Matthias Scheffler, Martin Aeschlimann, Martin Albrecht, Tristan Berau, Hans-Joachim Bungartz, Claudia Felser, Mark Greiner, Axel Groß, Christoph T Koch, Kurt Kremer, et al. Fair data enabling new horizons for materials research. *Nature*, 604(7907):635–642, 2022.
 - [60] Christopher Schiefer, Marc Bux, Jörgen Brandt, Clemens Messerschmidt, Knut Reinert, Dieter Beule, and Ulf Leser. Portability of scientific workflows in NGS data analysis: A case study. *CoRR*, abs/2006.03104, 2020.
 - [61] Daniel T. Speckhard, Christian Carbogno, Luca Ghiringhelli, Sven Lubeck, Matthias Scheffler, and Claudia Draxl. Extrapolation to complete basis-set limit in density-functional theory by quantile random-forest models. *CoRR*, abs/2303.14760, 2023.
 - [62] Jacek Sroka, Jan Hidders, Paolo Missier, and Carole A. Goble. A formal semantics for the taverna 2 workflow model. *J. Comput. Syst. Sci.*, 76(6):490–508, 2010.

- [63] Oleg V. Sukhoroslov. Toward efficient execution of data-intensive workflows. *J. Supercomput.*, 77(8):7989–8012, 2021.
- [64] Wei Tan and MengChu Zhou. *Business and Scientific Workflows: A Web Service-Oriented Approach*. John Wiley & Sons, Ltd, 2013.
- [65] Wil M. P. van der Aalst, Marcello La Rosa, and Flávia Maria Santoro. Business process management - don't forget to improve the process! *Bus. Inf. Syst. Eng.*, 58(1):1–6, 2016.
- [66] Thomas Vogel, Stephan Druskat, Markus Scheidgen, Claudia Draxl, and Lars Grunске. Challenges for verifying and validating scientific software in computational materials science. In *2019 IEEE/ACM 14th International Workshop on Software Engineering for Science (SE4Science)*, pages 25–32. IEEE, 2019.
- [67] Hal Wasserman and Manuel Blum. Software reliability via run-time result-checking. *Journal of the ACM (JACM)*, 44(6):826–849, 1997.
- [68] Carl Witt, Jakob van Santen, and Ulf Leser. Learning low-wastage memory allocations for scientific workflows at IceCube. In *17th International Conference on High Performance Computing & Simulation, HPCS 2019, Dublin, Ireland, July 15-19, 2019*, pages 233–240. IEEE, 2019.
- [69] Carl Witt, Dennis Wagner, and Ulf Leser. Feedback-based resource allocation for batch scheduling of scientific workflows. In *17th International Conference on High Performance Computing & Simulation, HPCS 2019, Dublin, Ireland, July 15-19, 2019*, pages 761–768. IEEE, 2019.
- [70] Jia Yu, Rajkumar Buyya, and Kotagiri Ramamohanarao. Workflow scheduling algorithms for grid computing. In Fatos Xhafa and Ajith Abraham, editors, *Metaheuristics for Scheduling in Distributed Computing Environments*, pages 173–214. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2008.
- [71] Matei Zaharia, Andrew Chen, Aaron Davidson, Ali Ghodsi, Sue Ann Hong, Andy Konwinski, Siddharth Murching, Tomas Nykodym, Paul Ogilvie, Mani Parkhe, Fen Xie, and Corey Zumar. Accelerating the machine learning lifecycle with MLflow. *IEEE Data Eng. Bull.*, 41(4):39–45, 2018.
- [72] Matei Zaharia, Reynold S. Xin, Patrick Wendell, Tathagata Das, Michael Armbrust, Ankur Dave, Xiangrui Meng, Josh Rosen, Shivaram Venkataraman, Michael J. Franklin, Ali Ghodsi, Joseph Gonzalez, Scott Shenker, and Ion Stoica. Apache Spark: a unified engine for big data processing. *Commun. ACM*, 59(11):56–65, 2016.
- [73] Daniel Zinn, Shawn Bowers, Timothy M. McPhillips, and Bertram Ludäscher. Scientific workflow design with data assembly lines. In Ewa Deelman and Ian J. Taylor, editors, *Proceedings of the 4th Workshop on Workflows in Support of Large-Scale Science, WORKS 2009, November 16, 2009, Portland, Oregon, USA*. ACM, 2009.