

MONO2REST: Identifying and Exposing Microservices: a Reusable RESTification Approach

Matthéo Lecrivain
Nantes Université, LS2N UMR 6004,
F-44000 Nantes, France
mattheo.lecrivain@tuta.io

Hanifa Barry
DIRO, Université de Montréal
Montréal (QC), Canada
hanifa.barry@umontreal.ca

Dalila Tamzalit
Nantes Université, LS2N UMR 6004,
F-44000 Nantes, France
Dalila.Tamzalit@univ-nantes.fr

Houari Sahraoui
DIRO, Université de Montréal
Montréal (QC), Canada
sahraouh@iro.umontreal.ca

Abstract—The microservices architectural style has become the de facto standard for large-scale cloud applications, offering numerous benefits in scalability, maintainability, and deployment flexibility. Many organizations are pursuing the migration of legacy monolithic systems to a microservices architecture. However, this process is challenging, risky, time-intensive, and prone-to-failure while several organizations lack necessary financial resources, time, or expertise to set up this migration process. So, rather than trying to migrate a legacy system where migration is risky or not feasible, we suggest exposing it as a microservice application without having to migrate it. In this paper, we present a reusable, automated, two-phase approach that combines evolutionary algorithms with machine learning techniques. In the first phase, we identify microservices at the method level using a multi-objective genetic algorithm that considers both structural and semantic dependencies between methods. In the second phase, we generate REST APIs for each identified microservice using a classification algorithm to assign HTTP methods and endpoints. We evaluated our approach with a case study on the Spring PetClinic application, which has both monolithic and microservices implementations that serve as ground truth for comparison. Results demonstrate that our approach successfully aligns identified microservices with those in the reference microservices implementation, highlighting its effectiveness in service identification and API generation.

Index Terms—Microservices Identification, Architecture Migration, REST API, Machine Learning, Software Architecture, Multi-Objective Optimization.

I. INTRODUCTION

Legacy software systems are applications developed using outdated architectural principles and technologies, rendering them technically obsolete despite their continued functional relevance. Most legacy systems rely on a monolithic architecture, where the application is a single, integrated entity encompassing all functionalities. However, monolithic legacy systems face significant challenges. They often lack scalability, struggle to improve performance, and fail to quickly incorporate new features, making them ill-suited to meet evolving market demands [24]. Additionally, the use of deprecated technologies increases the likelihood of bugs, necessitating specialized knowledge of the system and its dependencies. The

inherent complexity of the code further hinders upgrades to modern technologies, particularly cloud-native architectures.

Maintaining such legacy systems becomes increasingly burdensome over time [23]. Addressing these issues requires migrating these systems to newer technologies and modern architectural styles. Among these, microservices architecture (MSA) has emerged as a dominant paradigm in software engineering [15]. Designed for the cloud, MSA enables independent deployment of services, with communication facilitated through APIs [13]. This architecture improves scalability, simplifies maintenance, and enhances agility, as changes can be made to individual services without affecting the entire application [3], [15].

Despite its advantages, migrating monolithic legacy systems to microservices is a complex and resource-intensive process that requires specialized expertise, significant time, and substantial investment [18], [19], [28]. Moreover, not all organizations possess the readiness, budget, or skills necessary for such a transition [20]. For these cases, existing solutions fail to offer alternatives that enable legacy systems to operate as microservices-based applications without full migration.

This paper presents a novel approach that addresses this gap by exposing monolithic legacy systems as microservices-based applications without requiring migration. Our reusable, automated, two-phase framework combines evolutionary algorithms with machine learning techniques. In the first phase, a multi-objective genetic algorithm identifies microservices at the finest granularity—the method level—by analyzing both structural and semantic dependencies. In the second phase, REST APIs are generated for each identified microservice using a classification algorithm to assign HTTP methods and endpoints. To evaluate our approach, we conducted a case study using an application with both monolithic and microservices implementations. The results show that the identified microservices from the monolithic version align closely with those in the microservices version, and the generated REST APIs effectively expose the services in a consistent and functional manner.

This paper is organized as follows: Section II provides the

background and problem context. Our two-phase approach for microservice identification and REST API generation is detailed in Section III, while Section IV presents the case study of the Spring PetClinic application. Section V reviews related work in this domain. Section VI discusses our findings, and Section VII concludes the paper and proposes ideas on future work.

II. BACKGROUND AND PROBLEM STATEMENT

There are many research contributions targeting the detection of microservices in monolithic architectures and migrating them, or preparing them for migration, to this architectural style [5], [9], [18], [28], [34]. Migrating a legacy software system to a microservices architecture involves restructuring it into independent services, each representing a distinct functionality of the original application. These services function as standalone software applications, and their simultaneous operation produces functional results equivalent to traditional architectures [13]. Proposed solutions generally divide the migration process into two distinct phases: *service identification* and *application migration*.

Service identification involves partitioning and decomposing the original application into clusters, which then serve as a foundation for creating services. These clusters must align with business logic and be capable of autonomous operation. This phase is complex and requires a thorough understanding of the monolithic application's internal workings, including the relationships and dependencies among its components. In the application migration phase, the monolithic application is transformed into a microservices architecture based on the identified clusters. Although several studies have explored the challenges of automated approaches to migration [16], [17], to the best of our knowledge, no fully implemented solution currently exists. Automated migration faces several challenges: (i) converting a monolithic system into a microservices-based architecture requires significant rewriting and reorganization of code, which demands an in-depth understanding of the system, (ii) the generated services must meet high-quality standards and be compatible with the target environment while preserving core functionality and maintaining optimal performance, (iii) dependencies between services, whether through method calls or shared data, must be carefully managed to ensure smooth operation and prevent communication conflicts.

Given these challenges, not all monolithic systems are suitable for migration to a microservices architecture. The process is inherently challenging, risky, time-consuming, and prone to failure [39]. It requires significant financial resources, time, and expertise that many organizations lack. Furthermore, organizations may struggle to assess their readiness for migration [20]. Migrating poorly designed monoliths can also negatively affect the resulting microservices architecture by transferring technical debt, design flaws, and dead code into the new system [24]. Additionally, migration must preserve the application's integrity, including its data. These difficulties often lead to the persistence of legacy systems, which remain

constrained by their monolithic architectures due to a lack of viable alternatives.

In this context, companies face a binary choice: either retain their monolithic applications or fully migrate to a microservices architecture. Currently, no alternative solutions exist that balance the benefits of microservices with the risks and costs of migration. To address this gap, we propose a novel approach that enables monolithic systems to function as microservices-based architectures without requiring structural changes. Wrapping these systems with REST APIs offers several advantages: it allows organizations to evaluate the feasibility of continued use in their current form, assess their readiness and suitability for future migration, act as an intermediate step in the migration process, and identify potential challenges that could hinder a successful transition.

The context of migrating monolithic legacy systems to adopt a microservices architectural style involves several dimensions. The following assumptions delimit the scope of our approach and position the addressed issues. We focus on object-oriented monolithic software developed in Java and built using Maven or Gradle project architectures. This ensures that the project structure consistently follows a standard format, enabling operations and providing a reusable approach for legacy systems within the same ecosystem. Within this context, we address two main issues:

- 1) *MS granularity and semantic*: While service identification has been widely studied, many approaches fail to consider the optimal level of granularity and semantic similarity when creating clusters. Most approaches focus on class-level decomposition, but service identification should target behavior at the method level. Methods from different classes can contribute to the same functionality, and conversely, methods within the same class may belong to different microservices [1]. Additionally, most studies prioritize structural dependencies in the code while overlooking business semantics, which play a critical role in accurately identifying microservices [19].
- 2) *Alternative solution to migration*: To the best of our knowledge, no existing work has proposed exposing monolithic software systems on the web by wrapping them with automatically generated REST APIs without requiring migration.

In this paper, we address these issues by 1) leveraging a multi-objective genetic algorithm to identify microservices based on structural and semantic dependencies at the method level, and 2) exposing the identified microservices through automatically generated REST APIs using machine learning techniques to assign HTTP methods and endpoints.

III. APPROACH

This section describes the two stages of our approach. First, we describe our method for identifying microservices in a monolithic application, using a genetic algorithm and machine learning. Then, we present our interface identification approach for exposing the identified services, combining static analysis and several machine-learning algorithms and models.

A. Microservices identification

The primary challenge in migrating legacy monolithic systems lies in accurately identifying microservices with appropriate granularity, ensuring they reflect both the structural and semantic aspects of the original system [5], [18], [28], [34]. To address this, we propose a microservice identification approach based on a multi-objective genetic algorithm. As illustrated in Fig. 1, the identification process consists of three key components: call-graph extraction, which captures the structural dependencies within the monolithic system; method embedding, which represents semantic relationships between methods; and clustering, which groups methods into microservice candidates.

1) *Call-Graph Extraction*: The call graph is extracted from the JAR file of the monolithic application. This process begins by collecting all method calls using the static analyzer *java-callgraph*¹, which outputs a list of sources and destinations for all class and method calls (see an example in Fig. 2).

Next, the list is refined by removing class calls, JDK method calls, and recursive method calls, retaining only the dependencies between the application’s methods. This refinement produces a directed call graph. The resulting call graph serves as the basis for clustering, as it will be partitioned to identify potential microservices. Additionally, it provides a visual representation of the candidate microservices. Fig. 3 illustrates the call graph derived from the Spring PetClinic application, which will be used in our case study.

The structural dependencies within the call graph are used to calculate the *coupling* and *cohesion* between candidate clusters, which represent potential microservices. Coupling measures the dependencies between methods in two different clusters. For example, in Fig. 4, there is only one dependency between Cluster A and Cluster B, represented by the call from m_5 to m_2 . Cohesion, on the other hand, captures the internal dependencies between methods within the same cluster. For instance, in Cluster A, there are three calls among its four methods. The specific calculations for coupling and cohesion, as well as their role in the clustering process, are detailed in the description of the genetic algorithm.

2) *Method Embedding*: To capture the semantic relationships between methods, we employ a sentence embedding technique. The objective is to determine whether methods within a cluster, representing a potential microservice, are semantically related. There are two approaches for generating the method embeddings: method names only that consists in extracting terms from method names after tokenization, or full method context with the inclusion of all identifiers present in the method, such as parameter and variable names, in addition to method names. The list of extracted terms is then processed using an embedding model² [30], [35], which generates numerical vectors for each method. The semantic similarity between two methods is determined by the distance

	<code>findPetById</code>	<code>findOwnerById</code>	<code>setOwner</code>
<code>findPetById</code>	≈ 1.000	≈ 0.932	≈ 0.502
<code>findOwnerById</code>	≈ 0.932	≈ 1.000	≈ 0.597
<code>setOwner</code>	≈ 0.502	≈ 0.597	≈ 1.000

TABLE I
SUBSET OF THE SIMILARITY MATRIX OF THE SPRING PETCLINIC APPLICATION.

between their respective vectors: the smaller the distance, the stronger the semantic relation between the methods.

3) *Clustering*: Before performing the clustering, we first encode the call graph and the similarities between methods in data structures that facilitates the clustering process. The call graph is encoded as an adjacency matrix, where a value of 1 in a cell signifies a dependency between the two corresponding methods. Additionally, a second matrix encodes the semantic similarities between each pair of methods in the application. Each cell in this similarity matrix contains the cosine similarity, ranging from -1 to 1, between the vector representations of the two methods. Precomputing these similarities accelerates the iterative clustering process. Table I presents an excerpt of the similarity matrix from the application Spring Pet Clinic, highlighting a strong semantic similarity (≈ 0.932) between the methods `findPetById` and `findOwnerById`.

A clustering solution represents the partitioning of the set of n methods in the application into k subsets, where each subset corresponds to a potential microservice. The size of the search space is determined by the Stirling number of the second kind $\left\{ \begin{smallmatrix} n \\ k \end{smallmatrix} \right\}$. Given the exponential growth of this number, exhaustive exploration of the search space is infeasible, making heuristic algorithms essential for effectively navigating and optimizing the solution space.

To perform the clustering that generates microservice candidates, we leverage the latest version of the NSGA multi-objective optimization algorithm, NSGA-III [11], implemented in the *pymoo* library [6]. NSGA-III is designed to handle problems with three or more conflicting objectives effectively. It starts by the generation of a population of random solutions, in our case a set of different clustering solutions. Then in each iteration, the population of solutions undergoes non-dominated sorting to rank solutions based on Pareto dominance, dividing them into fronts. The algorithm uses reference points in the objective space to guide the selection process, ensuring diversity across the Pareto front. Solutions are then evolved through crossover and mutation to generate offspring, which are combined with the parent population. From this combined set, the next generation is selected based on both rank (non-domination level) and distance to reference points, favoring solutions near underrepresented points. This iterative process continues until a stopping criterion, such as a maximum number of generations, is met.

As illustrated in Fig. 5, the crossover operator involves injecting a cluster from one parent into the second parent and repairing the clusters to prevent method duplications. For the mutation operator, a method is randomly selected and transferred to another cluster.

¹<https://github.com/gousiosg/java-callgraph>

²<https://huggingface.co/sentence-transformers/bert-base-nli-mean-tokens>




Fig. 1. Service identification process.




Fig. 2. Preparation of data linked to method calls.




Fig. 3. Call graph for the Spring PetClinic application.

To evaluate the quality of a clustering solution and select solutions for the next iterations, we use three objective functions. Let us begin with some definitions:

- $V_{cluster}(x)$: Number of nodes (methods) within a cluster x .
- $E_{internal}(x)$: Number of links (calls) between nodes within a cluster x .
- $E_{external}(x)$: Number of links connecting nodes in cluster x to external clusters.
- $Sem(a, b)$: Semantic similarity between two methods a and b .
- N : Number of clusters within a solution S .




Fig. 4. Example of a directed dependency graph organized in clusters.

The three clustering objectives are defined as follows:

- 1) **Minimize coupling** between clusters, i.e., the connectivity between methods belonging to different clusters. The coupling value of a cluster x is defined as the proportion of external dependencies relative to the total dependencies of the methods in the cluster. Formally:

$$Coupling(x) = \frac{E_{external}(x)}{E_{internal}(x) + E_{external}(x)}$$

The coupling for a clustering solution S is the sum of the coupling values of its clusters:

$$Coupling(S) = \sum_{x_i \in S} Coupling(x_i)$$

- 2) **Maximize cohesion** within clusters, i.e., the connectivity between nodes of the same cluster. The cohesion value of a cluster x is defined as the number of internal dependencies normalized by the size of x . Formally:

$$Cohesion(x) = \frac{E_{internal}(x)}{V_{cluster}(x)}$$

If the number of internal dependencies exceeds the size of the cluster, the cohesion is set to 1. The cohesion




Fig. 5. Crossover and mutation operators.

of a clustering solution S is calculated as the average cohesion of its clusters:

$$Cohesion(S) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{x_i \in S} Cohesion(x_i)$$

- 3) **Maximize semantic similarity** between methods within clusters. For each cluster x , we use the similarity values $Sim(i, j)$ from the similarity matrix for pairs of methods (i, j) in x . The semantic similarity of a cluster x is the average similarity between pairs of methods in x :

$$SemSim(x) = \frac{1}{V_{cluster}} \sum_{i,j \in x \wedge i \neq j} Sim(i, j)$$

The semantic similarity of a clustering solution S is then calculated as the average semantic similarity of its clusters:

$$SemSim(S) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{x_i \in S} SemSim(x_i)$$

B. Interfaces identification and assignment

We now detail the second phase of our approach, which focuses on identifying interfaces to expose the microservices previously identified. The objective is to define a REST API for each cluster, enabling the application to be wrapped instead of fully migrated. This approach offers an alternative to complete application migration by simulating autonomous and independent services while retaining the monolithic structure. The API identification process combines regular expression-based parsing with machine learning models. Fig. 6 illustrates the pipeline for interface identification, a process we call "RESTification." This term refers to the creation of "RESTful" services, which are exposed through hierarchical interfaces and communicate using CRUD operations [14], [32].

The first step of the pipeline consists in selecting for each cluster the methods that should be exposed through an API together with their respective contexts. Fig. 7 shows an example where method m_1 is called by m_2 , which belongs to a different cluster. In this case, m_1 must be exposed through the API of

cluster A , allowing method m_2 to call it directly via the API. This subset of methods to expose is therefore defined as the set of methods within a cluster that are invoked by methods external to the cluster. Once a method is selected, we gather additional information about it. The algorithms used in subsequent steps require this contextual data about the methods to make informed decisions. Specifically, for each method, we extract its return type and the types of its parameters. To achieve this, the application's JAR file is extracted and analyzed using the `javap` command, which disassembles `.class` files and generates a file containing all class and method definitions within the application. Each selected method is then defined as "return_type method(parameters_types)"

Interactions with a REST API are conducted through HTTP requests. To perform these requests, it is necessary to determine the API "endpoint," which specifies the address where the request will operate, the type of HTTP request, and the request's content. This step focuses on determining the type of HTTP request to associate with each method that needs to be exposed. We consider the four most common types of HTTP requests:

- 1) **GET:** Used to retrieve a resource without making modifications.
- 2) **PUT:** Used to replace a resource's content with the content of the request.
- 3) **POST:** Used to send data to a resource, triggering processing on the server.
- 4) **DELETE:** Used to remove a resource.

To assign Java methods to an appropriate HTTP request type, we employ a "Zero-Shot Classification" model. This model predicts the class of an input text without requiring specific training examples for each class. By defining the four classes ("GET," "PUT," "POST," "DELETE") and using information about the method as input text, the model identifies the associated HTTP request type.

Fig. 8 illustrates this process with the method `java.lang.String getCity()`. The input to the model includes the method's return type, name, and parameters, providing enough context. The model outputs a




Fig. 6. Interface identification process.




Fig. 7. Comparison between a direct method call and a call to an API at cluster level.

probability distribution for the four classes. For `getCity`, the model estimates a 96% likelihood of belonging to the "GET" class.

The use of an AI model, rather than direct name-based analysis, is critical due to the wide variety of naming conventions for Java methods. It is impractical to create universal rules for method name classification. For example, while it may be clear that `getCity` should map to a "GET" request, another developer might name the same method `retrieveCity`. Our tool must consistently classify HTTP request types regardless of naming conventions.



Fig. 8. Representation of the HTTP request classification process.

The next step in this phase pipeline is the URI creation. A "Uniform Resource Identifier" (URI) is a string of characters that identifies a resource in a REST API [25]. Each segment of a URI, separated by slashes (/), represents a data hierarchy. In this process, we aim to identify a URI for each method, which will act as the access point for API requests. To achieve this, we utilize several algorithms and machine learning models to generate a URI for each method.

First, we define a data structure in the form of a search tree to store the generated API. Each element in the tree corresponds to a segment of the URI, and its child nodes represent subsequent segments. Each node includes attributes such as the segment name and any associated HTTP requests. The URI creation process is illustrated in Fig. 9, using methods from a cluster identified in the Spring PetClinic application as an example.




Fig. 9. Representation of the URI creation process.

- 1) **Tree Initialization:** The tree is initialized with the cluster name as the root node. For each method, a node named after the method's class is created, containing a child node named after the method itself. This corresponds to the first step in Fig. 9. At this stage, the URI format is: `http://api/cluster/Class/method`. The HTTP requests identified in the previous step are associated with the method nodes.
- 2) **Processing Method Name Segments:** URIs must comply with naming conventions [25]. Specifically, URI segments must be lowercase, separated by hyphens for multi-word names, and must not include action verbs. To meet these requirements, action verbs are removed from

method name segments, and the results are reformatted to comply with naming conventions. This corresponds to the second step in Fig. 9. Methods are first split into words based on camelCase notation. Then, a "Part-of-Speech tagging" algorithm³ is applied to identify grammatical roles (e.g., verbs, nouns, adjectives). Verbs are removed when the method name contains more than one word. Finally, the resulting segments are converted to lowercase and formatted with hyphens.

- 3) **Processing Class Name Segments:** Several methods may share a common conceptual grouping under a single URI segment associated with their class names. For instance, in the second step of Fig. 9, the classes `PetRequest`, `Pet`, and `PetType` all represent the same concept. In a REST API, these methods should be grouped under a single access path. To achieve this, a semantic analysis is performed on URI segments associated with class names. Using the sentence embedding model (SBERT) applied during multi-objective optimization, class names with high semantic similarity are grouped together. A second semantic analysis identifies the most representative word for the grouped classes, which is used as the new URI segment name. The results are formatted to adhere to URI naming conventions. This corresponds to the third step in Fig. 9.

IV. CASE STUDY

The proposed approach is evaluated using the open-source Spring PetClinic AngularJS⁴, a monolithic Java application that includes a server component developed with Java Spring. Additionally, we utilize Spring PetClinic Microservices⁵, a version of Spring PetClinic AngularJS migrated to a microservices architecture, consisting of seven microservices. This setup allows us to compare the services identified by our approach on the monolithic application with the microservices in the migrated version, providing a reference for assessing the quality of our solution.

A. First Analysis: Objective Functions and Number of Clusters

In the first analysis, we examined how well the objectives are achieved for different numbers of clusters. The aim is to demonstrate the importance of setting this parameter to obtain meaningful microservices. Table II presents the values of the objective functions for near-optimal solutions obtained after 100 generations, considering 3, 5, 7, and 10 microservices.

We observed that the semantic similarity of the solutions increases with the number of microservices. However, coupling and cohesion vary, with the worst values occurring for the largest number of microservices. The best trade-off is achieved with 7 microservices, which matches the number in the reference solution. In the remainder of this section, we focus on the results for this configuration.

³https://www.nltk.org/api/nltk.tag.pos_tag.html

⁴<https://github.com/spring-petclinic/spring-petclinic-angularjs>

⁵<https://github.com/spring-petclinic/spring-petclinic-microservices>

Figure 10 shows the evolution of the three objective functions during the search process for one execution targeting 7 microservices. Initially, the random solutions exhibit the worst values. These values steadily improve over iterations, stabilizing after the 60th generation.




Fig. 10. Evolution of objectives through iterations.

B. Second Analysis: Comparing Clusters to Reference Microservices

In the second analysis, we compared the clusters identified by our approach to the microservices in the reference version. First, we analyzed the methods present in both applications. While the microservices version retains all functionalities of the monolithic version, the two implementations differ in their structure, resulting in variations in method composition.

Table III shows the distribution of methods between the two versions, highlighting that only 22 of the 57 methods from the monolithic application are also found in the microservices version. Consequently, comparing clusters to microservices based solely on method names is not feasible. To address this limitation, we adopted a semantic comparison approach, as illustrated in Fig. 11. We constructed a similarity matrix by computing the embeddings of the clusters and the microservices in the reference version, using the same embedding model applied earlier for methods. Each cluster and microservice embedding was derived from the combined embeddings of its methods. Clusters were then assigned to microservices based on the highest similarity scores.

The results, shown in Table IV, reveal high to very high similarities between the identified clusters and the reference microservices, with values ranging from 0.67 to 0.9. Moreover, the identified REST APIs closely align with the microservice interfaces in the reference application.

V. RELATED WORK

Our work aligns with recent efforts to migrate legacy monolithic systems to microservices using multi-objective approaches and machine learning techniques. This section reviews related works selected for their methodological relevance, significance of proposed results, and recency. Service identification methods, central to our research, commonly rely on dependency analysis [22], genetic algorithms [31], [36], or machine learning [29], [38].

Number of identified clusters	Coupling	Cohesion	Semantic similarity
3	≈ 0.121	≈ 0.667	≈ 0.643
5	≈ 0.209	≈ 0.642	≈ 0.725
7	≈ 0.176	≈ 0.652	≈ 0.757
10	≈ 0.286	≈ 0.542	≈ 0.786

TABLE II
OBJECTIVE FUNCTION VALUES FOR VARYING NUMBER OF CLUSTERS.

Methods common to both applications	22
Methods unique to monolithic application	35
Methods unique to the microservices application	19

TABLE III
DISTRIBUTION OF METHODS BETWEEN THE MONOLITHIC AND MICROSERVICES VERSIONS OF SPRING PETCLINIC.




Fig. 11. Evaluate strategy for microservice identification.

Mono2Micro, a tool developed by IBM, facilitates the migration of monolithic applications to microservices [22]. It employs a technique based on business use cases and runtime call relationships to generate class-level partitions that are functionally cohesive. Evaluated against four different approaches on various applications, Mono2Micro achieves superior modularity and independence measures, demonstrating its effectiveness.

CARGO, an AI-assisted graph partitioning tool, improves the quality of partitions for microservices migration [11]. Developed as part of IBM’s Project Minerva, it employs three main steps: constructing a context-sensitive system dependency graph (SDG), extracting subgraphs to create context-sensitive snapshots, and grouping system components into services. CARGO has been evaluated on five JEE applications, outperforming four state-of-the-art approaches in partition quality.

MSExtractor approaches service identification as a combinatorial optimization problem [31]. Using NSGA-II [10], it assigns classes to services with the dual objectives of minimizing coupling and maximizing cohesion. Empirical evaluations

highlight MSExtractor’s effectiveness, particularly for large-scale systems [2], [21], [26]. A subsequent enhancement [33] replaces NSGA-II with IBEA [40], introducing an additional objective to optimize service granularity. The updated version demonstrates improved efficiency and produces decompositions with better coupling and cohesion metrics.

Dehghani et al. [12] propose a reinforcement learning (RL) framework for microservices decomposition. Using the SERVICECUTTER tool, services are identified and further refined by an RL algorithm that maps methods to microservices. While innovative, the complexity and computational demands of RL models present practical challenges for large-scale systems, requiring significant expertise and resources.

MicroMiner emphasizes the semantic relationships between application elements for microservice identification [37]. Combining static and semantic analysis with machine learning, it evaluates precision and recall on four monolithic systems. Its successor, MAGNET, employs graph neural networks (GNNs) [38], integrating static and semantic data into a graph of method calls. MAGNET focuses on service cohesion and low coupling, outperforming MicroMiner in precision and recall across four open-source systems.

Similarly to our work, a microservice identification approach called toMicroservices was proposed, utilizing NSGA-III with five distinct objectives [4]. However, none of these objectives take into account the semantic relationships between the elements of the legacy application, a key aspect addressed in our approach. Building on this work, the same team later explored the perceived usefulness of the identified microservices and found, among other insights, that participants were hesitant to adopt automatically generated microservices [8]. While this is an interesting finding, its generalizability is limited, as it is closely tied to the specific identification methodology employed by toMicroservices.

In summary, Mono2Micro [22], CARGO [11], and MSExtractor [33] operate at the class level, assigning entire classes to single microservices. However, we argue that method-level granularity offers finer decomposition, as methods within the same class may belong to different services, and methods from different classes may contribute to the same service. Class-level partitioning can thus overlook these relationships, limiting the flexibility and accuracy of microservice identification. Dehghani et al. [12] present a promising RL-based approach, but the computational complexity of RL models can hinder their scalability and practical application in large systems. MAGNET aligns closely with our approach in its focus on method-level granularity and semantic integration. However, while MAGNET leverages GNNs, our methodol-

Identified Clusters	Reference Microservices	Cosine Similarity
Cluster 1	spring-petclinic-customers-service	≈ 0.907
Cluster 2	spring-petclinic-config-server	≈ 0.685
Cluster 3	spring-petclinic-discovery-server	≈ 0.671
Cluster 4	spring-petclinic-admin-server	≈ 0.689
Cluster 5	spring-petclinic-vets-service	≈ 0.786
Cluster 6	spring-petclinic-api-gateway	≈ 0.866
Cluster 7	spring-petclinic-visits-service	≈ 0.776

TABLE IV
SIMILARITY BETWEEN THE IDENTIFIED CLUSTERS AND THE REFERENCE MICROSERVICES.

ogy incorporates a genetic algorithm (NSGA-III), providing a transparent and interpretable optimization process. This transparency allows us to observe the evolution of metrics and solutions, which is less evident in self-learning models like GNNs.

VI. DISCUSSION

By exposing identified services as microservices without requiring a complete application migration, our approach enables interaction with each service while providing an intermediate step in the migration process. This allows the identified services to remain operational and accessible.

Unlike Mono2Micro, which partitions applications at the class level, our approach focuses on method-level partitioning in monolithic applications. This finer granularity is a key contribution, allowing more precise service identification by grouping methods from different classes into cohesive services when appropriate [1]. To achieve this, we employ the NSGA-III multi-objective genetic algorithm, which optimizes service partitioning by simultaneously considering several objectives. NSGA-III enables a balanced trade-off among competing goals, ensuring the discovery of high-quality clustering solutions across a diverse solution space [7].

Our contributions include:

- A method-level granularity for service decomposition, which outperforms class-level approaches by capturing finer-grained functional relationships between methods. This ensures that methods contributing to the same business logic can be grouped, even if they belong to different classes.
- Integration of a semantic analysis model for method names to enhance service identification. By leveraging semantic similarity, our approach captures the business logic behind methods [19], providing critical insights into how the application operates and ensuring meaningful decomposition.

Our approach diverges from existing methods such as MSExtractor, which favors the IBEA algorithm for optimization, and Mono2Micro, which partitions at the class level. While these methods have demonstrated certain advantages, NSGA-III offers greater efficiency and flexibility, particularly for problems involving three or more conflicting objectives [27]. Compared to graph neural networks used in approaches like MAGNET, NSGA-III provides transparency in how solutions evolve and metrics improve during execution,

making it easier to interpret results. By combining semantic analysis and the powerful optimization capabilities of NSGA-III, our approach advances the state of the art in microservice identification, offering a more precise and interpretable decomposition strategy for monolithic applications.

VII. CONCLUSION AND FUTURE WORK

In this paper, we proposed a novel approach to migrating legacy monolithic systems to microservices by identifying and exposing services through REST APIs, without requiring a complete application migration. By focusing on method-level granularity and leveraging multi-objective optimization with the NSGA-III genetic algorithm, our approach achieves more accurate service identification compared to traditional class-level partitioning methods. We also integrated semantic analysis to better capture the business logic, enhancing the decomposition process and improving the quality of the resulting microservices.

The evaluation of our approach on the Spring PetClinic application demonstrated its effectiveness in identifying meaningful services that closely resemble the structure and functionality of microservices in the reference version. The results showed promising semantic similarity between the identified clusters and the actual microservices, highlighting the potential of our method to facilitate gradual migrations and serve as a viable intermediate step toward full microservice adoption.

While the results are encouraging, there are several avenues for future work that could further refine and expand the applicability of our approach. Although our method focuses on method-level decomposition based on method calls, other fine-grained analyses could be incorporated, such as integrating data access patterns or dynamic analysis to uncover usage patterns. Additionally, the semantic analysis can be enhanced by incorporating more advanced Natural Language Processing (NLP) techniques or by using pre-trained models specifically tailored for software engineering tasks. Exploring domain-specific semantic models could also improve the identification of business logic and service boundaries.

Although NSGA-III offers significant advantages in multi-objective optimization, integrating other optimization techniques—such as deep reinforcement learning or graph-based optimization—could further refine the clustering process, particularly in dynamic environments where system requirements evolve over time. Incorporating continuous learning represents another promising direction for future research. Future itera-

tions of the approach could benefit from feedback loops, where the system learns from the successes or failures of prior service compositions. This could involve the use of reinforcement learning or active learning techniques to optimize service identification and API exposure as the system evolves.

Furthermore, expanding our approach to automatically generate API documentation or refine the structure of the REST API based on the identified services would provide a more comprehensive solution for microservice exposure.

Finally, extending the evaluation to more complex, real-world legacy systems would provide deeper insights into the scalability and robustness of our approach in diverse environments, particularly for highly complex monolithic applications.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

This work is partially supported by the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada under Grant No. RGPIN-2019-07168 and the IUT de Nantes (Nantes Université).

REFERENCES

- [1] Yalemisew Abgaz, Andrew McCarren, Peter Elger, David Solan, Neil Lapuz, Marin Bivol, Glenn Jackson, Murat Yilmaz, Jim Buckley, and Paul Clarke. Decomposition of monolith applications into microservices architectures: A systematic review. *IEEE Transactions on Software Engineering*, 49(8):4213–4242, 2023.
- [2] Periklis Andritsos and Vassilios Tzerpos. Information-theoretic software clustering. *IEEE Transactions on Software Engineering*, 31:150–165, 2005.
- [3] Imam Asrowardi, SD Putra, and E Subyantoro. Designing microservice architectures for scalability and reliability in e-commerce. In *Journal of Physics: Conference Series*, volume 1450, page 012077. IOP Publishing, 2020.
- [4] Wesley KG Assunção, Thelma Elita Colanzi, Luiz Carvalho, Alessandro Garcia, Juliana Alves Pereira, Maria Julia de Lima, and Carlos Lucena. Analysis of a many-objective optimization approach for identifying microservices from legacy systems. *Empirical Software Engineering*, 27(2):51, 2022.
- [5] Armin Balalaie, Abbas Heydamoori, Pooyan Jamshidi, Damian A Tamburri, and Theo Lynn. Microservices migration patterns. *Software: Practice and Experience*, 48(11):2019–2042, 2018.
- [6] J. Blank and K. Deb. pymoo: Multi-objective optimization in python. *IEEE Access*, 8:89497–89509, 2020.
- [7] Julian Blank, Kalyan Deb, and Proteek Chandan Roy. *Investigating the Normalization Procedure of NSGA-III: 10th International Conference, EMO 2019, East Lansing, MI, USA, March 10-13, 2019, Proceedings*, pages 229–240. 02 2019.
- [8] Luiz Carvalho, Thelma Elita Colanzi, Wesley K. G. Assunção, Alessandro Garcia, Juliana Alves Pereira, Marcos Kalinowski, Rafael Maiani de Mello, Maria Julia de Lima, and Carlos Lucena. On the usefulness of automatically generated microservice architectures. *IEEE Transactions on Software Engineering*, 50(3):651–667, 2024.
- [9] Adambarage Anuruddha Chathuranga De Alwis, Alistair Barros, Colin Fidge, and Artem Polyvyanyy. Remodularization analysis for microservice discovery using syntactic and semantic clustering. In *International Conference on Advanced Information Systems Engineering*, pages 3–19. Springer, 2020.
- [10] Kalyanmoy Deb, Samir Agrawal, Amrit Pratap, and T. Meyarivan. A fast and elitist multiobjective genetic algorithm: Nsga-ii. *IEEE Trans. Evol. Comput.*, 6:182–197, 2002.
- [11] Kalyanmoy Deb and Himanshu Jain. An evolutionary many-objective optimization algorithm using reference-point-based nondominated sorting approach, part i: Solving problems with box constraints. *IEEE Transactions on Evolutionary Computation*, 18(4):577–601, 2014.
- [12] MohammadHadi Dehghani, Shekoufeh Kolahdouz-Rahimi, Massimo Tisi, and Dalila Tamzalit. Facilitating the migration to the microservice architecture via model-driven reverse engineering and reinforcement learning. *Software and Systems Modeling*, 21(3):1115–1133, 2022.
- [13] Nicola Dragoni, Saverio Giallorenzo, Alberto Lluch Lafuente, Manuel Mazzara, Fabrizio Montesi, Ruslan Mustafin, and Larisa Safina. Microservices: yesterday, today, and tomorrow. *Present and ulterior software engineering*, pages 195–216, 2017.
- [14] Roy T. Fielding. Architectural styles and the design of network-based software architectures. 2000.
- [15] Martin Fowler and James Lewis. Microservices, a definition of this new architectural term, 2014.
- [16] Paolo Francesco, Patricia Lago, and Ivano Malavolta. Migrating towards microservice architectures: An industrial survey. pages 29–2909, 04 2018.
- [17] Andrei Furda, Colin Fidge, Olaf Zimmermann, Wayne Kelly, and Alistair Barros. Migrating enterprise legacy source code to microservices: On multi-tenancy, statefulness and data consistency. *IEEE Software*, 35, 06 2018.
- [18] Jean-Philippe Gouigoux and Dalila Tamzalit. From monolith to microservices: Lessons learned on an industrial migration to a web oriented architecture. In *2017 IEEE international conference on software architecture workshops (ICSAW)*, pages 62–65. IEEE, 2017.
- [19] Jean-Philippe Gouigoux and Dalila Tamzalit. “functional-first” recommendations for beneficial microservices migration and integration lessons learned from an industrial experience. In *International Conference on Software Architecture Companion*, pages 182–186. IEEE, 2019.
- [20] Jean-Philippe Gouigoux, Dalila Tamzalit, and Joost Noppen. Microservice maturity of organizations: towards an assessment framework. In *International Conference on Research Challenges in Information Science*, pages 523–540. Springer, 2021.
- [21] Wuxia Jin, Ting Liu, Qinghua Zheng, Di Cui, and Yuanfang Cai. Functionality-oriented microservice extraction based on execution trace clustering. In *2018 IEEE International Conference on Web Services (ICWS)*, pages 211–218, 2018.
- [22] Anup K Kalia, Jin Xiao, Rahul Krishna, Saurabh Sinha, Maja Vukovic, and Debasish Banerjee. Mono2micro: a practical and effective tool for decomposing monolithic java applications to microservices. In *Proceedings of the 29th ACM joint meeting on European software engineering conference and symposium on the foundations of software engineering*, pages 1214–1224, 2021.
- [23] Grace Lewis, Edwin Morris, Dennis Smith, and Liam O’Brien. Service-oriented migration and reuse technique (smart). In *13th IEEE International Workshop on Software Technology and Engineering Practice (STEP’05)*, pages 222–229. IEEE, 2005.
- [24] Prabal Mahanta and Suchin Chouta. Translating a legacy stack to microservices using a modernization facade with performance optimization for container deployments. In *On the Move to Meaningful Internet Systems: OTM 2019 Workshops: Confederated International Workshops: EI2N, FBM, ICSP, Meta4eS and SIAnA 2019, Rhodes, Greece, October 21–25, 2019, Revised Selected Papers*, pages 143–154. Springer, 2020.
- [25] Mark Masse. *REST API Design Rulebook: Designing Consistent RESTful Web Service Interfaces*. O’Reilly Media, Inc., Sebastopol, CA, 2011.
- [26] Genc Mazlami, Jürgen Cito, and Philipp Leitner. Extraction of microservices from monolithic software architectures. *2017 IEEE International Conference on Web Services (ICWS)*, pages 524–531, 2017.
- [27] Mohamed Wiem Mkaouer, Marouane Kessentini, Slim Bechikh, Kalyanmoy Deb, and Mel Ó Cinnéide. High dimensional search-based software engineering: finding tradeoffs among 15 objectives for automating software refactoring using nsga-iii. *Proceedings of the 2014 Annual Conference on Genetic and Evolutionary Computation*, 2014.
- [28] Sam Newman. *Building microservices*. ” O’Reilly Media, Inc.”, 2021.
- [29] Vikram Nitin, Shubhi Asthana, Baishakhi Ray, and Rahul Krishna. Cargo: Ai-guided dependency analysis for migrating monolithic applications to microservices architecture, 2022.
- [30] Nils Reimers and Iryna Gurevych. Sentence-bert: Sentence embeddings using siamese bert-networks, 2019.
- [31] Islem Saidani, Ali Ouni, Mohamed Wiem Mkaouer, and Aymen Saied. *Towards Automated Microservices Extraction Using Multi-objective Evolutionary Search*, pages 58–63. 10 2019.
- [32] Maximilian Schiedermeier, Jörg Kienzle, and Bettina Kemme. Fiddlr: streamlining reuse with concern-specific modelling languages. In *Proceedings of the 14th ACM SIGPLAN International Conference on Software Language Engineering*, SLE 2021, page 164–176, New York, NY, USA, 2021. Association for Computing Machinery.

- [33] Khaled Sellami, Ali Ouni, Mohamed Saied, Salah Bouktif, and Mohamed Wiem Mkaouer. Improving microservices extraction using evolutionary search. *Information and Software Technology*, 151:106996, 11 2022.
- [34] Davide Taibi, Valentina Lenarduzzi, and Claus Pahl. Processes, motivations, and issues for migrating to microservices architectures: An empirical investigation. *IEEE Cloud Computing*, 4(5):22–32, 2017.
- [35] Nandan Thakur, Nils Reimers, Johannes Daxenberger, and Iryna Gurevych. Augmented sbert: Data augmentation method for improving bi-encoders for pairwise sentence scoring tasks, 2021.
- [36] Imen Trabelsi, Manel Abdellatif, Abdalgader Abubaker, Naouel Moha, Sébastien Mosser, Samira Ebrahimi-Kahou, and Yann-Gaël Guéhéneuc. From legacy to microservices: A type-based approach for microservices identification using machine learning and semantic analysis. *Journal of Software: Evolution and Process*, page e2503, 2022.
- [37] Imen Trabelsi, Manel Abdellatif, Abdalgader Abubaker, Naouel Moha, Sébastien Mosser, Samira Ebrahimi-Kahou, and Yann-Gaël Guéhéneuc. From legacy to microservices: A type-based approach for microservices identification using machine learning and semantic analysis. *Journal of Software: Evolution and Process*, 35, 09 2022.
- [38] Imen Trabelsi, Naouel Moha, Yann-Gaël Guéhéneuc, and Lucas Geffard. Magnet : Method-based approach using graph neural network for microservices identification. *21st IEEE International Conference on Software Architecture*, 2024.
- [39] Shenglin Zhang, Sibao Xia, Wenzhao Fan, Binpeng Shi, Xiao Xiong, Zhenyu Zhong, Minghua Ma, Yongqian Sun, and Dan Pei. Failure diagnosis in microservice systems: A comprehensive survey and analysis. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.01710*, 2024.
- [40] Eckart Zitzler and Simon Künzli. Indicator-based selection in multiobjective search. In *International conference on parallel problem solving from nature*, pages 832–842. Springer, 2004.