

# Statistical complexity of software systems represented as multi-layer networks

Jan Žižka<sup>a</sup>

<sup>a</sup>Masaryk University, Faculty of Informatics, Botanická 68a, Brno 60200, Czech Republic

---

## Abstract

Software systems are expansive, exhibiting behaviors characteristic of complex systems, such as self-organization and emergence. These systems, highlighted by advancements in Large Language Models (LLMs) and other AI applications developed by entities like DeepMind and OpenAI showcase remarkable properties. Despite these advancements, there is a notable absence of effective tools for empirically measuring software system complexity, hindering our ability to compare these systems or assess the impact of modifications on their properties. Addressing this gap, we propose the adoption of statistical complexity—a metric already applied in fields such as physics, biology, and economics—as an empirical measure for evaluating the complexity of software systems. Our approach involves calculating the statistical complexity of software systems modeled as multi-layer networks validated by simulations and theoretical comparisons. This measure offers insights into the organizational structure of software systems, exhibits promising consistency with theoretical expectations, and paves the way for leveraging statistical complexity as a tool to deepen our understanding of complex software systems and into their plausible and unplausible emergent behaviors.

*Keywords:* Statistical Complexity; Software Systems; Complex System Theory; Complex Software Systems; Multi-layer Networks

---

## 1. Introduction

Software systems are continuously growing in size and complexity, becoming increasingly large and complicated [13], with a super-linear growth rate. Some of these systems are starting to exhibit properties and features of complex systems, such as self-organization and emergence, which are bringing surprising advancements to our society, as seen in systems developed by DeepMind [5], and OpenAI [20]. However, we lack tools for designing and building large systems with valuable complex behaviors. Complex software systems may be defined by a set of properties [31], but these do not allow for calculable empirical values. Understanding software systems requires a combination of tools and viewpoints. The motivation for our work is to deepen our knowledge of complex software systems, providing insight into plausible emergent behaviors, such as those bringing added value to software system use beyond their original design, as well as unplausible emergent behaviors, such as emergent errors or increased security attack surface or indicators that the software system is complicated rather than complex, affecting its maintenance and development costs.

---

\*Corresponding author.Email: jzi@mail.muni.cz

In this paper, we propose using statistical complexity measures [2, 16] as a methodological tool to calculate the complexity of software systems. This measure may provide a means to compare different software systems based on their complexity and measure the effects of different properties on software system complexity. Statistical complexity appears to describe system complexity well [16] as it allows for the disqualification of purely ordered and fully chaotic systems. It measures the information in the system and the emergence of structure or patterns.

We hypothesize that statistical complexity can be calculated for software systems represented as multi-layer networks, where the state of the system is represented by the measure of inter-component communication and its internal state. We expect a completely ordered system where only one state out of all possible system states is realized will have zero statistical complexity. Conversely, a software system where the communication and component state is random, chaotic, or disordered and lacks internal organization will have low statistical complexity. We expect that a software system with an internal structure represented as a multi-layer network with ordered relationships among the layers will exhibit higher values of statistical complexity. We surmise that a system organization and information content exists that provides the highest statistical complexity. We suggest that software systems of a similar type, with the system state represented by the same qualitative measures, can be compared using normalized statistical complexity, providing information on which of the systems is more complex from the viewpoint of this measure, indicating where the system's organization and amount of information are the highest. We will validate the hypothesis by running simulations of software systems modeled as multi-layer networks with varying parameters, such as the number of components, layers, and simulation time. The results will be compared to the expected hypothesis.

The contributions of this paper are: Formulating equations to calculate the statistical complexity of a software system. Specifying the design of a software system model as a multi-layer network and the selection of a simulation framework. Providing validation of the hypothesis that statistical complexity calculated for a software system exhibits the expected behavior based on simulation. Demonstrating that statistical complexity can be used to compare software systems and that it reflects the software system's organization and information content.

The paper is structured as follows. First, we discuss software system complexity measures in Section 2, where we introduce statistical complexity. In Section 3, we describe the design of the software system model, and we share the discussion on simulation execution and obtained results. Observed limitations of the approach are presented in Section 4, and conclusions are shared in Section 5.

## 2. Software System Complexity Measure

### 2.1. System Complexity Calculation Methods

The literature proposes multiple methods for calculating a value corresponding to the complexity of a system [15, 16, 23], which might be applied to software systems. In this section, we briefly overview some of the methods and discuss, in more detail, those accepted as suitable measures of complexity. The methods are summarized in Table 1.

**Kolmogorov Complexity:** One of the primary system complexity measures is the algorithmic complexity, also known as Kolmogorov complexity [14]. The value of Kolmogorov complexity of an object, in our case, a system, defines the shortest program that can produce the object as output when run on a universal Turing machine [25]. The Kolmogorov's complexity is generally uncomputable, as already noted by Kolmogorov. Although Kolmogorov's complexity may be estimated [8], but even that is computationally difficult. The Kolmogorov's complexity is context-dependent [6], complicating its general usability. Using Kolmogorov complexity to measure software system complexity might be challenging.

**Effective Complexity:** Another proposed measure of complexity is effective complexity [11]. Defined by the length of a concise description of an object's regularities, effective complexity measures the amount of non-random information in the system. Like Kolmogorov's complexity, effective complexity is context-dependent and lacks a universally accepted calculation method, making it impractical to measure the complexity of software systems.

**Shannon Entropy:** Originating from thermodynamics and information theory [21], quantifies the uncertainty in a system's state, with ordered systems having low Shannon entropy and disordered or chaotic systems having high Shannon entropy. The Shannon's entropy does not capture the system's organization or structure, thus failing to distinguish between complex and chaotic systems.

**Statistical Complexity:** Combines information quantity and system organization measures [2]. A fully ordered

system has zero statistical complexity. As the organization of a system increases along with its complexity, the statistical complexity increases, while a fully chaotic system has again low statistical complexity. Statistical complexity will be discussed in detail in the following sections.

**Network Theory Based Complexity:** The work by Gao & Li [10] measures software system complexity using complex network theory, introducing a system as a network, and deriving complexity calculations based on the distance to “average” values representing the system. This method, conceptually similar to statistical complexity, focuses primarily on structural complexity without considering information or entropy.

**Graph Theory Based Complexity:** Dali [4] utilizes network graph theory to measure a system’s structural complexity based on various metrics. The proposed method utilizes network graph theory to determine the structural complexity of a system based on  $d$  the average shortest distance,  $p_k$  the degree of distribution,  $C$  the average clustering coefficient,  $B$  the betweenness, and the correlation  $R(k_i, k_j)$ ,  $R(k_i, C_i)$  determining collaboration relation and modularization degree. This method does not account for information content, potentially misrepresenting ordered systems as complex. Publications [4, 17] provide evidence that software systems exhibit small-world and scale-free network properties, based on analysis of software systems and calculated characteristic parameters. With this proposed measure, an ultimately ordered system would show high complexity measures. Hanyan [12] extends work of Dali [4] and Ma et al. [17] with modeling a software system with three-dimensionality layers, the structure level, the function level, and the code level.

**Generalized Framework:** Efatmaneshnik [7] proposes a framework combining subjective and objective measures of system complexity, demonstrating that statistical measures fit within this framework. The author introduces a subjective simplicity and proposes to calculate a subjective complexity as a distance from simple measured as, following the Kullback-Leibler distance, topological difference. The subjectivity depends on the selection of a suitable reference model, and the author demonstrates that statistical measures of complexity fit into the general framework of measuring complexity. Other measures shown to follow the proposed general framework are those offered by Shiner [22]; however, this measure was criticized by Crutchfield [3] by "... pointing out that it is over universal, in the sense that it has the same dependence on disorder for structurally distinct systems." Efatmaneshnik [7] also proposes that the cyclomatic complexity measure follows the proposed general framework. The authors then suggest that the engineered systems opt to be described by graph theory as the most appropriate tool. The proposed generalized framework can also utilize the self-dissimilarity defined by Wolpert [27] described by the Maximum Common Subgraph (MCS). Extracting MCS is not straightforward, and finding MCS is an NP-hard problem [1]. The size of a system can be measured as graph entropy [18] or by counting the number of graph elements (nodes and links). Determining the simplicity is itself subjective and therefore unreliable. The authors conclude that complexity measures tend to be context-dependent; The useful complexity measure for engineered systems has two components, objective and subjective, which “allows to study system complexity from the perspective of multiple stakeholders.”

Table 1: comparison of system complexity calculation methods

Method	Calculable	Agreed methods	Information	Structure	Context independent
Kolmogorov complexity	-	-	+	+	-
Effective complexity	+	-	-	+	-
Shannon entropy	+	+	+	-	+
Statistical complexity	+	+	+	+	-/+
Network theory based complexity	+	+	-	+	-/+
Graph theory based complexity	+/-	+	-	+	-/+

Several methods proposed by literature for calculation of system complexity were discussed in this section. A suitable method for calculating the complexity of software systems requires the following properties: i) Must be calculable, ii) must provide low complexity values for fully ordered as well as for disordered systems, and if possible, iii) should be context-independent.

Based on the discussed properties, statistical complexity emerges as a suitable measure of system complexity for software systems due to its ability to account for ordered and disordered systems while preferably being context-independent. Graph-based metrics show promise; however, their emphasis on structural aspects rather than infor-

mational content, combined with the challenges in calculating them, make them less ideal as a universal measure of complexity. We focus on utilizing statistical complexity as a measure of software system complexity.

## 2.2. Statistical Complexity

The Statistical Complexity Measure (SCM) [2, 16] is a concept used to quantify the complexity of a system, combining elements of randomness (entropy) and structure. The most common formulation of SCM is based on the concept of Shannon entropy and the Jensen-Shannon divergence. The formula for SCM is typically given as follows:

$$SCM = H \cdot Q \quad (1)$$

Where:  $SCM$  is the statistical complexity,  $H$  is the Shannon entropy, which measures the randomness or unpredictability in the system, and  $Q$  is the disequilibrium, which is often quantified using a measure such as the Jensen-Shannon divergence. It measures how different the actual system state probability distribution is from a uniform distribution (equidistribution). The Shannon entropy  $H$  is calculated as:

$$H = - \sum_i p_i \log(p_i) \quad (2)$$

where  $p_i$  is the probability of the  $i$ -th state. The disequilibrium  $Q$ , using Jensen-Shannon divergence, is calculated as:

$$Q = JS D(P||R) \quad (3)$$

Where  $P$  is the actual probability distribution of the system,  $R$  is the reference probability distribution (often taken as the uniform distribution), and  $JS D$  is the Jensen-Shannon divergence. The Jensen-Shannon divergence itself is defined as:

$$JS D(P||R) = \frac{1}{2} D(P||M) + \frac{1}{2} D(R||M) \quad (4)$$

where  $M$  is the average of  $P$  and  $R$ , and  $D$  is the Kullback-Leibler divergence, given by:

$$D(P||M) = \sum_i p_i \log\left(\frac{p_i}{m_i}\right) \quad (5)$$

and similarly

$$D(R||M) = \sum_i r_i \log\left(\frac{r_i}{m_i}\right) \quad (6)$$

SCM combines the concepts of entropy and divergence to provide a measure of complexity that accounts for both randomness and pattern or structure in the system. It is used in complexity science, information theory, and statistical physics. Figure 1 [16] demonstrates SCM with respect to the system organization for physics systems ranging from a crystal to an ideal gas. It shows how the entropy and the disequilibrium contribute to statistical complexity. It also demonstrates the fact that a completely disordered system, as well as a completely ordered system has low statistical complexity.




Figure 1: Sketch of the intuitive notion of the magnitudes of “information” ( $H$ ) and “disequilibrium” ( $Q$ ) for the physical systems and the behavior intuitively required for the magnitude of “complexity.” The quantity  $SCM = H \cdot Q$  is proposed to measure such a magnitude. [16]

The statistical complexity as proposed by Lòpez-Ruiz, Mancini, and Calbet [16] has to have a quantified clear interpretation as pointed out by Feldman [9]. This implies that the use of the SCM relies on the knowledge of the expected structure of the system. In software systems, the engineered systems, such knowledge lies within the software system design and implementation, allowing for determining and quantifying the statistical complexity results.

Both the magnitude of the Shannon entropy  $H$  and disequilibrium  $Q$  depend on the number of states of the system. The values must be normalized to compare the statistical complexity of systems with different numbers of components and different numbers of states. The entropy  $H$  is directly correlated to the number of states; therefore it can be normalized into the range 0 to 1 with:

$$\bar{H} = \frac{H}{n \cdot \log(n - 1)} \quad (7)$$

Note that we do construct the system state probability vector by concatenating component state probabilities (see Equation 13), therefore we must normalize  $H$  with  $n \cdot \log(n - 1)$  where  $n$  is number of components in the system. The disequilibrium  $Q$  represented with Jensen-Shannon divergence does not have a direct correlation to probabilities of the system state vector. For complex systems,  $Q_{max}$  might be estimated empirically by simulating or enumerating various possible distributions and calculating which yields the maximum divergence from  $R$ . We expect that an *ordered* system configuration has the maximum  $Q$  compared to any other system configuration with same number of components. We define  $Q_{max} = Q_{Ordered}$  and the normalized  $\bar{Q}$  can be calculated as:

$$\bar{Q} = \frac{Q}{Q_{max}} \quad (8)$$

To determine the system state probabilities, the number of messages sent among components are collected. The state vector is defined as:

$$v_i = [s_1, s_2, \dots, s_{n-1}] \quad (9)$$

Where:  $v_i$  is the state vector of the  $i$ -th component,  $s_j$  represents the count of messages sent to the  $j$ -th component in the system, for  $j = 1, 2, \dots, n - 1$ .  $n$  is the number of components in the system. To calculate the probabilities of each state as defined by the number of messages between components in the system, we can normalize the vector  $v_i$  by calculating the total number of messages  $S$ :

$$S = \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} s_i \quad (10)$$

Utilizing  $S$  we define the vector of probabilities  $p = [p_1, p_2, \dots, p_n]$ , where each element  $p_j$  is calculated as the fraction of the  $j$ -th element of  $v_i$  divided by  $S$ . Therefore, each  $p_j$  can be defined as:

$$p_j = \frac{s_j}{S} \quad (11)$$

for  $i = 1, 2, \dots, n - 1$ . The vector of probabilities  $p_i$  derived from the initial vector  $v_i$  is:

$$p_i = \left[ \frac{s_1}{S}, \frac{s_2}{S}, \dots, \frac{s_{n-1}}{S} \right] \quad (12)$$

Each  $s_j$  in the vector  $v_i$  can take values from a set that defines all possible states for that component. The system state probability vector is then defined by:

$$P = [p_1, p_2, \dots, p_n] \quad (13)$$

The vector  $P$  represents the probability of a complete system state, combining state probabilities of all components into a single vector. The component state reference probabilities  $r_i$  are constructed as a uniform distribution.

$$r_i = [u, u, \dots, u]_{n-1} \quad (14)$$

Where:  $r_i$  is the reference state probability  $i$ -th component,  $u$  represents uniform probability distribution calculated as  $\frac{1}{n-1}$ . The system state reference probability vector is then defined by:

$$R = [r_1, r_2, \dots, r_n] \quad (15)$$

This vector  $R$  represents the reference probability of the complete system state, combining reference state probabilities of all components into a single vector. An example Python implementation is provided in [29].

### 3. Validation of SCM calculation for software systems

Our goal is to validate that the SCM can be calculated for software systems and that it follows the proposed theory. To have a controlled environment where experiments can be executed, we need to define a software system model, which may be executed using simulation software. The simulation results will provide data for validation.

#### 3.1. Software system model design

A system is a set of interconnected and interdependent components forming an integrated whole. A software system is a system composed of software components [19, 26]. A software system can be modeled as a network with nodes and connections between nodes. The topology of the system is defined by connections among the nodes, some typical topologies are [24]: **Full Mesh**, **Layered**, **P2P**, **Tree**, **Ring**, **Star**, **Bus**, **Hybrid**.

Implementing each topology using the **Full Mesh** model with configurable properties of the connections between nodes is possible. Such a model allows flexibility when simulating different types of software system topologies. The model complexity grows quadratically and is  $O(N^2)$ . For evaluating the statistical complexity, the **Full Mesh** has an advantage as the probabilities for the system can be determined directly, and simulations with 1024 nodes can still be executed with reasonable time and resources. Considering the flexibility and simplicity of calculations, we have chosen to use the **Full Mesh** model. An example of a model diagram is in Figure 2. For purposes of verification of SCM, we'll be using **P2P**, **Full Mesh**, and **Layered** topologies, which may represent ordered, chaotic, and structured types of systems, respectively.

Each system component can send or receive messages to or from any other component. The states of the system are represented by the states of each component, forming a vector defined by the amount of communication with other components. By default, each component will send or forward the received message to a random component generated from a uniform probability distribution. This emulates chaotic, unstructured communication and allows the creation of the **Chaotic** system topology.

The model implementation allows the system to be partitioned into groups of components by defining several groups. The components within the group send and forward messages to randomly selected components from a uniform probability distribution, similarly as in the case of chaotic system, but only within the group of components. The groups of components represent layers in a multi-layer network of components. The model is designed so that if more than one layer is configured, then 1% of components on the layer send and forward messages to a specific component in another group in a strictly orderly configuration. This creates a **Layered** topology with a system containing a different number of layers. To create a **P2P** topology, the model has the option to send messages only to one component in the system or to a specific group of components. For purposes of verification of statistical complexity measure calculation, we will create the following system models:

**Ordered** system model is designed to represent a fully ordered system where only one state takes place out of all possible states. The probability of this state is equal to one, and the probability of any other possible state is zero. The expected entropy of such a system is zero, and the disequilibrium is maximum for such a system configuration. The resulting statistical complexity is, therefore, zero. This model is realized by a full mesh generic model where only one component sends messages to another specific component. Only one state among all possible states in the full mesh system is visited.

**Chaotic** system model represents a system on the other edge of the spectrum, where any state has an equal probability of occurrence. This model is implemented by **Full Mesh** network where every component sends a message to any component at random with uniform probability distribution.

**Layered** system model is executed by partitioning the system into 2, 4, 8, 16, 32, and 64 layers. The number of layers is intentionally configured as powers of 2. Such systems' resulting entropy is also expected to be on the exponential power scale of 2 between ordered and chaotic systems. This assumption defines the numerical value of system configuration (see Table 2).




Figure 2: Layered system

### 3.2. Simulation execution

The model and system configurations were implemented using *OMNeT++*. The system component was implemented as a C++ *Component* class derived from *cSimpleModule*. The system was modeled as a network constructed as a full mesh using *OMNeT++* modeling language NED. The definition also contains configurable parameters of the model for specifying the number of components, the number of component groups (layers), and the definition of whether the component should use random, uniformly distributed message targets or strictly predicted destinations. The used model implementation is provided in [28]. The simulation was run with a different number of components and different simulation times for the following set of system configurations: **Ordered**, **Layered** with 64, 32, 16, 8, 4, and 2 layers and **Chaotic**. The configurations are in detail described in Section 3.1. The simulation was run for systems with the following number of components: 128, 256, 512, and 1024. Simulation times were: 10, 100, 200, and 500 seconds. The simulation times were selected based on experiments; longer simulation times did not yield significant differences compared to results with a simulation time of 500 seconds. As highlighted by Feldman [9], defining the complexity's relationship to the system's actual structure is essential. As the models have an exponentially increasing number of layers, we expect the system configuration dimension to be exponential. We define the completely ordered system as having dimensionality 1. The dimensionality of the configurations is summarized in Table 2.

Table 2: System configuration dimensionality

Configuration	Dimension	Abbreviation
Ordered	1 ( $2^0$ )	Or
64 Layers	2 ( $2^1$ )	L64
32 Layers	4 ( $2^2$ )	L32
16 Layers	8 ( $2^3$ )	L16
8 Layers	16 ( $2^4$ )	L8
4 Layers	32 ( $2^5$ )	L4
2 Layers	64 ( $2^6$ )	L2
Chaotic	128 ( $2^7$ )	Ch

### 3.3. Results

The results of the simulations and calculation of normalized statistical complexity are shown in Figure 3. The data points for a simulation time of 500 seconds are shared in Table 3. Complete results, including graphs and data






Figure 3: Normalized statistical complexity of simulated systems

tables, are provided in [30]. The graph's x-axis represents the system configuration or system dimensionality described in Table 2, ranging between ordered and chaotic systems. The y-axis provides calculated entropy values  $H$ , disequilibrium  $Q$ , and resulting statistical complexity measure  $SCM$ . The graphs show simulations of different sizes of simulated systems with 128, 256, 512, and 1024 components respectively coded in the graphs' legend as  $SCM_n$  where  $n$  represents the number of components. Each graph shows results for different simulation times denoted by  $t = [timeinseconds]$  for simulation times 10, 100, 200 and 500 seconds respectively. Similar to the graphs, the Table 3 shows calculated results for each system configuration. The columns provide compound values of  $Q$ ,  $H$  and  $SCM$  for each system size  $n$ . The rows represent the system configuration defined by Table 2. The normalized results of calculated  $SCM$  for simulated software systems, as presented in Figure 3 and in Table 3 show agreement with the theoretical intuitive behavior of  $SCM$  as described in Figure 1. The normalization allows for the comparison of different sizes of simulated software systems, unlike the actual values where magnitudes of  $SCM$  differ as expected [30].

The results demonstrate that the absolute value of entropy  $H$  for layered configurations increases as the number of components increases. This is expected as the system with more components contains more information. The disequilibrium  $Q$  converges to zero irrespective of the number of components where the system configuration reaches a chaotic type of system. This behavior is also expected as this is the measure of the organization of a system. For an unordered system, the value should be low, irrespective of the number of components of the system. We can determine the system configuration with the highest complexity from the obtained results by locating a row with  $SCM$  equal to value 1.000. For example, in Table 3, the highest complexity was measured for system L8. The system with eight layers and assigned dimensionality 16 based on Table 2. As the simulation time increases, the values of  $Q$ ,  $H$ , and  $SCM$  converge. With short simulation times, the amount of accumulated information is low. Since the calculations are based on probabilities of system state, the precision of the measurements depends on the sample size.

The simulated software system model was designed to scale with the number of components, and the maximum measured complexity peaks with the same system clustering configuration. The graphs show that with a higher amount of components, the complexity measurement shifts towards a lesser number of layers. This shift results from the fact that layers contain more components, resulting in an overall higher amount of information. The same is also visible in entropy values  $H$ , an expected consequence of  $SCM$  being a measure of the information in the system. The complexity of the ordered system is low, as well as the complexity of the disordered system. The system's organization into layers increases the measured complexity of the system, and for the selected system design, the highest complexity is achieved for a system with eight layers.

#### 4. Limitations

Although it was shown that the statistical complexity measure can be calculated for software systems modeled as multi-layer networks, the method comes with limitations that must be considered. As commented by Feldman [9], the statistical complexity requires an understanding of the interpretation of the system's structure calculated using disequilibrium  $Q$ . The measured values must have concrete representations. This might be challenging for software systems viewed as a black box. Knowing the software system design will allow for unambiguous interpretation, as demonstrated by the software system design used in our research. The definition of system state vector by Equation 13 and selection of reference system probabilities defined by Equation 15 is critical. It might not be easy to derive

Table 3: Normalized simulation results for t=500s

	$\bar{H}$	$\frac{128}{\bar{Q}}$	$\overline{SCM}$	$\bar{H}$	$\frac{256}{\bar{Q}}$	$\overline{SCM}$	$\bar{H}$	$\frac{512}{\bar{Q}}$	$\overline{SCM}$	$\bar{H}$	$\frac{1024}{\bar{Q}}$	$\overline{SCM}$
Or	0.000	1.000	0.000	0.000	1.000	0.000	0.000	1.000	0.000	0.000	1.000	0.000
L64	0.072	0.987	0.170	0.206	0.969	0.439	0.309	0.957	0.610	0.391	0.950	0.727
L32	0.235	0.946	0.534	0.346	0.925	0.705	0.431	0.913	0.812	0.498	0.907	0.884
L16	0.395	0.873	0.829	0.483	0.853	0.907	0.550	0.842	0.954	0.603	0.836	0.987
L8	0.552	0.755	1.000	0.616	0.738	1.000	0.665	0.728	1.000	0.706	0.724	1.000
L4	0.703	0.578	0.976	0.746	0.565	0.928	0.778	0.559	0.898	0.805	0.558	0.879
L2	0.852	0.329	0.674	0.872	0.324	0.622	0.887	0.324	0.593	0.902	0.329	0.580
Ch	1.000	0.005	0.012	1.000	0.010	0.021	1.000	0.019	0.040	1.000	0.041	0.080

these for all software systems, and universally usable and validated methods must be developed. Understanding that statistical complexity gives just one specific view of a software system is essential. Other methods have to be utilized to interpret the measured data, such as qualitative analysis of the system properties and comparison of estimated statistical complexity between real software systems and system models. Digital twin technologies could be utilized. The statistical complexity is based on system state probabilities, so the measurement duration must be defined carefully.

## 5. Conclusions

We have demonstrated that statistical complexity measure (SCM) can be utilized to measure the complexity of a software system modeled as a network composed of components and interconnections. The measured complexity is reflecting both the amount of information in the system as well as the structure or organization of the system. We have also shown how the state vector of such a system can be designed in order to collect probabilities of the system state necessary for the SCM calculation. The hypothesis about complexity measure values as presented by López-Ruiz [16] were validated using simulation of a software system with varying organization structure emulating a system as a multi-layer network. The SCM measurements on simulated systems show good agreement with the theory. We have demonstrated the importance of normalization of the calculated values, allowing comparison of software systems of different sizes. This has direct implications, showing that the SCM may be used to compare systems based on complexity measures. The complexity of a system can be approached from different angles, a complex software system can be defined by a set of properties [31], however, such a definition does not provide a means to measure and compare the systems quantitatively. The statistical complexity measure can be used as one of the perspectives describing complex software systems, providing a qualitative measure. The qualitative measure can then be used to compare software systems based on the SCM and analyze software systems by comparing them to models. This measure may then reveal relationships between software system organization and information contained in the system, and such knowledge may be utilized to understand the effects of complex software system properties as presented in [31]. There is a potential to use SCM to assist in the optimization of software systems to maximize the system complexness providing emergent behaviors, such optimization may be implemented as an adaptive self-organization of the software systems based on SCM feedback values. The measured SCM may also gain insight into unwanted emergent behaviors, such as emergent errors, increased security attack space and the system being complicated rather than complex, further increasing maintenance and development costs. We will, in future research, focus on these aspects and on utilization of SCM in real software systems bridging results provided by this paper through simulation into practice. These possibilities open new directions of research toward understanding complex software systems.

## Acknowledgements

The author would like to express his profound gratitude to Dr. Bruno Rossi and Prof. Tomáš Pitner for their invaluable comments and thorough review, which enhanced the quality and clarity of the text of this paper.

## References

- [1] Bunke, H., Shearer, K., 1998. A graph distance metric based on the maximal common subgraph. *Pattern recognition letters* 19, 255–259.
- [2] Crutchfield, J., Young, K., 1989. Inferring statistical complexity. *Physical review letters* 63, 105–108.
- [3] Crutchfield, J.P., Feldman, D.P., Shalizi, C.R., 2000. Comment i on “simple measure for complexity”. *Physical review E* 62, 2996.
- [4] Dali, L., 2014. Complexity measurement of large-scale software system based on complex network. *Journal of Networks* 9, 1317.
- [5] DeepMind, . URL: <https://www.deepmind.com/>.
- [6] Edmonds, B.M., 1999. Syntactic measures of complexity. University of Manchester Manchester, UK.
- [7] Efatmaneshnik, M., Ryan, M.J., 2016. A general framework for measuring system complexity. *Complexity* 21, 533–546.
- [8] Evans, S.C., Hershey, J.E., Saulnier, G., 2002. Kolmogorov complexity estimation and analysis, in: 6th World Conf. on Systemics, Cybernetics and Informatics.
- [9] Feldman, D.P., Crutchfield, J.P., 1998. Measures of statistical complexity: Why? *Physics Letters A* 238, 244–252.
- [10] Gao, S., Li, C., 2009. Complex network model for software system and complexity measurement, in: 2009 WRI World Congress on Computer Science and Information Engineering, IEEE. pp. 624–628.
- [11] Gell-Mann, M., 2002. What is complexity?, in: *Complexity and industrial clusters: Dynamics and models in theory and practice*. Springer, pp. 13–24.
- [12] Hanyan, L., Shihai, W., Bin, L., Peng, X., 2017. Software complexity measurement based on complex network, in: 2017 8th IEEE International Conference on Software Engineering and Service Science (ICSESS), IEEE. pp. 262–265.
- [13] Koch, S., 2007. Software evolution in open source projects—a large-scale investigation. *Journal of Software Maintenance and Evolution: Research and Practice* 19, 361–382.
- [14] Kolmogorov, A.N., 1965. Three approaches to the quantitative definition of information’. *Problems of information transmission* 1, 1–7.
- [15] Ladyman, J., Lambert, J., Wiesner, K., 2013. What is a complex system? *European Journal for Philosophy of Science* 3, 33–67.
- [16] López-Ruiz, R., Mancini, H., Calbet, X., 1995. A statistical measure of complexity. *Physics Letters A* 209, 321–326.
- [17] Ma, Y.T., He, K.Q., Li, B., Liu, J., Zhou, X.Y., 2010. A hybrid set of complexity metrics for large-scale object-oriented software systems. *Journal of Computer Science and Technology* 25, 1184–1201.
- [18] Mowshowitz, A., Dehmer, M., 2012. Entropy and the complexity of graphs revisited. *Entropy* 14, 559–570.
- [19] Myers, C.R., 2003. Software systems as complex networks: Structure, function, and evolvability of software collaboration graphs. *Physical review E* 68, 046116.
- [20] OpenAI, . URL: <https://openai.com/>.
- [21] Shannon, C.E., 1948. A mathematical theory of communication. *The Bell system technical journal* 27, 379–423.
- [22] Shiner, J.S., Davison, M., Landsberg, P.T., 1999. Simple measure for complexity. *Physical review E* 59, 1459.
- [23] Tabilo Alvarez, J., Ramírez-Correa, P., et al., 2023. A brief review of systems, cybernetics, and complexity. *Complexity* 2023.
- [24] Tanenbaum, A.S., 2003. *Computer networks*. Pearson Education India.
- [25] Turing, A.M., et al., 1936. On computable numbers, with an application to the entscheidungsproblem. *J. of Math* 58, 5.
- [26] Valverde, S., Solé, R.V., 2003. Hierarchical small worlds in software architecture. *arXiv preprint cond-mat/0307278* .
- [27] Wolpert, D.H., Macready, W., 2007. Using self-dissimilarity to quantify complexity. *Complexity* 12, 77–85.
- [28] Žižka, J., 2024a. OMNeT++ model of multi-layer software system URL: [https://figshare.com/articles/software/OMNeT\\_model\\_of\\_multi-layer\\_software\\_system/25465798](https://figshare.com/articles/software/OMNeT_model_of_multi-layer_software_system/25465798), doi:10.6084/m9.figshare.25465798.v1.
- [29] Žižka, J., 2024b. Statistical complexity measure (SCM) in Python URL: [https://figshare.com/articles/software/Statistical\\_complexity\\_measure\\_SCM\\_in\\_Python/25466836](https://figshare.com/articles/software/Statistical_complexity_measure_SCM_in_Python/25466836), doi:10.6084/m9.figshare.25466836.v1.
- [30] Žižka, J., 2024c. Statistical Complexity of Software Systems Represented as Multi-layer Networks - data URL: [https://figshare.com/articles/figure/Statistical\\_Complexity\\_of\\_Software\\_Systems\\_Represented\\_as\\_Multi-layer\\_Networks\\_-\\_data/25465795](https://figshare.com/articles/figure/Statistical_Complexity_of_Software_Systems_Represented_as_Multi-layer_Networks_-_data/25465795), doi:10.6084/m9.figshare.25465795.v1.
- [31] Žižka, J., Rossi, B., Pitner, T., 2023. Towards a definition of complex software system, in: Ganzha, M., Maciaszek, L., Paprzycki, M., Ślęzak, D. (Eds.), *Position Papers of the 18th Conference on Computer Science and Intelligence Systems, PTI*. p. 119–126.