


2011 Symposium on Applied Computing



Association for
Computing Machinery

Advancing Computing as a Science & Profession

Main Menu



Committee



Sponsor



Chair Messages



Table of Contents



Keyword Index



Author Index



Reviewer Index

- **CD-ROM Help**
- **Search**
- **Copyright**

Message from the Symposium Chairs

Welcome to ACM SAC 2011, The 26th Symposium on Applied Computing, and welcome to TaiChung, one of the five major metropolitan cities in Taiwan.

Following the tradition, SAC 2011 provides an international forum for applied computer scientists, computer engineers and application developers to interact and present their work. This year we have a very strong technical program. In addition to a keynote address, it also includes 237 rigorously refereed papers and 59 posters.

We would like to thank the ACM Special Interest Group on Applied Computing (SIGAPP) for being a sponsor of this conference and Tunghai University as a co-sponsor for making all the local arrangements. We have received additional funding from Taiwan National Science Council, Ministry of Education, Bureau of Foreign Trade Ministry of Economic Affairs, and Tunghai University. Special thanks go to many individuals who have contributed to the success of this conference. We thank the authors for sharing their ideas with us, the reviewers for providing valuable feedback, all the track chairs, as well as steering committee and program committee members, especially the two Program co-Chairs: Professor Chi-Cheng Hung from Southern Polytechnic State, and Professor Mathew Palatal from IUPUI, for taking time from their busy schedules to help us organize this conference. Thank you also to Professor Hisham Haddad (Member of Steering Committee and Treasurer of SAC 2011) and Professor Sung Shin (Chair of ACM SIGAPP) for their invaluable support, Professor Chih-Hsiong Shih (Tunghai University, Taiwan) for serving as the Tutorial Chair, Professor Chao-Tung Yang (Tunghai University, Taiwan) as the Local Arrangement Chair, Professor Jiman Hong (Soongsil University, Korea) as the Poster Chair, and Professor Dongwan Shin (New Mexico Tech) as the Publication Chair. We also thank all the student volunteers for assisting with registration and many other logistics without which it would be difficult, if not impossible, to proceed.

Thank you for attending SAC 2011. We hope that you enjoy the program and have a pleasant stay at Tunghai University which has one of the most beautiful college campuses in Taiwan.



William Chu
Tunghai University
TaiChung, Taiwan



W. Eric Wong
University of Texas at Dallas
Richardson, Texas, USA

Message from the Program Chairs

Mathew J. Palakal

Indiana University Purdue University, Indianapolis, USA

Chih-Cheng Hung

Southern Polytechnic State University, Marietta, USA

Welcome to the 26th International Symposium on Applied Computing (SAC 2011). For the past 25 years, SAC has become a major international venue for computing researchers and applied practitioners to convene and share ideas on recent developments in a variety of applied areas of Information Technology. The success of SAC has been the consolidation of a wide range of applied areas into specialized modules called Tracks. Each of the Tracks are then organized and administered by experts in the respective areas by instituting program committees, carrying out blind reviews according to the ACM guidelines, and finally selecting the highly qualified papers for the Track. Since its inception seven years ago, the Poster Sessions at SAC have become a tradition, and this year again the Poster will be an integral part of the Technical Program at SAC 2011.

The open Call for Track Proposals and after prescreening the proposals, 40 Tracks were finally accepted for SAC 2011. The prescreening and selections were made based on the success of those Tracks in the previous SACs as well as targeting new and emerging areas. The Call for Papers for these Tracks attracted 790 final paper submissions from 35 different countries. The submitted papers underwent the blind review process and 237 papers were finally accepted as full papers for inclusion in the Conference Proceedings and presentation during the Symposium. The final acceptance rate for SAC 2011 is 30% for the overall track. In addition to the accepted full papers, 59 papers that received high enough review scores were accepted as short papers for the Poster Program.

The Technical Program Organization of SAC 2011 is made possible through the hard work of many people from the scientific community who have volunteered and committed many hours to make it a success. Much credit goes to all the Track Chairs for making SAC 2011 Technical Sessions a huge success. Some of the popular Tracks had an unprecedented submissions and having three blind reviews for each paper was certainly a major challenge. Once again this year, we follow the previous years' tradition of organizing various tracks into six different themes. The Symposium Proceedings and the technical presentations are focused around these themes to form a series of related track sessions.

On behalf of the entire SAC 2011 Organizing Committee, we congratulate all the authors for having their papers accepted in their respective Tracks, and we wish to thank all of those who made this year's technical program a huge success. Specifically we wish to thank the speakers, track chairs, reviewers, program committee members, session chairs, presenters, and all the attendees. We also wish to convey our special thanks to the local organizing committee lead by William Chu from Tunghai University, Taichung, Taiwan.

We wish you all a pleasant stay in Taichung, hope you have a great time at SAC 2011, and you will have the opportunity to share and exchange your ideas and foster new collaborations. We would also like to take this opportunity to convey to you the news that the 27th International Symposium on Applied Computing (SAC 2012) will be held in Trento, Italy. We hope to see you all and your colleagues at SAC 2012.

Table of Contents

Scroll to the title and select a [Blue](#) link to open a paper. After viewing the paper, use the bookmarks to the left to return to the beginning of the Table of Contents.

Symposium Organizing Committee	iii
Sponsoring SIG Information	iv
Track Chairs (Co-Editors)	v
Message from the Symposium Chairs	xi
Message from the Program Chairs	xii

Volume I: Applications, Distributed Systems, and Engineering

Applied Biometrics Track

Track Co-Chairs: Jean Hennebert, University of Applied Science HES-SO, Switzerland
Andreas Humm, University of Fribourg, Switzerland

Track Editorial	1
Shifting Score Fusion: On Exploiting Shifting Variation in Iris Recognition	3
<i>Christian Rathgeb, University of Salzburg, Austria</i> <i>Andreas Uhl, University of Salzburg, Austria</i> <i>Peter Wild, University of Salzburg, Austria</i>	
Raster Image Representation of Fingerprint Minutiae	8
<i>Bian Yang, Gjøvik University College, Norway</i> <i>Zhibo Chen, Technicolor Corporate Research, China</i> <i>Christoph Busch, Gjøvik University College, Norway</i>	
Fusion in Fingerprint Authentication: Two Finger Types vs. Two Scanner Types	13
<i>Davrondzhon Gafurov, Gjøvik University College, Norway</i> <i>Christoph Busch, Gjøvik University College, Norway</i> <i>Patrick Bours, Gjøvik University College, Norway</i> <i>Bian Yang, Gjøvik University College, Norway</i>	
Keystroke Dynamics Authentication for Mobile Phones	21
<i>Emanuele Maiorana, Università degli Studi "Roma Tre", Rome, Italy</i> <i>Patrizio Campisi, Università degli Studi "Roma Tre", Rome, Italy</i> <i>Noelia González-Carballo, Universidad de Vigo, Spain</i> <i>Alessandro Neri, Università degli Studi "Roma Tre", Rome, Italy</i>	

Poster Papers

Random Forgery Attacks Against DTW-Based Online Signature Verification Algorithm	27
<i>Daigo Muramatsu, Seikei University, Japan</i>	

Document Engineering Track

Track Co-Chairs: Rafael Lins, Universidade Federal de Pernambuco, Brazil

Track Editorial 238

Massive Character Recognition with a Large Ground-Truthed Database 240

Wenjie Cai, O-RID Company, Japan

Yaokai Feng, Kyushu University, Japan

Seiichi Uchida, Kyushu University, Japan

Pixel Accurate Document Image Content Extraction 245

Siyuan Chen, Lehigh University, United States

Henry S. Baird, Lehigh University, United States

Multi-Document Summarization of Scientific Corpora 252

Ozge Yeloglu, Dalhousie University, Canada

Evangelos Milios, Dalhousie University, Canada

Nur Zincir-Heywood, Dalhousie University, Canada

A New Algorithm for Segmenting Warped Text-Lines in Document Images 259

Daniel Marques Oliveira, UFPE, Brazil

Rafael Dueire Lins, UFPE, Brazil

Gabriel Torreão, UFPE, Brazil

Jian Fan, Hewlett-Packard, United States

Marcelo Thielo, Hewlett-Packard, Brazil

Poster Papers

An Assessment of Data Matrix Barcode Recognition under Scaling, Rotation and Warping 266

Andrei de A. Formiga, UFPE, Brazil

Rafael D. Lins, UFPE, Brazil

Steven J. Simske, Hewlett-Packard, United States

Gary Dispoto, Hewlett-Packard, United States

Marcelo Thielo, Hewlett-Packard, Brazil

**Automated Extractive Single-Document Summarization:
Beating the Baselines with a New Approach** 268

Araly Barrera, University of Houston, United States

Rakesh Verma, University of Houston, United States

Enterprise Engineering Track

Track Co-Chairs: Artur Caetano, IST, Technical University of Lisbon, Portugal

Rogério Carvalho, IFF, Brazil

Maria-Eugenia Iacob, University of Twente, Netherlands

Track Editorial 270

An Empirical Comparison of Static and Dynamic Business Process Mining 272

Ricardo Pérez-Castillo, Alarcos Research Group, University of Castilla-La Mancha, Spain

Ignacio García-Rodríguez de Guzmán, Alarcos Research Group, University of Castilla-La Mancha, Spain

Mario Piattini, Alarcos Research Group, University of Castilla-La Mancha, Spain

Barbara Weber, University of Innsbruck, Austria

Ángeles S. Places, Universidade da Coruña, Spain

Process Performance Management – Illuminating Design Issues through a Systematic Problem Analysis	280
<i>Anne Cleven, University of St. Gallen, Switzerland</i>	
<i>Robert Winter, University of St. Gallen, Switzerland</i>	
<i>Felix Wortmann, University of St. Gallen, Switzerland</i>	
Efficiency Evaluation of Open Source ETL Tools	287
<i>Tim A. Majchrzak, University of Münster, Germany</i>	
<i>Tobias Jansen, SHS VIVEON AG, Germany</i>	
<i>Herbert Kuchen, University of Münster, Germany</i>	
Slipstream: Architecture Options for Real-Time Process Analytics	295
<i>Christian Janiesch, SAP Australia Pty Ltd, Australia</i>	
<i>Martin Matzner, ERCIS, Germany</i>	
<i>Oliver Müller, ERCIS, Germany</i>	
<i>Robert Vollmer, SAP AG, Germany</i>	
<i>Jörg Becker, ERCIS, Germany</i>	
An Integrated Approach for Modeling and Facilitating RFID-Based Collaborative Logistics Processes	301
<i>Yu Li, Institute AIFB, Karlsruhe Institute of Technology, Germany</i>	
<i>Andreas Oberweis, Institute AIFB, Karlsruhe Institute of Technology, Germany</i>	
<i>Huayu Zhang, Institute AIFB, Karlsruhe Institute of Technology, Germany</i>	
Strong Non-Leak Guarantees for Workflow Models	308
<i>Rafael Accorsi, University of Freiburg, Germany</i>	
<i>Claus Wonnemann, University of Freiburg, Germany</i>	
Software Reuse in Agile Development Organizations – A Conceptual Management Tool	315
<i>Wouter Spoelstra, University of Twente, Netherlands</i>	
<i>Maria Iacob, University of Twente, Netherlands</i>	
<i>Marten van Sinderen, University of Twente, Netherlands</i>	
On the Elements of an Enterprise: Towards an Ontology-Based Account	323
<i>João Paulo A. Almeida, Federal University of Espírito Santo, Brazil</i>	
<i>Evellin C.S. Cardoso, Federal University of Espírito Santo, Brazil</i>	
Poster Papers	
Tool Support for Realising a Common Understanding of Business Documents in Collaborating Enterprises	331
<i>Usman Wajid, University of Manchester, United Kingdom</i>	
<i>Panagiotis Gouvas, Singular Logic, Greece</i>	
<i>Nikolay Mehandjiev, University of Manchester, United Kingdom</i>	
<i>Abdallah Namoun, University of Manchester, United Kingdom</i>	
An Architecture Proposal for the Prosumerized Enterprise	334
<i>Andreas Emrich, German Research Center for Artificial Intelligence, Germany</i>	
<i>Alexandra Chapko, German Research Center for Artificial Intelligence, Germany</i>	
<i>Christina di Valentin, German Research Center for Artificial Intelligence, Germany</i>	
<i>Dirk Werth, German Research Center for Artificial Intelligence, Germany</i>	

ID* Lite: Improved D* Lite Algorithm	1364
<i>Weiya Yue, University of Cincinnati, United States</i>	
<i>John Franco, University of Cincinnati, United States</i>	
<i>Weiwei Cao, Chinese Academy of Sciences, China</i>	
<i>Hongwei Yue, Zhongkai University of Agriculture and Engineering and Guangdong University of Technology, China</i>	

Incremental Feature-Based Mapping from Sonar Data using Gaussian Mixture Models	1370
<i>Milton Roberto Heinen, UFRGS, Brazil</i>	
<i>Paulo Martins Engel, UFRGS, Brazil</i>	

Template-Based Autonomous Navigation in Urban Environments	1376
<i>Jefferson R. Souza, University of Sao Paulo, Brazil</i>	
<i>Daniel O. Sales, University of Sao Paulo, Brazil</i>	
<i>Patrick Y. Shinzato, University of Sao Paulo, Brazil</i>	
<i>Fernando S. Osório, University of Sao Paulo, Brazil</i>	
<i>Denis F. Wolf, University of Sao Paulo, Brazil</i>	

Integrated PSO and Line based Representation Approach for SLAM	1382
<i>Mohammad Reza Mohammadi, Islamic Azad University Qazvin Branch, Iran</i>	
<i>Saeed Shiry Ghidary, Amirkabir University of Technology, Iran</i>	

Software Engineering Track

Track Co-Chairs: W. Eric Wong, UT-Dallas, United States
Chang Oan Sung, Indiana University Southeast, United States
John Kim, Utica College, United States

Track Editorial	1389
------------------------------	------

A Test Suite Reduction Approach based on Pairwise Interaction of Requirements	1390
<i>Xiang Chen, Nanjing University, China</i>	
<i>Lijiu Zhang, Nanjing University, China</i>	
<i>Qing Gu, Nanjing University, China</i>	
<i>Haigang Zhao, Nanjing University, China</i>	
<i>Ziyuan Wang, Nanjing University, China</i>	
<i>Xiaobing Sun, Southeast University, China</i>	
<i>Daoxu Chen, Nanjing University, China</i>	

An Empirical Study on the Usage of Testability Information to Fault Localization in Software	1398
<i>Alberto Gonzalez-Sanchez, Delft University of Technology, Netherlands</i>	
<i>Rui Abreu, University of Porto, Portugal</i>	
<i>Hans-Gerhard Gross, Delft University of Technology, Netherlands</i>	
<i>Arjan J.C. van Gemund, Delft University of Technology, Netherlands</i>	

Locating Faults using Multiple Spectra-Specific Models	1404
<i>Kai Yu, Beihang University, China</i>	
<i>Mengxiang Lin, Beihang University, China</i>	
<i>Qing Gao, Beihang University, China</i>	
<i>Hui Zhang, Beihang University, China</i>	
<i>Xiangyu Zhang, Beihang University, China</i>	

IMPULSE: A Design Framework for Multi-Agent Systems based on Model Transformation	1411
<i>Hiroyuki Nakagawa, University of Electro-Communications, Japan</i>	
<i>Nobukazu Yoshioka, National Institute of Informatics, Japan</i>	
<i>Akihiko Ohsuga, University of Electro-Communications, Japan</i>	
<i>Shinichi Honiden, National Institute of Informatics, Japan</i>	
Using a Class Abstraction Technique to Predict Faults in OO Classes	1419
<i>Djuradj Babich, Florida International University, United States</i>	
<i>Peter J. Clarke, Florida International University, United States</i>	
<i>James F. Power, National University of Ireland, Maynooth, Ireland</i>	
<i>B.M. Golam Kibria, Florida International University, United States</i>	
Security Mutation Testing of the FileZilla FTP Server	1425
<i>Daniel Woodraska, Dakota State University, United States</i>	
<i>Michael Sanford, Dakota State University, United States</i>	
<i>Dianxiang Xu, Dakota State University, United States</i>	
Automatic Reuse of Process Patterns in Process Modeling	1431
<i>Hanh Nhi Tran, IRIT, University of Toulouse, France</i>	
<i>Bernard Coulette, IRIT, University of Toulouse, France</i>	
<i>Dan Thu Tran, University of Science - HCMC VNU, Vietnam</i>	
<i>My Hang Vu, University of Science - HCMC VNU, Vietnam</i>	
Using Lattice of Class and Method Dependence for Change Impact Analysis of Object Oriented Programs	1439
<i>Xiaobing Sun, Southeast University, China</i>	
<i>Bixin Li, Southeast University, China</i>	
<i>Sai Zhang, University of Washington, United States</i>	
<i>Chuanqi Tao, Southeast University, China</i>	
<i>Xiang Chen, Nanjing University, China</i>	
<i>Wanzhi Wen, Southeast University, China</i>	
Towards Thresholds of Control Flow Complexity Measures for BPMN Models	1445
<i>Laura Sánchez-González, University of Castilla La Mancha, Paseo de la Universidad, Spain</i>	
<i>Francisco Ruiz, University of Castilla La Mancha, Paseo de la Universidad, Spain</i>	
<i>Félix García, University of Castilla La Mancha, Paseo de la Universidad, Spain</i>	
<i>Jorge Cardoso, University of Coimbra, Portugal</i>	
An Empirical Study on the Effectiveness of Time-Aware Test Case Prioritization Techniques	1451
<i>Dongjiang You, Nanjing University, China</i>	
<i>Zhenyu Chen, Nanjing University, China</i>	
<i>Baowen Xu, Nanjing University, China</i>	
<i>Bin Luo, Nanjing University, China</i>	
<i>Chen Zhang, Nanjing University, China</i>	
On the Equivalence of Certain Fault Localization Techniques	1457
<i>Vidroha Debroy, University of Texas at Dallas, United States</i>	
<i>W. Eric Wong, University of Texas at Dallas, United States</i>	
Identifying Properties of UML State Machine Diagrams that Affect Data and Control Dependence	1464
<i>HyeonJeong Kim, Korea Advanced Institute of Science and Technology, Korea</i>	
<i>Vidroha Debroy, University of Texas at Dallas, United States</i>	
<i>DooHwan Bae, Korea Advanced Institute of Science and Technology, Korea</i>	

Towards Thresholds of Control Flow Complexity Measures for BPMN models

Laura Sánchez-González, Francisco Ruiz, Félix García,
Alarcos Research Group, TSI Department, University of Castilla La Mancha, Paseo de la Universidad, nº4, 13071, Ciudad Real, España
{Laura.Sanchez | Francisco.RuizG | Felix.Garcia}@uclm.es

Jorge Cardoso
Dept. Engenharia Informática, University of Coimbra, jcardoso@dei.uc.pt

ABSTRACT

Business process models are considered to be a good mechanism for communication among stakeholders and are a key instrument in the analysis and design of information systems. It is therefore important to design business process models with a high level of quality, which can be discovered through measurement application. Several measurement initiatives exist in the literature, but these measures are only useful in real world decision making if we also have criteria with which to establish the goodness of models. We consider that measures with thresholds and decision criteria form indicators. Indicators allow us to make decisions by using the values of the measures which models should not exceed to ascertain whether the model is good in practice. In this paper we present the initial empirical results from which thresholds for the Control-Flow Complexity measure applied in BPMN models have been obtained according to the Bender method. Our findings reveal that there are different levels of understandability depending on the number of decision nodes: a very easily understandable model would have no more than 6 *xor* nodes, 1 *or* nodes and 1 *and* nodes, versus the 46 *xor* nodes, 14 *or* nodes and 7 *and* nodes which would constitute a model with a very difficult level of understandability.

Categories and Subject Descriptors

D.2.8 [Software Engineering]: Metrics – Process metrics

General Terms

Measurement and Experimentation.

Keywords

Business process, measurement, thresholds, indicators.

1. INTRODUCTION

Measurement is an important discipline in any type of engineering, and measurement activities are a good means to allow organizations to obtain useful information, and to help them

Permission to make digital or hard copies of all or part of this work for personal or classroom use is granted without fee provided that copies are not made or distributed for profit or commercial advantage and that copies bear this notice and the full citation on the first page. To copy otherwise, or republish, to post on servers or to redistribute to lists, requires prior specific permission and/or a fee.

SAC'11, March 21-25, 2011, TaiChung, Taiwan.

Copyright 2011 ACM 978-1-4503-0113-8/11/03...\$10.00.

plan and carry out improvement efforts [1]. Measurement also helps to provide objective information about process and project performance, process capability and product and service quality. Process capability is extremely important for organizations because “the quality of products and services is largely determined by the quality of the processes used to develop, deliver and support them”[2].

Several measurement initiatives with which to obtain information about process quality exist, most of which are shown in [3]. This study reveals that the majority are applied to conceptual models (approximately 77% of the initiatives studied) owing to the fact that models are used for process reengineering and other business-oriented tasks. The study also reveals that business process measurement is still an immature subject as a result of limited empirical validation and the lack of thresholds with which to analyze measurement results.

In this paper we contribute towards resolving the lack of thresholds for business process measures. Researchers have worked on thresholds for others disciplines and all of them agree on the importance of their definition. Henderson-Sellers emphasizes the practical utility of thresholds by stating that “an alarm would occur whenever the value of a specific internal measure exceeded some predetermined value”[4]. The idea of extracting thresholds is to use them to identify unsafe design structures, thus enabling engineers to gauge the threshold values to avoid obtaining hazardous structures [5]. The problem of determining appropriate threshold values is made even more difficult by many factors that may vary from experiment to experiment [6]. The identification of such threshold values, therefore, requires methods for quantitative risk assessment [7].

In order to deal with the issues identified above, in this paper we use a quantitative methodology based on the logistic regression curve (Bender methodology) [7] to extract thresholds for Cardoso’s Control-Flow complexity measure (CFC) [8] when applied to BPMN models [9]. This measure is described as follows:

$$CFC(P) = \sum_{i \in [AND-split\ of\ P]} CFC_{AND-split}(i) + \sum_{j \in [XOR-split\ of\ P]} CFC_{XOR-split}(j) + \sum_{k \in [OR-split\ of\ P]} CFC_{OR-split}(k)$$

The value of $CFC_{AND-split}(a)$ is 1 for each and-split in the process (since all the transitions from the gateway are executed in parallel, thus reaching the same state space when they are

finalized), the value of CFCXOR-split(a) is calculated as the fan out of the split (since only one transition can be executed from it but could be any of the possibilities, so the reachable state space is therefore the sum of all the transitions), and the value of CFCOR-split(a) is the result of calculating $2n-1$ where n is the fan out of the split (since the execution of the transitions could correspond to one, some, or all, so the state space corresponds to all the possible combinations between the transitions to be executed). The fan out of the split corresponds to the number of transitions that start from it.

The statistical method used to extract threshold values is the “Bender method” defined in [7]. As a result, we obtained threshold values for the CFC measure, which constitutes an indicator, as was described in [10]: “an indicator is a measure that is derived from other measures using an analysis model with associated decision criteria, which are used to determine the level of confidence in a given result”.

This paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we describe work related to business process measurements and thresholds. In Section 3 the work method, results and the main lessons learned and implications regarding business process modeling, are explained. In Section 4 we present a practical example of using the thresholds discovered in BPMN models. Finally, in Section 5, we close with some of the conclusions drawn from this research.

2. RELATED WORKS

Various proposals concerning business process measurement can be found in the literature (see Table 1), but to the best of our knowledge there are, to date, no proposals in which threshold values are defined.

Some of the measures shown in Table 1 have been validated, and some practical usefulness has therefore been obtained. However, it is also important to know more about the decisions that will be made with the values of the measures.

This aspect is more mature in the field of software process measurement, since some proposals concerning thresholds for well known software engineering measures already exist. However, there is no consensus on the threshold values for software measures and perhaps not even for what the best methods to use in extracting these values are. Some proposals for thresholds are derived from experience [24-26], but the lack of scientific support has led to disputes about their values. Some authors, on the other hand, have used statistical techniques to obtain thresholds. For example, Shatnawi [27] extracted thresholds for Object Oriented (OO) measures in order to study the relationship between OO and error-severity categories. In this research the author identified thresholds for Coupling between Objects (CBO), Response for Class (RFC), Weighted Methods Complexity (WMC), Depth of Inheritance Hierarchy (DIT), Number of Child Classes (NOC) and Lack of Cohesion of Methods (LCOM), that can be used to differentiate high-risk error-proneness classes in the ordinal categorization from the no-error classes. The author also validated the Bender method, and found that there are effective thresholds for the measures analyzed.

Another piece of research was carried out by Benlarbi et al [28]. The authors’ purpose was to predict which classes were likely to contain a fault through the use of Chidamber and Kemerer

measures [29]. Their findings indicate that there is no value for the studied measures in which the fault-proneness changes from being steady to rapidly increasing. However, these results are only valid for the measures used by the authors, and other models may potentially lead to different results. In [30], the authors have used the Bender method and others to extract threshold values, and have compared the results of each method. They conclude that methods based on regression models are a useful tool with which to extract threshold values. The use of this method or of others depends on the available data.

Table 1. Measures for business process models

Source	Measurable Concept	Notation
Vanderfeesten et al [11], [12]	Coupling, cohesion, connectivity level	Petri net
Rolón et al. [13]	Understandability and modifiability	BPMN
Mendling [14]	Error probability	EPC
Cardoso [15]	complexity	Graph
Jung [16]	Entropy	Petri net
Gruhn and Laue [17], [18]	complexity	UML, BPMN, EPC
Rozinat and van der Aalst [19]	compliance model-logs	Simulation Logs
Laue and Mendling [20]	Structuredness	EPC
Meimandi and Abdul Azim [21]	Activity, control-flow, data-flow and resource complexity	BPEL
Bisgaard and van der Aalst [22]	Extended Control Flow Complexity, extended cyclomatic metric and structuredness	WF-net
Huan and Kumar [23]	Goodness of models’ respect execution logs	Simulation logs

3. APPROXIMATION OF THE THRESHOLD VALUES

In this section, we describe the steps followed to obtain a first approximation of threshold values for the CFC measure. The experimental data used as input is that of the Bender method. The results are then obtained. Finally, we show some of the conclusions about the thresholds extracted in this work.

3.1 Experimental Data

The data input used to extract thresholds values has been generated in 3 experiments with the intention of evaluating which model factors affect the understandability of models described with BPMN. More details about these experiments are shown in [31] and a summary is presented in Table 2.

The experimental material consisted of 15 BPMN models with a set of comprehension tasks. Each subject was evaluated according to the time taken, the number of correct answers and efficiency (relation between time and correct answers) when carrying out

these tasks. A personal opinion about how difficult it was to understand each model was also requested, with the subjects using a value of between 1 and 5, where 1 represented very easy and 5 very difficult. Table 3 shows the CFC values for all 15 models, the median of personal opinion of all the subjects with regard to each model, and the median value between experiments.

Table 2. Context of experiments

Exp 1	Exp 2	Exp 3
UCLM, Spain 22 subjects (pre and post graduates)	UCLM, Spain 40 subjects (pregraduates)	UCLM, Spain, 9 subjects (postgraduates)

Table 3. CFC value and subjective opinion for each model

model	CFC xor	CFC or	CFC and	CFC total	Exp 1	Exp 2	Exp 3	Median
1	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1
2	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1
3	2	0	0	2	1	1	1	1
4	2	0	0	2	3	3	3	3
5	4	0	0	4	3	2	2.5	2,5
6	4	0	0	4	3	3	3	3
7	5	0	0	5	2.5	2	3	2,5
8	6	1	0	7	3	3	3	3
9	8	0	0	8	3	3	3	3
10	8	0	0	8	4	3.5	4	4
11	9	0	0	9	3	3	3	3
12	22	3	0	25	3	3	3	3
13	18	6	1	25	3	3	3	3
14	25	3	3	31	3	3	3	3
15	23	9	1	33	4	4	4	4

The personal opinion and the complexity of the models – using CFC values - are directly related. That is to say, the experimental subjects stated that the models were complex when these models had a high value of CFC. This means that the CFC measure is good at predicting the understandability of business process conceptual models. These results were extracted from a correlation analysis described in previous works [36].

3.2 Results of Bender Method

The Bender Method has been used in “studies in which it is interesting to assess whether an explanatory factor has a threshold effect on a specific response variable” [7]. This method was created to find thresholds in epidemiological studies, but it can also be used in other fields, including software engineering [28, 32, 33]. It is additionally possible to obtain thresholds of measures since this method assumes that the risk regarding an event which has occurred is constant below the threshold value and that it increases according to a logistic equation. For our calculations we used the experimental data of the 3 experiments

defined previously in Table 3 in order to find threshold values that characterize the understandability of BPMN models.

This method uses a logistic regression to determine (in this case) whether there is a significant relationship between measures and the understandability of conceptual models. A logistic regression model is used to describe the association between a binary response variable and a continuous risk factor [34]. The general logistic regression model is shown as follows: $P(x) = \frac{e^{g(x)}}{1+e^{g(x)}}$

In this equation, $g(x)$ is the logit (log odds) function (which is represented as $g(x) = \alpha + \beta * x$), x is the measure (in this case, CFC), and $P(x)$ is the probability of a model being understandable. In our case the continuous risk factor would be the value of CFC in each model and the binary response would be the average subjective opinion of how understandable the models are. In our experiments this variable is not binary because it fluctuates between 1 and 5 but it can be converted into a dichotomous variable, signifying that it would be 1 when it was higher than the median and 0 when it was lower [35].

Table 4. Alpha and Beta values of logistic regression equations

CFC	Experiment 1		Experiment 2		Experiment 3	
	alpha	beta	alpha	beta	alpha	Beta
XOR-split	1.731	-0.094	2.471	-0.091	1.736	-0.090
OR-split	1.255	-0.282	2.073	-0.296	1.232	-0.242
AND-split	1.005	-0.580	1.653	-0.436	0.988	-0.427
CFC total	1.622	-0.070	2.431	-0.071	1.630	-0.066

Table 5. VARL values for CFC

	P0 %	Experiment		
		1	2	3
XOR-SPLIT	30	9	18	10
	50	18	27	51
	90	10	19	44
OR-SPLIT	30	1	4	2
	50	4	7	5
	90	12	14	14
AND-SPLIT	30	1	2	1
	50	2	4	2
	90	6	9	7
CFC TOTAL	30	11	22	12
	50	23	34	25
	90	54	65	58

The method defines a “value of an acceptable risk level (VARL)”. This value is given by a probability $p0$. This means that when measuring CFC values below VARL, the risk of the model being

non-understandable is lower than p_0 (for example, $p_0=0.2$). This value is calculated as follows:

$$VARL = p^{-1}(p_0) = \frac{1}{\beta} (\log \frac{p_0}{1-p_0} - \alpha)$$

After applying the logistic regression, we obtained α and β coefficients, which are needed to calculate thresholds. These α and β values allowed us to obtain VARL values for each experiment through the application of the formula. Table 5 shows the acceptable threshold for $CFC_{XOR-split}$, $CFC_{OR-split}$, $CFC_{AND-split}$, CFC_{total} which can be interpreted as, for example, “if the $CFC_{XOR-split}$ value is lower than 9, the risk of the model being non-understandable is lower than 30%” or “if the $CFC_{OR-split}$ value is lower than 4, the risk of the model being non-understandable is lower than 50%”.




Figure 1. Evolution of threshold values in each experiment for $CFC_{XOR-split}$ (top left), $CFC_{AND-split}$ (top right), $CFC_{OR-split}$ (bottom left) and CFC_{TOTAL} (bottom right)

Figure 1 shows the evolution of threshold values (x-axis) and the probability of considering models as non-understandable (y-axis). For example, Table 5 shows that for a $CFC_{XOR-split}$ value of approximately 18, there is a 50% of risk of the model being non-understandable. The higher the $CFC_{XOR-split}$ value is, the higher the probability that the model will be non-understandable.

Another research question is related to the fluctuation of values with regard to each different experiment (see Table 5). We believe that this might depend on the nature of the subjects. The experiments in which we obtained similar threshold values were experiment 1 and experiment 3, whose subjects were under- and post-graduate students (the same subjects in both experiments), compared with experiment 2, which was only composed of undergraduate students. It may seem odd that the models were easier for undergraduates to understand.

We formulated the hypothesis that their limited experience in process modeling led them to overestimate their own capabilities. This led us to compare the efficiency of each of the groups of subjects to test this hypothesis. Efficiency in experiment 1 is 0,0328, in experiment 2 is 0,027 and in experiment 3 is 0,0285. These values show the average efficiency of subjects in carrying out the understandability tasks. A higher efficiency value indicates that the subjects produce more correct answers in a shorter amount of time. In this case, the group of subjects who seemed to find it easier to understand the models is that which made most

errors in practice, demonstrating the theory of over-capacity for undergraduate subjects.

3.3 Discussions and Implications

After applying the Bender method we obtained threshold values which are resumed in Table 6 (average threshold value of all experiments with decimal rounding). In this table, we consider the different levels of understandability of models depending on the number of decision nodes. For example, a business process model which is considered “easy to understand” would have no more than 12 *xor* nodes, 2 *or* nodes and 1 *and* nodes:

Table 6. Levels of understandability

Levels of understandability		$CFC_{XOR-split}$	$CFC_{OR-split}$	$CFC_{AND-split}$
1	Very easy to understand	6	1	1
2	Easy to understandable	12	2	1
3	Moderately understandable	22	6	3
4	Difficult to understand	31	9	4
5	Very difficult to understand	46	14	7

Extracting thresholds for CFC measures has helped to establish guidelines concerning the modeling of business processes in terms of using decision nodes. With regard to OR-split type decision nodes, the threshold value is 14, which means that business process models are understandable if they contain no more than 3 OR-split nodes. The threshold values of AND-split type decision nodes is about 7, which means that an understandable model should have no more than 7 AND-split nodes. On the other hand, $CFC_{XOR-split}$ values are calculated by taking into account a fan-out of these values and, assuming that the average value of a fan-out is 2, an understandable model should have no more than 23 XOR nodes. One important aspect in extracting thresholds is that it depends on the subjects’ cognitive ability. This signifies that threshold values fluctuate depending on the stakeholders’ previous knowledge and experience in modeling and on the business process domain. Our work was based on human subjects with rather weak theoretical knowledge (under- and post-graduate students) and this may have caused some undesirable effects when obtaining the thresholds (overestimation of the capabilities, low efficiency in the work, etc).

4. PRACTICAL APPLICATION

In this section we present two examples of the application of the aforementioned results and their evaluation, based on business process decision nodes. Both selected models (see Figures 2 & 3) have the same size but they differ in the number and type of decision nodes (size is calculated as the number of nodes: events, tasks, sub-processes, decision nodes and data objects). In these models we use abstract labels in tasks in order to avoid adding to the complexity caused by the business domain. The results of CFC measures in model 1 from Figure 2 are as follows: $CFC_{XOR-split} = 11$ $CFC_{OR-split} = 2$ $CFC_{AND-split} = 3$ $CFC_{TOTAL} = 16$.

The specific result of CFC may indicate the complexity of this model (from a decision node perspective). In order to extract an

evaluation of the complexity of this model we use the average threshold values obtained in the previous sections:

- $CFC_{XOR-split} = 11 \rightarrow$ there is a probability of 21% that the model will be non-understandable
- $CFC_{OR-split} = 3 \rightarrow$ there is a probability of 25% that the model will be non-understandable
- $CFC_{AND-split} = 3 \rightarrow$ there is a probability of 42% that the model will be non-understandable
- $CFC_{TOTAL} = 16 \rightarrow$ there is a probability of 24% that the model will be non-understandable




Figure 2. Example model 1




Figure 3. Example model 2

The first model illustrates a low complexity related to decision nodes, specifically in the second level of understandability (easily understandable) and it is therefore possible that stakeholders will find this model easy to understand. On the other hand, Figure 3 shows another example of a business process model in which the CFC value is higher.

The CFC values for model 2 in Figure 3 are the following:

$$CFC_{XOR-split} = 18 \quad CFC_{OR-split} = 7 \quad CFC_{AND-split} = 4 \quad CFC_{TOTAL} = 29$$

These values can be used to obtain the following conclusions about the model:

- $CFC_{XOR-split} = 18 \rightarrow$ there is a probability of 24% that the model will be non-understandable
- $CFC_{OR-split} = 7 \rightarrow$ there is a probability of 48% that the model will be non-understandable
- $CFC_{AND-split} = 4 \rightarrow$ there is a probability of 54% that the model will be non-understandable
- $CFC_{TOTAL} = 29 \rightarrow$ there is probability of 42% that the model will be non-understandable

The second model is in third level of understandability, “moderately understandable”. It has more decision nodes, and this

leads to an increase in the probability of finding the model non-understandable. If both models are compared, then the first is considered to be better because it has a lower level of difficulty of understandability. In consequence, if the size is kept constant, factors relating to complexity seem to be the most significant. After analyzing these models we deduced that the number and type of decision nodes are directly related to complexity. Although other factors should also be considered, it is possible to use the CFC measure to check the complexity of BPMN models, which implies that there is a starting point for improvement.

5. CONCLUSIONS AND FUTURE WORKS

In this paper we have investigated threshold values for business process measures and Cardoso’s Control-Flow complexity measure. We have used the Bender method to extract threshold values. Our findings demonstrate that it is possible to obtain thresholds for the CFC measure by following the Bender method.

We obtained different threshold values for each experiment but we believe that this may have been as a result of the experimental subjects’ different theoretical and practical backgrounds. In this case, all the subjects received the same introductory course to the BPMN notation, but their background in other similar modeling languages may have affected the results. Our findings reveal that a business process model should have no more than 31 decision nodes if an increased difficulty in understanding is to be avoided. There should be about 22 xor decision nodes, which are those most frequently used in BPMN models, while no more than 6 or decision nodes and no more than 3 and decision nodes should be used.

In future research we will enlarge the validation of these threshold values by applying them in new experiments with human subjects with different backgrounds and knowledge. Moreover, it would be interesting to apply this method to other business process measures in order to obtain a group of indicators, because measuring the complexity of models requires consideration of many aspects that are not covered with a single measure, as in this case is the analyzed measure, CFC. These indicators might serve as a useful guide to obtain high-quality conceptual models.

6. ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This work was partially funded by projects INGENIO (Junta de Comunidades de Castilla-La Mancha, PAC08-0154-9262), ESFINGE (Ministerio de Educación y Ciencia, FEDER, TIN2006-15175-C05-05) and PEGASO/MAGO (Ministerio de Ciencia e Innovación, FEDER, TIN2009-13718-C02-01).

7. REFERENCES

- [1] Park, R.E., W.B. Goethert, and W.A. Florac, *Goal-Driven software Measurement: A Guidebook*. HANDBOOK CMU/SEI-96-HB-002, 1996.
- [2] OMG. Business Process Maturity Model (BPMM), Beta 1 Adopted Specification. 2007; Available from: <http://www.omg.org/docs/dtc/07-07-02.pdf>.
- [3] Sánchez, L., F. García, F. Ruiz, and M. piattini, Measurement in Business Processes: a Systematic Review. *Business process Management Journal*, 2010. 16(1): p. 114-134.

- [4] Henderson-Sellers, B., *Object-Oriented Metrics: Measures of Complexity*. Prentice-Hall, 1996.
- [5] Shatnawi, R., W. li, J. Swain, and T. Newman, Finding Software Metrics Threshold values using ROC Curves. *Software Maintenance and Evolution: Research and Practice*, 2009.
- [6] Churchill, G.A. and R.W. Doerge, Empirical Threshold Values for Quantitative Trait Mapping. *Genetics Society of America*, 1995. 138: p. 963-971.
- [7] Bender, R., Quantitative Risk Assessment in Epidemiological Studies Investigatin Threshold Effects. *Biometrical Journal*, 1999. 41(3): p. 305-319.
- [8] Cardoso, J., Process control-flow complexity metric: An empirical validation. *SCC '06: Proceedings of the IEEE International Conference on Services Computing*, 2006: p. 167--173.
- [9] OMG. *Business Process Modeling Notation (BPMN), Final Adopted Specification*. 2006; Available from: <http://www.omg.org/bpm>.
- [10] García, F., M. Bertoa, C. Calero, A. Vallecillo, F. Ruiz, M. Piattini, and M. Genero, Towards a Consistent Terminology for Software Measurement. *Information and Software Technology*, 2005. 48: p. pg 631-644.
- [11] Vanderfeesten, I., H.A. Reijers, and W.M.P. van der Aalst, Evaluating Workflow Process Designs using Cohesion and Coupling Metrics. *Computer in Industry*, 2008.
- [12] Vanderfeesten, I., H.A. Reijers, J. Mendling, W.M.P. van der Aalst, and J. Cardoso, On a Quest for Good Process models: the Cross Conectivity Metric. *International Conference on Advanced Information Systems Engineering*, 2008.
- [13] Rolón, E., F. García, and F. Ruiz, Evaluation Measures for Business Process Models. *Simposium in Applied Computing SAC06*, 2006.
- [14] Mendling, J., Testing Density as a complexity Metric for EPCs, in *Technical Report JM-2006-11-15*. 2006.
- [15] Cardoso, J., How to Measure the Control-Flow Complexity of Web Processes and Workflows, in *Workflow Handbook 2005*. 2005.
- [16] Jung, J.Y., Measuring entropy in business process models. *International Conference on Innovative Computing, Information and Control*, 2008. 0: p. 246-252.
- [17] Gruhn, V. and R. Laue, Complexity Metrics for business Process Models. *International Conference on Business Information Systems*, 2006.
- [18] Gruhn, V.a.L., R., Adopting the Cognitive Complexity Measure for Business Process Models. *Cognitive Informatics*, 2006. ICCI 2006. 5th IEEE International Conference on, 2006. 1: p. 236--241.
- [19] Rozinat, A. and W.M.P. van der Aalst, Conformance checking of processes based on monitoring real behavior. *Information Systems*, 2008. 33: p. 64--95.
- [20] Laue, R. and J. Mendling, Structuredness and its Significance for Correctness of Process Models. *Information Systems and E-Business Management*, 2009.
- [21] Meimandi Parizi, R. and A.A.A. Ghani, An Ensemble of Complexity Metrics for BPEL Web Processes. *Ninth ACIS International Conference on Software Engineering, Artificial Intelligence, Networking, and Parallel/Distributed Computing*, 2008: p. 753-758.
- [22] Bisgaard Lassen, K. and W. Van der Aalst, Complexity Metrics for Workflow Nets. *Information and Software Technology*, 2008: p. 610-626.
- [23] Huan, Z. and A. Kumar, New quality metrics for evaluating process models. *Business Process Intelligence workshop*, 2008.
- [24] McCabe, T.J., A Complexity Measure. *IEEE Transactions on Software Engineering*, 1976. SE-2(4): p. 308-320.
- [25] Nejme, B.A., NPATH: a Measure of Execuion Path Complexity and its Applications. *ACM*, 1988. 31(2): p. 188-200.
- [26] Coleman, D., B. Lowther, and P. Oman, The Application of Software Maintainability Models in Industrial Software Systems. *Journal of Systems and Software*, 1995. 29(1): p. 3-16.
- [27] Shatnawi, R., A Quantitative Investigation of the Acceptable Risk levels of Object-Oriented Metrics in Open-Source Systems. *IEEE Transactions on Software Engineering*, 2010. 36(2): p. 216-225.
- [28] Benlarbi, S., K. El-Emam, N. Goel, and S. N.Rai, Thresholds for Object-Oriented Measures. *Institute for Information Technology, National Research Council Canada*, 2000.
- [29] Chidamber, S.R. and C.F. Kemerer, A Metrics Suite for Object Oriented Design. *IEEE Transactions on Software Engineering*, 1994. 20(6): p. 476-493.
- [30] Grouven, U., H. Küchenhoff, P. Shräder, and R. Bender, Flexible regression models are useful tools to calculate and assess threshold values in the context of minimum provider volumes. *Journal of Clinical Epidemiology*, 2007. 61: p. 1125-1131.
- [31] ExperimentsURL, <http://alarcos.inf-cr.uclm.es/bpmn experiments/>. 2009.
- [32] Shatnawi, R., An Investigation of CK Metrics Thresholds. *ISSRE Supplementary Conference Proceedings*, 2006.
- [33] Erni, K. and C. Lewerentz, Applying Design-metrics to Object-Oriented Frameworks. *Proceedings of METRICS*, 96, 1996: p. 64-74.
- [34] Hosmer, D. and S. Lemeshow, *Applied Logistic Regression (2nd edn)*. Wiley-InterScience, 2000.
- [35] Royston, P., G.A. Douglas, and W. Sauerbrei, Dichotomizing continuous predictors in multiple regression: a bad idea. *Statistics in Medicine*, Wiley InterScience, 2005. 25: p. 127-141.
- [36] Rolon, E., L. Sanchez, F. Garcia, F. Ruiz, M. Piattini, D. Caivano, and G. Visaggio, Prediction Models for BPMN Usability and Maintainability. *BPMN 2009 - 1st International Workshop on BPMN*, 2009: p. 383-390