Master Thesis

Model Repair by Incorporating Negative Instances in Process Enhancement

Author: **Kefang Ding**

Email: **kefang.ding@rwth-aachen.de**

Supervisor: Dr. Sebastiaan J. van Zelst

Examiners: Prof. Wil M.P. van der Aalst
Prof. Thomas Rose

Institute: Lehrstuhl für Process and Data Science

Chair of Process and Data Science

RWTH AACHEN UNIVERSITY

Outline

- Motivation
- Problem Definition
- Approach
- Demo
- Evaluation
- Conclusion



Outline

- **Motivation**
  - Scope
  - Related work
  - Motivating examples
- **Problem Definition**
- **Approach**
- **Demo**
- **Evaluation**
- **Conclusion**



Chair of Process and Data Science

RWTH AACHEN UNIVERSITY

Scope





Process Mining

https://medium.com/@pedrorobledobpm/process-mining-plays-an-essential-role-in-digital-transformation-384839236bbe

Scope







https://medium.com/@pedrorobledobpm/process-mining-plays-an-essential-role-in-digital-transformation-384839236bbe

Scope







https://medium.com/@pedrorobledobpm/process-mining-plays-an-essential-role-in-digital-transformation-384839236bbe

Scope







https://medium.com/@pedrorobledobpm/process-mining-plays-an-essential-role-in-digital-transformation-384839236bbe

Scope









https://medium.com/@pedrorobledobpm/process-mining-plays-an-essential-role-in-digital-transformation-384839236bbe

Related Work

- **Rediscovery**



- **Model Repair by Fahland**
  - Deviations
  - Subprocesses
- **Model Repair by Dees**
  - Event log with performance labels
  - Classify deviations
  - Fahland's repair only on positive deviations

Related Work

- **Rediscovery**



Process Rediscovery

- **Model Repair by Fahland**

- **Model Repair by Dees**

Related Work

- **Rediscovery**



Process Rediscovery

- **Model Repair by Fahland**
  - Deviations
  - Subprocesses



- **Model Repair by Dees**

Related Work

- **Rediscovery**



- **Model Repair by Fahland**
  - Deviations
  - Subprocesses

- **Model Repair by Dees**
  - Event log with performance labels
  - Classify deviations
  - Fahland's repair only on positive deviations



Motivation – shortcominngs

Master thesis process

M0: reference model

x1: write propose
x2: check course requirement

$$L_1 := \{< a1, b, \mathbf{x1}, c, d1, e1, e2, f >^{50,pos}, \\ < a1, b, \mathbf{x2}, c, d2, e1, e2, f >^{50,pos}, \}$$



M0

Motivation – shortcominngs

$$L_1 := \{< a1, b, \mathbf{x1}, c, d1, e1, e2, f >^{50,pos}, \\ < a1, b, \mathbf{x2}, c, d2, e1, e2, f >^{50,pos}, \}$$

- **IM not consider reference model**

Similarity decreases!



M0



M1.1

M1.2

Motivation – shortcominngs

$$L_1 := \{< a1, b, \mathbf{x1}, c, d1, e1, e2, f >^{50,pos}, \\ < a1, b, \mathbf{x2}, c, d2, e1, e2, f >^{50,pos}, \}$$

- **IM not consider reference model**
- **Fahland's: add subprocesses as loops**
- **Dee's: same as Fahland's method**

Similarity decreases!

Precision decrease by adding subprocess in loops



M0



M1.1



M1.2

Motivation – shortcomings

$$L_2 := \{< a1, b, c, d2, \mathbf{e1}, \mathbf{e2}, f >^{30,pos}, \\ < a2, b, c, d1, \mathbf{e1}, \mathbf{e2}, f >^{20,pos}; \\ < a2, b, c, d2, \mathbf{e2}, \mathbf{e1}, f >^{10,pos}; \\ < a1, b, c, d2, \mathbf{e2}, \mathbf{e1}, f >^{20,neg}, \\ < a1, b, c, d1, \mathbf{e2}, \mathbf{e1}, f >^{20,neg}; \\ < a2, b, c, d1, \mathbf{e1}, \mathbf{e2}, f >^{5,neg}\}$$

- **IM keeps the model same**
- **Fahland's keep model same**
- **Dee's keep model same**

Unable to adapt model with negative information



M0



M2-expected

Motivation – shortcomings

$$L_3 := \{ < \mathbf{a1}, b, c, \mathbf{d1}, e1, e2, f >^{50,pos}, \\ < \mathbf{a2}, b, c, \mathbf{d2}, e1, e2, f >^{50,pos}; \\ < \mathbf{a1}, b, c, \mathbf{d2}, e1, e2, f >^{50,neg}, \\ < \mathbf{a2}, b, c, \mathbf{d1}, e1, e2, f >^{50,neg} \}$$

- **Long-term dependency**
  - Choices decides choices
  - Additional places to limit behavior

Unable to detect long-term dependency



M0



M3-expected

Motivation – Shortcomings

- Similarity decreases with rediscovery
- Precision decrease by adding subprocess in loops
- Unable to adapt model with negative information
- Unable to detect long-term dependency

Outline

- Motivation for Research
- Problem Definition
- Approach
- Demo
- Evaluation
- Conclusion



Chair of Process and Data Science
RWTH AACHEN UNIVERSITY

Research Problem

Given an **event log with labels**, a **reference Petri net**, how to incorporate **negative instances** to generate the **repaired Petri net** which supports better performance?



– enforce positive instances
– block negative instances
– similar
– simple
……

Chair of Process and Data Science | RWTH AACHEN UNIVERSITY

Outline

- **Motivation for Research**
- **Problem Definition**
- **Approach**
  - Framework
  - Data models
  - Modules
- **Demo**
- **Evaluation**
- **Conclusion**



Algorithm – framework





Algorithm – framework



Algorithm – data model



Chair of Process and Data Science | RWTH AACHEN UNIVERSITY

Data Model – directly-follows graph

A directly-follows graph of an event log L is $G(L) = (A, F, A_{start}, A_{end})$ where A is the set of activities in L, $F = \{(a, b) \in A \times A | a >_L b\}$ is the directly-follows relation set, A_{start}, A_{end} are the set of start and end activities respectively, $A_{start} = \{a | \exists \sigma \in L, a = \sigma(1)\}, A_{end} = \{a | \exists \sigma \in L, a = \sigma(|\sigma|)\}$

The cardinality of G(L) is defined
$\forall (a, b) \in F, c(a, b) = \sum_{\sigma \in L} |\{i \in \{1, 2...|\sigma|\} | \sigma(i) = \sigma(i + 1)\}|$
$\forall a \in A_{start}, c(a) = \sum_{\sigma \in L} |\{\sigma | \sigma(1) = a\}|$
$\forall a \in A_{end}, c(a) = \sum_{\sigma \in L} |\{\sigma | \sigma(|\sigma|) = a\}|$

$L = \{\langle a, c, d \rangle^{20}, \langle b, c, e \rangle^{10}, \langle a, c, e \rangle^{20}, \langle b, c, d \rangle^{10}\}$

Data Model – directly-follows graph

A directly-follows graph of an event log L is $\mathrm{G(L)} = (\mathrm{A}, \mathrm{F}, \mathrm{A}_{start}, A_{end})$
where A is the set of activities in L, $F = \{(a, b) \in A \times A | a >_L b\}$
is the directly-follows relation set, A_{start}, A_{end}
are the set of start and end activities respectively,
$A_{start} = \{a | \exists \sigma \in L, a = \sigma(1)\}, A_{end} = \{a | \exists \sigma \in L, a = \sigma(|\sigma|)\}$

The cardinality of G(L) is defined
$\forall (a, b) \in F, c(a, b) = \sum_{\sigma \in L} |\{i \in \{1, 2...|\sigma|\} | \sigma(i) = \sigma(i + 1)\}|$
$\forall a \in A_{start}, c(a) = \sum_{\sigma \in L} |\{\sigma | \sigma(1) = a\}|$
$\forall a \in A_{end}, c(a) = \sum_{\sigma \in L} |\{\sigma | \sigma(|\sigma|) = a\}|$

$\mathrm{L} = \{\langle a, c, d\rangle^{20}, \langle b, c, e\rangle^{10}, \langle a, c, e\rangle^{20}, \langle b, c, d\rangle^{10}\}$



Data Model – directly-follows graph

A directly-follows graph of an event log L is $\mathrm{G(L)} = (\mathrm{A}, \mathrm{F}, \mathrm{A}_{start}, A_{end})$
where A is the set of activities in L, $F = \{(a, b) \in A \times A | a >_L b\}$
is the directly-follows relation set, A_{start}, A_{end}
are the set of start and end activities respectively,
$A_{start} = \{a | \exists \sigma \in L, a = \sigma(1)\}, A_{end} = \{a | \exists \sigma \in L, a = \sigma(|\sigma|)\}$

The cardinality of G(L) is defined
$\forall (a, b) \in F, c(a, b) = \sum_{\sigma \in L} |\{i \in \{1, 2...|\sigma|\} | \sigma(i) = \sigma(i + 1)\}|$
$\forall a \in A_{start}, c(a) = \sum_{\sigma \in L} |\{\sigma | \sigma(1) = a\}|$
$\forall a \in A_{end}, c(a) = \sum_{\sigma \in L} |\{\sigma | \sigma(|\sigma|) = a\}|$

$\mathrm{L} = \{\langle a, c, d \rangle^{20}, \langle b, c, e \rangle^{10}, \langle a, c, e \rangle^{20}, \langle b, c, d \rangle^{10}\}$



Data Model – directly-follows graph

A directly-follows graph of an event log L is $\mathrm{G(L)} = (\mathrm{A}, \mathrm{F}, \mathrm{A}_{start}, A_{end})$
where A is the set of activities in L, $F = \{(a, b) \in A \times A | a >_L b\}$
is the directly-follows relation set, A_{start}, A_{end}
are the set of start and end activities respectively,
$A_{start} = \{a | \exists \sigma \in L, a = \sigma(1)\}, A_{end} = \{a | \exists \sigma \in L, a = \sigma(|\sigma|)\}$

The cardinality of G(L) is defined
$\forall (a, b) \in F, c(a, b) = \sum_{\sigma \in L} |\{i \in \{1, 2...|\sigma|\} | \sigma(i) = \sigma(i + 1)\}|$
$\forall a \in A_{start}, c(a) = \sum_{\sigma \in L} |\{\sigma | \sigma(1) = a\}|$
$\forall a \in A_{end}, c(a) = \sum_{\sigma \in L} |\{\sigma | \sigma(|\sigma|) = a\}|$

$\mathrm{L} = \{\langle a, c, d\rangle^{20}, \langle b, c, e\rangle^{10}, \langle a, c, e\rangle^{20}, \langle b, c, d\rangle^{10}\}$



Convert to directly-follows graph

From Event log

- Directly-follows relation
- Existing plugin

$$L=\{\langle a,c,d\rangle^{20},\langle b,c,e\rangle^{10},\langle a,c,e\rangle^{20},\langle b,c,d\rangle^{10}\}$$





Convert to directly-follows graph

From Petri net



Convert to directly-follows graph

From Petri net

- Transition System
- Transitions before and after states





Data Model

- **Unification of cardinality**
  - Models from existing model, positive and negative event log
  - For any directly-follows relation

$$u(a,b) = \frac{c(a,b)}{\sum_{(a,b') \in F} c(a,b')}$$

  - For any start activity

$$u(a) = \frac{c(a)}{\sum_{a' \in A_{start}} c(a')}$$

  - For any end activity

$$u(a) = \frac{c(a)}{\sum_{a' \in A_{end}} c(a')}$$



dfg from event log

Unified dfg from event log



dfg from model

Unified dfg from model

Algorithm – data model



Incorporate Data Models

- **Incorporate method**
  - For any directly-follows relation

$$u^n(a,b) = u^M(a,b) + u^+(a,b) - u^-(a,b)$$

  - For any start activity,

$$a \in A^M_{start} \cup A^+_{start} \cup A^-_{start}, u^n(a) = u^M(a) + u^+(a) - u^-(a)$$

  - For any end activity,

$$a \in A^M_{end} \cup A^+_{end} \cup A^-_{end}, u^n(a) = u^M(a) + u^+(a) - u^-(a)$$



- **Weighted value**
  - Three control weights w^+, w^-, w^M

$$u^n_w(a,b) = w^M \cdot u^M(a,b) + w^+ \cdot u^+(a,b) - w^- \cdot u^-(a,b)$$



new unified dfg: D^n

$w^M = 1, w^+ = w^- = 0$ ⟹ Keep the reference model

$w^+ = 1, w^M = w^- = 0$ ⟹ Mine a new model from positive instances

Algorithm – data model



Chair of Process and Data Science

RWTH AACHEN UNIVERSITY

Generate Petri net



- **Choose directly-follows relation**

$$u_w^n(a,b) > t$$

  - T=0



- **Assign normal cardinality back**

$$c^n(a,b) = u_w^n(a,b) \cdot (|L^+| + |L^-|)$$



- **IM algorithm**
  - Directly-follows graph
  - Process tree
  - Petri net





Generate Petri net



- **Choose directly-follows relation**

$$u_w^n(a,b) > t$$

  - T=0



- **Assign normal cardinality back**

$$c^n(a,b) = u_w^n(a,b) \cdot (|L^+| + |L^-|)$$



- **IM algorithm**
  - Directly-follows graph
  - Process tree
  - Petri net





Generate Petri net



- **Filter unified directly-follows relation**
- **Transform into normal dfg**
- **IM algorithm**
  - Directly-follows graph
  - Process tree
  - Petri net







Post Process Petri net

- **Long-term dependency**
  - Choices dependency
  - Exclusive choices
  - Strong correlation

$$L_3 := \{ < \mathbf{a1}, b, c, \mathbf{d1}, e1, e2, f >^{50,pos}, \\ < \mathbf{a2}, b, c, \mathbf{d2}, e1, e2, f >^{50,pos}; \\ < \mathbf{a1}, b, c, \mathbf{d2}, e1, e2, f >^{50,neg}, \\ < \mathbf{a2}, b, c, \mathbf{d1}, e1, e2, f >^{50,neg} \}$$



M0



M3-expected

Post Process Petri net

- **Long-term dependency**



  - Process tree as intermediate result
  - Exclusive choices
    - xor blocks/branches
  - In order
    - Least common ancestor is Seq
      - A < C < B, D<F
    - In same level
      - A,B,C pair
      - D,F pair
  - Strong correlation





Post Process Petri net

- **Long-term dependency**
  - Strong correlation: frequently coexist

$$d(X_i, Y_j) = w^+ \cdot d^+(X_i, Y_j) - w^- \cdot d^-(X_i, Y_j) > t$$

$$d^+(X_i, Y_j) = \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if } \sum_{Y_k \in T} f_{L^+}(X_i, Y_k) = 0; \\ \frac{f_{L^+}(X_i, Y_j)}{\sum_{Y_k \in T} f_{L^+}(X_i, Y_k)}, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

$$d^-(X_i, Y_j) = \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if } \sum_{Y_k \in T} f_{L^-}(X_i, Y_k) = 0; \\ \frac{f_{L^-}(X_i, Y_j)}{\sum_{Y_k \in T} f_{L^-}(X_i, Y_k)}, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

Frequency of multiple xor branches is
$\mathrm{f}_L(X_i, Y_j) = \sum_{\sigma \in L} |\{\sigma | \sigma \models X_i \wedge \sigma \models Y_j\}|$

Frequency of an xor branch X_i in an event log L is the count of traces which replay this xor branch,
$f : X \to N, f_L(X) = \sum_{\sigma \in L} |\{\sigma | \sigma \models X\}|$

$$L_3 := \{< \mathbf{a1}, b, c, \mathbf{d1}, e1, e2, f >^{50,pos}, < \mathbf{a2}, b, c, \mathbf{d2}, e1, e2, f >^{50,pos}; < \mathbf{a1}, b, c, \mathbf{d2}, e1, e2, f >^{50,neg}, < \mathbf{a2}, b, c, \mathbf{d1}, e1, e2, f >^{50,neg}\}$$

$\mathrm{w}^+ = 1, w^- = 1, t = 0$
$d(a1, d1) = d^+(a1, d1) - d^-(a1, d1)$
$= 50/50 - 0 = 1;$
$d(a1, d2) = d^+(a1, d2) - d^-(a1, d2)$
$= 0 - 50/50 = -1;$
$d(a2, d1) = -1;$
$d(a2, d2) = 1.$

$LT = \{a1 \rightsquigarrow d1, a2 \rightsquigarrow d2\}.$



Algorithm – add long-term dependency

- express on Petri net
  - Add silent transition
    - Add control place as post-place post after S={A,B}

$$S = \{A, B\}, T = \{D, E\}, LT = \{A \rightsquigarrow D, A \rightsquigarrow E, B \rightsquigarrow E\}.$$





Algorithm – add long-term dependency

- How to express on Petri net
  - Add silent transition
    - Add control place as post-place post after S={A,B}
    - Add control place as pre-place before T={D,E}



$$LT = \{A \rightsquigarrow D, A \rightsquigarrow E, B \rightsquigarrow E\}.$$



Algorithm – add long-term dependency

- How to express on Petri net
  - Add silent transition
    - Add control place as post-place post after S={A,B}
    - Add control place as pre-place before T={D,E}
    - Add silent transitions for each long-term dependency



$$LT = \{A \rightsquigarrow D, A \rightsquigarrow E, B \rightsquigarrow E\}.$$



Algorithm – add long-term dependency

- How to express on Petri net
  - Add silent transition
    - Add control place as post-place post after S
    - Add control place as pre-place before T
    - Add silent transitions for each long-term dependency



$$LT = \{A \rightsquigarrow D, A \rightsquigarrow E, B \rightsquigarrow E\}.$$



Algorithm – add long-term dependency

$$LT_S := \{X_i | \exists Y_j, X_i \rightsquigarrow Y_j \in LT\}$$

$$LT_T := \{Y_j | \exists X_i, X_i \rightsquigarrow Y_j \in LT\}$$

- **Long-term dependency Situations**

1. $LT = \{A \rightsquigarrow D, A \rightsquigarrow E, B \rightsquigarrow D, B \rightsquigarrow E\}.$
   $LT_S = \{A, B\}, LT_T = \{D, E\}, |LT| = |S| \cdot |T|.$
2. $LT = \{A \rightsquigarrow D, A \rightsquigarrow E, B \rightsquigarrow E\}.$
   $LT_S = \{A, B\}, LT_T = \{D, E\}$ $LT_S = S$ and $LT_T = T, |LT| < |S| \cdot |T|.$
3. $LT = \{A \rightsquigarrow D, B \rightsquigarrow E\}.$
   $LT_S = \{A, B\}, LT_T = \{D, E\}$ $LT_S = S$ and $LT_T = T, |LT| < |S| \cdot |T|.$
4. $LT = \{A \rightsquigarrow D, B \rightsquigarrow D\}.$
   $LT_S = S, LT_T \subsetneq T.$
5. $LT = \{A \rightsquigarrow D, A \rightsquigarrow E\}.$
   $LT_S \subsetneq S, LT_T = T.$
6. $LT = \{A \rightsquigarrow E\}.$
   $LT_S \subsetneq S, LT_T \subsetneq T.$
7. $LT = \emptyset$



- Situation 1 is full dependency ==> no consideration
- Situation 7 is empty. ==> no consideration

Algorithm – add long-term dependency

- **Long-term dependency Situations**

1. $LT = \{A \rightsquigarrow D, A \rightsquigarrow E, B \rightsquigarrow D, B \rightsquigarrow E\}$.
   $LT_S = \{A, B\}, LT_T = \{D, E\}, |LT| = |S| \cdot |T|$.
2. $LT = \{A \rightsquigarrow D, A \rightsquigarrow E, B \rightsquigarrow E\}$.
   $LT_S = \{A, B\}, LT_T = \{D, E\}$ $LT_S = S$ and $LT_T = T, |LT| < |S| \cdot |T|$.
3. $LT = \{A \rightsquigarrow D, B \rightsquigarrow E\}$.
   $LT_S = \{A, B\}, LT_T = \{D, E\}$ $LT_S = S$ and $LT_T = T, |LT| < |S| \cdot |T|$.
4. $LT = \{A \rightsquigarrow D, B \rightsquigarrow D\}$.
   $LT_S = S, LT_T \subsetneq T$.
5. $LT = \{A \rightsquigarrow D, A \rightsquigarrow E\}$.
   $LT_S \subsetneq S, LT_T = T$.
6. $LT = \{A \rightsquigarrow E\}$.
   $LT_S \subsetneq S, LT_T \subsetneq T$.
7. $LT = \emptyset$

$$LT_S := \{X_i | \exists Y_j, X_i \rightsquigarrow Y_j \in LT\}$$
$$LT_T := \{Y_j | \exists X_i, X_i \rightsquigarrow Y_j \in LT\}$$

$$LT_S = S, LT_T = T$$



Soundness

- Safeness.
- Proper completion.
- Option to complete.
- No dead parts.

Algorithm – add long-term dependency

$$LT_S := \{X_i | \exists Y_j, X_i \rightsquigarrow Y_j \in LT\}$$
$$LT_T := \{Y_j | \exists X_i, X_i \rightsquigarrow Y_j \in LT\}$$

- **Long-term dependency Situations**

1. $LT = \{A \rightsquigarrow D, A \rightsquigarrow E, B \rightsquigarrow D, B \rightsquigarrow E\}$.
   $LT_S = \{A, B\}, LT_T = \{D, E\}, |LT| = |S| \cdot |T|$.
2. $LT = \{A \rightsquigarrow D, A \rightsquigarrow E, B \rightsquigarrow E\}$.
   $LT_S = \{A, B\}, LT_T = \{D, E\}$ $LT_S = S$ and $LT_T = T, |LT| < |S| \cdot |T|$.
3. $LT = \{A \rightsquigarrow D, B \rightsquigarrow E\}$.
   $LT_S = \{A, B\}, LT_T = \{D, E\}$ $LT_S = S$ and $LT_T = T, |LT| < |S| \cdot |T|$.
4. $LT = \{A \rightsquigarrow D, B \rightsquigarrow D\}$.
   $LT_S = S, LT_T \subsetneq T$.
5. $LT = \{A \rightsquigarrow D, A \rightsquigarrow E\}$.
   $LT_S \subsetneq S, LT_T = T$.
6. $LT = \{A \rightsquigarrow E\}$.
   $LT_S \subsetneq S, LT_T \subsetneq T$.
7. $LT = \emptyset$

$$LT_S \subsetneq S, LT_T \subsetneq T$$



$$LT_S = S, LT_T = T, |LT| < |S| \cdot |T|$$

Soundness

- Safeness.
- Proper completion.
- Option to complete.
- No dead parts.

Algorithm – add long-term dependency

$$LT_S := \{X_i | \exists Y_j, X_i \rightsquigarrow Y_j \in LT\}$$
$$LT_T := \{Y_j | \exists X_i, X_i \rightsquigarrow Y_j \in LT\}$$

- **Long-term dependency Situations**

1. $LT = \{A \rightsquigarrow D, A \rightsquigarrow E, B \rightsquigarrow D, B \rightsquigarrow E\}$.
   $LT_S = \{A, B\}, LT_T = \{D, E\}, |LT| = |S| \cdot |T|$.
2. $LT = \{A \rightsquigarrow D, A \rightsquigarrow E, B \rightsquigarrow E\}$.
   $LT_S = \{A, B\}, LT_T = \{D, E\}$ $LT_S = S$ and $LT_T = T, |LT| < |S| \cdot |T|$.
3. $LT = \{A \rightsquigarrow D, B \rightsquigarrow E\}$.
   $LT_S = \{A, B\}, LT_T = \{D, E\}$ $LT_S = S$ and $LT_T = T, |LT| < |S| \cdot |T|$.
4. $LT = \{A \rightsquigarrow D, B \rightsquigarrow D\}$.
   $LT_S = S, LT_T \subsetneq T$.
5. $LT = \{A \rightsquigarrow D, A \rightsquigarrow E\}$.
   $LT_S \subsetneq S, LT_T = T$.
6. $LT = \{A \rightsquigarrow E\}$.
   $LT_S \subsetneq S, LT_T \subsetneq T$.
7. $LT = \emptyset$

$$LT_S = S, LT_T = T, |LT| < |S| \cdot |T|$$

Soundness

- Safeness.
- Proper completion.
- Option to complete.
- No dead parts.

Post process

- **Delete redundant silent transitions**





Algorithm – architecture



Outline

- **Motivation for Research**
- **Problem Definition**
- **Approach**
- **Demo Show**
  - ProM
  - KNIME
- **Evaluation**
- **Conclusion**



Demo


(3) change Model type
ProM
fluxicon
Directly follows graph of seq_3_xor
Select visualisation ...
Generated Model
(1). repaired model view
S2
S1
A
B2
B1
C
T2
T1
(4) change weights
Show Process Tree
Show Petri net
Show Petri net with lt
Show Petri net with LT After Reduc...
Set Weights
Weight for Existing Model
Weight for Pos Examples
Weight for Neg Examples
0.7
1.0
1.0
Reset
Submit
Add Long-term Dependency on Petr...
Select Add Method
Add All In Order
Add XOR Pair By Choice
Choose XOR Pair To Add Or Remove
Chosse XOR Pair To Add LT
Add this pair
(2). control panel

Demo


Directly follows graph of seq_3_xor
Select visualisation ...
Generated Model
S2
S1
A
B2
B1
C
T2
T1
Result in Confusion Matrix
Show Process Tree
Show Petri net
Show Petri net with It
Show Petri net with LT After Reduc...
Set Weights
Weight for Existing Model
Weight for Pos Examples
Weight for Neg Examples
0.7
1.0
1.0
Reset
Submit
Add Long-term Dependency on Petr...
Select Add Method
Add All In Order
Add XOR Pair By Choice
Choose XOR Pair To Add Or Remove
Chosse XOR Pair To Add LT
Add this pair
Choose Source
Choose Target
Choose Pair to Remove
Remove this pair
Choose Source
Choose Target
(5) long-term dependency control panel

Demo



(5) long-term dependency control panel manually

Demo


Directly follows graph of seq_3_xor
Select visualisation ...
Generated Model
(6)reduce silent transitions
Show Process Tree
Show Petri net
Show Petri net with lt
Show Petri net with LT After Reduc...
Set Weights
Weight for Existing Model
Weight for Pos Examples
Weight for Neg Examples
0.7
1.0
1.0
Reset
Submit
Add Long-term Dependency on Petr...
Select Add Method
Add All In Order
Add XOR Pair By Choice
Choose XOR Pair To Add Or Remove
Chosse XOR Pair To Add LT
Add this pair
S2
S1
A
B2
B1
C
T2
T1

Demo

Integration with KNIME



Outline

- Motivation for Research
- Problem Definition
- Approach
- Demo
- Evaluation
  - Synthetic data
  - Real life data
- Conclusion



Evaluation

Confusion matrix

	Allowed behavior	Not allowed behavior
positive	TP	FN
negative	FP	TN

- **Confusion matrix**
  - Recall

$$Recall = \frac{TP}{TP + FN}$$

  - Precision

$$Precision = \frac{TP}{TP + FP}$$

  - Accuracy

$$Accuracy = \frac{TP + TN}{TP + TN + FP + FN}$$

  - F1

$$F_1 = \frac{2 * Recall * Precision}{Precision + Recall}$$

Evaluation --implementation

- Naive conformance checking
- Alignment-based
- External plugin & Embedded



Demo --result

Overcome s1:
add subprocesses
as loops

Overcome s2:
Unable to adapt model
With negative instances

Overcome s3:
Unable to detect
long-term dependency



M0



M1.3



M2.3



M3.3

Demo --result

Situation	Method	Generated Model	Confusion matrix measurements							
			TP	FP	TN	FN	recall	precision	accuracy	F1
S1	IM-Infrequent Noise threshold: 20%	M1.1	50	50	0	0	1	0.5	0.5	0.667
	Fahland's Repair Model	M1.2	50	50	0	0	1	0.5	0.5	0.667
	Dfg-repair	M1.3	50	50	0	0	**1**	**0.5**	**0.5**	**0.667**
S2	IM/Fahland's	M0	60	45	0	0	**1**	0.571	0.571	0.727
	Dfg-repair	M2.3	50	5	40	10	0.833	**0.909**	**0.857**	**0.870**
S3	IM/Fahland repair	M0	100	100	0	0	1	0.5	0.5	0.667
	Dfg-repair	M3.3	100	0	100	0	**1**	**1**	**1**	**1**

Conclusion:

- Conquer shortcomings of current techniques in listed situations,
- Better precision, accuracy, F1 score

Experiments -- Real life data

- **Data description**
  - BPI Challenge 2015

    BPIC15_1.xes.xml:

    1199 cases,

    52217 events

    398 event classes



Experiments

- **Event logs**

ID	Description	Traces Num	Events Num	Event Class
D1	Heuristic filter 40%	495	9565	20
D2	Heuristic filter 60% on D1	378	4566	12
D3.1	Classify on Sumledge; Below 70% as positive	349	6744	20
D3.2	Classify on Sumledge; over 70% as negative	146	2811	20
D3.3	Union of D3.1 and D3.2	495	9565	20
D4.1	Classify on throughput time; Below 70% as positive	346	6719	20
D4.2	Classify on Sumledge; over 70% as negative	146	2846	20
D4.3	Union of D4.1 and D4.2	495	9565	20

Experiments



M1

Model ID	Data ID	Confusion matrix							
		TP	FP	TN	FN	recall	Precision	Accuracy	F1
M1	D3.3	112	40	106	237	0.321	0.737	0.440	0.447
	D4.3	131	21	128	215	0.379	0.862	0.523	0.526
M2	D3.3	106	39	107	243	0.304	0.731	0.430	0.429
	D4.3	125	20	129	221	0.361	0.862	0.513	0.509
M3	D3.3	0	0	146	349	0	NaN	0.295	0
	D4.3	0	0	149	346	0	NaN	0.301	0
M4	D3.3	0	0	146	349	0	NaN	0.295	0
	D4.3	0	0	149	346	0	NaN	0.301	0

Experiments

- **Petri net Models**

M3



Model ID	Data ID	Confusion matrix							
		TP	FP	TN	FN	recall	Precision	Accuracy	F1
M1	D3.3	112	40	106	237	0.321	0.737	0.440	0.447
	D4.3	131	21	128	215	0.379	0.862	0.523	0.526
M2	D3.3	106	39	107	243	0.304	0.731	0.430	0.429
	D4.3	125	20	129	221	0.361	0.862	0.513	0.509
M3	D3.3	0	0	146	349	0	NaN	0.295	0
	D4.3	0	0	149	346	0	NaN	0.301	0
M4	D3.3	0	0	146	349	0	NaN	0.295	0
	D4.3	0	0	149	346	0	NaN	0.301	0

Experiments- result

Repaired model M3.2 with Fahland's method on M3 with default setting

M3



M3.2



Experiments results

Repaired model M3.3 from dfg-repair with default setting

Simpler than Fahland's method



M3.3



M3.2

Experiment result

Table 6.5: Test Results on BPI15-M1 data

event log	reference model	method	confusion matrix metrics							
			TP	FP	TN	FN	recall	precision	accuracy	F1
D3.1	-	IM	137	48	118	289	0.32	0.74	0.43	0.45
D3.1	M1	Fahland	343	136	10	6	0.983	0.716	0.713	0.829
D3.3	M1	Dfg-repair:1-1-1	124	52	94	225	0.355	0.705	0.44	0.472
D3.3	M1	Dfg-repair:0.5-1-0.5	155	66	80	194	0.444	0.701	0.474	0.544
D3.1	M2	Fahland	317	133	13	32	0.908	0.704	0.667	0.793
D3.3	M2	Dfg-repair:1-1-1	124	52	94	225	0.355	0.705	0.44	0.472
D3.3	M2	Dfg-repair:0.5-1-0.5	155	66	80	194	0.444	0.701	0.475	0.544
D3.1	M3	Fahland	35	7	139	314	0.100	0.833	0.352	0.179
D3.3	M3	Dfg-repair:1-1-1	0	0	146	349	0	NaN	0.295	0
D3.3	M3	Dfg-repair:0.5-1-0.5	132	63	83	217	0.378	0.677	0.434	0.485
D3.1	M4	Fahland	0	0	146	349	0	NaN	0.294	0.0
D3.3	M4	Dfg-repair:1-1-1	0	0	146	349	0	NaN	0.294	0
D3.3	M4	Dfg-repair:0.5-1-0.5	125	59	87	224	0.358	0.679	0.428	0.469
D4.1	-	IM	131	21	128	215	0.379	0.862	0.523	0.526
D4.1	M1	Fahland	325	133	16	21	0.939	0.710	0.689	0.808
D4.3	M1	Dfg-repair:1-1-1	139	36	113	207	0.402	0.794	0.509	0.534
D4.3	M1	Dfg-repair:0.5-1-0.5	172	48	101	174	0.497	0.782	0.552	0.608
D4.1	M2	Fahland	325	130	19	21	0.939	0.714	0.695	0.811
D4.3	M2	Dfg-repair:1-1-1	139	36	113	207	0.402	0.794	0.509	0.534
D4.3	M2	Dfg-repair:0.5-1-0.5	172	48	101	174	0.497	0.782	0.552	0.608
D4.1	M3	Fahland	10	20	129	336	0.029	0.333	0.281	0.053
D4.3	M3	Dfg-repair:1-1-1	0	0	346	149	0	NaN	0.303	0
D4.3	M3	Dfg-repair:0.5-1-0.5	182	49	164	100	0.526	0.788	0.70	0.631
D4.1	M4	Fahland	5	14	135	341	0.014	0.263	0.283	0.027
D4.3	M4	Dfg-repair:1-1-1	0	0	346	149	0	NaN	0.303	0
D4.3	M4	Dfg-repair:0.5-1-0.5	172	48	101	174	0.497	0.782	0.552	0.608

Experiment result



Fahland's Repair:
M1,M2
TN and FN low values
M3,M4 high values

Dfg-repair:

With 0.5-1-0.5 Perform better than 1-1-1

High values in TP and TN

Experiment result



dfg2-repair with setting 0.5-1-0.5, rank higher in precision, accuracy and F1 than other techniques; Different setting leads to different results

Experiment result



Fahland's Repair:
M1,M2
TN and FN low values
M3,M4 high values

Dfg-repair:

With 0.5-1-0.5 Perform better than 1-1-1

High values in TP and TN

Experiment result



dfg2-repair with setting 0.5-1-0.5, rank higher in precision, accuracy and F1 than other techniques; Different setting leads to different results

Outline

- Motivation for Research
- Problem Definition
- Approach
- Demo
- Evaluation
- Conclusion



Conclusion

- Conquer the shortcomings
- Repair model with better precision, accuracy, F1
- Feasible to use in practice
- In observation, repaired model simpler

  run faster

Conclusion

- Conquer the shortcomings
- Repair model with better precision, accuracy, F1
- Feasible to use in practice
- In observation, repaired model simpler

  run faster

Future Work

- Improve the method to incorporate different data models
- Improve rules to decide long-term dependency
- Drop process tree as intermediate result

Questions & Answers

Why transition system

- **Simple extraction can’t get directly-follows graph**



- **Tool exists to transform a Petri net into Transition systems**



Why transition system

- **Simple extraction can’t get directly-follows graph**





- **Tool exists to transform a Petri net into Transition systems**



Experiment result

- **Weight for the reference model**



Experiment result

- **Weight for positive instance**



Experiment result

- **Weight for negative instance**