

ANTWERP MANAGEMENT SCHOOL

On the convergence of Clean Architecture with the Normalized Systems Theorems

*A Design Science approach of stability, evolvability and modularity on a
C# software artifact.*

Author:

Gerco Koks

Supervisor:

Prof. Dr. Ing. Hans Mulder


Promotor:

Dr. ir. Geert Haerens

*A thesis submitted in fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of Master of Enterprise IT Architecture*

May 7, 2023

Information

Title: On the convergence of Clean Architecture with the Normalized Systems Theorems
Subtitle: A Design Science approach of stability, evolvability and modularity on a C# software artifact.
Submission date: 15 May 2022
Language: US English
Reference Style: APA 7th Edition
Copyright © 2023 G.C. Koks
License:  This work is licensed under a CC-BY-SA 4.0 license.

Repositories

Thesis: <https://github.com/liquidvisions/master-thesis/>
artifacts: <https://github.com/liquidvisions/liquidvisions.pantharhei/>

Author

Name: Gerco Koks
Email: gerco.koks@outlook.com
LinkedIn: <https://www.linkedin.com/in/gercokoks/>

Supervisor

Name: Prof. Dr. Ing. Hans Mulder
Email: Hans.Mulder@ams.ac.be
LinkedIn: <https://www.linkedin.com/in/jbfmulder/>

Promotor

Name: Dr. ir. Geert Haerens
Email: geert.haerens@uantwerpen.be
LinkedIn: <https://www.linkedin.com/in/geerthaerens/>

"The essence of science is that it is always
willing to abandon a given idea for a better one."
— *Albert Einstein* —

"Life is a series of natural and spontaneous changes.
Don't resist them; that only creates sorrow. Let reality
be reality. Let things flow naturally forward in
whatever way they like."
— *Lao Tzu* —

"The secret of change is to focus all of your energy
not on fighting the old, but on building the new."
— *Socrates* —

"Change is the only constant in life."
— *Heraclitus* —

In loving dedication to my cherished family members. To my parents, who are courageously battling a devastating illness and have been admitted to a care home during the final stages of my research, my thoughts are always with you. I am eternally grateful to my brother and sister for their understanding and patience as I poured my heart into this pursuit. And to the brightest star in my life, my dear daughter Emma. To all of you, thank you for your unwavering love, support, and belief in me. I love you all!

Acknowledgements

*“With unwavering commitment, heartfelt encouragement,
and steadfast support, the impossible becomes possible.”*

Looking back, I never imagined I would embark on this academic journey. As a youngling, I struggled with a focusing disorder, which led me to attend a school specializing in helping kids with similar challenges. Despite this, I discovered I could excel by dedicating myself to enjoyable activities. Early in my life, this manifested primarily in sports.

I knew I had to provide for myself as an adult, so I pursued an education in what I loved most: Sports. Consequently, the first decade of my professional career revolved around being a sports instructor. Eventually, my interests shifted toward the technical challenges of software programming. I decided to take the plunge and pursue it professionally. So, I embarked on my first educational endeavor, my bachelor’s degree in Computer Science, completed in 2012. In hindsight, it was the best decision I have made. It caused a giant leap forward from a career perspective but also for my personal growth. My decision has brought me to this point where I am close to completing my Master’s degree, which makes me incredibly proud.

It would have been a much more difficult journey without the encouragement and support of many people. Rene Blikendaal encouraged and convinced me to embark on this journey. Thank you! I also greatly respect my employer for facilitating this pursuit while I continued to work full-time. Your flexibility has played an important role in making it a reality.

I sincerely thank my supervisor, Hans Mulder, and promoter, Geert Haerens, for their invaluable guidance, feedback, and mentorship throughout my research. Your expertise and insights have been instrumental in shaping my work and ensuring this success. Also, a special mention goes to Frans Vertreken, who really stepped up in guiding me in the early stages of research when no one else was available. Your knowledge and encouragement have been inspiring and laid the basis for my result.

I extend my heartfelt gratitude to Antwerp Management School, which provided me with an excellent platform to pursue my personal and scholarly growth. To everyone else who has played a role in this journey, no matter how big or small, I offer my heartfelt thanks. This achievement would not have been possible without each one of you.

So, what is next for me? First, I fully intend to repay my employer’s continued support and encouragement by sharing my knowledge and planning to bring additional value. Then, in my free time, I’ll spend some well-deserved and needed time focusing on my health and my closest family members. After that? I’m not sure yet, but I want to explore more on the subject of Software stability and Evolvability, as this is where my true passion and potential lie.

— Gerco

Table of Contents

| | |
|--|-----------|
| Acknowledgements | i |
| Table of Contents | ii |
| 1. Introduction | 1 |
| 1.1. Research method | 2 |
| 1.2. Research Objectives | 4 |
| 1.3. Thesis Outline | 4 |
| 2. Theoretical background | 5 |
| 2.1. Generic Concepts | 5 |
| 2.1.1. Modularity | 5 |
| 2.1.2. High Cohesion | 5 |
| 2.1.3. Low Coupling | 6 |
| 2.2. Normalized Systems Theory | 6 |
| 2.2.1. Stability | 6 |
| 2.2.2. Evolvability | 6 |
| 2.2.3. Combinatorial effects versus Ripple effects | 7 |
| 2.2.4. Expansion and code generation | 7 |
| 2.2.5. Harvesting and Rejuvenation | 7 |
| 2.2.6. The Design Theorems | 7 |
| 2.2.7. Normalized Elements | 8 |
| 2.3. Clean architecture | 9 |
| 2.3.1. The Design principles | 9 |
| 2.3.2. Component architecture | 11 |
| 2.3.3. The Design Elements | 12 |
| 2.3.4. The Dependency rule | 12 |
| 2.3.5. Screaming Architecture | 13 |
| 3. Requirements | 14 |
| 3.1. Software Transformation Requirements | 14 |
| 3.2. Artifact requirements | 15 |
| 3.2.1. Component Architecture Requirements | 15 |
| 3.2.2. Software Architecture Requirements | 16 |
| 3.2.3. Expander Framework & Clean Architecture Expander Requirements | 21 |
| 3.2.4. Generated Artifact Requirements | 22 |
| 4. Artifact Design Decisions. | 23 |
| 4.1. The Artifact name and use | 23 |

| | | |
|-----------|---|-----------|
| 4.2. | The meta-model and model | 23 |
| 4.3. | Plugin Architecture | 24 |
| 4.4. | Expanders | 25 |
| 4.5. | The IExecutionInteractor command | 26 |
| 4.6. | Dependency management | 26 |
| 5. | Analysis results | 28 |
| 5.1. | An Analysis of Principles | 28 |
| 5.1.1. | Single Responsibility Principle | 29 |
| 5.1.2. | Open/Closed Principle | 31 |
| 5.1.3. | Liskov Substitution Principle | 32 |
| 5.1.4. | Interface Segregation Principle | 33 |
| 5.1.5. | Dependency Inversion Principle | 34 |
| 5.1.6. | The Principles Alignment Overview | 34 |
| 5.2. | An analysis of Elements | 35 |
| 5.2.1. | The Entity Element | 35 |
| 5.2.2. | The Interactor Element | 36 |
| 5.2.3. | The RequestModel Element | 37 |
| 5.2.4. | The ResponseModel Element | 38 |
| 5.2.5. | The ViewModel Element | 39 |
| 5.2.6. | The Controller Element | 40 |
| 5.2.7. | The Gateway Element | 41 |
| 5.2.8. | The Presenter Element | 41 |
| 5.2.9. | The Boundary Element | 42 |
| 5.2.10. | The Elements Alignment Overview | 42 |
| 6. | Conclusions and discussion | 44 |
| 6.1. | Conclusion | 44 |
| 6.2. | Discussion | 45 |
| 6.3. | Reflections | 45 |
| 6.3.1. | Way of Thinking | 46 |
| 6.3.2. | Way of Managing | 46 |
| 6.3.3. | Way of Modeling | 47 |
| 6.3.4. | Way of Working | 47 |
| 6.3.5. | Way of Supporting | 47 |
| | Bibliography | 49 |
| | Web References | 51 |
| | Code Samples | 52 |
| | Glossary | 59 |
| | Acronyms | 60 |
| | Appendix A. Code listings | 61 |

| | |
|---|-----------|
| Appendix B. Installing & using Pantha Rhei | 71 |
| B.1. Installation instructions | 71 |
| Appendix C. The Entity Relationship Diagram of the Meta Mode | 75 |
| C.1. The App entity | 75 |
| C.2. The Component entity | 75 |
| C.3. The ConnectionString entity | 76 |
| C.4. The Entity entity | 76 |
| C.5. The Expander entity | 76 |
| C.6. The Field entity | 77 |
| C.7. The Package entity | 78 |
| C.8. The Relationship entity | 78 |
| Appendix D. Designs & Architecture | 79 |
| D.1. Component Layer Naming Conventions | 79 |
| D.2. Element Naming Conventions | 79 |
| D.3. UML2 Notation Legend | 80 |
| Appendix E. Component Cohesion Principles | 81 |

1. Introduction

Shortly after starting my bachelor's degree in 2008, I started to work as a junior software engineer. I was confident I was willing to accept any technical challenge as my experience up until that point led me to believe that creating some software was not that difficult. I could not have been more wrong. I quickly discovered it was a real challenge to apply new requirements to existing pieces of (legacy) software or explain my craftings to the more mature engineers. The craftsmanship of software engineering was enormously challenging to me.

Determined to overcome the difficulties, I started reading and investigating and immediately recognized the Law of Increasing Complexity of Lehman (1980), where he explained the balance between the forces driving new requirements and those that slow down progress. Other pioneers in software have recognized these challenges in engineering also.

D. McIlroy (1968) proposed a vision for systematically reusing software building blocks that should lead to more reuse. D. McIlroy (1968) stated, "The real hero of programming is the one who writes negative code," i.e., when a change in a program source makes the number of lines of code decrease ('negative' code), while its overall quality, readability or speed improves (Wikipedia, 2023b). Perhaps very early concepts of modular software constructs?

Dijkstra (1968) argued against using unstructured control flow in programming and advocated for using structured programming constructs to improve the clarity and maintainability of the source code. In addition, Dijkstra advocated structured programming techniques that improved the modularity and evolvability of software artifacts.

Parnas (1972) continued with the principle of information hiding. Parnas stated that design decisions used multiple times by a software artifact should be modularized to reduce complexity.

Over the years, I got introduced to various software design principles and philosophies like Clean Architecture (CA), increasing my knowledge and craftsmanship. My career moved more toward architecture and product management. Nevertheless, I have always retained my passion for Software Engineering.

My obsession got re-ignited during the Master's degree introduction days at the Priory of Corsendock. Jan Verelst introduced me to Normalized Systems (NS), and I was intrigued by software stability and evolvability. It was fascinating to learn that there is now empirical scientific evidence for a quest I have been on for almost a decade.

NS Had to be the topic of my research. I was curious to compare what I knew (CA) with what science offered (NS). In early investigations, I found overlapping characteristics. Nevertheless, there were also a couple of differences. Could these design approaches be used in conjunction with each other?

Java SE has primarily been used for case studies in order to develop the Normalized Systems Theory (De Bruyn et al., 2018; Oorts et al., 2014). Although sufficient in Java, I was pleased to read that both software design approaches have formulated modular structures independent of any programming technology (Mannaert & Verelst, 2009; Robert C. Martin, 2018). So I could use my favorite programming language C#, to create a software artifact that supported my research.

Based on early investigations, I instinctively found that many applications of CA are a specialization of the NS Theorems. Consequently, I hypothesized that CA and NS could be used to achieve a modular, evolvable, and stable software artifact.




Figure 1.1.: The hypothesis

Since this research is investigating the convergence of glsca and NS, it is relevant to introduce them and discuss the concepts mentioned in the following sections.

1.1. Research method

This research is a Design Science Method and relies on the Engineering Cycles as described by Wieringa (2014). The engineering cycle provides a structured approach to developing the required artifacts to analyze the design problem.




Figure 1.2.: The Engineering Cycle of Wieringa (2014)

In the context of this research, the artifacts described in chapters 4 are considered information systems. Hevner et al. proposed a framework for research in information systems by introducing the interacting relevance and rigor cycles.

Figure 1.3 depicts a specialization of the Design Science Framework of Hevner et al. (2004). The rigor cycle comprises the theories and knowledge from NS and CA, supplemented by the rigorous knowledge of modularity, evolvability, and stability of software systems. The relevance cycle represents the business needs of the stakeholders. The research requirements are described as research objectives.




Figure 1.3.: The Design Science Framework for IS Research

1.2. Research Objectives

In this Design Science Research, we will shift the focus from Research Questions to Research Objects. The primary goal of this research is to determine the degree of convergence of CA with the NS Theory. In order to achieve this goal, the research is divided into the following objectives:

1. **Literature Analysis**

Conduct a literature review of CA and NS, focusing on their fundamental elements, principles, and real-world case studies. This review will provide a solid foundation for understanding the underlying concepts and their practical implications.

2. **Architectural Desing**

Create an Architectural Design fully and solely based on CA. Implement the findings of the Literature Review in the Design. This design will be the basis for the Artifact Development.

3. **Artifact Development**

Construct two artifacts that facilitates the study on the convergence between CA and NS Theories.

- 3.1. **Expander framework & Clean Architecture Expander**

These two components will be designed and implemented based on the CA design. The Clean Architecture Expander will enable the parameterized instantiation of software systems that adhere to the principles and design of CA. The Expander framework serves as a supporting system for the expander, loading and orchestrating dependencies and models and executing the expander.

- 3.2. **Expanded Clean Architecture artifact**

The expanded artifact will facilitate the analysis of a RESTful API implementation and its alignment with the CA principles and design.

4. **Analysis of combinatorics**

Analyze the artifacts to determine if any combinatorial effects occur due to following the principles and architectural approach of CA.

1.3. Thesis Outline

The thesis is organized into seven main chapters, beginning with the introduction. The introduction provides an overview of the study's research method and objectives and includes this Section of the Thesis Outline.

Chapter 2 focuses on the study's theoretical background, covering CA, NS, and some generic concepts. Chapter 3 is dedicated to the requirements for Software Transformation and the artifacts built as part of this study. Chapter 4 focuses on specific Artifact Design Decisions where Chapter 5 discusses the evaluation results of this study. We conclude with the conclusion in 6 and a personal reflection on the journey of this research in 6.3.

2. Theoretical background

This thesis aims to study the convergence of CA with NS. Therefore, it is essential to understand the key concepts and principles, design elements, and characteristics of both software design approaches. This chapter starts with concepts that apply to both CA and NS, followed by a reference to the essential concepts, principles, and design elements of NS. We will conclude with the concepts, principles, and elements of CA.

2.1. Generic Concepts

The following sections will explore the fundamental concepts of modularity, cohesion, and coupling. These concepts are incorporated by both CA and NS and are essential to study evolvability of software artifacts.

2.1.1. Modularity

Both CA and NS use a slightly different definitions for the concept of modularity. Robert C. Martin (2018, p. 82) describes a module as a piece of code encapsulated in a source file with a cohesive set of functions and data structures. According to Mannaert et al. (2016, p. 22), modularity is a hierarchical or recursive concept that should exhibits a high degree of cohesion. While both design approaches agree on the cohesiveness of a module's internal parts, there seems to be a slight difference in granularity in their definitions.

2.1.2. High Cohesion

Mannaert et al. (2016, p. 22) consider cohesion as modules that exist out of connected or inter-related parts of a hierarchical structure. On the other hand, Robert C. Martin (2018, p. 118) discusses cohesion in the context of components. He attributes the three component cohesion principles as crucial to grouping classes or functions into cohesive components. Cohesion is a complex and dynamic process, as the level of cohesiveness might evolve as requirements change over time. The component cohesion principles are further described in *Appendix E Component Cohesion Principles*, and the beneficiary impact of applying cohesion on this research's artifacts.

2.1.3. Low Coupling

Coupling is an essential concept in software engineering related to the degree of interdependence among software modules and components. High coupling between modules indicates the strength of their relationship, whereby a high level of coupling implies a significant degree of interdependence. Conversely, low coupling signifies a weaker relationship between modules, where modifications in one module are less likely to impact others. Although not always possible, the level of coupling between the various modules of the system should be kept to a bare minimum. Both Mannaert et al. (2016, p. 23) and Robert C. Martin (2018, p. 130) agree with the idea that modules should be coupled as loosely as possible

2.2. Normalized Systems Theory

NS is a computer science approach that aims to create stable and evolvable systems. NS utilizes scientific insights from System Theory and Entropy from Statistical Thermodynamics. This Thesis acknowledges the software engineering background of NS, as it consistently refers to software Artifacts and Information Systems. However, the underlying Theory of NS can be applied to various other domains, such as Enterprise Engineering (Huysmans & Verelst, 2013), Business Process Modeling (van Nuffel, 2011), and the application in TCP-IP based firewall rule base (Haerens, 2021), emphasizing the impact of NS Theory. In the following sections, we will highlight the concepts of NS Theory that has impacted this study.

2.2.1. Stability

NS Theory considers stability a crucial property. Mannaert et al. (2016, pp. 269–270) describe that stable software is not excessively sensitive to small changes. The number of changes required for new versions of the system is not dependent on the size of that system. Conversely, instabilities occur when the total number of changes relies on the size of the system. The bigger the size of the system, the more changes are required to implement the requirement. Mannaert et al. (2016, p. 271) refer to these instabilities as Combinatorial Effects.

2.2.2. Evolvability

In section 2.2.1, it was highlighted that stability in a system is achieved when it exhibits low sensitivity to minor changes, regardless of the system's size. On the other hand, evolvability refers to a system's ability to adapt and adjust to changing requirements continuously and the absence of Combinatorial Effects.

2.2.3. Combinatorial effects versus Ripple effects

Combinatorial Effects and Ripple Effects are characteristics often used in NS Theory. Both are closely related to the challenges of maintaining evolvable systems but are certainly not interchangeable. A Ripple Effect is referred to indicate the total amount of changes that are required to adhere to new requirements.

Mannaert et al. (2016, pp. 271–272) describe Combinatorial Effects as: “instabilities in the evolution of an information system where the number of additional software primitives is not only dependent on the amount of additional functional requirements, but also on the set of existing software primitives —the size of the system— at that point in time. These dependencies on the size of the system are caused by the dimensions of variability due to the various versions. They are combinatorial effects between the additional functional requirements, and the various existing versions of software primitives.”

2.2.4. Expansion and code generation

Creating and maintaining a stable and evolvable system is, according to Mannaert et al. (2016, p. 403), a particularly challenging, repetitive, and meticulous engineering job. Developers must have a sound knowledge of NS while implementing new requirements in an always consistent manner. Mannaert et al. (2016, p. 403) propose to automate the instantiation process of software structures by using code generation for recurring tasks

2.2.5. Harvesting and Rejuvenation

Expansion and code generation should embrace manually added craftings on parts of the system where automation is not possible or desirable. These craftings are preserved after each expansion by a method that is called harvesting and rejuvenation (Mannaert et al., 2016, pp. 405–406).

2.2.6. The Design Theorems

In the following table we will describe the Design Theorems of NS, firstly presented by Mannaert and Verelst (2009, pp. 111–119). They are known as Separation Of Concerns (SoC), Data Version Transparency (DvT), Action Version Transparency (AvT) and Separation of State (SoS).

| Principle | Definition |
|-----------|--|
| SoC | The latest definition of SoC has been defined by Mannaert et al. (2016, p. 274) as: A processing function can only contain a single task to achieve stability. |
| DvT | A data structure that is passed through the interface of a processing function needs to exhibit version transparency to achieve stability. |
| AvT | A processing function that is called by another processing function, needs to exhibit version transparency to achieve stability. |
| SoS | Calling a processing function within another processing function, needs to exhibit state keeping to achieve stability. |

Table 2.1.: The Design Theorems of Normalized Systems.

2.2.7. Normalized Elements

In the context of the NS Theory approach, the goal is to design evolvable software, independent of the underlying technology. Nevertheless, when implementing the software and its components, a particular technology must be chosen. For Object Oriented Programming Languages like Java, the following Normalized Elements have been proposed (Mannaert et al., 2016, pp. 363–398). It is essential to recognize that different programming languages may necessitate alternative constructs (Mannaert et al., 2016, p. 364).

| Element | Description |
|-----------|---|
| Data | This object represents a piece of data in the system. Data elements are used to pass information between processing functions and other objects. In NS, data elements are typically standardized to ensure consistency across the system. |
| Task | This object represents a specific task or action in the system. Tasks can be composed of one or more processing functions and can be used to represent complex operations within the system. |
| Connector | This object is used to connect different parts of the system. Connectors can link processing functions, data elements, and other objects to work together seamlessly. |
| Flow | This object represents the flow of control through the system. It determines the order in which processing functions are executed and can be used to handle error conditions or other exceptional cases. |
| Trigger | A trigger represents an object that reacts to specific events or changes in the system by executing predefined actions. |

Table 2.2.: The Elements proposed by Normalized Systems Theory

2.3. Clean architecture

CA is a software design approach that emphasizes the organization of code into independent, modular layers with distinct responsibilities. This approach aims to create more flexible, maintainable, and testable software systems by enforcing the separation of concerns and minimizing dependencies between components. The goal of clean architecture is to provide a solid foundation for software development, allowing developers to build applications that can adapt to changing requirements, scale effectively, and remain resilient against the introduction of bugs (Robert C. Martin, 2018).

2.3.1. The Design principles

Robert C. Martin (2018, p. 78) argues that software can quickly become a well-intended mess of bricks and building blocks without a rigorous set of design principles. So, from the early 1980s, he began to assemble a set of software design principles as guidelines to create software structures that tolerate change and are easy to understand. The principles are intended to promote modular and component-level software structure (Robert C. Martin, 2018, p. 79). In 2004 the arrangement of the principles was definitively arranged to form the acronym SOLID.

The following sections will provide an overview of each of the SOLID principles.

The Single Responsibility Principle

This principle has gone through several iterations of the formal definition. The final definition of the Single Responsibility Principle (SRP) is: *a module should be responsible to one, and only one, actor* (Robert C. Martin, 2018, p. 82). The word actor in this statement refers to all the users and stakeholders represented by the (functional) requirements. The modularity concept in this definition is described by Robert C. Martin (2018, p. 82) as a cohesive set of functions and data structures.

In conclusion, this principle allows for modules with multiple tasks as long as they cohesively belong together. Robert C. Martin (2018, p. 81) acknowledges the slightly inappropriate name of the principle, as many interpreted it that a module should do just one thing.

The Open-Closed Principle

Meyer (1988) first mentioned the Open/Closed Principle (OCP) and formulated the following definition: *A module should be open for extension but closed for modification*. The software architecture should be designed such that the behavior of a module can be extended without modifying existing source code. The OCP promotes the use of abstraction and polymorphism to achieve this goal. The OCP is one of the driving forces behind the software architecture of systems making it relatively easy to apply new requirements. (Robert C. Martin, 2018, p. 94).

The Liskov Substitution Principle

The Liskov Substitution Principle (LSP) is named after Barbara Liskov, who first introduced the principle in a paper she co-authored in 1987. Barbara Liskov wrote the following statement to define subtypes (Robert C. Martin, 2018, p. 95).

If for each object $o1$ of type S , there is an object $o2$ of type T such that for all programs P defined in terms of T , the behavior of P is unchanged when $o1$ is substituted for $o2$ then S is a subtype of T .¹ Or in simpler terms: To build Software from interchangeable parts, those parts must adhere to a contract that allows those parts to be substituted for an other (Robert C. Martin, 2018, p. 80)

The Interface Segregation Principle

The Interface Segregation Principle (ISP) suggests that software components should have narrow, specific interfaces rather than broad, general-purpose ones. In addition, the ISP states that consumer code should not be allowed to depend on methods it does not use. In other words, interfaces should be designed to be as small and focused as possible, containing only the methods relevant to the consumer code using them. This allows for the consumer code to use only the needed methods without being forced to implement or depend on unnecessary methods (Robert C. Martin, 2018, p. 104).

The Dependency Inversion Principle

The Dependency Inversion Principle (DIP) prescribes that high-level modules should not depend on low-level modules and that both should depend on abstractions. The principle emphasizes that the architecture should be designed so that the flow of control between the different objects, layers, and components is always from higher-level implementations to lower-level details. In other words, high-level implementations, like business rules, should not be concerned about low-level implementations, such as how the data is stored or presented to the end user. Additionally, both the high-level and low-level implementations should only depend on abstractions or interfaces that define a contract for how they should interact with each other (Robert C. Martin, 2018, p. 91).

This approach allows for great flexibility and a modular architecture. Modifications in the low-level implementations will not affect the high-level implementations as long as they still adhere to the contract defined by the abstractions and interfaces. Similarly, changes to the high-level modules will not affect the low-level modules as long as they still fulfill the contract. This reduces coupling and ensures the evolvability system over time, as changes can be made to specific modules without affecting the rest of the system.

2.3.2. Component architecture

CA organizes their components into distinct layers. This architecture promotes the separation of concerns, maintainability, testability, and adaptability. The following section is a short description of each layer (Robert C. Martin, 2018).

Domain layer

This layer contains the application's core business objects, rules, and domain logic. Entities represent the fundamental concepts and relationships in the problem domain and are independent of any specific technology or framework. The domain layer focuses on encapsulating the essential complexity of the system and should be kept as pure as possible.

Application layer

This layer contains the use cases or application-specific business rules orchestrating the interaction between entities and external systems. Use cases define the application's behavior regarding the actions users can perform and the expected outcomes. This layer is responsible for coordinating the flow of data between the domain layer and the presentation or infrastructure layers while remaining agnostic to the specifics of the user interface or external dependencies.

Presentation layer

This layer translates data and interactions between the use cases and external actors, such as users or external systems. Interface adapters include controllers, view models, presenters, and data mappers, which handle user input, format data for display, and convert data between internal and external representations. The presentation layer should be as thin as possible, focusing on the mechanics of user interaction and deferring application logic to the use cases.

Infrastructure layer

This layer contains the technical implementations of external systems and dependencies, such as databases, web services, file systems, or third-party libraries. The infrastructure layer provides concrete implementations of the interfaces and abstractions defined in the other layers, allowing the core application to remain decoupled from specific technologies or frameworks. This layer is also responsible for configuration or initialization code to set up the system's runtime environment.

By organizing code into these layers and adhering to the principles of CA, developers can create software systems that are more flexible, maintainable, and testable, with well-defined boundaries and separation of concerns

2.3.3. The Design Elements

Robert C. Martin (2018) proposes the following elements to achieve the goal of “Clean Architecture”.

| Element | Description |
|--------------|--|
| Entity | Entities are the core business objects, representing the domain’s fundamental data. |
| Interactor | Interactors encapsulate business logic and represent specific actions that the system can perform. |
| RequestModel | RequestModels are used to represent the input data required by a specific interactor. |
| ViewModel | ViewModels are responsible for managing the data and behaviour of the user interface. |
| Controller | Controllers are responsible for handling requests from the user interface and routing them to the appropriate Interactor. |
| Presenter | Presenters are responsible for formatting and the data for the user interface. |
| Gateway | A Gateway provides an abstraction layer between the application and its external dependencies, such as databases, web services, or other external systems. |
| Boundary | Boundaries are used to separate the the different layers of the component. |

Table 2.3.: The Elements proposed by Clean Architecture

2.3.4. The Dependency rule

An essential aspect is described as the dependency rule. The rule states that *source code dependencies must point only inward toward higher-level policies* (Robert C. Martin, 2018, p. 206). This ‘flow of control’ is designed following the DIP and can be represented schematically as concentric circles containing all the components described in section 2.3.2 Component architecture. The arrows in Figure 2.1 clearly show that the dependencies flow from the outer layers to the inner layers. Most outer layers are historically subjected to large-scale refactorings due to technology changes and innovation. Separating the layers and adhering to the dependency rule ensures that the domain logic can evolve independently from external dependencies or certain specific technologies.




Figure 2.1.: Flow of control

2.3.5. Screaming Architecture

Robert C. Martin adopts this concept of Screaming Architecture from Jacobson (1992), who points out that Software Architecture are structures that supports Use Cases of a Software System. Robert C. Martin (2018, p. 195) builds on that idea describing that Software Architectures should emphasize the intent, theme and purpose of the System, rather than being dictated by frameworks, technology, and delivery mechanisms.

3. Requirements

This Chapter outlines the requirements for this Design Science Research study, where we focus on the stability & evolvability of Software Artifacts. Section 3.1 begins by discussing Software Transformation Requirements proposed by Mannaert et al. (2016), which serve as a foundation for assessing the stability & evolvability of the Artifacts. Next, Section 3.2 details the specific requirements of the Artifacts used in this study. These requirements will help ensure that the Artifacts are suitable for evaluating the stability & evolvability of Software Artifacts designed based on Clean Architecture and SOLID Principles.

3.1. Software Transformation Requirements

We study stability and evolvability by investigating potential Combinatorial Effects in CA artifacts. Therefore, during the implementation, we will apply parts of the Functional-Construction Software Transformation from Mannaert et al. (2016, p. 251) by using the following five proposed Functional Requirements Specifications. Mannaert et al. (2016, pp. 254–261) have defined them as followed.

1. An information system needs to be able to represent instances of data entities. A data entity consists of several data fields. Such a field may be a basic data field representing a value of a reference to another data entity.
2. An information system needs to be able to execute processing actions on instances of data entities. A processing action consists of several consecutive processing tasks. Such a task may be a basic task, i.e., a unit of processing that can change independently, or an invocation of another processing action.
3. An information system needs to be able to input or output values of instances of data entities through connectors.
4. An existing information system representing a set of data entities, needs to be able to represent a new version of a data entity that corresponds to including an additional data field and an additional data entity.
5. An existing information system providing a set of processing actions, needs to be able to provide a new version of a processing task, whose use may be mandatory, a new version of a processing action, whose use may be mandatory, an additional processing task and an additional processing action

3.2. Artifact requirements

Chapter 1.2 Research Objectives outlines the construction of two artifacts. Both of these artifacts will be meticulously designed and developed in accordance with the design philosophy and principles of CA, by strict adherence to the following requirements.

3.2.1. Component Architecture Requirements

The following requirements are applied to the Component Architecture of both the Generator Artifact and the Generated Artifact.

| Nr. | The Component Architecture Requirements |
|-----|---|
| 1.1 | The solution is organized into separate Visual Studio projects for the Domain, Application, Infrastructure, and Presentation layers of the component. A detailed description of these layers can be found in Section 2.3.2 Component architecture |
| 1.2 | The Visual Studio projects representing the component layers comply with the naming conventions outlined in the appendix D.1 Component Layer Naming Conventions |
| 1.3 | The dependencies between the component layers must follow an inward direction towards the higher-level components as illustrated in Figure 2.1 schematically, and cannot skip layers. |

Table 3.1.: The Component Architecture Requirements

| Nr. | Technology Expander Requirements |
|-----|---|
| 2.1 | The Domain and Application layers have no dependencies on any infrastructure technologies, like web- or database technologies. |
| 2.2 | The Presentation Layer relies on various infrastructure technologies for facilitating end-user interaction. Examples of such technologies include Command Line Interfaces (CLIs), RESTful APIs, and web-based solutions. Each dependency is isolated and managed in separate Visual Studio Projects to ensure the stability and evolvability of the system. |
| 2.3 | The Infrastructure Layer may rely on other infrastructure components, such as databases or filesystems. Each infrastructure dependency is isolated and managed in separate Visual Studio Projects to promote stability and evolvability. |
| 2.4 | All Component Layers utilize the C# programming language, explicitly targeting the .NET 7.0 framework. |
| 2.5 | Reusing existing functionality or technology (packages) is permitted only when adhering to the LSP and utilizing the open-source package manager, Nuget.org. |

Table 3.2.: Technology Expander Requirements

3.2.2. Software Architecture Requirements

Figure 3.1 illustrates the generic Software Architecture of the Artifacts. Each instantiated element adheres to the Element Naming Convention outlined in Appendix D.2. In addition, the following tables detail the requirements specific to each element.




Figure 3.1.: The Generic architecture of the artifacts

| Nr. | Technology Requirements |
|-----|--|
| 3.1 | The ViewModel consists of data attributes representing fields from the corresponding Entity. In addition, it may contain information specific to the user interface. |
| 3.2 | The ViewModel has no external dependencies on other objects within the architecture. |

Table 3.3.: Technology Requirements

| Nr. | Presenter Requirements |
|-----|---|
| 4.1 | The Presenter Implementation is derived from the IPresenter interface and follows the specified implementation. The IPresenter interface can be found in the Application Layer. |
| 4.2 | The Presenter is responsible for creating the Controller's Response by instantiating the ViewModel, constructing the HTTP Response message, or combining both elements as needed. |
| 4.3 | When required, the Presenter utilizes the IMapper interface without depending on specific implementations of the IMapper interface. |
| 4.4 | The Presenter has an internal scope and cannot be instantiated outside of the Presentation layer. |

Table 3.4.: Presenter Requirements

| Nr. | ViewModelMapper Requirements |
|-----|--|
| 5.1 | The ViewModelMapper is derived from the IMapper interface and follows the specified implementation. The IMapper interface can be found in the Application Layer. |
| 5.2 | The ViewModelMapper is responsible for mapping the values of the necessary data attributes from the ResponseModel to the ViewModel. |
| 5.3 | The ViewModelMapper has an internal scope and cannot be instantiated outside of the Presentation layer. |

Table 3.5.: ViewModelMapper Requirements

| Nr. | Controller Requirements |
|-----|--|
| 6.1 | The Controller is responsible for receiving external requests and forwarding the request to the appropriate Boundary within the Application Layer. |
| 6.2 | The Controller relies on the IBoundary interface without depending on specific implementations of the IBoundary interface. |

Table 3.6.: Controller Requirements

Application Layer

| Nr. | IBoundary Requirements |
|-----|--|
| 7.1 | The IBoundary interface establishes the contract for its derived Boundary implementations. |
| 7.2 | The IBoundary interface has public scope within the system. |

Table 3.7.: IBoundary Requirements

| Nr. | Boundary Implementation Requirements |
|-----|---|
| 8.1 | A Boundary implementation is derived from the IBoundary interface and follows the specified implementation. |
| 8.2 | The Boundary implementation serves as a separation between the internal aspects of the Application Layer and the other layers within the Component. |
| 8.3 | Each Boundary implementation handles a single task, which is then executed using the IInteractor interface. |
| 8.4 | Boundary implementations have an internal scope and cannot be instantiated outside the Application Layer. |

Table 3.8.: Boundary Implementation Requirements

| Nr. | IInteractor Requirements |
|-----|--|
| 9.1 | The IInteractor interface establishes the contract for its derived Interactor implementations. |
| 9.2 | The IInteractor has an internal scope and cannot be implemented outside the Application Layer. |

Table 3.9.: IInteractor Requirements

| Nr. | Interactor Implementation Requirements |
|------|--|
| 10.1 | An Interactor implementation is derived from the IInteractor interface and follows the specified implementation. |
| 10.2 | The Interactor implementation executes a single task or orchestrates a series of tasks. Each of these tasks is implemented in separate Interactors. Alternatively, a Gateway is used for Tasks with Infrastructure dependencies, such as data persistence in a database. |
| 10.3 | Depending on the Task, the Interactor implementation orchestrates the mapping from RequestModels to Entities, or from Entities to ResponseModels, utilizing the IMapper interface. |
| 10.4 | Interactor implementations have an internal scope and cannot be implemented outside the Application Layer. |

Table 3.10.: Interactor Implementation Requirements

| Nr. IMapper Requirements | |
|--------------------------|--|
| 11.1 | The IMapper interface establishes the contract for its derived Mapper implementations. |
| 11.2 | The IMapper interface has a public scope within the system. |

Table 3.11.: IMapper Requirements

| Nr. RequestModelMapper Requirements | |
|-------------------------------------|---|
| 12.1 | The RequestModelMapper is derived from the IMapper interface and follows the specified implementation. |
| 12.2 | The RequestModelMapper is responsible for mapping the values of the necessary data attributes from the RequestModel to an Entity. |
| 12.3 | The RequestModelMapper has an internal scope and cannot be implemented outside the Application Layer. |

Table 3.12.: RequestModelMapper Requirements

| Nr. ResponseModelMapper Requirements | |
|--------------------------------------|---|
| 13.1 | The RequestModelMapper is derived from the IMapper interface and follows the specified implementation. |
| 13.2 | The RequestModelMapper is responsible for mapping the values of the necessary data attributes from the RequestModel to an Entity. |
| 13.3 | The RequestModelMapper has an internal scope and cannot be implemented outside the Application Layer. |

Table 3.13.: ResponseModelMapper Requirements

| Nr. IPresenter Requirements | |
|-----------------------------|---|
| 14.1 | The IPresenter interface establishes the contract for its derived Presenter implementations, typically implemented as part of the Presentation Layer. |
| 14.2 | The IPresenter interface has a public scope within the system. |

Table 3.14.: IPresenter Requirements

| Nr. | Gateway Requirements |
|------|--|
| 15.1 | The Domain and Application layers have no dependencies on any infrastructure technologies, like web- or database technologies. |
| 15.2 | The <i>/Verb/Gateway</i> interface establishes the contract for its derived Gateway implementations, which are typically implemented in the Infrastructure Layer. |
| 15.3 | The <i>/Verb/Gateway</i> interface has a public scope within the system. |
| 15.4 | Each task is represented in the naming convention of the interface. As an example, the basic CRUD actions result in a total of five IGateway interfaces: ICreateGateway, IGetGateway, IGetByIdGateway, IUpdateGateway, and IDeleteGateway. |

Table 3.15.: Gateway Requirements

| Nr. | ResponseModel Requirements |
|------|---|
| 16.1 | The ResponseModel consists primarily of data attributes representing the fields of the corresponding Entity. Additionally, the ResponseModel may contain data specific to the output of the Interactor. |
| 16.2 | The ResponseModel does not depend on external objects within the architecture. |

Table 3.16.: ResponseModel Requirements

| Nr. | RequestModel Requirements |
|------|--|
| 17.1 | The RequestModel consists primarily of data attributes representing the fields of the corresponding Entity. Additionally, the RequestModel may contain data specific to the input of the Interactor. |
| 17.2 | The RequestModel does not depend on external objects within the architecture. |

Table 3.17.: RequestModel Requirements

Domain Layer

| Nr. | Data Entity Requirements |
|------|---|
| 18.1 | The Data Entity consists solely of attributes representing the corresponding data fields. |
| 18.2 | The Data Entity does not rely on external objects within the architecture. |
| 18.3 | The Application Layer is the only layer that utilizes the Data Entity. |

Table 3.18.: Data Entity Requirements

The Infrastructure Layer

| Nr. | Gateway Implementation Requirements |
|------|--|
| 19.1 | The [Verb]Gateway Implementation derives from the I[Verb]Gateway interface and adheres to the specified implementation. |
| 19.2 | The [Verb]Gateway Implementation is responsible for the interaction associated with the specific task, utilizing the infrastructure technology of the specific layer (e.g., a SQL database or a filesystem). |
| 19.3 | The [Verb]Gateway Implementation has an internal scope and cannot be instantiated outside of the Layer. |

Table 3.19.: Gateway Implementation Requirements

Design Principles compliancy

Each architectural pattern adheres to at least one of the SOLID principles to ensure that none of the implementations violate these principles.

3.2.3. Expander Framework & Clean Architecture Expander Requirements

In addition to the more generic requirements of previous sections, the following requirements are specific for Clean Architecture Exander & Expander Framework Artifact.

| Nr. | Expander Framework Requirements |
|------|---|
| 20.1 | The Expander Framework enables interaction with the Clean Architecture Expander via a Command Line Interface (CLI). The CLI is implemented in the Presentation Layer of the Expander Framework. |
| 20.2 | The Expander Framework retrieves the model from a Microsoft SQL Database (MSSQL) using the EntityFramework ORM technology. The EntityFramework technology is implemented in the Infrastructure Layer of the Expander Framework. |
| 20.3 | The Expander Framework loads and executes the configured Expanders. In the case of this research, only the Clean Architecture Expander is applied. |
| 20.4 | The Expander Framework supports generic harvesting and rejuvenation, which can be used or extended by the Expanders using the OCP principle. |
| 20.5 | The Expander Framework supports generic template handling, which can be used or extended by the Expanders using the OCP principle. |
| 20.6 | The Expander framework adheres to this chapter's Component and Software Requirements specified in Sections 3.2.1 and 3.2.2. |

Table 3.20.: Expander Framework Requirements

| Nr. | Clean Architecture Expander Requirements |
|------|--|
| 21.1 | The Clean Architecture Expander generates a C# net7.0 RESTful service that provides an HTTP interface on top of the metamodel of the Expander Framework, allowing the basic CRUD operations. |
| 21.2 | The Clean Architecture Expander consists solely of an Application Layer and reuses the Domain Layer of the Expander Framework. |
| 21.3 | The Clean Architecture Expander adheres to this chapter's Component and Software Requirements specified in Sections 3.2.1 and 3.2.2. |

Table 3.21.: Clean Architecture Expander Requirements

3.2.4. Generated Artifact Requirements

| Nr. | The Generated Artifact Requirements |
|------|---|
| 22.1 | The Generated artifact adheres to this chapter's Component and Software Requirements specified in Sections 3.2.1 and 3.2.2. |

Table 3.22.: The Generated Artifact Requirements

4. Artifact Design Decisions.

Chapter 3 Requirements outlines all the requirements of the artifacts, which aim to ensure compliance and adherence to the Clean Architecture Design and SOLID principles. This chapter will discuss specific design decisions made to meet the required functionality while adhering to the requirements outlined in Chapter 3.

4.1. The Artifact name and use

The name of the Expander Framework, Pantha Rhei, was inspired by the Greek philosopher *Heraclitus*, who famously stated that “life is flux”. The name reflects the artifact’s ability to cope with constant change in a stable and evolvable manner. The name is also reflected in the use of the “flux” command in the CLI, which allows users to interact with the application.

To install Pantha Rhei, interested readers can follow the instructions provided in the appendix B Installing & using Pantha Rhei.

4.2. The meta-model and model

The meta-model is a blueprint that describes a software system’s structure, entities, relationships, and expanders. The model is an instantiation of the meta-model, representing a specific software system with unique characteristics.

In this research, the model represents the elements, relationships, and characteristics of the meta-model. The aim is to achieve meta-circularity, although it is not fully implemented according to NS Theory. However, by combining the model with the Clean Architecture Expander, users can modify and extend the model and the meta-model to adapt to changing requirements.

Figure 4.1 illustrated the version of the meta-model used for this research. A detailed description of each of the elements can be found in Appendix C The Entity Relationship Diagram of the Meta Mode




Figure 4.1.: The meta-model represented as an Entity Relationship Diagram

4.3. Plugin Architecture

The Expander Framework Artifact is responsible for loading and bootstrapping Expanders and initiating the generation process. Expanders are dynamically loaded at runtime through a dotnet capability called assembly binding, allowing the architecture illustrated in the following image (Koks, 2023n).




Figure 4.2.: Expanders are considered plugins

This plugin design adheres to several principles of SOLID. The Single Responsibility Principle (SRP) principle is implemented by ensuring that an expander generates one and only one construct. The OCP principle is applied by allowing the creation of new expanders in addition to the already existing ones. The LSP principle is respected by enabling the addition or replacement of expanders without modifying the internal workings of the Expander Framework.

More details can be found in the Appendix A.1 The ExpanderPluginLoaderInteractor

4.4. Expanders

The requirement for an expander is to have an implementation of the IExpanderInteractor (Koks, 2023u) interface, as displayed in Figure 4.3. Although it is not mandatory, it is recommended to use the abstract AbstractExpander (Koks, 2023a) class, which provides a full Expander experience.

check
this




Figure 4.3.: The Design of an Expander

4.5. The IExecutionInteractor command

An exciting implementation that facilitates a high degree of cohesion while maintaining low coupling is the utilization of the *IExecutionInteractor* interface (Koks, 2023t). This interface allows for the execution of various derived types responsible for specific tasks, such as executing Handlers, Harvesters, and Rejuvenators (Koks, 2023m, 2023z, 2023aa). The implementation promotes decoupling by adhering to both OCP and LSP.




Figure 4.4.: Low coupling with *IExecutionInteractor*

Figure 4.4 illustrates that the required interfaces are placed in the Domain Layer of the Expander Framework. In contrast, the concrete classes also can be implemented as part of the internal scope of the Clean Architecture Expander (Koks, 2023y). Code listing A.3 The `ExpandEntitiesHandlerInteractor` illustrates an implementation example of this interface. Finally, the code listing A.2 The `CodeGeneratorInteractor` illustrates the aggregation of the execution, which allows for a graceful cohesion of the execution Tasks (Koks, 2023b).

4.6. Dependency management

Dependency management is an extremely valuable aspect of achieving stability and evolvability. Dependency management can be achieved by using Dependency Injection. This research acknowledges the statement of Mannaert et al. (2016, p. 215) that Dependency Injection does not solve coupling between classes. Working on the Artifact has shown that combinatorial effects can occur when not careful. Nevertheless, Dependency Injection is a widely used pattern in building the Artifact. In order to achieve stability and evolvability, the Dependency Injection pattern must be combined with various other principles of both CA and NS.

The goal is to centralize the management of dependencies and remove unwanted manual object instantiations in the code. At this while respecting the DIP principle so that each Component Layer is responsible for managing its dependencies. The Artifact achieves this by using extension methods as illustrated in Code Listing A.9 (Koks, 2023i). Additionally, and quite significantly, implementations primarily rely on abstractions or contracts (interfaces) instead of the details of concrete implementations.

Traditionally, Dependency Injection injects instantiations through constructor parameters or class properties. Although there are benefits in this approach, doing so will eventually lead to combinatorial effects, breaking the stability of a Software Artifact. In order to solve this problem, the Artifact used the Service Locator pattern, a central registry responsible for resolving dependencies (Wikipedia, 2023a). Many frameworks are available from Nuget.org, but the Artifact uses the Service Registry that is part of the .NET framework. This service registry is considered a cross-cutting concern. The dependency on this technology is reduced by applying the principles of the LSP and ISP. The Artifact creates and uses separate interfaces to register (Koks, 2023s) and resolve (Koks, 2023r) dependencies. As illustrated in Code Listing A.10, the framework technology dependency is abstracted behind implementing those interfaces (Koks, 2023j).

Practically every class gets the `IDependencyFactoryInteractor` (Koks, 2023r) injected, on which further resolving is responsible for that class's inner workings. Code Listing A.11 illustrates how this is done in the `AbstractExpander` (Koks, 2023a) class. Finally, all the dependencies are bootstrapped on application bootstrap, depicted in Code Listing A.12.

The approach described here has many advantages in managing the stability and evolvability of the Software Artifact. However, as for most things, there are also some drawbacks. For example, a good amount of experience is required for developers to understand code that incorporates abstractions, contracts, and Dependency Injection. Another drawback is that dependency errors are detected in runtime rather than compile time. The benefits of the Artifacts, however, outweigh the drawbacks.

5. Analysis results

This chapter will analyze the two development approaches, CA and NS. We will examine how these approaches align and affect software architecture on the Artifact. First, in Section 5.1, we will compare the principles of CA with the principles of NS. Then, we will compare the design elements in section 5.2. We will showcase real-world examples from the Artifacts to illustrate their practical manifestations.

5.1. An Analysis of Principles

In this section, we will apply a systematic cross-referencing approach to assess the level of alignment between each of the principles of CA with NS. Along with a brief explanation, the level of alignment is denoted as follows:

| | | |
|----------------------|-----------|--|
| Strong alignment | ++ | This indicates that the principles of CA and NS are highly aligned. Both have a similar impact on the design and implementation of the artifact. |
| Supports alignment | + | The CA principle supports in implementing the NS principle through specific design choices. However, applying the CA principle does not inherently ensure adherence to the corresponding NS principle. |
| No or weak alignment | - | The principles are not aligned or have no significant similarities in terms of their purpose, goals, or architectural supports |

5.1.1. Single Responsibility Principle

| | | |
|-----|----|--|
| SoC | ++ | The main goal of both SRP and SoC is to promote and encourage modularity, low coupling, and high cohesion. While the definition has some differences, the two principles can be regarded as practically interchangeable. Many examples in the Artifacts show a strong alignment between SRP and SoC. To name one, an Expander should be able to can perform multiple Tasks to complete the full instantiation of the Model. Each of those Tasks can be implemented separately from each other. Figure 5.1 illustrated some of the Tasks that are implemented in the Clean Architecture Expander Artifact. The Code Listing A.4 is an example of one implementation of such a Task <code>ExpandEntitiesHandlerInteractor</code> (Koks, 2023m). |
| DvT | + | Although using SRP does not implicitly guarantees DvT, it does support DvT by directing certain design choices. For example, both CA and NS assign specific DTO objects to support specific use cases (Interactors or Tasks) or to transfer (parts of) Data between architectural layers. CA specifically assigned DTOs and guidelines on where and when to use them. These are also applied in the Artifact of this study as <code>ResponseModels</code> , <code>RequestModels</code> , and <code>ViewModels</code> (Koks, 2023ab, 2023ad). The separation of data structures specific to Use Cases minimizes the impact of data structure changes by preferring stamp coupling over data coupling. However, SRP is not a guaranteed measure for DvT. |
| AvT | + | While SRP emphasizes limiting the responsibility of each module, it does not explicitly require handling specific versions of use cases. Nevertheless, adhering to glssrp can still indirectly contribute to achieving AvT. One way to achieve this is by separating versions of Actions into separate contracts, objects, or methods, enabling Action Version transparency to some degree. Although not yet available in the Artifact, the Code Listing A.5 shows that API versioning is a common standard practice and fully supported by the open API specification and the .net core framework (Github, 2023a; OAS, 2023). Manifestations in the Artifact can be located in the <code>Logger</code> (Code Listing A.6), amongst others (2023x). |
| SoS | - | Following SRP might lead to separate modules that manage their state, indirectly contributing to SoS. However, the alignment is very weak, and no manifestations are found in the artifacts. |

Table 5.1.: The alignment of SRP with the NS principles




Figure 5.1.: Each of the handlers handles an isolated part of the expanding process.

5.1.2. Open/Closed Principle

| | | |
|-----|-----------|--|
| SoC | ++ | The OCP is strongly aligned with the SoC principle of NS. OCP states that software architectures should be open for extension but closed for modification. When applying OCP correctly, the architecture supports new requirements built as an extension, affecting as few existing implementations as possible. Conversely, adhering to SoC does not guarantee the adherence of OCP, as SoC focuses on modularization and encapsulation rather than the extensibility of functionality. The same example with the Tasks provided in sub-section 5.1.1 is also an excellent manifestation of this principle. |
| DvT | - | The OCP indirectly relates to the DvT principle. The alignment of both principles is weak, and no manifestations are found in the artifacts. |
| AvT | ++ | The OCP is strongly aligned with the AvT principle of NS, as both principles emphasize the importance of allowing changes or extensions to actions without affecting existing implementations. OCP is also closely related to SRP. Besides SRP, OCP have the most manifestations in the Artifact, some of which are already mentioned in previous examples. |
| SoS | - | The OCP indirectly relates to the SoS principle. The alignment of both principles is weak, and no manifestations are found in the artifacts. |

Table 5.2.: The alignment of OCP with the NS principles

5.1.3. Liskov Substitution Principle

| | | |
|-----|-----------|--|
| SoC | ++ | LSP states that objects of a derived class should be able to replace objects of the base class without affecting the program negatively. Replacing objects can only be achieved by separating them, aligning the principles inherently. A good example is the implementation of the ITemplateInteractor (Koks, 2023v) where the template engine Scriban (Github, 2023b) is used to generate code instantiations as a result of the Expanding the Model (Koks, 2023ac). We could easily replace the Scriban template engine for an other engine with only impacting the Dependency Injection Register. |
| DvT | - | The alignment between LSP and DvT is weak, and no manifestations are found in the artifacts. |
| AvT | + | The LSP supports the AvT principle. Both principles emphasize the importance of allowing the extensibility of the software system. By adhering to LSP, the architecture allows for class hierarchies that can be easily extended to accommodate new (versions of) actions, which can contribute to achieving AvT. However, adhering to LSP alone may not guarantee full adherence with AvT. Consider ICreateGateway (Koks, 2023q) in Code Listing A.7. The artifact contains multiple implementations of this interface. Each implementation could be considered a different version applied to the interface. |
| SoS | - | The LSP does not relate to the SoS principle. The alignment of both principles is weak, and no manifestations are found in the artifacts. |

Table 5.3.: The alignment of LSP with the NS principles

5.1.4. Interface Segregation Principle

| | | |
|-----|-----------|--|
| SoC | ++ | The ISP strongly aligns with the SoC principle, as both emphasize the importance of modularity and the separation of concerns. ISP states that clients should not be forced to depend on implementation they do not use, promoting the creation of smaller, focused interfaces. In Listing A.8, you can see that each CRUD operation has its own interface (Koks, 2023g). |
| DvT | - | The ISP does not relate to the DvT principle. The alignment of both principles is weak, and no manifestations are found in the artifacts. |
| AvT | + | The alignment between ISP and AvT arises from the emphasis of ISP on creating targeted interfaces that are tailored to specific needs. Smaller interfaces can enhance modularity and minimize unwanted side effects when modifying Actions in the software system, positively impacting the implementation of the AvT. For example, modifications in Actions are likely to have a limited impact. However, adhering to ISP is not a guarantee for AvT. |
| SoS | - | The ISP does not relate to the SoS principle. The alignment of both principles is weak, and no manifestations are found in the artifacts. |

Table 5.4.: The alignment of ISP with the NS principles

5.1.5. Dependency Inversion Principle

| | | |
|-----|----------|--|
| SoC | + | DIP states that high-level modules should not depend on low-level modules. By adhering to DIP correctly, the architecture promotes modular architectures and the use of component layers, as described in 2.3.4 The Dependency rule (Koks, 2023w). Managing Dependencies inherently promotes SoC, therefore DIP aligns with SoC to some extent. However, adhering to SoC does not guarantee SoC. |
| DvT | - | The DIP does not relate to the DvT principle. The alignment of both principles is weak, and no manifestations are found in the artifacts. |
| AvT | + | The DIP can support the AvT principle. The AvT principle emphasizes the importance of isolating actions or operations within a system. By adhering to DIP, the architecture simplifies the dependency management of those isolated versions of actions, which may contribute to achieving AvT. The artifact's handling of this is already described in Chapter 2.3.1 The Dependency Inversion Principle. However, the alignment between DIP and AvT is not so strong as with SoC, and adhering to DIP alone will not guarantee a system that entirely complies to AvT. |
| SoS | - | The DIP does not relate to the SoS principle. The alignment of both principles is weak, and no manifestations are found in the artifacts. |

Table 5.5.: The alignment of DIP with the NS principles

5.1.6. The Principles Alignment Overview

The following table offers a brief overview of the alignment of all principles from both CA and NS.

| | SoC | DVT | AVT | SoS |
|-----|-----------|----------|-----------|----------|
| SRP | ++ | + | + | - |
| OCP | ++ | - | ++ | - |
| LSP | ++ | - | + | - |
| ISP | ++ | - | + | - |
| DIP | ++ | - | + | - |

Table 5.6.: An overview of the alignment of all CA and NS principles

5.2. An analysis of Elements

In this section, we will apply a systematic cross-referencing approach to assess the level of alignment between the elements of both CA and NS. Along with a brief explanation, the level of alignment is denoted as follows:

| | | |
|----------------------|-----------|--|
| Strong alignment | ++ | Both elements have a high level of similarity or are closely related in terms of their purpose, structure, or functionality. |
| Supports alignment | + | Both elements have some similarities or share certain aspects in their purpose, structure, or functionality, but they are not identical or directly interchangeable. |
| No or weak alignment | - | The elements are unrelated or have no significant similarities in terms of purpose, structure, or functionality. |

5.2.1. The Entity Element

| | | |
|-----------|-----------|---|
| Data | ++ | Both elements represent data objects that are part of the ontology or data schema of the application, and typically include attributes and relationship information. While both can contain a full set of attributes and relationships, the Data Element of NS may also be tailored to serve a specific set of information that is required for a single task or use case. In CA these type of Data Elements are specified explicitly as ViewModels, RequestModels or ResponseModels. Code Listing A.13 illustrates an example of an Entity in a way that is very similar to the Data Element from NS (Koks, 2023k) |
| Task | - | There is no alignment between the Entity element of CA and the Connector element of NS and no manifestations are found in the Artifact. |
| Flow | - | There is no alignment between the Entity element of CA and the Flow element of NS and no manifestations are found in the Artifact. |
| Connector | - | There is no alignment between the Entity element of CA and the Connector element of NS and no manifestations are found in the Artifact. |
| Trigger | - | There is no alignment between the Entity element of CA and the Trigger element of NS and no manifestations are found in the Artifact. |

Table 5.7.: The alignment of the Element Entity with the elements of NS

5.2.2. The Interactor Element

| | | |
|-----------|----|---|
| Data | — | There is no alignment between the Interactor element of CA and the Data element of NS and no manifestations are found in the Artifact. |
| Task | ++ | The Interactor element of CA has a strong alignment with the Task element of NS, as both encapsulate the execution of business rules. This is illustrated in Code Listing A.14 which aligns with an implementation of a Task, having a single execution of a business rule (Koks, 2023f). |
| Flow | ++ | The Interactor has a strong alignment with the Flow element of NS as the both elements can orchestrates the flow of execution for a use case, which can involve multiple Tasks in NS. This is clearly illustrated in Code Listing A.15, where the Interactor handles Validation, mapping and persistance of the Entity (2023d). |
| Connector | — | There is no alignment between the Interactor element of CA and the Connector element of NS and no manifestations are found in the Artifact. |
| Trigger | — | There is no alignment between the Interactor element of CA and the Trigger element of NS and no manifestations are found in the Artifact. |

Table 5.8.: The alignment of the Element Interactor with the elements of NS

5.2.3. The RequestModel Element

| | | |
|-----------|----|---|
| Data | ++ | Both elements represent data objects that are part of the ontology or data schema of the application, and typically include attributes and relationship information. While both elements can contain an aggregated or subset of data attributes representing the ontology, the RequestModel element is specifically targeting the needs of the input on behalf of a particular Use Case. This is illustrated in Code Example A.16, where the available data attributes are tailored to the Use Case of deleting an Entity record (Koks, 2023h). |
| Task | - | There is no alignment between the RequestModel element of CA and the Task element of NS and no manifestations are found in the Artifact. |
| Flow | - | There is no alignment between the RequestModel element of CA and the Flow element of NS and no manifestations are found in the Artifact. |
| Connector | - | There is no alignment between the RequestModel element of CA and the Connector element of NS and no manifestations are found in the Artifact. |
| Trigger | - | There is no alignment between the RequestModel element of CA and the Trigger element of NS and no manifestations are found in the Artifact. |

Table 5.9.: The alignment of the Element RequestModel with the elements of NS

5.2.4. The ResponseModel Element

| | | |
|-----------|----|--|
| Data | ++ | Both elements represent data objects that are part of the ontology or data schema of the application, and typically include attributes and relationship information. While both elements can contain an aggregated or subset of data attributes representing the ontology, the ResponseModel element is specifically targeting the needs of the output on behalf of a particular Use Case. |
| Task | - | There is no alignment between the ResponseModel element of CA and the Task element of NS and no manifestations are found in the Artifact. |
| Flow | - | There is no alignment between the ResponseModel element of CA and the Flow element of NS and no manifestations are found in the Artifact. |
| Connector | - | There is no alignment between the ResponseModel element of CA and the Connector element of NS and no manifestations are found in the Artifact. |
| Trigger | - | There is no alignment between the ResponseModel element of CA and the Trigger element of NS and no manifestations are found in the Artifact. |

Table 5.10.: The alignment of the Element ResponseModel with the elements of NS

5.2.5. The ViewModel Element

| | | |
|-----------|-----------|--|
| Data | ++ | Both elements represent data objects that are part of the ontology or data schema of the application, and typically include attributes and relationship information. While both elements can contain an aggregated or subset of data attributes representing the ontology, the ViewModel element is specifically targeting the needs on behalf of a particular (user)interface of the application. |
| Task | - | There is no alignment between the ViewModel element of CA and the Task element of NS and no manifestations are found in the Artifact. |
| Flow | - | There is no alignment between the ViewModel element of CA and the Flow element of NS and no manifestations are found in the Artifact. |
| Connector | - | There is no alignment between the ViewModel element of CA and the Connector element of NS and no manifestations are found in the Artifact. |
| Trigger | - | There is no alignment between the ViewModel element of CA and the Trigger element of NS and no manifestations are found in the Artifact. |

Table 5.11.: The alignment of the Element ViewModel with the elements of NS

5.2.6. The Controller Element

| | | |
|-----------|---|--|
| Data | — | There is no alignment between the Controller element of CA and the Data element of NS and no manifestations are found in the Artifact. |
| Task | — | There is no alignment between the Controller element of CA and the Task element of NS and no manifestations are found in the Artifact. |
| Flow | — | There is no alignment between the Controller element of CA and the Flow element of NS and no manifestations are found in the Artifact. |
| Connector | + | Although the Controller of CA supports the intent of the Connector element of NS, they are only partially interchangeable. While both elements are involved in the interaction between components, the Controller element from CA primarily intends to interact with external systems using a specific protocol or technology involving user or web interfaces. An example of such a Controller is illustrated in Code Listing A.18. (Koks, 2023l). In this example, the Controller exposes a Restful interface. |
| Trigger | + | Although the Controller of CA supports the intent of the Trigger element of NS, they are only partially interchangeable. While both elements are involved in receiving events from external systems, a Controller is also able to initiate communication with the same external systems using specific protocols or technologies involving user or web interfaces. |

Table 5.12.: The alignment of the Element Controller with the elements of NS

5.2.7. The Gateway Element

| | | |
|-----------|----|--|
| Data | — | There is no alignment between the Gateway element of CA and the Data element of NS and no manifestations are found in the Artifact. |
| Task | — | There is no alignment between the Gateway element of CA and the Task element of NS and no manifestations are found in the Artifact |
| Flow | — | There is no alignment between the Gateway element of CA and the Flow element of NS and no manifestations are found in the Artifact |
| Connector | ++ | The Gateway element of CA has a strong alignment with the Connector element of NS, as both are involved in communication between components and provide interfaces for accessing external resources or systems. Code Listing A.7 is an example of two different type of Gateways. The HarvestRepository (Koks, 2023p) interacts with the File System of the operating system, while GenericRepository (Koks, 2023o) interacts with a SQL Database. |
| Trigger | — | There is no alignment between the Gateway element of CA and the Trigger element of NS and no manifestations are found in the Artifact |

Table 5.13.: The alignment of the Element Gateway with the elements of NS

5.2.8. The Presenter Element

| | | |
|-----------|---|---|
| Data | — | There is no alignment between the Presenter element of CA and the Data element of NS and no manifestations are found in the Artifact. |
| Task | + | The Presenter is responsible for preparing the ViewModel on behalf of the Controller and can be considered a Task Element with a narrow scope. Because of this narrow scope, the elements are not fully interchangeable. Code Listing A.17 illustrated the inner workings of a Presenter (Koks, 2023e). |
| Flow | + | Presenters can handle multiple Tasks when this is required. in this case there is also some alignment between the Presenter Element of CA with the Flow Element of NS. |
| Connector | — | There is no alignment between the Presenter element of CA and the Connector element of NS and no manifestations are found in the Artifact. |
| Trigger | — | There is no alignment between the Presenter element of CA and the Trigger element of NS and no manifestations are found in the Artifact. |

Table 5.14.: The alignment of the Element Presenter with the elements of NS

5.2.9. The Boundary Element

| | | |
|-----------|----|---|
| Data | — | There is no alignment between the Boundary element of CA and the Data element of NS and no manifestations are found in the Artifact. |
| Task | — | There is no alignment between the Boundary element of CA and the Task element of NS and no manifestations are found in the Artifact. |
| Flow | — | There is no alignment between the Boundary element of CA and the Flow element of NS and no manifestations are found in the Artifact. |
| Connector | ++ | The Boundary element of CA has a strong alignment with the Connector element of NS, as both are involved in communication between components and help ensure loose coupling between these components. However, the Boundary element's scope seems narrower, as this element usually separates architectural boundaries within the application or component. In the Code Listing Example A.19 we can notice that the main purpose of the Boundary is to separate the inner parts of the Application Layer from the Presentation Layer, which aligns with the goal of the Connector Element of NS |
| Trigger | — | There is no alignment between the Boundary element of CA and the Task element of NS and no manifestations are found in the Artifact. |

Table 5.15.: The alignment of the Element Boundary with the elements of NS

5.2.10. The Elements Alignment Overview

The following table offers a brief overview of the alignment of all elements from both CA and NS.

| | Data | Task | Flow | Connector | Trigger |
|---------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|----------|
| Entity | ++ | - | - | - | - |
| Interactor | - | ++ | ++ | - | - |
| RequestModel | ++ | - | - | - | - |
| ResponseModel | ++ | - | - | - | - |
| ViewModel | ++ | - | - | - | - |
| Controller | - | - | - | + | + |
| Gateway | - | - | - | ++ | - |
| Presenter | - | + | + | - | - |
| Boundary | - | - | - | ++ | - |

Table 5.16.: An overview of the alignment of all CA and NS elements

6. Conclusions and discussion

This thesis culminates a multifaceted exploration into the convergence of CA with NS. We have drawn upon the author’s firsthand experience in designing Software Architectures used rigorous theoretical research and created a practical and working Software Artifact. The primary objective was to investigate the alignment between CA and NS, by analyzing their principles and design elements through theory and practice. This Chapter will summarize the findings into a research conclusion.

6.1. Conclusion

A noteworthy distinction between NS and CA lies in their foundational roots. NS is a product of computer science research built upon formal theories and principles derived from rigorous scientific investigation. Although, throughout this thesis, NS is referred to as a development approach, it is a part of Computer Science.

Stability and evolvability are concepts not directly referenced in the literature of CA, but very much aligns with the goal of Mannaert et al. (2016, p. 31). The attentive reader surely observes the shared emphasis on modularity and the separation of concerns. Both approaches attempt to achieve low coupling and high cohesion. In addition, CA add the dimensions of dependency management as an essential measure to improve maintainability and manage modularity.

A critical difference between CA and NS lies in their approach to handling state. CA does not explicitly address state management in its principles or design elements. At the same time, NS provides the principle of Separation of State, ensuring that state changes within a Software System are stable and evolvable. This principle can be crucial in developing scalable and high-performance systems, as it isolates state changes from the rest of the system, reducing the impact of state-related dependencies and side effects. This finding leads to the first conclusion of this thesis.

1. The alignment between CA and NS is incomplete because CA needs specific state management principles. As a result, CA cannot fully ensure stable and evolvable software artifacts as defined by NS.

6.2. Discussion

TOEVOEGEN DAT SOMMIGE ELEMENTEN (TRIGGER) EN PRINCIPES (STATE) NIET
JUIST VERTEGENWOORDIGD ZIJN IN DE ARTIFACTS. OOK TOELICHTEN DAT HET
ARTIFACT WEL WERKT MAAR WSS NIET VOLDOET AAN EEN MVP

OOK DVT IS ONDER GEREPRÉSENTEERD IN SOLID. TERWIJL DIT IN CA WEER
ERG STERK TERUG KOMT IN DE ELEMENTEN

VRIJWEL ALLE SOLID PRINCIPLES HEBBEN EEN RELATIE MET SOC

Nevertheless, NS and CA can be effectively applied to enhance the stability and evolvability of Software Systems. This synergetic relationship stems from the fact that NS contributes a solid theoretical foundation for understanding and addressing the combinatorial effects of system changes. At the same time, CA offers a robust, practical framework for architectural design in software development.

By integrating the theoretical underpinnings of NS with the pragmatic principles of CA, Software Architectures can harness both approaches' strengths to create stable software systems and adaptable to changing requirements. In addition, the convergence of these methodologies allows for a comprehensive understanding of the factors contributing to reducing the complexity of the Software Architecture, enabling developers to make informed design decisions prioritizing modularity, scalability, and extensibility, leading to the last conclusion of this thesis.

The synergistic application of NS and CA can significantly improve software systems' stability and evolvability. It leverages the advantages of both approaches—combining NSs rigorous theoretical basis with CAs practical guidelines for architectural design. This fusion of methodologies offers a powerful, holistic approach to software development that addresses the challenges of system complexity and fosters adaptability in an ever-evolving technological landscape.

2. The alignment between CA and NS is incomplete because CA needs specific state management principles. As a result, CA cannot fully ensure stable and evolvable software artifacts as defined by NS.

IN CONCLUSIE OPNEMEN DAT SOMMIGE ELEMENTEN VAN NS MEER GRANULARITEIT AFDWINGEN (BV TASK en FLOW elementen) EN IN ANDERE GEVALLEN IS HET WEER ANDERSOM (VIEWMODEL, Entity, -> TASK)

6.3. Reflections

This section will dive into my enriching experiences and invaluable learnings acquired while working on this research and thesis and is inspired by one of the master classes about the Enterprise Engineering (EE) discipline. EE encourages using grounded methodologies and theories, like Five Way Framework, to comprehend the inner workings of an enterprise (Dietz & Mulder, 2020). I will apply the so-called Five Way Framework to reflect on this research. By incorporating the Five Way Framework into the section, I aspire to coherently showcase

my learnings and reflections, shedding light on my thought processes, strategies, modeling techniques, working methodologies, and support mechanisms.




Figure 6.1.: The Five Way Framework, inspired by Dietz and Mulder (2020)

6.3.1. Way of Thinking

Early in my career, I became obsessed with Software Quality and Maintainability. The NS theory shifted the obsession toward Stability and Evolvability. Gaining a thorough understanding of the essential principles of this theory has boosted my confidence in making informed decisions regarding all aspects of architecture, not just limited to software.

As a Domain Architect, my job involved creating software products using the Model Driven Development (MDD) paradigm. Initially, I was skeptical about this approach based on my early experiences. The theory of NS taught me to understand better the reasoning and characteristics of code generation, on which I then realized that my skepticism was more about the process caused as an effect on the implementation of the MDD. The knowledge of NS helped me gain a clearer vision and helped me push the roadmap on the MDD framework in the right direction.

6.3.2. Way of Managing

I should have been able to finish sooner. I was one of the first with a research topic and started working on my artifact in the first month when starting this journey. The artifact was as good as ready before the summer holidays of the first year. Unfortunately, I postponed writing the thesis until a later moment. I want to think that next time I will start sooner, but knowing myself, I need some pressure to perform the less fun tasks, like writing this thesis.

The review process seemed difficult and sometimes even problematic for a couple of reasons. Next time I will ensure having the proper tools and agree on procedures to improve reviews from multiple proofreaders. Secondly, I noticed that having multiple proofreaders sometimes steers

in opposite directions. This sometimes affected my ability to make decisions and negatively affected my confidence. Having a joined review document, where all proofreaders can leave comments, will significantly improve this experience for me and my proofreaders. Then there is the personal aspect of sometimes taking things too personally, grounded in a lack of self-confidence. However, this experience improved my self-confidence.

6.3.3. Way of Modeling

To explain the implementation concepts of the artifact, I looked into various modeling languages. Archimate was the first option I considered. However, during one of the EE masterclasses, I learned the hard way that Archimate is not always the best choice for communicating your models to a broad audience. I thought about using basic "boxes and arrows" but decided to use the UML2 standard because it is a formal modeling language.

6.3.4. Way of Working

I very much enjoyed designing and creating the C# artifacts. In hindsight, I enjoyed it so much that I put in way too much effort than was needed. I was very curious about the aspects of code generation, the effect of code generation on stable and evolvable artifacts, and meta-circularity characteristics. I am confident I could have arrived at the same conclusions presented in this thesis using a manually built Restful C# artifact. However, the insights I gained on the subjects of code expansion are of invaluable value to me. Therefore, I am very pleased and satisfied that I took the effort to build the Code Expander as a primary artifact.

The NS theorems are formulated very clearly and abstractly, making them also applicable outside the software engineering field. During the masterclasses, we learned about the application of NS in the domains of Firewalls, Document management systems, and Evolvable Business Processes. I also experienced benefits in structuring and maintaining my Thesis document using Visual Studio Code (VSCoDe) and Latex by applying the principle of SoC in managing the various chapters and sections.

6.3.5. Way of Supporting

At the beginning of my research, I received a thorough introduction to the NS Theories and the Prime Radiant tooling from an employer at NSX. This introduction was extremely helpful in gaining a better understanding of the fundamentals of NS. It also inspired me to consider the Code Expansion as a primary artifact.

For the writing of the Thesis, I decided to use Latex. I quickly discovered that Overleaf was one of the most popular editors. Nevertheless, I continued my search since I rejected the idea of relying on online tooling for writing my Thesis. At some point, I decided to experiment with my favorite code editor VSCoDe, and with the help of a latex package manager and some VSCoDe plugins, I was able to create a fully-fledged Latex Editor in VSCoDe, being able to use all the other benefits that come with VSCoDe. In my next project, I will likely use the VSCoDe

Latex editor again. In Appendix ??, I included instructions for the interested reader to convert VSCode into a Latex Editor.

Bibliography

- D. McIlroy. (1968). NATO SOFTWARE ENGINEERING CONFERENCE 1968.
- De Bruyn, P., Mannaert, H., Verelst, J., & Huysmans, P. (2018). Enabling Normalized Systems in Practice – Exploring a Modeling Approach. *Business & Information Systems Engineering*, 60(1), 55–67. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12599-017-0510-4>
- Dietz, J. L. G., & Mulder, H. B. F. (2020). *Enterprise ontology: A human-centric approach to understanding the essence of organisation*. Springer International Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-38854-6>
- Dijkstra, E. (1968). Letters to the editor: Go to statement considered harmful. *Communications of the ACM*, 11(3), 147–148. <https://doi.org/10.1145/362929.362947>
- Haerens, G. (2021). On the Evolvability of the TCP-IP Based Network Firewall Rule Base.
- Hevner, A. R., March, S. T., Park, J., & Ram, S. (2004). Design Science in Information Systems Research.
- Huysmans, P., & Verelst, J. (2013). Towards an Engineering-Based Research Approach for Enterprise Architecture: Lessons Learned from Normalized Systems Theory. In *Progress in Pattern Recognition, Image Analysis, Computer Vision, and Applications* (pp. 58–72, Vol. 8827). Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-38490-5_5
- Jacobson, I. (1992). *Object-oriented software engineering: A use case driven approach*. ACM Press ; Addison-Wesley Pub.
- Lehman, M. (1980). Programs, life cycles, and laws of software evolution. *Proceedings of the IEEE*, 68(9), 1060–1076. <https://doi.org/10.1109/PROC.1980.11805>
- Mannaert, H., & Verelst, J. (2009). *Normalized systems re-creating information technology based on laws for software evolvability*. Koppa. OCLC: 1073467550.
- Mannaert, H., Verelst, J., & De Bruyn, P. (2016). *Normalized systems theory: From foundations for evolvable software toward a general theory for evolvable design*. nsi-Press powered bei Koppa.
- Meyer, B. (1988). *Object-oriented software construction* (1st ed). Prentice Hall PTR.
- Oorts, G., Huysmans, P., De Bruyn, P., Mannaert, H., Verelst, J., & Oost, A. (2014). Building Evolvable Software Using Normalized Systems Theory: A Case Study. *2014 47th Hawaii International Conference on System Sciences*, 4760–4769. <https://doi.org/10.1109/HICSS.2014.585>
- Parnas, D. (1972). On the criteria to be used in decomposing systems into modules. *Communications of the ACM*, 15(12), 1053–1058. <https://doi.org/10.1145/361598.361623>

- Robert C. Martin. (2018). *Clean architecture: A craftsman's guide to software structure and design*. Prentice Hall.
OCLC: on1004983973.
- van Nuffel, D. (2011). Towards Designing Modular and Evolvable Business Processes, 424.
- Wieringa, R. J. (2014). *Design Science Methodology for Information Systems and Software Engineering*. Springer Berlin Heidelberg. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-662-43839-8>

Web References

- Github. (2023a). *Aspnet-api-versioning/Program.cs at main · dotnet/aspnet-api-versioning*. Retrieved May 5, 2023, from <https://github.com/dotnet/aspnet-api-versioning/blob/main/examples/AspNetCore/WebApi/MinimalApiExample/Program.cs>
- Github. (2023b). *Scriban*. <https://github.com/scriban/scriban>
- OAS. (2023). *Versioning an API*. Google Cloud. Retrieved May 5, 2023, from <https://cloud.google.com/endpoints/docs/openapi/versioning-an-api>
- Wikipedia. (2023a). Service locator pattern. In *Wikipedia*. https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Service_locator_pattern&oldid=1152702717
- Wikipedia. (2023b, March 25). Douglas McIlroy. In *Wikipedia*. Retrieved April 21, 2023, from https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Douglas_McIlroy&oldid=1146587956
- Page Version ID: 1146587956.

Code Samples

- Koks, G. (2023a). *AbstractExpander*. GitHub. <https://github.com/LiquidVisions/LiquidVisions.PanthaRhei/blob/9687c96eb368d96201d4baa66b1b0536cb90c12c/Generator/src/PanthaRhei.Generator.Domain/Interactors/Generators/Expanders/AbstractExpander.cs>
- Koks, G. (2023b). *CodeGeneratorInteractor*. GitHub. <https://github.com/LiquidVisions/LiquidVisions.PanthaRhei/blob/9687c96eb368d96201d4baa66b1b0536cb90c12c/Generator/src/PanthaRhei.Generator.Application/Interactors/Generators/CodeGeneratorInteractor.cs>
- Koks, G. (2023c). *CreateEntityBoundary*. Retrieved May 7, 2023, from <https://github.com/LiquidVisions/LiquidVisions.PanthaRhei/blob/master-thesis-artifact/PanthaRhei.Output/Output/6c6984a1-c87a-429b-b91f-2a976adb3c0e/LiquidVisions.PanthaRhei.Generated/src/Application/Boundaries/Entities/CreateEntityBoundary.cs>
- Koks, G. (2023d). *CreateEntityInteractor*. <https://github.com/LiquidVisions/LiquidVisions.PanthaRhei/blob/master-thesis-artifact/PanthaRhei.Output/Output/6c6984a1-c87a-429b-b91f-2a976adb3c0e/LiquidVisions.PanthaRhei.Generated/src/Application/Interactors/Entities/CreateEntityInteractor.cs>
- Koks, G. (2023e). *CreateEntityPresenter*. <https://github.com/LiquidVisions/LiquidVisions.PanthaRhei/blob/master-thesis-artifact/PanthaRhei.Output/Output/6c6984a1-c87a-429b-b91f-2a976adb3c0e/LiquidVisions.PanthaRhei.Generated/src/Presentation.Api/Presenters/Entities/CreateEntityPresenter.cs>
- Koks, G. (2023f). *CreateEntityValidator*. <https://github.com/LiquidVisions/LiquidVisions.PanthaRhei/blob/master-thesis-artifact/PanthaRhei.Output/Output/6c6984a1-c87a-429b-b91f-2a976adb3c0e/LiquidVisions.PanthaRhei.Generated/src/Application/Validators/Entities/CreateEntityValidator.cs>
- Koks, G. (2023g). *CRUDGateways*. GitHub. <https://github.com/LiquidVisions/LiquidVisions.PanthaRhei/tree/master-thesis-artifact/Generator/src/PanthaRhei.Generator.Domain/Gateways>
- Koks, G. (2023h). *DeleteEntityRequestModel*. <https://github.com/LiquidVisions/LiquidVisions.PanthaRhei/blob/master-thesis-artifact/PanthaRhei.Output/Output/6c6984a1-c87a-429b-b91f-2a976adb3c0e/LiquidVisions.PanthaRhei.Generated/src/Application/RequestModels/Entities/DeleteEntityRequestModel.cs>
- Koks, G. (2023i). *DependencyInjectionExtension*. <https://github.com/LiquidVisions/LiquidVisions.PanthaRhei/blob/master-thesis-artifact/Generator/src/PanthaRhei.Generator.Application/DependencyInjectionExtension.cs>

- Koks, G. (2023j). *DependencyManagerInteractor*. <https://github.com/LiquidVisions/LiquidVisions.PanthaRhei/blob/master-thesis-artifact/Generator/src/PanthaRhei.Generator.Domain/Interactors/Dependencies/DependencyManagerInteractor.cs>
- Koks, G. (2023k). *Entity*. <https://github.com/LiquidVisions/LiquidVisions.PanthaRhei/blob/master-thesis-artifact/PanthaRhei.Output/Output/6c6984a1-c87a-429b-b91f-2a976adb3c0e/LiquidVisions.PanthaRhei.Generated/src/Domain/Entities/Entity.cs>
- Koks, G. (2023l). *EntityController*. <https://github.com/LiquidVisions/LiquidVisions.PanthaRhei/blob/master-thesis-artifact/PanthaRhei.Output/Output/6c6984a1-c87a-429b-b91f-2a976adb3c0e/LiquidVisions.PanthaRhei.Generated/src/Presentation.Api/Controllers/EntityControllers.cs>
- Koks, G. (2023m). *ExpandEntitiesHandlerInteractor*. GitHub. <https://github.com/LiquidVisions/LiquidVisions.PanthaRhei/blob/9687c96eb368d96201d4baa66b1b0536cb90c12c/Expanders/src/PanthaRhei.Expanders.CleanArchitecture/Handlers/Domain/ExpandEntitiesHandlerInteractor.cs>
- Koks, G. (2023n). *ExpanderPluginLoaderInteractor*. Retrieved May 1, 2023, from <https://github.com/LiquidVisions/LiquidVisions.PanthaRhei/blob/master-thesis-artifact/Generator/src/PanthaRhei.Generator.Application/Interactors/Initializers/ExpanderPluginLoaderInteractor.cs>
- Koks, G. (2023o). *GenericRepository*. GitHub. <https://github.com/LiquidVisions/LiquidVisions.PanthaRhei/blob/9687c96eb368d96201d4baa66b1b0536cb90c12c/Generator/src/PanthaRhei.Generator.Infrastructure.EntityFramework/Repositories/GenericRepository.cs>
- Koks, G. (2023p). *HarvestRepository*. GitHub. <https://github.com/LiquidVisions/LiquidVisions.PanthaRhei/blob/9687c96eb368d96201d4baa66b1b0536cb90c12c/Generator/src/PanthaRhei.Generator.Infrastructure/HarvestRepository.cs>
- Koks, G. (2023q). *ICreateGateway*. GitHub. <https://github.com/LiquidVisions/LiquidVisions.PanthaRhei/blob/9687c96eb368d96201d4baa66b1b0536cb90c12c/Generator/src/PanthaRhei.Generator.Domain/Gateways/ICreateGateway.cs>
- Koks, G. (2023r). *IDependencyFactoryInteractor*. <https://github.com/LiquidVisions/LiquidVisions.PanthaRhei/blob/master-thesis-artifact/Generator/src/PanthaRhei.Generator.Domain/Interactors/Dependencies/IDependencyFactoryInteractor.cs>
- Koks, G. (2023s). *IDependencyManagerInteractor*. <https://github.com/LiquidVisions/LiquidVisions.PanthaRhei/blob/master-thesis-artifact/Generator/src/PanthaRhei.Generator.Domain/Interactors/Dependencies/IDependencyManagerInteractor.cs>
- Koks, G. (2023t). *IExecutionInteractor*. GitHub. <https://github.com/LiquidVisions/LiquidVisions.PanthaRhei/blob/9687c96eb368d96201d4baa66b1b0536cb90c12c/Generator/src/PanthaRhei.Generator.Domain/Interactors/Generators/IExecutionInteractor.cs>
- Koks, G. (2023u). *IExpanderInteractor*. GitHub. <https://github.com/LiquidVisions/LiquidVisions.PanthaRhei/blob/9687c96eb368d96201d4baa66b1b0536cb90c12c/>

- Generator/src/PanthaRhei.Generator.Domain/Interactors/Generators/Expanders/IExpanderInteractor.cs
- Koks, G. (2023v). *ITemplateInteractor*. Retrieved May 5, 2023, from <https://github.com/LiquidVisions/LiquidVisions.PanthaRhei/blob/9687c96eb368d96201d4baa66b1b0536cb90c12c/Generator/src/PanthaRhei.Generator.Domain/Interactors/Templates/ITemplateInteractor.cs#L6>
- Koks, G. (2023w). *Layers of the CodeGenerator*. GitHub. <https://github.com/LiquidVisions/LiquidVisions.PanthaRhei/tree/master-thesis-artifact/Generator/src>
- Koks, G. (2023x). *Logger*. GitHub. <https://github.com/LiquidVisions/LiquidVisions.PanthaRhei/blob/9687c96eb368d96201d4baa66b1b0536cb90c12c/Generator/src/PanthaRhei.Generator.Infrastructure/Logging/Logger.cs>
- Koks, G. (2023y). *MigrationHarvesterInteractor*. <https://github.com/LiquidVisions/LiquidVisions.PanthaRhei/blob/master-thesis-artifact/Expanders/src/PanthaRhei.Expanders.CleanArchitecture/Harvesters/MigrationHarvesterInteractor.cs>
- Koks, G. (2023z). *RegionHarvesterInteractor*. GitHub. <https://github.com/LiquidVisions/LiquidVisions.PanthaRhei/blob/9687c96eb368d96201d4baa66b1b0536cb90c12c/Generator/src/PanthaRhei.Generator.Domain/Interactors/Generators/Harvesters/RegionHarvesterInteractor.cs>
- Koks, G. (2023aa). *RegionRejuvenatorInteractor*. GitHub. <https://github.com/LiquidVisions/LiquidVisions.PanthaRhei/blob/9687c96eb368d96201d4baa66b1b0536cb90c12c/Generator/src/PanthaRhei.Generator.Domain/Interactors/Generators/Rejuvenator/RegionRejuvenatorInteractor.cs>
- Koks, G. (2023ab). *RequestModels*. <https://github.com/LiquidVisions/LiquidVisions.PanthaRhei/tree/master-thesis-artifact/PanthaRhei.Output/Output/6c6984a1-c87a-429b-b91f-2a976adb3c0e/LiquidVisions.PanthaRhei.Generated/src/Application/RequestModels/Apps>
- Koks, G. (2023ac). *ScribanTemplateInteractor*. <https://github.com/LiquidVisions/LiquidVisions.PanthaRhei/blob/9687c96eb368d96201d4baa66b1b0536cb90c12c/Generator/src/PanthaRhei.Generator.Application/Interactors/Templates/ScribanTemplateInteractor.cs>

List of Figures

| | |
|---|----|
| 1.1. The hypothesis | 2 |
| 1.2. Engineering cycle | 3 |
| 1.3. Design Science Framework for IS Research | 3 |
| 2.1. Flow of control | 13 |
| 3.1. Generic architecture | 16 |
| 4.1. The meta-model represented as an Entity Relationship Diagram | 24 |
| 4.2. Plugin Architecture | 25 |
| 4.3. The Design of an Expander | 25 |
| 4.4. Low coupling with <i>IExecutionInteractor</i> | 26 |
| 5.1. handlers | 30 |
| 6.1. The Five Way Framework | 46 |
| D.1. UML Notation used | 80 |

List of Tables

| | |
|--|----|
| 2.1. The Design Theorems of Normalized Systems. | 8 |
| 2.2. The Elements proposed by Normalized Systems Theory | 8 |
| 2.3. The Elements proposed by Clean Architecture | 12 |
| 3.1. The Component Architecture Requirements | 15 |
| 3.2. Technology Expander Requirements | 15 |
| 3.3. Technology Requirements | 17 |
| 3.4. Presenter Requirements | 17 |
| 3.5. ViewModelMapper Requirements | 17 |
| 3.6. Controller Requirements | 17 |
| 3.7. IBoundary Requirements | 18 |
| 3.8. Boundary Implementation Requirements | 18 |
| 3.9. IInteractor Requirements | 18 |
| 3.10. Interactor Implementation Requirements | 18 |
| 3.11. IMapper Requirements | 19 |
| 3.12. RequestModelMapper Requirements | 19 |
| 3.13. ResponseModelMapper Requirements | 19 |
| 3.14. IPresenter Requirements | 19 |
| 3.15. Gateway Requirements | 20 |
| 3.16. ResponseModel Requirements | 20 |
| 3.17. RequestModel Requirements | 20 |
| 3.18. Data Entity Requirements | 20 |
| 3.19. Gateway Implementation Requirements | 21 |
| 3.20. Expander Framework Requirements | 21 |
| 3.21. Clean Architecture Expander Requirements | 22 |
| 3.22. The Generated Artifact Requirements | 22 |
| 5.1. The alignment of SRP with the NS principles | 29 |
| 5.2. The alignment of OCP with the NS principles | 31 |
| 5.3. The alignment of LSP with the NS principles | 32 |
| 5.4. The alignment of ISP with the NS principles | 33 |
| 5.5. The alignment of DIP with the NS principles | 34 |
| 5.6. An overview of the alignment of all CA and NS principles | 34 |
| 5.7. The alignment of the Element Entity with the elements of NS | 35 |
| 5.8. The alignment of the Element Interactor with the elements of NS | 36 |
| 5.9. The alignment of the Element RequestModel with the elements of NS | 37 |
| 5.10. The alignment of the Element ResponseModel with the elements of NS | 38 |
| 5.11. The alignment of the Element ViewModel with the elements of NS | 39 |
| 5.12. The alignment of the Element Controller with the elements of NS | 40 |

| | |
|--|----|
| 5.13. The alignment of the Element Gateway with the elements of NS | 41 |
| 5.14. The alignment of the Element Presenter with the elements of NS | 41 |
| 5.15. The alignment of the Element Boundary with the elements of NS | 42 |
| 5.16. An overview of the alignment of all CA and NS elements | 43 |
| B.1. The <i>flux</i> command line parameters | 73 |
| B.2. The available <i>Generation modes</i> | 73 |
| C.1. The fields of the App entity | 75 |
| C.2. The fields of the Component entity | 75 |
| C.3. The fields of the ConnectionString entity | 76 |
| C.4. The fields of the Entity entity | 76 |
| C.5. The fields of the Expander entity | 77 |
| C.6. The fields of the Field entity | 77 |
| C.7. The fields of the Package entity | 78 |
| C.8. The fields of the Relationship entity | 78 |
| D.1. Naming convention component layers | 79 |
| D.2. Naming convention of recurring elements | 80 |
| E.1. The Component Cohesion Principles | 81 |

Glossary

comp The name of the Company that is considered the owner of the software. If there is no company involved, this can be left blank..

CRUD An acronym that stands for Create, Read, Update, and Delete. It represents the basic operations required to manage persistent data in a database or software system..

DTO DTO stands for Data Transfer Object. It is a design pattern used in software development that involves simple objects for transferring data between layers or processes within an application. They are often lightweight, and have no business logic, serving primarily as a container for data to be transferred..

Noun The primary subject or object that that class or interface is associated with..

Nuget.org NuGet is a free and open-source package manager for the Microsoft development platform, primarily targeting the .NET Framework. It utilizes third-party libraries into projects by providing a centralized platform for discovering, downloading, and managing dependencies..

prod The name of the product of the software..

SOLID An acronym that stands for a set of design principles composed by Robert C. Martin. The five principles that comprise SOLID are: Single Responsibility Principle, Open/-Closed Principle, Liskov Substitution Principle, Interface Segregation Principle, Dependency Inversion Principle.

tech The primary technology that is used by the component layer..

Verb The primary action that that class or interface is associated with..

Acronyms

AvT Action Version Transparency.

CA Clean Architecture.

CCP The Common Closure Principle.

CLI Command Line Interface.

CRP The Common Reuse Principle.

DIP Dependency Inversion Principle.

DvT Data Version Transparency.

EE Enterprise Engineering.

ISP Interface Segregation Principle.

LSP Liskov Substitution Principle.

MDD Model Driven Development.

MSSQL Microsoft SQL Database.

NS Normalized Systems.

OCP Open/Closed Principle.

REP The Resuse/Release Equivalence Principle.

SoC Separation Of Concerns.

SoS Separation of State.

SRP Single Responsibility Principle.

VSCode Visual Studio Code.

[title=Glossary of Terms]

A. Code listings

```
1 internal class ExpanderPluginLoaderInteractor : IExpanderPluginLoaderInteractor
2 {
3     \\...other code
4
5     /// <inheritdoc/>
6     public void LoadAllRegisteredPluginsAndBootstrap(App app)
7     {
8         foreach (Expander expander in app.Expanders)
9         {
10             string rootDirectory = Path.Combine(expandRequestModel.ExpandersFolder,
11                 expander.Name);
12             string[] files = directoryService.GetFiles(rootDirectory, searchPattern,
13                 SearchOption.TopDirectoryOnly);
14             if (!files.Any())
15             {
16                 throw new InitializationException($"No plugin assembly detected in '{
17                     rootDirectory}'. The plugin assembly should match the following '{
18                         searchPattern}' pattern");
19             }
20
21             LoadPlugins(files)
22                 .ForEach(assembly => BootstrapPlugin(expander, assembly));
23         }
24     }
25
26     \\...other code
27
28     private List<Assembly> LoadPlugins(string[] assemblyFiles)
29     {
30         List<Assembly> plugins = new();
31
32         foreach (string assemblyFile in assemblyFiles)
33         {
34             try
35             {
36                 Assembly assembly = LoadPlugin(assemblyFile);
37                 plugins.Add(assembly);
38             }
39             catch (Exception innerException)
40             {
41                 throw new InitializationException($"Failed to load plugin '{
42                     assemblyFile}'.", innerException);
43             }
44         }
45
46         return plugins;
47     }
48
49     private Assembly LoadPlugin(string assemblyFile)
50     {
51         Assembly assembly = assemblyContext.Load(assemblyFile);
52         logger.Trace($"Plugin context {assemblyFile} has been successfully loaded...");
53         return assembly;
54     }
55 }
```

```

51
52 private void BootstrapPlugin(Expander expander, Assembly assembly)
53 {
54     Type bootstrapperType = assembly.GetExportedTypes()
55         .Where(x => x.IsClass && !x.IsAbstract)
56         .Single(x => x.GetInterfaces()
57             .Contains(typeof(IExpanderDependencyManagerInteractor)));
58
59     IExpanderDependencyManagerInteractor expanderDependencyManager = (
60         IExpanderDependencyManagerInteractor)activator
61         .CreateInstance(bootstrapperType, expander, dependencyManager);
62
63     expanderDependencyManager.Register();
64 }

```

Listing A.1: The ExpanderPluginLoaderInteractor.

```

1 /// <summary>
2 /// Implements the contract <seealso cref="ICodeGeneratorInteractor"/>.
3 /// </summary>
4 internal sealed class CodeGeneratorInteractor : ICodeGeneratorInteractor
5 {
6     // ... other code
7
8     /// <inheritdoc/>
9     public void Execute()
10    {
11        foreach (IExpanderInteractor expander in expanders
12            .OrderBy(x => x.Model.Order))
13        {
14            expander.Harvest();
15
16            Clean();
17
18            expander.PreProcess();
19            expander.Expand();
20            expander.Rejuvenate();
21            expander.PostProcess();
22        }
23    }
24
25    // ... other code
26 }

```

Listing A.2: The CodeGeneratorInteractor.

```

1 public class ExpandEntitiesHandlerInteractor
2     : IExpanderHandlerInteractor<CleanArchitectureExpander>
3 {
4     // ... other code
5
6     /// <inheritdoc/>
7     public void Execute()
8     {
9         directory.Create(entitiesFolder);
10
11         foreach (var entity in app.Entities)
12         {
13             string fullSavePath = Path.Combine(
14                 entitiesFolder,
15                 $"{entity.Name}.cs"
16             );
17
18             templateService.RenderAndSave(
19                 pathToTemplate,

```

```

20         new { entity },
21         fullSavePath
22     };
23 }
24 }
25 }

```

Listing A.3: The ExpandEntitiesHandlerInteractor.

```

1 public class ExpandEntitiesHandlerInteractor
2     : IExpanderHandlerInteractor<CleanArchitectureExpander>
3 {
4     // ... other code
5
6     /// <inheritdoc/>
7     public void Execute()
8     {
9         directory.Create(entitiesFolder);
10
11         foreach (var entity in app.Entities)
12         {
13             string fullSavePath = Path.Combine(
14                 entitiesFolder,
15                 $"{entity.Name}.cs"
16             );
17
18             templateService.RenderAndSave(
19                 pathToTemplate,
20                 new { entity },
21                 fullSavePath
22             );
23         }
24     }
25 }

```

Listing A.4: The ExpandEntitiesHandlerInteractor.

```

1 var forecast = app.NewVersionedApi();
2
3 // GET /weatherforecast?api-version=1.0
4 forecast.MapGet( "/weatherforecast", () =>
5 {
6     return Enumerable.Range( 1, 5 ).Select( index =>
7         new WeatherForecast
8         (
9             DateTime.Now.AddDays( index ),
10            Random.Shared.Next( -20, 55 ),
11            summaries[Random.Shared.Next( summaries.Length )]
12        ) );
13 } )
14 .HasApiVersion( 1.0 );
15
16 // GET /weatherforecast?api-version=2.0
17 var v2 = forecast.MapGroup( "/weatherforecast" )
18     .HasApiVersion( 2.0 );

```

Listing A.5: The AspNet-API-Versioning/Program.Cs at Main · Dotnet/AspNet-API-Versioning.

```

1 internal class Logger : ILogger
2 {
3     /// <summary>
4     /// Writes the message at the trace level.
5     /// </summary>
6     /// <param name="message">The message that needs to be logged.</param>
7     public void Trace(string message)

```

```

8      {
9          Trace(message, null);
10     }
11
12     /// <summary>
13     /// Writes the diagnostic message at the Trace level using the specified
14     /// expandRequestModel.
15     /// </summary>
16     /// <param name="message">A string containing format items.</param>
17     /// <param name="args">Arguments to format.</param>
18     public void Trace(string message, params object[] args)
19     {
20         internalLogger.Trace(message, args);
21     }

```

Listing A.6: The Logger.

```

1 internal class HarvestRepository : ICreateGateway<Harvest>
2 {
3     // other code
4
5     public bool Create(Harvest entity)
6     {
7         if(string.IsNullOrEmpty(entity.HarvestType))
8         {
9             throw new InvalidProgramException("Expected harvest type.");
10        }
11
12        string fullPath = Path.Combine(
13            expandRequestModel.HarvestFolder,
14            app.FullName,
15            $"{file.GetFileNameWithoutExtension(entity.Path)}.{entity.HarvestType}");
16
17        serializer.Serialize(entity, fullPath);
18
19        return true;
20    }
21
22    // other code..
23 }
24
25 internal class GenericRepository<TEntity> : ICreateGateway<TEntity>
26 {
27     // other code ...
28
29     public bool Create(TEntity entity)
30     {
31         context.Set<TEntity>().Add(entity);
32         context.Entry(entity).State = EntityState.Added;
33
34         return context.SaveChanges() >= 0;
35     }
36
37     // other code ...
38 }

```

Listing A.7: Partial examples of implementations of the ICreateGateway (Koks, 2023q) in the GenericRepository (Koks, 2023o) and the HarvestRepository (Koks, 2023p).

```

1 // Create
2 public interface ICreateGateway<in TEntity>
3     where TEntity : class
4 {
5     bool Create(TEntity entity);
6 }

```



```

7
8 // Read
9 public interface IGetGateway<out TEntity>
10     where TEntity : class
11 {
12     IEnumerable<TEntity> GetAll();
13
14     TEntity GetById(object id);
15 }
16
17 // Update
18 public interface IUpdateGateway<in TEntity>
19     where TEntity : class
20 {
21     bool Update(TEntity entity);
22 }
23
24 // Delete
25 public interface IDeleteGateway<in TEntity>
26     where TEntity : class
27 {
28     bool Delete(TEntity entity);
29
30     bool DeleteAll();
31
32     bool DeleteById(object id);
33 }
34
35 internal class AppSeederInteractor : IEntitySeederInteractor<App>
36 {
37     private readonly ICreateGateway<App> createGateway;
38     private readonly IDeleteGateway<App> deleteGateway;
39     private readonly Parameters parameters;
40
41     public AppSeederInteractor(IDependencyFactoryInteractor dependencyFactory)
42     {
43         createGateway = dependencyFactory.Get<ICreateGateway<App>>();
44         deleteGateway = dependencyFactory.Get<IDeleteGateway<App>>();
45         parameters = dependencyFactory.Get<Parameters>();
46     }
47
48     public int SeedOrder => 1;
49
50     public int ResetOrder => 1;
51
52     public void Seed(App app)
53     {
54         app.Id = parameters.AppId;
55         app.Name = "Pantharhei.Generated";
56         app.FullName = "LiquidVisions.Pantharhei.Generated";
57
58         createGateway.Create(app);
59     }
60
61     public void Reset() => deleteGateway.DeleteAll();
62 }

```

Listing A.8: The Gateways for Create, Read, Update, Delete operations.

```

1 public static class DependencyInjectionExtension
2 {
3     /// <summary>
4     /// Adds the dependencies of the project to the dependency inversion object.
5     /// </summary>
6     /// <param name="services"><seealso cref="IServiceCollection"/></param>
7     /// <returns>An instance of <seealso cref="IServiceCollection"/>.</returns>

```

```

8 public static IServiceCollection AddApplicationLayer(this IServiceCollection
    services)
9 {
10     return services.AddTransient<ICodeGeneratorBuilderInteractor,
        CodeGeneratorBuilderInteractor>()
11         .AddTransient<IEntitiesToSeedGateway, EntitiesToSeedGateway>()
12         .AddTransient<ICodeGeneratorInteractor, CodeGeneratorInteractor>()
13         .AddInitializers()
14         .AddSeedersInteractors()
15         .AddBoundaries()
16         .AddTemplateInteractors();
17 }
18
19 private static IServiceCollection AddTemplateInteractors(this IServiceCollection
    services)
20 {
21     services.AddTransient<ITemplateInteractor, ScribanTemplateInteractor>()
22         .AddTransient<ITemplateLoaderInteractor, TemplateLoaderInteractor>();
23
24     return services;
25 }
26
27 private static IServiceCollection AddInitializers(this IServiceCollection services)
28 {
29     return services.AddTransient<IExpanderPluginLoaderInteractor,
        ExpanderPluginLoaderInteractor>()
30         .AddTransient<IAssemblyContextInteractor, AssemblyContextInteractor>()
31         .AddTransient<IAssemblyContextInteractor, AssemblyContextInteractor>()
32         .AddTransient<IExpanderPluginLoaderInteractor,
        ExpanderPluginLoaderInteractor>()
33         .AddTransient<IObjectActivatorInteractor, ObjectActivatorInteractor>();
34 }
35
36 private static IServiceCollection AddBoundaries(this IServiceCollection services)
37 {
38     return services.AddTransient<IExpandBoundary, ExpandBoundary>()
39         .AddTransient<ISeederInteractor, SeederInteractor>();
40 }
41
42 private static IServiceCollection AddSeedersInteractors(this IServiceCollection
    services)
43 {
44     services.AddTransient<IEntitySeederInteractor<App>, AppSeederInteractor>()
45         .AddTransient<IEntitySeederInteractor<App>, ExpanderSeederInteractor>()
46         .AddTransient<IEntitySeederInteractor<App>, EntitySeederInteractor>()
47         //.AddTransient<ISeederInteractor<App>, PackageSeederInteractor>()
48         .AddTransient<IEntitySeederInteractor<App>, FieldSeederInteractor>()
49         .AddTransient<IEntitySeederInteractor<App>, ComponentSeederInteractor>()
50         .AddTransient<IEntitySeederInteractor<App>,
        ConnectionStringsSeederInteractor>()
51         .AddTransient<IEntitySeederInteractor<App>, RelationshipSeederInteractor>()
52         ;
53
54     return services;
55 }

```

Listing A.9: Bootstrapping dependencies in DependencyInjectionExtension (Koks, 2023i).

```

1 /// <summary>
2 /// The <see cref="IServiceCollection">dependency container</see>.
3 /// </summary>
4 internal class DependencyManagerInteractor : IDependencyFactoryInteractor,
    IDependencyManagerInteractor
5 {
6     private readonly IServiceCollection serviceCollection;

```

```

7     private IServiceProvider provider;
8
9     /// <summary>
10    /// Initializes a new instance of the <see cref="DependencyManagerInteractor"/>
11    /// class.
12    /// </summary>
13    /// <param name="serviceCollection">The <see cref="IServiceCollection"/>.</param>
14    public DependencyManagerInteractor(IServiceCollection serviceCollection)
15    {
16        this.serviceCollection = serviceCollection;
17    }
18
19    /// <inheritdoc/>
20    public void AddTransient(Type serviceType, Type implementationType)
21    {
22        serviceCollection.AddTransient(serviceType, implementationType);
23    }
24
25    /// <inheritdoc/>
26    public IDependencyFactoryInteractor Build()
27    {
28        provider = serviceCollection.BuildServiceProvider();
29
30        return this;
31    }
32
33    /// <inheritdoc/>
34    public IEnumerable<T> GetAll<T>()
35    {
36        if (provider == null)
37        {
38            Build();
39        }
40
41        return provider.GetServices<T>();
42    }
43
44    /// <inheritdoc/>
45    public T Get<T>()
46    {
47        if (provider == null)
48        {
49            Build();
50        }
51
52        return provider.GetRequiredService<T>();
53    }
54
55    /// <inheritdoc/>
56    public void AddSingleton<T>(T singletonObject)
57    where T : class => serviceCollection.AddSingleton(singletonObject);
58
59    /// <inheritdoc/>
60    public void AddSingleton(Type serviceType, Type implementationType)
61    {
62        serviceCollection.AddSingleton(serviceType, implementationType);
63    }
64 }

```

Listing A.10: The DependencyManagerInteractor (Koks, 2023j) as an abstraction on external technology dependencies.

```

1 public abstract class AbstractExpander<TExpander> : IExpanderInteractor
2     where TExpander : class, IExpanderInteractor
3 {
4     private readonly ILogger logger;
5     private readonly IDependencyFactoryInteractor dependencyFactory;

```

```

6     private readonly App model;
7
8     /// <summary>
9     /// Initializes a new instance of the <see cref="AbstractExpander{TExpander}"/>
10    class.
11    /// </summary>
12    /// <param name="dependencyFactory"><seealso cref="IDependencyFactoryInteractor
13    "/></param>
14    protected AbstractExpander(IDependencyFactoryInteractor dependencyFactory)
15    {
16        this.dependencyFactory = dependencyFactory;
17
18        logger = this.dependencyFactory.Get<ILogger>();
19        model = dependencyFactory.Get<App>()
20            .Expanders
21            .Single(x => x.Name == Name);
22    }
23 }

```

Listing A.11: An example of resolving dependencies as part of the AbstractExpander (Koks, 2023a).

```

1 // ... other code
2 cmd.OnExecute(() =>
3 {
4     var provider = new ServiceCollection()
5         .AddConsole()
6         .AddDomainLayer()
7         .AddApplicationLayer()
8         .AddEntityFrameworkLayer()
9         .AddInfrastructureLayer()
10        .BuildServiceProvider();
11
12    // ... other code
13 });
14
15 // ... other code

```

Listing A.12: Bootstrapping the dependencies of each component layer of the generator artifact.

```

1 public class Entity
2 {
3     public virtual Guid Id { get; set; }
4     public virtual string Name { get; set; }
5     public virtual string Callsite { get; set; }
6     public virtual string Type { get; set; }
7     public virtual string Modifier { get; set; }
8     public virtual string Behaviour { get; set; }
9     public virtual App App { get; set; }
10    public virtual List<Field> Fields { get; set; }
11    public virtual List<Field> ReferencedIn { get; set; }
12    public virtual List<Relationship> Relations { get; set; }
13    public virtual List<Relationship> IsForeignEntityOf { get; set; }
14 }

```

Listing A.13: An Entity in CA is practically the same as Data Elements in NS (Koks, 2023k).

```

1 internal class CreateEntityValidator : AbstractValidator<CreateEntityCommand>,
2     IValidator<CreateEntityCommand>
3 {
4     public CreateEntityValidator()
5     {
6         #region ns-custom-validations
7
8         RuleFor(x => x.Name).NotEmpty();
9     }
10 }

```

```

9      #endregion ns-custom-validations
10    }
11
12    public new Response Validate(CreateEntityCommand objectToValidate) =>
13        base.Validate(objectToValidate)
14            .ToResponse();
15 }

```

Listing A.14: An Interactor performing a single Task as it is intended for the Task Element of NS (Koks, 2023f).

```

1 internal class CreateEntityInteractor : IInteractor<CreateEntityRequestModel>
2 {
3     //...
4
5     public async Task<Response> ExecuteUseCase(CreateEntityRequestModel requestModel)
6     {
7         Response result = validator.Validate(requestModel);
8         if (result.IsValid)
9         {
10             try
11             {
12                 Entity entity = mapper.Map(requestModel);
13                 entity.Id = Guid.NewGuid();
14
15                 result.SetParameter(entity);
16
17                 int repositoryResult = await repository.Create(entity);
18                 if (repositoryResult != 1)
19                 {
20                     result.AddError(ErrorCodes.InternalServerError, $"Failed to create
21                                     {nameof(Entity)}.");
22                     return result;
23                 }
24                 catch (Exception exception)
25                 {
26                     result.AddError(ErrorCodes.InternalServerError, exception.Message);
27                 }
28             }
29
30             return result;
31         }
32 }

```

Listing A.15: An Interactor orchestrating multiple Tasks as it is intended by the Flow Element of NS (Koks, 2023d).

```

1 public class DeleteEntityRequestModel : RequestModel
2 {
3     public Guid Id { get; set; }
4 }

```

Listing A.16: The DeleteEntityRequestModel (Koks, 2023h).

```

1 public class CreateEntityPresenter : ICreateEntityPresenter
2 {
3     private readonly IMapper<Entity, EntityViewModel> mapper;
4
5     public CreateEntityPresenter(IMapper<Entity, EntityViewModel> mapper)
6     {
7         this.mapper = mapper;
8     }
9
10    public Response Response { get; set; }
11
12    public IResult GetResult(HttpRequest request = null)

```

```

13 {
14     return Response.IsValid ?
15         Results.Created($"://{mapper.Map(Response.GetParameter<Entity>()).Id}",
16             mapper.Map(Response.GetParameter<Entity>())) :
17         Response.ToWebApiResult(request);
18 }

```

Listing A.17: The CreateEntityPresenter (Koks, 2023e).

```

1 public static class EntityController
2 {
3     // ...
4
5     private static WebApplication MapCreateEntity(this WebApplication app)
6     {
7         RouteHandlerBuilder builder = app.MapPost(endpointTemplate, async (
8             CreateEntityRequestModel model, IBoundary<CreateEntityRequestModel>
9             boundary, ICreateEntityPresenter presenter, HttpRequest request) =>
10         {
11             await boundary.Execute(model, presenter);
12             return presenter.GetResult(request);
13         });
14
15         builder.Produces(StatusCodes.Status201Created, typeof(EntityViewModel));
16         builder.Produces(StatusCodes.Status500InternalServerError, typeof(
17             ErrorViewModel));
18         builder.Produces(StatusCodes.Status400BadRequest, typeof(ErrorViewModel));
19         builder.WithTags("Entities");
20
21         return app;
22     }
23
24     // ...
25 }

```

Listing A.18: The EntityController (Koks, 2023l).

```

1 internal class CreateEntityBoundary : IBoundary<CreateEntityRequestModel>
2 {
3     private readonly IInteractor<CreateEntityRequestModel> interactor;
4
5     public CreateEntityBoundary(IInteractor<CreateEntityRequestModel> interactor)
6     {
7         this.interactor = interactor;
8     }
9
10    public async Task Execute(CreateEntityRequestModel requestModel, IPresenter
11        presenter) =>
12        presenter.Response = await interactor.ExecuteUseCase(requestModel);
13 }

```

Listing A.19: The CreateEntityBoundary (Koks, 2023c).

B. Installing & using Pantha Rhei

B.1. Installation instructions

Step 1: Create output folder

Create an output folder so that the applications...

- ...has a location where to find the required expanders.
- ...has a location where the log files are stored.
- ...has a location where the result of the generation processes can be stored.

The location of the output folder is irrelevant.

Step 2: Create the Nuget configuration file

Add a configuration file named *nuget.config* file to the output folder with the the following content:

```
1 <?xml version="1.0" encoding="utf-8"?>
2 <configuration>
3   <packageSources>
4     <clear />
5     <add key="github" value="https://nuget.pkg.github.com/liquidvisions/index.json"
6       />
7   </packageSources>
8   <packageSourceCredentials>
9     <github>
10      <add key="Username" value="" />
11      <add key="ClearTextPassword" value="{email me for a valid access token @
12        gerco.koks@outlook.com}" />
13    </github>
14  </packageSourceCredentials>
15 </configuration>
```

Listing B.1: The content of the Nuget configuration file

This config file is needed for the following step where the Pantha Rhei application is installed. The file contains the information to the private feed where the Pantha Rhei application can be downloaded and installed.

Step 3: Installing Pantha Rhei

Open a console in on the location where the Nuget configuration file is stored. The following command will download the package, and start the installation process which is executed in the background.

```
1 dotnet tool install LiquidVisions.PanthaRhei.Flux -g
```

Listing B.2: The install command

Step 4: Download & Install the Expanders

By clicking on the following link, an archived folder will be presented as a download by your browser. Download the archived folder and extract it on completion. Store the extracted folder, in a subfolder called *Expanders* in the root of the output folder. By doing so, the following folder structure should be available:

```
PanthaRhei.Output
├── Expanders
│   └── .Templates
└── nuget.config
```

The Pantha Rhei application is now ready for use.

Step 5: Setup a SQL database

Currently, Pantha Rhei is working with an MS SQL database for storing the model of the applications. Set up a SQL Database. This can either be a licensed version of SQL Server, the free-to-use SQL Express or an Azure SQL instance. See <https://www.microsoft.com/en/sql-server/sql-server-downloads> for more information. Make sure to have a valid connection string to the SQL server instance that is needed in step B.1 Step 6: Execute the command.

Step 6: Execute the command

Pantha Rhei is used by executing the *flux* command with the parameters as described in table B.1

```
1 flux --root "{folder}"
2     --mode Default
3     --app "{uniqueid}"
4     --db "{connectionstring}"
```

Listing B.3: Example command executing Pantha Rhei

| | |
|---------|--|
| -root | A mandatory parameter that should contain the full path to the output directory B Installing & using Pantha Rhei. |
| -db | A mandatory parameter that contains the connection string to the database. |
| -app | A mandatory parameter indicating the unique identifier of the application that should be generated. |
| -mode | An optional parameter that determines if a handler should be executed. <i>Default</i> is the default fallback mode (see B.2). |
| -reseed | An optional parameter that bypasses the expanding process. The model will be thoroughly cleaned and reseeded based on the entities of the expander artifact. This enables to a certain extent the meta-circularity and enables the expander artifact to generate itself. |

Table B.1.: The *flux* command line parameters

RunModes are available to isolate the execution of the ExpanderHandler. It requires a current implementation shown in listing B.4. The following RunModes are available.

| | |
|---------|--|
| Default | This is the default generation mode that executes all configured handlers of the CleanArchitectureExpander. This will also install the required Visual Studio templates which are needed for scaffolding the Solution and C# Project files. Furthermore, it also executes the Harvest and Rejuvenation handlers. This mode will clean up the entire output folder prior after the Harvesting process is finished prior to the execution of the handlers. |
| Extend | This mode will skip the installation of the Visual Studio templates and the project scaffolding. It will not clean up the output folder but will overwrite any files handled. This mode is often less time-consuming and can be used in scenarios to quickly check the result of a part of the generation process. |
| Deploy | An optional mode that allows for expander handlers to run deployments in isolation. For example, when a developer wants to deploy the output to an Azure App Service. |
| Migrate | An optional mode that allows for expander handlers to run migrations in isolation. For example, this currently updates the database schema by running the Entity Framework Commandline Interface (see https://learn.microsoft.com/en-us/ef/core/cli/dotnet). |

Table B.2.: The available *Generation modes*

```

1 public class ExpandDatabaseContextHandlerInteractor
2     : IExpanderHandlerInteractor<CleanArchitectureExpander>
3 {
4     // ... other code
5     public bool CanExecute =>

```

```

6     parameters
7         .GenerationMode
8         .HasFlag(GenerationModes.Default) ||
9     parameters
10        .GenerationMode
11        .HasFlag(GenerationModes.Extend);
12    // ... other code
13 }

```

Listing B.4: Example on how an expander handler can adhere to the RunMode parameters

C. The Entity Relationship Diagram of the Meta Mode

C.1. The App entity

The App entity represents the application and is regarded as the entry point for the model. The App Entity and the subsequent entities contain all the information required to perform the expansion of a software system.

| Name | DataType | Description |
|-------------------|----------------------------|--|
| Id | Guid | Unique identifier of the application |
| Name | string | Name of the application |
| FullName | string | Full name of the application |
| Expanders | List of Expanders | The Expanders that will be used during the generation process. |
| Entities | List of Entities | The Entities that are applicable for the Generated artifact. |
| ConnectionStrings | List of Connection-Strings | The ConnectionString to the database that is used by the Generator Artifact. |

Table C.1.: The fields of the App entity

C.2. The Component entity

The Component entity represents a software component that can be part of an application. Based on this entity the Generator Artifact can make design time on where to place certain elements

| Name | DataType | Description |
|-------------|-----------------|---|
| Id | Guid | Unique identifier of the component |
| Name | string | Name of the component |
| Description | string | Description of the component |
| Packages | List of Package | The Packages that should be applied to the component. |
| Expander | Expander | Navigation property to the Expander entity. |

Table C.2.: The fields of the Component entity

C.3. The `ConnectionString` entity

The `ConnectionString` entity represents a `ConnectionString` used by an application to connect to a database or other external system.

| Name | DataType | Description |
|------------|----------|--|
| Id | Guid | Unique identifier of the <code>ConnectionString</code> |
| Name | string | Name of the <code>ConnectionString</code> |
| Definition | string | Definition of the <code>ConnectionString</code> |
| App | App | Navigation property to the App entity |

Table C.3.: The fields of the `ConnectionString` entity

C.4. The Entity entity

The Entity entity represents an entity in the application's data model.

| Name | DataType | Description |
|-------------------|-----------------------|--|
| Id | Guid | Unique identifier of the entity |
| Name | string | Name of the entity |
| Callsite | string | The source code location where the entity is defined. In the case of a <code>C#</code> artifact, this is to determine the name of the namespace. |
| Type | string | Type of the entity |
| Modifier | string | Modifier of the entity (e.g. public, private) |
| Behavior | string | The behavior of the entity (e.g. abstract, virtual) |
| App | App | Navigation property to the App entity. |
| Fields | List of Fields | The Fields property represents a collection of the fields that make up the entity. |
| ReferencedIn | List of Fields | Represents a navigation property to a Field that uses the current entity as a return type. |
| Relations | List of Relationships | List of relationships involving this entity |
| IsForeignEntityOf | List of Relationships | List of relationships where this entity is the foreign entity |

Table C.4.: The fields of the Entity entity

C.5. The Expander entity

The Expander entity represents an expander, which is responsible for generating code for an application. The Generator Artifact attempts to execute all expanders that are related to the selected App.

| Name | DataType | Description |
|----------------|--------------------|---|
| Id | Guid | Unique identifier of the expander |
| Name | string | Name of the expander |
| TemplateFolder | string | relative path to the templates that are used by the expander. |
| Order | int | The order in which the expander is executed |
| Apps | List of Apps | List of applications associated with the expander. |
| Components | List of Components | List of components associated with the expander |

Table C.5.: The fields of the Expander entity

C.6. The Field entity

The Field entity represents a field or property of an entity in an application's data model. Each field has a unique ID, name, and other properties such as its return type, modifiers, and behavior. It can be associated with an entity and can have relationships with other entities. The IsKey and IsIndex properties indicate whether the field is part of the primary key or an index of the entity, respectively.

| Name | DataType | Description |
|----------------------|-----------------------|--|
| Id | Guid | Unique identifier of the field |
| Name | string | Name of the field |
| ReturnType | string | Return type of the field |
| IsCollection | bool | Whether the field is a collection or not |
| Modifier | string | Modifier of the field (e.g. public, private) |
| GetModifier | string | Modifier of the get accessor for the field |
| SetModifier | string | Modifier of the set accessor for the field |
| Behavior | string | The behavior of the field (e.g. abstract, virtual) |
| Order | int | The order of the field within its entity |
| Size | int? | The size of the field |
| Required | bool | Whether the field is required or not |
| Reference | Entity | The entity that this field refers to |
| Entity | Entity | A navigation property to the parent entity |
| IsKey | bool | Indicates whether the field is part of the primary key |
| IsIndex | bool | Indicates whether the field is part of an index |
| RelationshipKeys | List of Relationships | A List of entities that are defined as relations. |
| IsForeignEntityKeyOf | List of Relationships | List of relationships to the field that is the foreign key |

Table C.6.: The fields of the Field entity

C.7. The Package entity

The Package entity represents a software package that can be used by a component. This could either be a Nuget package in the case of .NET projects, or for example npm packages for web projects.

| Name | DataType | Description |
|-----------|-----------|---------------------------------------|
| Id | Guid | Unique identifier of the package |
| Name | string | Name of the package |
| Version | string | Version of the package used |
| Component | Component | Component associated with the package |

Table C.7.: The fields of the Package entity

C.8. The Relationship entity

The Relationship entity represents a relationship between two entities in the App's data model. The Relationship entity has proper cardinality support. Relationships are bidirectional and can be navigated from either entity.

| Name | DataType | Description |
|-------------------|----------|--|
| Id | Guid | Unique identifier of the relationship |
| Key | Field | The key field of the relationship |
| Entity | Entity | Navigation property to the parent Entity |
| Cardinality | string | The cardinality of the relationship |
| WithForeignKeyKey | Field | The foreign key field of the relationship, pointing to a Field entity. |
| WithForeignKey | Entity | The entity associated with the foreign key field |
| WithCardinality | string | The cardinality of the relationship with the foreign entity |
| Required | bool | indicates whether the relationship is required or not |

Table C.8.: The fields of the Relationship entity

D. Designs & Architecture

D.1. Component Layer Naming Conventions

[prod] is defined as *The name of the product of the software.*

[comp] is defined as *The name of the Company that is considered the owner of the software.*
If there is no company involved, this can be left blank.

[tech] is defined as *The primary technology that is used by the component layer.*

| Layer | Project name | Package name |
|----------------|------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Domain | [prod].Domain | [comp].[prod].Domain |
| Application | [prod].Application | [comp].[prod].Application |
| Presentation | [prod].Presentation.[tech] | [comp].[prod].Presentation.[tech] |
| Infrastructure | [prod].Infrastructure.[tech] | [comp].[prod].Infrastructure.[tech] |

Table D.1.: Naming convention component layers

D.2. Element Naming Conventions

[Verb] is defined as *The primary action that that class or interface is associated with.*

[Noun] is defined as *The primary subject or object that that class or interface is associated with.*

| Layer name | Element | Type | Naming Convention |
|----------------|--------------------|-----------|--|
| Presentation | Controller | class | [<i>Noun</i>]Controller |
| | ViewModelMapper | class | [<i>Noun</i>]ViewModelMapper |
| | Presenter | class | [<i>Verb</i>][<i>Noun</i>]Presenter |
| | ViewModel | class | [<i>Noun</i>]ViewModel |
| Application | Boundary | class | [<i>VerbNoun</i>]Boundary |
| | Boundary | interface | IBoundary |
| | Gateway | interface | I[<i>Verb</i>]Gateway |
| | Interactor | interface | I[<i>Verb</i>]Interactor |
| | Interactor | class | [<i>Verb</i>][<i>Noun</i>]Interactor |
| | Mapper | interface | IMapper |
| | RequestModelMapper | class | [<i>Verb</i>][<i>Noun</i>]RequestModelMapper |
| | Presenter | interface | IPresenter |
| | Validator | interface | IValidator |
| | Validator | class | [<i>Verb</i>][<i>Noun</i>]Validator |
| Infrastructure | Gateway | class | [<i>Noun</i>]Repository |
| Domain | Data Entity | class | [<i>Noun</i>] |

Table D.2.: Naming convention of recurring elements

D.3. UML2 Notation Legenda

In order to visualize the designs of the artifact, a standard UML notation is used. The designs containing relationships adhere to the following definitions.




Figure D.1.: UML notation

E. Component Cohesion Principles

| Name | Description |
|--|--|
| The Resuse/Release Equivalence Principle | REP is a concept related to software development that refers to the balance between reusing existing software components and releasing new ones to ensure the efficient use of resources and time (Robert C. Martin, 2018, p. 104). |
| The Common Closure Principle | In the context of Clean Architecture, the CCP states that classes or components that change together should be packaged together. In other words, if a group of classes is likely to be affected by the same kind of change, they should be grouped into the same package or module. This approach enhances the maintainability and modularity of the software (Robert C. Martin, 2018, p. 105). |
| The Common Reuse Principle | CRP states that classes or components that are reused together should be packaged together. It means that if a group of classes tends to be used together or has a high level of cohesion, they should be grouped into the same package or module. This approach aims to make it easier for developers to reuse components and understand their relationships (Robert C. Martin, 2018, p. 107). |

Table E.1.: The Component Cohesion Principles

Cohesion facilitates the reduction of complexity and interdependence among the components of a system, thereby contributing to a more efficient, maintainable, and reliable system. By organizing components around a shared purpose or function or by standardizing their interfaces, data structures, and protocols, cohesion can offer the following benefits:

- **Reduce redundancy and duplication of effort:**
Cohesion ensures that components are arranged around a common purpose or function, reducing duplicates or redundant code. This simplifies system comprehension, maintenance, and modification.
- **Promoting code reuse:**
Cohesion facilitates code reuse by making it easier to extract and reuse components designed for specific functions. This saves time and effort during development and enhances overall system quality.

- **Enhance maintainability:**

Cohesion decreases the complexity and interdependence of system components, making it easier to identify and rectify bugs or errors in the code. This improves system maintainability and reduces the risk of introducing new errors during maintenance.

- **Increase scalability:**

Cohesion improves a system's scalability by enabling it to be extended or modified effortlessly to accommodate changing requirements or conditions. By designing well-organized and well-defined components, developers can easily add or modify functionality as needed without disrupting the rest of the system.