Module Guide: Kaplan

Jen Garner

December 3, 2018

1 Revision History

Date	Version	Notes
November 5th, 2018 (Monday)	1.0	First draft
December 3rd, 2018 (Monday)	1.1	Update uses hierarchy and apply some updates from github issues

Contents

List of Tables

List of Figures

2   Introduction

Decomposing a system into modules is a commonly accepted approach to developing software. A module is a work assignment for a programmer or programming team (Parnas et al., 1984). We advocate a decomposition based on the principle of information hiding (Parnas, 1972). This principle supports design for change, because the "secrets" that each module hides represent likely future changes. Design for change is valuable in SC, where modifications are frequent, especially during initial development as the solution space is explored.

Our design follows the rules laid out by Parnas et al. (1984), as follows:

- System details that are likely to change independently should be the secrets of separate modules.

- Each data structure is used in only one module.

- Any other program that requires information stored in a module's data structures must obtain it by calling access programs belonging to that module.

After completing the first stage of the design, the Software Requirements Specification (SRS), the Module Guide (MG) is developed (Parnas et al., 1984). The MG specifies the modular structure of the system and is intended to allow both designers and maintainers to easily identify the parts of the software. The potential readers of this document are as follows:

- New project members: This document can be a guide for a new project member to easily understand the overall structure and quickly find the relevant modules they are searching for.

- Maintainers: The hierarchical structure of the module guide improves the maintainers' understanding when they need to make changes to the system. It is important for a maintainer to update the relevant sections of the document after changes have been made.

- Designers: Once the module guide has been written, it can be used to check for consistency, feasibility and flexibility. Designers can verify the system in various ways, such as consistency among modules, feasibility of the decomposition, and flexibility of the design.

The rest of the document is organized as follows. Section 3 lists the anticipated and unlikely changes of the software requirements. Section 4 summarizes the module decomposition that was constructed according to the likely changes. Section 5 specifies the connections between the software requirements and the modules. Section 6 gives a detailed description of the modules. Section 7 includes two traceability matrices. One checks the completeness of the design against the requirements provided in the SRS. The other shows the relation between anticipated changes and the modules. Section 8 describes the use relation between modules.

3 Anticipated and Unlikely Changes

This section lists possible changes to the system. According to the likeliness of the change, the possible changes are classified into two categories. Anticipated changes are listed in Section 3.1, and unlikely changes are listed in Section 3.2.

3.1 Anticipated Changes

Anticipated changes are the source of the information that is to be hidden inside the modules. Ideally, changing one of the anticipated changes will only require changing the one module that hides the associated decision. The approach adapted here is called design for change.

AC1: Hardware used to run the software.

AC2: Format of the input data. The number of inputs may also change, which is dependent on the data structure used. [For example, the Ring updating rule is dependent on inputs, but a vanilla GA wouldn't need such an updating rule. There might also be a data structure where more inputs would be required. —JG]

AC3: The RMSD module may be re-written or changed to use another library. The reasons for switching the RMSD library would be either an increase in performance or an easier installation process.

AC4: The ring may change to another data structure. [Can you create an abstract data structure that anticipates the future possibilities? —SS] [See my comments below. I think I accounted for all of my changes. —JG]

AC5: The calculation for Fit_G may be expanded to include more formats than initially described in the SRS document.

AC6: Kaplan may be required to run on cell phones through a web interface. The input/output device therefore will change from a keyboard and mouse to a touchscreen.

AC7: The external program used to run the energy calculations may change or multiple choices may become available (depending on user input).

AC8: The format of the solutions to the GA may change. The dihedral angles may be generated differently, and thus it may not be viable how the dihedral angles are recombined with the original geometry as in the Geometry module. [This AC is to accommodate for my supervisor's comments, where my assumptions about the ordering of atoms and generation of valid dihedral angles was incorrect. A11 was incorrect. —JG].

In order to accommodate for a change in data structure, the input parameters could be expanded/modified to include:

1. Add num_levels parameter.

2. Add ga_type; choose from Vanilla, Ring, and King of the Hill (KOTH).

The Vanilla data structure should be filled throughout the optimization, whereas the Ring and KOTH data structures can have empty slots. To initialize a KOTH data structure, this step would involve making many Ring data structures of varying sizes. The updating rule would also change such that unless the smallest ("top") ring was being updated, then the tournament would be conducted across Rings. Therefore, a num_rings input would be required to see how many Rings are in the data structure. Tournament selection for a Vanilla data structure occurs whereby the two worst population members from a selection are replaced with two children as generated from the two best population members from the selection. The other change needed in going from Vanilla and/or Ring to KOTH would be to have lists for num_filled and num_slots (since these values would simply be 1 item long for the Vanilla and Ring). A constraint on these values for Vanilla would be that num_filled has to be equal to num_slots.

3.2 Unlikely Changes

The module design should be as general as possible. However, a general system is more complex. Sometimes this complexity is not necessary. Fixing some design decisions at the system architecture stage can simplify the software design. If these decision should later need to be changed, then many parts of the design will potentially need to be modified. Hence, it is not intended that these decisions will be changed.

UC1: The genetic algorithm component is unlikely to be exchanged for another algorithm.

UC2: The energy is unlikely to be calculated using methods other than those from quantum mechanics.

UC3: The goal of Kaplan is unlikely to change from locating conformers.

4 Module Hierarchy

This section provides an overview of the module design. Modules are summarized in a hierarchy decomposed by secrets in Table 1. The modules listed below, which are leaves in the hierarchy tree, are the modules that will actually be implemented.

M1: Hardware-Hiding

M2: GA Input

M3: Molecule Input

M4: GA Control

M5: Fit_G

M6: Tournament

M7: Crossover & Mutation

M8: Ring

M9: Pmem

M10: Output

M11: Geometry

M12: Energies

M13: RMSD

Level 1	Level 2
Hardware-Hiding Module	
Behaviour-Hiding Module	GA Input
	Molecule Input
	GA Control
	Fit_G
	Tournament
	Crossover & Mutation
	Ring
	Pmem
	Output
Software Decision Module	Geometry
	Energies
	RMSD

Table 1: Module Hierarchy

5   Connection Between Requirements and Design

The design of the system is intended to satisfy the requirements developed in the SRS. In this stage, the system is decomposed into modules. The connection between requirements and modules is listed in Table 2.

6 Module Decomposition

Modules are decomposed according to the principle of "information hiding" proposed by Parnas et al. (1984). The *Secrets* field in a module decomposition is a brief statement of the design decision hidden by the module. The *Services* field specifies *what* the module will do without documenting *how* to do it. For each module, a suggestion for the implementing software is given under the *Implemented By* title. If the entry is *OS*, this means that the module is provided by the operating system or by standard programming language libraries. Also indicate if the module will be implemented specifically for the software.

Only the leaf modules in the hierarchy have to be implemented. If a dash (–) is shown, this means that the module is not a leaf and will not have to be implemented. Whether or not this module is implemented depends on the programming language selected.

6.1 Hardware Hiding Modules (M1)

Secrets: The data structure and algorithm used to implement the virtual hardware.

Services: Serves as a virtual hardware used by the rest of the system. This module provides the interface between the hardware and the software. So, the system can use it to display outputs or to accept inputs.

Implemented By: OS

6.2 Behaviour-Hiding Module

Secrets: The contents of the required behaviours.

Services: Includes programs that provide externally visible behaviour of the system as specified in the software requirements specification (SRS) documents. This module serves as a communication layer between the hardware-hiding module and the software decision module. The programs in this module will need to change if there are changes in the SRS.

Implemented By: –

6.2.1 GA Input Module (M2)

Secrets: The format and structure of the input data for the genetic algorithm, including how the input data is verified.

Services: Communicates the size of the Ring data structure, the number of mating events to perform, the maximum number of mutations, the maximum number of swaps, the number of conformers in the optimization, the size of the initial population, and which fitness function to use to M4. Ensures all input data is of the correct type and within

reasonable bounds. These values are static and should not change during the optimization.

Implemented By: Kaplan

6.2.2 Molecule Input Module (M3)

Secrets: The format and structure of the input data for the molecule, including how the input data is verified.

Services: Reads in a molecular structure data file input and verifies the types, values, and completeness of the input.

Implemented By: Kaplan

6.2.3 GA Control Module (M4)

Secrets: How the pieces of the genetic algorithm work together to find and optimize conformer geometries.

Services: Initializes the Ring data structure and calls the Tournament to update the Ring. When the number of mating events specified by the user has been completed, calls the Output module.

Implemented By: Kaplan

6.2.4 Fit_G Module (M5)

Secrets: How to calculate the fitness of a set of conformers.

Services: Calculate the fitness of given population members from the Ring.

Implemented By: Kaplan

6.2.5 Tournament Module (M6)

Secrets: How to compare the set of available solutions (in the Ring M8) for the conformer optimization problem.

Services: Chooses participants and winners in the tournament. Returns children (made by M7) such that these population members can be given to the Ring.

Implemented By: Kaplan

6.2.6 Crossover & Mutation Module (M7)

Secrets: How to generate new population members.

Services: Generates new population members to put in the Ring data structure.

Implemented By: Kaplan

6.2.7 Ring Module (M8)

Secrets: The data structure for the Ring (the population of solutions).

Services: Determines if a new population member (Pmem) can be added, and where they are added.

Implemented By: Kaplan

6.2.8 Pmem Module (M9)

Secrets: The data structure for the individual solutions to the conformer search optimization problem.

Services: Defines the potential solutions to the conformer optimization in the form of dihedral angles (and energies if calculated).

Implemented By: Kaplan

6.2.9 Output Module (M10)

Secrets: The format and content of the output data.

Services: Provides the results of the conformer optimization to the user. Receives the input geometry from M4 to reconstruct the new conformer geometries.

Implemented By: Kaplan

6.3 Software Decision Module

Secrets: The design decision based on mathematical theorems, physical facts, or programming considerations. The secrets of this module are *not* described in the SRS.

Services: Includes data structure and algorithms used in the system that do not provide direct interaction with the user.

Implemented By: –

6.3.1 Geometry Module (M11)

Secrets: Data structure for full geometric specifications.

Services: Combines a list of dihedral angles and the original molecular geometry to produce a new geometry. Creates an object capable of reading and writing structure files.

Implemented By: Vetee, Openbabel O'Boyle et al. (2011) oba (2018)

6.3.2 Energies Module (M12)

Secrets: How to calculate the energy of a conformer geometry.

Services: Calculates the energy for a given geometry based on user-specified basis set and method.

Implemented By: Psi4 Parrish et al. (2017), Gaussian Frisch et al. (2016), Horton Verstraelen et al. (2017)

6.3.3 RMSD Module (M13)

Secrets: How to calculate the root-mean-square deviation for a set of conformers.

Services: Calculates the RMSD for a set of geometries.

Implemented By: rmsd (charnley)

7 Traceability Matrix

This section shows two traceability matrices: between the modules and the requirements and between the modules and the anticipated changes.

Req.	Modules
R1	M3
R2	M5, M8
R3	M5, M13, M12
R4	M5, M12
R5	M10, M3
NFR1	M5
NFR2	M2-M11, but especially M4
NFR3	M2-M11
NFR4	M3, M2
NFR5	M12, M13, M3, M10

Table 2: Trace between requirements and modules.

As in Table 3, there are two modules that change as a result of AC2. The input will be divided into two modules - one module (M2) is responsible for handling the genetic algorithm inputs and the other module (M3) is responsible for handling the molecular inputs. The author has already written a software package that can handle molecular geometry (and its conversion to other formats). This package also interfaces with Openbabel O'Boyle et al. (2011). The author has decided to use a Behaviour-Hiding module for the genetic algorithm, as these algorithms are very dependent on the format of the data structure used to represent the problem (and thus converting to a format acceptable to another external program might change the results significantly). Furthermore, one of the goals of the program is to make the package work on high-performance computing clusters. If there are fewer external programs necessary to run Kaplan, then it will be easier to install the program. All modules will change upon change of the programming language, hence the reason AC**??** is linked to all Behaviour-Hiding and Software Decision modules.

AC	Modules
AC1	M1
AC2	M3 M2
AC3	M13
AC4	M8
AC5	M5
AC??	M4
AC6	M10
AC??	M2-M11
AC7	M12

Table 3: Trace between anticipated changes and modules.

8   Use Hierarchy Between Modules

In this section, the uses hierarchy between modules is provided. Parnas (1978) said of two programs A and B that A *uses* B if correct execution of B may be necessary for A to complete the task described in its specification. That is, A *uses* B if there exist situations in which the correct functioning of A depends upon the availability of a correct implementation of B. Figure 1 illustrates the use relation between the modules. It can be seen that the graph is a directed acyclic graph (DAG). Each level of the hierarchy offers a testable and usable subset of the system, and modules in the higher level of the hierarchy are essentially simpler because they use modules from the lower levels.

Figure 1: Use hierarchy among modules. Note the hardware-hiding module has been omitted for clarity.

[Do any other modules use the Input module? It is usually the case that other modules will ask the Input module for its values. Or will the Control module be the only one that needs these values? —SS] [The gac module will be the only one that directly accesses the two input modules. The gac module knows all of the inputs so that it can pass them to the relevant data structures/routines. In the cases where the inputs are used, they will be as part of the data structures or as a simple string or number. I could write my code such that the inputs module was an object that other modules could call; I just didn't think of that structure until I read your comments. I'm also unclear as to how that would reduce the amount of data being passed in my program or make it easier to follow. —JG]

References

The open babel package, version 2.3.1, 2018. URL http://openbabel.org.

Jimmy Charnley Kromann (charnley). rmsd, 2018. URL https://github.com/charnley/rmsd.

M. J. Frisch, G. W. Trucks, H. B. Schlegel, G. E. Scuseria, M. A. Robb, J. R. Cheeseman, G. Scalmani, V. Barone, G. A. Petersson, H. Nakatsuji, X. Li, M. Caricato, A. V. Marenich, J. Bloino, B. G. Janesko, R. Gomperts, B. Mennucci, H. P. Hratchian, J. V. Ortiz, A. F. Izmaylov, J. L. Sonnenberg, D. Williams-Young, F. Ding, F. Lipparini, F. Egidi, J. Goings, B. Peng, A. Petrone, T. Henderson, D. Ranasinghe, V. G. Zakrzewski, J. Gao, N. Rega, G. Zheng, W. Liang, M. Hada, M. Ehara, K. Toyota, R. Fukuda, J. Hasegawa, M. Ishida, T. Nakajima, Y. Honda, O. Kitao, H. Nakai, T. Vreven, K. Throssell, J. A. Montgomery,

Jr., J. E. Peralta, F. Ogliaro, M. J. Bearpark, J. J. Heyd, E. N. Brothers, K. N. Kudin, V. N. Staroverov, T. A. Keith, R. Kobayashi, J. Normand, K. Raghavachari, A. P. Rendell, J. C. Burant, S. S. Iyengar, J. Tomasi, M. Cossi, J. M. Millam, M. Klene, C. Adamo, R. Cammi, J. W. Ochterski, R. L. Martin, K. Morokuma, O. Farkas, J. B. Foresman, and D. J. Fox. Gaussian16 Revision B.01, 2016. Gaussian Inc. Wallingford CT.

N M O'Boyle, M. Banck, James C. A, C. Morley, T. Vandermeersch, and G. R. Hutchison. Open babel: An open chemical toolbox. *J. Cheminf.*, 3, 2011. doi: 10.1186/ 1758-2946-3-33.

David L. Parnas. On the criteria to be used in decomposing systems into modules. *Comm. ACM*, 15(2):1053–1058, December 1972.

David L. Parnas. Designing software for ease of extension and contraction. In *ICSE '78: Proceedings of the 3rd international conference on Software engineering*, pages 264–277, Piscataway, NJ, USA, 1978. IEEE Press. ISBN none.

D.L. Parnas, P.C. Clement, and D. M. Weiss. The modular structure of complex systems. In *International Conference on Software Engineering*, pages 408–419, 1984.

R. M. Parrish, L. A. Burns, D. G. A. Smith, A. C. Simmonett, A. E. DePrince III, E. G. Hohenstein, U. Bozkaya, A. Yu. Sokolov, R. Di Remigio, R. M. Richard, J. F. Gonthier, A. M. James, H. R. McAlexander, A. Kumar, M. Saitow, X. Wang, B. P. Pritchard, P. Verma, H. F. Schaefer III, K. Patkowski, R. A. King, E. F. Valeev, F. A. Evangelista, J. M. Turney, T. D. Crawford, and C. D. Sherrill. Psi4 1.1: An open-source electronic structure program emphasizing automation, advanced libraries, and interoperability. *J. Chem. Theory Comput.*, 13:3185–3197, 2017.

Toon Verstraelen, Pawel Tecmer, Farnaz Heidar-Zadeh, Cristina E. González-Espinoza, Matthew Chan, Taewon D. Kim, Katharina Boguslawski, Stijn Fias, Steven Vandenbrande, Diego Berrocal, and Paul W. Ayers. Horton 2.1.0, 2017. URL http://theochem. github.com/horton/.