

# Contents

<b>Abstract</b>	<b>xi</b>
<b>List of Tables</b>	<b>xvii</b>
<b>List of Figures</b>	<b>xix</b>
<b>List of Symbols</b>	<b>xxiii</b>
<b>List of Abbreviations</b>	<b>xxv</b>
<b>1 Introduction</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1 Program and Architectural Model Slicing . . . . .	2
1.2 Motivation for Our Work . . . . .	5
1.3 Objectives of Our Work . . . . .	5
1.4 Overview of the Work Done . . . . .	7
1.5 Applications of Model Slicing . . . . .	9
1.6 Organization of the Thesis . . . . .	9
<b>2 Background Concepts</b>	<b>11</b>
2.1 An Overview of UML 2.0 . . . . .	11
2.1.1 Taxonomy of UML 2.0 Models . . . . .	11
2.1.2 Structural Model Constructs . . . . .	13
2.1.3 Behavioral Model Constructs . . . . .	14
2.2 Basic Concepts and Definitions . . . . .	18
2.3 Precision and Correctness of Model Slices . . . . .	19
2.4 Complexity of Model Slicing . . . . .	20
2.4.1 Time Complexity of Slice Computation . . . . .	20
2.4.2 Space Complexity of A Computed Slice . . . . .	21
2.5 Conclusion . . . . .	21
<b>3 MDG: Our Proposed Metamodel</b>	<b>23</b>
3.1 Relevant Issues in UML Models . . . . .	23
3.1.1 Syntax and Semantics of Notes . . . . .	23
3.1.2 Naming Elements of UML Class Models . . . . .	24
3.1.3 Naming Interactions in UML Models . . . . .	25
3.2 Basic Concepts and Definitions . . . . .	26
3.3 MDG : A UML Metamodel . . . . .	27

---

3.3.1	Elements of MDG . . . . .	28
3.3.2	Mapping A UML Metamodel to MDG Representation . . . . .	28
3.3.3	Representation of Dependencies in MDG . . . . .	30
3.3.4	UML Model Views . . . . .	30
3.4	Model Dependency Graph . . . . .	30
3.4.1	MDG Nodes and Edges . . . . .	32
3.4.2	Definition of MDG . . . . .	34
3.4.3	MDG Construction Technique . . . . .	35
3.4.4	Our <i>ModelGraph</i> Algorithm . . . . .	35
3.4.5	Complexity Analysis of <i>ModelGraph</i> . . . . .	39
3.5	Illustration of Working of <i>ModelGraph</i> . . . . .	46
3.6	Proof of Concept . . . . .	49
3.6.1	Prototype Tool <i>MDGConstructor</i> . . . . .	49
3.6.2	Data Set Used in Experiments . . . . .	50
3.6.3	Experimental Study . . . . .	50
3.6.4	Experimental Results . . . . .	52
3.7	Comparison with Related Work . . . . .	56
3.8	Conclusions . . . . .	59
<b>4</b>	<b>Static Slicing of UML Models</b>	<b>61</b>
4.1	Basic Concepts and Definitions . . . . .	61
4.1.1	Static Slicing Terminologies . . . . .	61
4.1.2	Some Definitions . . . . .	64
4.1.3	MDG Traversal . . . . .	65
4.1.4	Reverse-Mapping of UML Model Elements . . . . .	68
4.2	Our SSUAM Methodology . . . . .	68
4.2.1	Pseudo Code of SSUAM . . . . .	69
4.2.2	Correctness of SSUAM . . . . .	70
4.2.3	Complexity Analysis of SSUAM . . . . .	71
4.3	Illustration of Working of SSUAM . . . . .	76
4.4	Proof of Concept . . . . .	81
4.4.1	Prototype Tool <i>ArchliceS</i> . . . . .	81
4.4.2	Experimental Study . . . . .	82
4.4.3	Experimental Results . . . . .	84
4.5	Comparison with Related Work . . . . .	89
4.6	Conclusions . . . . .	91
<b>5</b>	<b>Dynamic Slicing of UML Models</b>	<b>93</b>
5.1	Basic Concepts and Definitions . . . . .	93
5.1.1	Modified MDG Traversal . . . . .	94
5.1.2	Dynamic Slicing Terminologies . . . . .	96
5.2	Our DSUAM Methodology . . . . .	98
5.2.1	Pseudo Code of DSUAM . . . . .	99
5.2.2	Correctness of DSUAM . . . . .	101
5.2.3	Complexity Analysis of DSUAM . . . . .	102

---

5.3	Illustration of Working of DSUAM . . . . .	105
5.4	Proof of Concept . . . . .	112
5.4.1	Prototype Tool <i>ArchliceD</i> . . . . .	113
5.4.2	Experimental Study . . . . .	113
5.4.3	Experimental Results . . . . .	114
5.5	Comparison with Related Work . . . . .	123
5.5.1	Comparison between DSUAM and SSUAM Algorithms . . . . .	126
5.6	Conclusions . . . . .	127
<b>6</b>	<b>Slicing With State Information</b>	<b>129</b>
6.1	Basic Concepts and Definitions . . . . .	129
6.1.1	Labelling of State Machines in UML Models . . . . .	130
6.1.2	Representation of State Machines . . . . .	130
6.1.3	Incorporation of an Object's State Information in MDG . . . . .	131
6.1.4	Utilization of State Information for Improving Precision of Computed Slices . . . . .	135
6.2	The Modified MDG Construction Technique . . . . .	136
6.2.1	Handling State Models in <i>ConstructMDG()</i> Procedure . . . . .	136
6.2.2	The Modified <i>ModelGraph</i> Algorithm . . . . .	138
6.3	Our SDSUM Methodology . . . . .	139
6.3.1	Pseudo Code of SDSUM . . . . .	139
6.3.2	Precision and Correctness of SDSUM . . . . .	141
6.3.3	Complexity Analysis of SDSUM . . . . .	142
6.4	Illustration of Working of SDSUM . . . . .	144
6.5	Proof of Concept . . . . .	150
6.5.1	Prototype Tool <i>ArchliceDE</i> . . . . .	151
6.5.2	Experimental Study . . . . .	152
6.5.3	Experimental Results . . . . .	154
6.6	Comparison with Related Work . . . . .	160
6.6.1	Comparison between SDSUM and DSUAM Algorithms . . . . .	164
6.7	Conclusions . . . . .	166
<b>7</b>	<b>Conclusions and Future Work</b>	<b>167</b>
7.1	Contributions of the Thesis . . . . .	167
7.2	Directions for Future Research . . . . .	169
<b>A</b>	<b>Illustrative UML Models</b>	<b>171</b>
A.1	Example-1 UML Model . . . . .	171
A.2	Example-2 UML Model . . . . .	172
<b>List of Publications from the Thesis</b>		<b>175</b>
<b>Bibliography</b>		<b>176</b>

---

Copyright  
IIT Kharagpur