

Mapping Cardinality-based Feature Models to Weighted Automata over Featured Multiset Semirings

(Extended Version)

Robert Müller
University of Siegen
Siegen, Germany
robert.mueller@uni-siegen.de

Mathis Weiß
University of Siegen
Siegen, Germany
mathis.weiss@uni-siegen.de

Malte Lochau
University of Siegen
Siegen, Germany
malte.lochau@uni-siegen.de

ABSTRACT

Cardinality-based feature models permit to select multiple copies of the same feature, thus generalizing the notion of product configurations from subsets of Boolean features to multisets of feature instances. This increased expressiveness shapes a-priori infinite and non-convex configuration spaces, which renders established solution-space mappings based on Boolean presence conditions insufficient for cardinality-based feature models. To address this issue, we propose weighted automata over featured multiset semirings as a novel behavioral variability modeling formalism for cardinality-based feature models. The formalism uses multisets over features as a predefined semantic domain for transition weights. It permits to use any algebraic structure forming a proper semiring on multisets to aggregate the weights traversed along paths to map accepted words to multiset configurations. In particular, tropical semirings constitute a promising sub-class with a reasonable trade-off between expressiveness and computational tractability of canonical analysis problems. The formalism is strictly more expressive than featured transition systems, as it enables upper-bound multiplicity constraints depending on the length of words. We provide a tool implementation of the behavioral variability model and present preliminary experimental results showing applicability and computational feasibility of the proposed approach.

CCS CONCEPTS

• **Software and its engineering** → **Software product lines.**

KEYWORDS

Cardinality-Based Feature Models, Weighted Automata, Behavioral Variability Modeling

© Müller, Weiß and Lochau 2024. This is the author’s version of the work. It is posted here for your personal use. Not for redistribution. The definitive version was published in *Proceedings of 28th ACM International Systems and Software Product Lines Conference (SPLC’24)*, <https://doi.org/10.1145/3646548.3676539>.

1 INTRODUCTION

Background and Motivation. Many modern software-intensive systems must be highly configurable to allow flexible adaptations to user requirements, technical platforms etc. on demand. Software product-line engineering offers a comprehensive methodology to systematically develop a family of similar, yet explicitly distinguished software variants being automatically derivable from a configurable software implementation [2]. The variability of a

configurable software is defined by *features* (i.e., customer-visible configuration options). Most recent product-line approaches are limited to *finite Boolean* configuration spaces, shaped by a predefined set F of configuration options (features) from the problem domain. A configuration $C \subseteq F$ thus corresponds to a subset of selected features. Feature models such as feature diagrams [24, 28] are used to specify the (sub-)space of *valid* configurations supported by a product line, which formally corresponds to a subset of the overall set 2^F of all possible feature selections.

Features also build the conceptual glue between problem-space and solution-space variability, in the sense that every valid feature selection controls the presence/absence of optional increments of implemented functionality [2]. Initially inspired by C pre-processor directives [25], most recent feature-mapping techniques attach *presence conditions* (i.e., propositional formulae over features) to variable solution-space artifacts (e.g., model elements and code fragments) [6, 8, 10]. Presence conditions symbolically characterize in a concise way the subsets of feature selections for which the marked artifacts are included in the respective software variant. For instance, in featured transition systems (FTS), transitions are annotated by presence conditions to specify the subset of configurations for which the behavior defined by this transition is relevant [8]. In this way, one FTS model superimposes the set of all variants included in the valid configuration space into one behavioral model.

However, in many modern application domains like cloud computing and cyber-physical systems, Boolean configuration options are not sufficiently expressive. Customers may not only decide about the presence or absence, but also about the *multiplicity* (number of instances) of resources. In cardinality-based feature models (CFMs), features are augmented by cardinality intervals $\langle l, u \rangle$, $l \leq u$, requiring a feature to be selected at least l and at most u times [12]. The notion of configurations thus generalizes to *multisets* $M : F \rightarrow \mathbb{N}_0$ over feature sets F and the valid configuration space of CFMs comprises a subset of all possible multisets over F [44]. For the upper-bound u , an a-priori unbounded wildcard $*$ may be used instead of a fixed value, which gives rise to *infinite* configuration spaces. Moreover, further constructs for expressing cardinality constraints may lead to interval gaps within *non-convex* configuration spaces [44].

Research Challenges. Adapting feature-mapping concepts from Boolean feature models to cardinality-based feature models is not straight-forward and, to the best of our knowledge, no systematic approach tackling this issue has been proposed so far. Many structural modeling formalisms offer built-in constructs for declaring multi-instantiable model entities [43] (e.g., multiplicity constraints

in UML class diagrams), whereas typical behavioral models like transition systems do not comprise an analogous counterpart. To fill this conceptual gap, we face the following research challenges:

Expressiveness-Tractability Trade-offs. There is no obvious generalization of the notion of presence conditions from propositional formulae over Boolean features to multisets of feature instances. A naive approach would rely on some generalization of propositional logics being rich enough to express *every possible subset of all multisets* over feature set F . However, this would lead to presence conditions being far more expressive (and far more complex to comprehend and to analyze) than cardinality constraints of CFMs, thus leading to a conceptual misalignment between problem-space and solution-space variability.

Automated Reasoning. Presence conditions over Boolean features are usually added to existing modeling/programming languages as *syntactic* mark-ups [10] or by *semantic* variability encoding [34]. Hence, their proper handling either requires a separate mechanism complementing native tool support of the host language or a lifting of existing tools to properly handle variability. Automated reasoning about Boolean presence conditions is usually delegated to constraint solvers [5, 29]. For multiset-based presence conditions, however, no such canonical mathematical representation with out-of-the-box analysis tools exists.

To define a feasible mapping approach between CFMs and behavioral solution-space modeling, we consider the following research challenges.

- Define a mapping approach that constitutes a reasonable trade-off between expressiveness and analyzability.
- Define a mapping approach that enables a semantic embedding of feature multiplicities into an existing behavioral host formalism with native tool support.

Concepts and Contributions. In this paper, we argue that *weighted automata* [14] constitute a suitable behavioral modeling formalism for mapping configuration spaces of CFMs to behavioral variability in the solution space. Weighted automata generalize classical finite automata by assigning weights to accepted words, where the domain of weights applied to a weighted automaton can be any algebraic structure constituting a *semiring* [27]. Here, we employ weighted automata over *multisets* as target behavioral model for solution-space mapping of CFMs. Transitions are annotated by multisets M over feature set F , denoting the *multiplicity* of feature instances *at least* required for this transition to be enabled. In this way, we obtain a natural semantic mapping between multisets of features corresponding to valid configurations of a CFM in the problem space and multisets of features assigned to behaviors (words) of a weighted automaton in the solution space. This conceptual correspondence allows us (1) to apply arbitrary semiring-preserving operations on multisets to aggregate feature multiplicity constraints in different ways, and (2) to adopt many useful analysis techniques known for certain classes of weighted automata [1] to efficiently reason about key properties in a family-based and an automated way [42]. In particular, using tropical semirings over multisets appears to be a reasonable trade-off between expressiveness and complexity.




Figure 1: Cardinality-Based Feature Model for the Multiplayer Game.

Tool Support. We provide tool support based on the JAutomata library [22] which allows the creation of behavioral model instances and provides the automatic analysis using the proposed formalism.

Experimental Evaluation. We describe experimental results obtained by applying our tool to a collection of example models demonstrating efficiency/effectiveness trade-offs.

Verifiability. To make our results reproducible, we provide the tool implementation, all experimental results and raw data on a supplementary web page [32].

2 BACKGROUND: CARDINALITY-BASED FEATURE MODELS

We introduce a running example to illustrate the modeling concepts of cardinality-based feature models.

Running Example: Multiplayer Game. We consider a simplified multiplayer game inspired by [20, 36]. We do not describe the actual gameplay in detail, but focus on the configuration of the game by players. In each game, two, up-to arbitrary many, teams participate in a game of solitaire or chess. Each team has at least one player, whereas the maximum number of players per team is not limited. Processing modules provide configurable communication protocols for each team (e.g., WiFi or Bluetooth). Some configuration constraints can be specified in a classical (Boolean) feature model (e.g., alternative choice between solitaire and chess) [24]. In contrast, the fact that the number of teams is freely configurable and that each such team can have an individually configurable number of players is not expressible in classical Boolean feature models. Instead, we employ cardinality-based feature models (CFMs) to precisely specify the valid configuration space (problem space) of the game.

Syntax of CFM. In classical (Boolean) feature models, each feature is either selected (true) or deselected (false) in a configuration [24] and the valid configuration space is shaped by propositional constraints over features. CFMs generalize this by feature *multiplicities* to denote the number of times a feature is selected [11, 12]. The valid configuration space of CFMs is thus shaped by cardinality constraints restricting valid multiplicity intervals of feature instances.

Figure 1 shows a CFM for our running example. The cardinality constraint $\langle 2, * \rangle$ attached at feature *Team* restricts the multiplicity

interval for it. The lower-bound value 2 denotes that each valid multiplayer game configuration must consist of at least two teams (i.e., two instances/copies/clones of feature *Team*). As upper-bound value, the wildcard $*$ denotes that an arbitrary (a-priori unbounded) number of instances of feature *Team* may be chosen. For each instance, the corresponding sub-tree of feature *Team* is cloned to enable individual configuration decisions (e.g., number of players) for each team instance. Sub-feature *Player* is annotated with $\langle 1, * \rangle$, thus allowing at least one, up-to an arbitrary number of players per team.

We use slightly simplified CFM syntax to keep the example graspable. For instance, feature *GameMode* is marked as a mandatory sub-feature of feature *Team* using FODA notation as a shorthand for CFM constraint $\langle 1, 1 \rangle$. For each team, exactly one game mode must be selected from the alternative group (in FODA notation) containing *Solitaire* and *Chess*. CFM generalizes the notion of groups by two kinds of group cardinality constraints [44] which we also omit here for the sake of simplicity. Also, cross-tree constraints like require- and exclude-edges are generalized in CFM [35]. In our example, an exclude-edge holds between features *ProcessingModule* and *Team*. The cardinality constraints attached to both ends of the edge express that if 1 to $*$ many teams are selected, then we cannot select 4 or 5 processing modules and vice versa. We added this made-up constraint for illustrative purposes only. The require-edge from *BT* to *Player* expresses that the usage of Bluetooth is only valid for teams with up to 20 players.

Semantics of CFM. In case of a Boolean feature model bm over a set F of Boolean features, a *configuration* is a subset $C \subseteq F$ of selected features such that all constraints of bm are satisfied. Hence, the semantics of bm classifies a particular subset $\llbracket bm \rrbracket \subseteq 2^F$ as *valid configuration space*. Abstract features (e.g., root feature *MultiplayerGame* in Figure 1) do not represent actual functionality but are used to structure the feature model. Thus, abstract features may be omitted in configurations C as there is no solution-space mapping defined for them. In CFMs, a configuration not only comprises information about presence/absence of features, but also about the multiplicity (number of instances) of each feature. The semantic domain is thus generalized from subsets to *multisets* over F , denoted by a mapping $M : F \rightarrow \mathbb{N}_0$ of features to non-negative integers. By $M(f)$, we denote *multiplicities* of $f \in F$ in M . We write

$$M = \{f_1^{M(f_1)}, f_2^{M(f_2)}, \dots, f_n^{M(f_n)}\}$$

to explicitly enumerate multisets M over F in a set-oriented way and omit entries for those features $f_i \in F$ with $M(f_i) = 0$. A valid configuration with two teams having each one player playing chess together without processing modules corresponds to the multiset:

$$M = \{Team^2, Player^2, Chess^2\},$$

omitting abstract features. In contrast, the multiset:

$$M' = \{BT^1, ProcessingModule^4, Team^2, Player^{30}, Solitaire^1\}$$

does not correspond to a valid configuration as it violates various constraints of the CFM (e.g., the exclude-edge is violated as 4 instances of *ProcessingModule* are selected). The valid configuration space shaped by CFMs such as our example has two remarkable properties as compared to Boolean feature models.




Figure 2: (F)TS for the Multiplayer Game.

- **Infinite.** The number of players, teams and processing modules are a-priori unbounded (upper bound $*$) thus the valid configuration space contains infinitely many configurations.
- **Non-convex.** Due to the exclude-edge between *Team* and *ProcessingModule*, the sub-interval $[4..5]$ is a gap within the valid interval. The resulting non-convexity of the valid configuration space makes automated analysis harder than in the convex case [44].

CFMs comprise further semantic subtleties for which no generally accepted interpretation exists. For instance, we consider the example configuration M described above as valid, as we assume that both teams *may* consist of exactly one player. However, it may also be possible that in M both players are part of the *same* team instance which would be invalid. The first interpretation (*global* multiset-based) only comprises the total number of instances per feature, whereas the second interpretation (*local* instance-based) comprises a richer notion of configuration including instances of child-parent relationships on feature instances. For the sake of simplicity, we consider the global interpretation in this paper (see [20] for more details). In this case, the semantics of a CFM cm classifies a subset $\llbracket cm \rrbracket \subseteq 2^{\mathcal{M}_F}$ of the set $\mathcal{M}_F = \{M \mid M : F \rightarrow \mathbb{N}_0\}$ of all multisets over feature set F as valid. However, this semantic generalization from Boolean feature models to cardinality-based feature models is not straight-forward as the semantic domain of \mathcal{M}_F essentially comprises *all possible* mappings from feature sets F into the non-negative integers. In this sense, the expressiveness of CFM is far away from being complete. For example, we cannot model a game in which we allow an arbitrary, but *even* number of players in each team. These and more fine-grained configuration constraints must be expressed by behavioral variability models in the solution space instead.

3 MAPPING CARDINALITY-BASED FEATURE MODELS TO FTS

We now discuss the limitations of a state-of-the-art behavioral variability modeling approach for finite, Boolean configuration spaces to serve as a mapping target for configuration spaces shaped by cardinality-based feature models.

State-of-the-Art: Featured Transition Systems. A finite state automaton A defined over an alphabet Σ characterizes a *language*

$\mathcal{L}(A) \subseteq \Sigma^*$ containing only those words $\ell \in \Sigma^*$ (i.e., finite sequences of symbols from Σ) for which an accepting path exists in A . In this sense, A defines a function $A : \Sigma^* \rightarrow \{\perp, \top\}$ (i.e., from words to Booleans). Transition systems formalize the possible behavior (sets of runs) of computational systems as sequences of steps between states via transitions, labeled by actions. Figure 2 shows a transition system of our example. All runs start in the initial state q_1 and terminate in the final state q_5 . Initially, one team is added to the game, followed by an arbitrary number of players. Then, the solitaire game mode can be selected, which requires at least one team. Alternatively, another team with additional players can be added. In this branch, also selecting the chess game mode becomes possible, as this requires two teams. After one game has been completely configured, an additional processing module may be added to the system to configure more games. Finally, either Bluetooth or WiFi must be selected.

Transition systems have been extended to Featured Transition Systems (FTS) to map problem-space variability to behavioral variability in the solution space [8]. FTS extend transition labels by a second component denoting *presence conditions*. A presence condition is a propositional formula over Boolean features that symbolically specifies for the corresponding transition the sets of configurations for which this transition is present. In Figure 2, presence conditions are denoted in square brackets. In this sense, FTS are the behavioral complement of Boolean configuration spaces due to the conceptual alignment between Boolean feature models and Boolean presence conditions over features. For instance, the choice between Bluetooth or WiFi communication maps directly to the alternative branches in the FTS with mutually excluding presence conditions.

Semantically, the logical conjunction of all presence conditions along the path taken in a run (accepted word) qualifies the configurations for which this run is *valid*. FTS therefore define a mapping from the set of runs to a subset of valid configurations. For instance, the word *addTeam*, *addSolitaire*, *addWiFi* is mapped to path condition $Team \wedge Player \wedge Solitaire \wedge WiFi$ thus requiring at least these features to be selected.

Expressing Multiplicity Constraints in FTS. FTS with Boolean presence conditions are able to express that the absence (instance multiplicity 0) or presence (instance multiplicity > 0) of particular *types* of features is required for a particular transition. In contrast, multiplicity constraints denoting that an exact and/or relative number of feature instances is required for a transition are not directly expressible in Boolean FTS. For instance, the Boolean presence condition of the transition labeled *addBT* specifies that Bluetooth requires *at least one* processing module. However, this does not reflect that *sufficiently many* processing modules must be selected within the *same* run. We next discuss two possible solutions within the FTS framework: (1) duplication of the state-transition graph and (2) extension of presence conditions to higher-order logics.

(1) *Duplicating FTS Parts.* The CFM in Figure 1 allows selecting any number k of processing modules in a valid multiset configuration M . For instance, in case of $k = 2$, only those runs of the FTS should be considered valid for M in which the action *addProcMod* occurs at most two times which is not expressible by Boolean presence conditions. Figure 3 shows a possible FTS representation for the case $k = 2$ using duplicated parts. Note that all presence conditions




Figure 3: FTS Representation with Duplicated Parts.

except for those involving *ProcMod* have been omitted here for brevity. The transition loop for *addProcMod* has been unrolled twice to ensure that the *addProcMod* transition is taken at most two times in any valid run. After taking the *addProcMod* transition twice, choosing *Bluetooth* becomes disabled, as Bluetooth requires an additional processing unit. Additionally, the transition for *addWiFi* from state q_4^1 to state q_5^1 has been removed as the *WiFi* feature requires at least one processing module, which does not hold after the first iteration. The last transition for *addBT* from state q_4^3 to state q_5^3 has also been removed as this would require a further processing module which is not permitted by configuration M . This pattern may be applied for any given upper-bound value k , yet leading to excessively bloated behavioral models. Even worse, due to the explicitly declared unboundedness of feature *ProcMod* in the CFM, no such upper-bound value exists, thus yielding an infinite number of unfoldings which is infeasible as (F)TS are limited to a finite number of states.

(2) *Extending Presence Conditions.* Another approach consists in a generalization of presence conditions from propositional formulas over Boolean formulas to higher-order logical formulas including multisets as modulo theories. For instance, the extended presence condition $[ProcMod^2 \wedge WiFi^1]$ attached to a transition for *addWiFi* would require one instance of feature *WiFi* and two instances of feature *ProcMod*. However, regardless of the expressiveness of the formalism used for presence conditions to mark *individual transitions*, the state space of FTS remains limited to a finite number of states. In this regard, the notion of presence conditions used in FTS-like behavioral variability models only enables *qualitative* mapping constraints for individual transitions. More involved mapping

constraints including aggregated conditions over *complete runs* are not expressible in this way. For instance, we cannot express that the number of times the *addProcMod* is taken in a run requires a configuration with exactly this number of *ProcMod* feature instances. Furthermore, FTS-like presence conditions cannot express *quantitative* constraints like aggregating properties related to feature multiplicities reflecting costs or rewards caused by feature selections. Enabling FTS-like presence conditions to also express these types of constraints and properties would require far more complicated extensions, such as quantifiable multiplicity variables and (hyper-)properties over aggregated multiplicities. If these extensions are not introduced with care, we obtain an incomprehensible and computationally intractable mapping formalism which obstructs usability and automated analysis.

Summary. A straight-forward generalization of presence conditions of FTS-like behavioral models to handle configuration spaces of CFM is not obvious for two reasons. First, configuration semantics of Boolean feature models denotes purely *qualitative* constraints, being conceptually aligned with Boolean presence conditions (propositional formulae over features) in the solution space. In contrast, configuration semantics of cardinality-based feature models denotes *quantitative* constraints (multiplicity of feature instances). Second, FTS-like presence conditions are usually added as conservative (i.e., purely *syntactic*) extensions to existing solution-space modeling/programming languages, being (post-)processed by separate tools (e.g., SAT solvers). In contrast, a proper mapping of feature instances asks for a conceptually integrated (i.e., *semantic*) embedding into an appropriate solutions-space formalism.

4 MAPPING CARDINALITY-BASED FEATURE MODELS TO WEIGHTED AUTOMATA

In this section, we describe a solution-space mapping for cardinality-based feature models using weighted automata over multisets.

4.1 Background: Weighted Automata

Similar to FTS, weighted automata also constitute a conservative extension of finite state automata [14]. A weighted automaton $\mathcal{A} : \Sigma^* \rightarrow K$ generalizes finite state automata by mapping words $\ell \in \Sigma^*$ to arbitrary sets K denoting *weights* [1, 14, 15]. Set K is part of a *semiring* comprising two binary operations, \oplus (*addition*) and \otimes (*multiplication*), on K . The addition operation is associative and commutative with an identity element $\bar{0} \in K$ and the multiplication operation is associative with an identity element $\bar{1} \in K$.

Definition 4.1 (Semiring [14]). A *semiring* is tuple $\mathbb{K} = (K, \oplus, \otimes, \bar{0}, \bar{1})$, where

- K is a non-empty set,
- $\oplus : K \times K \rightarrow K$ s.t. $(a \oplus b) \oplus c = a \oplus (b \oplus c)$ $a \oplus b = b \oplus a$,
- $\otimes : K \times K \rightarrow K$ such that $(a \otimes b) \otimes c = a \otimes (b \otimes c)$,
- $\bar{0} \in K$ such that $\bar{0} \oplus a = a \oplus \bar{0} = a$ and $\bar{0} \otimes a = a \otimes \bar{0} = \bar{0}$, and
- $\bar{1} \in K$ such that $\bar{1} \otimes a = a \otimes \bar{1} = a$.

Transitions of weighted automata are labeled by pairs of symbols $\sigma \in \Sigma$ and weights $k \in K$ and states are labeled by pairs of initial and final weights, respectively.

Definition 4.2 (Weighted Automaton [14]). A *weighted automaton* is a tuple $\mathcal{A} = (\mathbb{K}, \Sigma, Q, w_i, w_f, w_t)$, where




Figure 4: Example of a Weighted Automaton.

- \mathbb{K} is a semiring over a set K ,
- Σ is a finite alphabet,
- Q is a non-empty, finite set of states,
- $w_i : Q \rightarrow K$ assigns initial weights to states,
- $w_f : Q \rightarrow K$ assigns final weights to states, and
- $w_t : Q \times \Sigma \times Q \rightarrow K$ assigns weights to transitions.

The operations \otimes and \oplus compute for any word $\ell \in \Sigma^*$ its weight: for every path labeled ℓ , the initial weight of the first state, the final weight of the last state and all weights along the transitions of all paths labeled ℓ are aggregated by \otimes . The overall weight of ℓ is aggregated by applying \oplus to the aggregated weights of each such path. The set of all weighted words defines the *weighted language* of the automaton.

Definition 4.3 (Weighted Language [14]). Let \mathcal{A} be a weighted automaton over alphabet Σ and semiring \mathbb{K} .

- A *path* of \mathcal{A} is any sequence $P = q_0 a_1 q_1 \dots a_n q_n \in Q(\Sigma Q)^*$.
- The *weight* of path P is

$$w(P) = w_i(q_0) \cdot \left(\prod_{0 \leq i < n} w_t(q_i, a_{i+1}, q_{i+1}) \right) \cdot w_f(q_n)$$

where the empty product is defined as $\bar{1}$.

- The label of a path P is defined as $\ell(P) = a_1 a_2 \dots a_n$.
- The weighted language of \mathcal{A} is defined as

$$\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{A}) = \{(\ell, w(\ell)) \mid \ell \in \Sigma^* \wedge w(\ell) = \sum_{P \text{ s.t. } \ell(P)=\ell} w(P)\}.$$

Example. Figure 4 shows a weighted automaton \mathcal{A} defined over alphabet $\Sigma = \{a\}$ and semiring $\mathbb{K} = (\mathbb{N}_0 \cup \{-\infty\}, \min, +, -\infty, 0)$ using a common graphical representation. Transitions between states are labeled by pairs σ, w of symbols σ from alphabet Σ (i.e., $\sigma = a$ in this example) and transition weights $w \in K$ defined by w_t . The example contains three transitions: one from state q_1 to state q_2 with weight 1 and two self-loop transitions, one of state q_1 with weight 2 and one of state q_2 with weight 1. Each state q additionally has one dangling incoming edge labeled with the initial weight $w_i(q)$ and a dangling outgoing edge labeled with the final weight $w_f(q)$. In the considered semiring, the \otimes -operation is defined as numerical addition of the weights (natural numbers) along paths. Any path for a word $\ell \in \{a\}^*$ of length $|\ell| = k$ may start either in state q_1 or q_2 . When starting in q_1 , the path may switch from state q_1 to state q_2 after any prefix of ℓ of arbitrary length $k' \leq k$ and then remain in q_2 or it may remain in q_1 for the whole word. The initial weight and the weight added for every additional a is 2 in q_1 and 1 in q_2 , whereas the final weight is 0 in q_0 but 5 in q_2 . Hence, we have multiple possible paths with different aggregated weights for the same word $\ell \in \{a\}^*$ in \mathcal{A} , where the \oplus -operation is defined

to select the minimum weight. The weighted language of \mathcal{A} for the considered semiring is

$$\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{A}) = \{(\ell, 2k+2) \mid \ell = a^k \wedge k < 5\} \cup \{(\ell', k'+6) \mid \ell' = a^{k'} \wedge k' \geq 5\}$$

In all upcoming examples, we use a simplified graphical notation as follows. If $w_i(q) = \bar{1}$ holds for exactly one state q and $w_i(q') = \bar{0}$ for all other states q' we then omit the weight on the dangling incoming edge of *initial state* q (e.g., q_1 in Figure 5) and we also omit the dangling incoming edges on all other states q' . Similarly, we omit outgoing dangling edges for all states q with $w_f(q) = \bar{1}$ and instead depict q as *accepting state* marked by a double-lined circles (e.g., q_5 in Figure 5), whereas all other states q' with $w_f(q') = \bar{0}$ are drawn with single-lined circles.

Note that any finite state automaton is a weighted automaton over the Boolean semiring $\mathcal{B} = (\{\perp, \top\}, \vee, \wedge, \perp, \top)$. Due to the generic definition of weighted automata over any kind of semiring, it enjoys a wide range of different applications (e.g., reasoning about non-functional properties, natural language processing, image processing) [14]. In particular, the *tropical* semiring has proven very useful for many domains, where the *min-tropical* semiring is defined as $\mathcal{T}_{min} = (\mathbb{R} \cup \{\infty\}, \min, +, \infty, 0)$ and the *max-tropical* semiring is defined as $\mathcal{T}_{max} = (\mathbb{R} \cup \{-\infty\}, \max, +, -\infty, 0)$, respectively [1, 33]. Using tropical semirings, weights along paths are added and the final weight for a word either corresponds to the minimum or maximum aggregated path weight for that word.

4.2 Weighted Automata over Featured Multisets

In Section 2, we described the semantic domain of CFMs models as sets \mathcal{M}_F of multisets over feature set F (featured multisets). Hence, it is reasonable to investigate weighted automata over featured multisets as behavioral solution-space formalism for CFMs. Operations like union, intersection, and addition are lifted to multisets as component-wise maximum, minimum, and addition on the multiplicity domain \mathbb{N}_0 :

- $(M_1 \cup M_2)(a) = \max(M_1(a), M_2(a)) \quad \forall a \in A,$
- $(M_1 \cap M_2)(a) = \min(M_1(a), M_2(a)) \quad \forall a \in A,$ and
- $(M_1 + M_2)(a) = M_1(a) + M_2(a) \quad \forall a \in A,$

To generalize, any pair of operations on \mathbb{N}_0 forming a semiring on \mathbb{N}_0 can be used to define a semiring on multisets, by applying the operations to the multiplicity values in an element-wise manner.

Definition 4.4 (Multiset Semiring). Given a semiring

$$\mathbb{K}_{\mathbb{N}_0} = (\mathbb{N}_0, \oplus_{\mathbb{N}_0}, \otimes_{\mathbb{N}_0}, \bar{0}_{\mathbb{N}_0}, \bar{1}_{\mathbb{N}_0}) \text{ on } \mathbb{N}_0$$

we define the *multiset semiring*

$$\mathbb{K}_{\mathcal{M}} = (\mathcal{M}_A, \oplus_{\mathcal{M}_A}, \otimes_{\mathcal{M}_A}, \bar{0}_{\mathcal{M}_A}, \bar{1}_{\mathcal{M}_A})$$

on $\mathbb{K}_{\mathbb{N}_0}$ as:

- $(M_1 \oplus_{\mathcal{M}_A} M_2)(k) = M_1(k) \oplus_{\mathbb{N}_0} M_2(k) \quad \forall k \in K,$
- $(M_1 \otimes_{\mathcal{M}_A} M_2)(k) = M_1(k) \otimes_{\mathbb{N}_0} M_2(k) \quad \forall k \in K,$
- $\bar{0}_{\mathcal{M}_A} = \{a \rightarrow \bar{0}_{\mathbb{N}_0} \mid a \in A\},$ and
- $\bar{1}_{\mathcal{M}_A} = \{a \rightarrow \bar{1}_{\mathbb{N}_0} \mid a \in A\}.$

Finally, we define

$$M_1 \subseteq M_2 \Leftrightarrow M_1(a) \leq M_2(a) \quad \forall a \in A$$

to lift the subset relation to multisets as usual.




Figure 5: Weighted Automaton for the Multiplayer Game.

Table 1: Overview of Numeric Semirings [14].

Semiring	\oplus	\otimes	$\bar{0}$	$\bar{1}$
Max-tropical	<i>max</i>	$+$	$-\infty$	0
Min-tropical	<i>min</i>	$+$	∞	0
Min-min	<i>min</i>	<i>min</i>	∞	∞
Max-max	<i>max</i>	<i>max</i>	$-\infty$	$-\infty$

Featured Multiset Semirings. Figure 5 shows an extract of a weighted automaton \mathcal{A}_{MPG} for the behavior of the Multiplayer Game with the same structure and action alphabet as the FTS in Figure 2. Note that the shown extract actually describes the configuration process of a game rather than the behavior of the game itself (see Figure 6 and Figure 7 below). However, we use this example as it contains most crucial cases in a graspable way. Instead of Boolean presence conditions, behavioral variability is specified as transition weights over featured multisets $M \in \mathcal{M}_F$. This representation is agnostic to the actual semiring used for mapping multisets over features to weighted automata. Table 1 shows a selection of semirings [14] we consider as reasonable choices.

Max-Tropical Semiring. Using the *max-tropical semiring* over featured multisets, weights of transitions describe how many *additional* feature instances are required when taking the respective transition in a run (i.e., every further occurrence of a transition in a path increases the number of feature instances required in the respective configuration by the transition weight). Note that we omit all features having weight 0. For instance, the weight $\{Team^1\}$ of the *addTeam* transition denotes that the required number of instances of feature *Team* increases by 1 for every further traversal of this transition in a run. For each instance of feature *Team*, exactly one *Gamemode* must be selected thus requiring a corresponding number of instances of chess or solitaire games. The *addSolitaire* transition increments the number of instances of feature *Solitaire* as well as of feature *Player* to ensure that at least one player plays solitaire. Similarly, Chess requires at least two players. The game mode must be configured for each team separately according to the CFM, such that the number of instances of feature *Chess* is also incremented by 2 to cover both teams. The *addProcMod* transition adds two *ProcMod* feature instances, as each additional game




Figure 6: Weighted Automaton for Variable Behaviour during a Chess Game.




Figure 7: Weighted Automaton for Variable Team Behaviour depending on the Number of Teams.

requires at least two more processing modules. Moreover, the behavioral model specifies that three instances of feature *WiFi* are required when choosing this communication method, whereas the number of processing modules is not restricted. The aggregated weight M_ℓ for a word ℓ corresponds to the overall sum of feature instances required for accepting word ℓ . In case multiple accepting paths exist for ℓ , the element-wise *max*-operation selects for each feature the maximum number of instances required along all accepting paths. This ensures that the final weight (multiset) reflects a sufficient number of feature instances to accept word ℓ in any case. For instance, the aggregated weight for accepting the word

$$\ell = \text{addTeam}, \text{addSolitaire}, \text{addProcMod}, \text{addTeam}, \text{addTeam}, \\ \text{addChess}, \text{addBT}$$

in the *max-tropical semiring* is

$$M_\ell = \{BT^1, ProcMod^3, Team^3, Player^3, Solitaire^1, Chess^2\}$$

Max-Max Semiring. In the *max-max* semiring, both semiring operations are defined as *max*-operation, such that we ignore all features having weight of $-\infty$. Here, weights describe how many feature instances are *at least* required for executing the respective transition in a run. The weight of a word along one accepting path corresponds to the *maximum lower bound* for the number of required instances per feature. The final weight for word ℓ aggregated from all accepting paths thus describes how many feature instances are *at least* required for all possible accepting paths of word ℓ . Hence, the weight for the word

$$\ell = \text{addTeam}, \text{addSolitaire}, \text{addProcMod}, \text{addTeam}, \text{addTeam}, \\ \text{addChess}, \text{addBT}$$

in the *max-max semiring* is

$$M_\ell = \{BT^1, ProcMod^2, Team^1, Player^2, Solitaire^1, Chess^2\}$$

Min-X Semiring. In the *min-tropical* semiring, the overall number of feature instances is given as the minimum number aggregated over all accepting paths and in the *min-min* semiring, the minimum operation is also used along one particular path, respectively, to obtain the *minimum upper bound*. In contrast to the *max-tropical* and *max-max* semirings in which the weight of a word may be interpreted as *costs* (i.e., we have to buy at least this number of feature instances to enable this run), the *Min-X* case may be interpreted as *rewards* (we gain at most this number of feature instances by this run). To this end, we may partition the set F of features into multiple subsets and apply separate semirings to aggregate their costs. For example, the weight of the word

$$\ell = \text{addTeam}, \text{addSolitaire}, \text{addProcMod}, \text{addTeam}, \text{addTeam}, \\ \text{addChess}, \text{addBT}$$

in the *min-min semiring* is

$$M_\ell = \{BT^1, ProcMod^1, Team^1, Player^1, Solitaire^1, Chess^2\}$$

Example: Hand and Brain. Figure 6 shows an extract from the variable behavior during a chess game. Initial state q_1 requires as initial weight two players to start a chess game. The two players make alternating moves until one player wins and the game ends, which may happen after an arbitrary number of moves as q_1 and q_2 are both accepting states. After any two consecutive moves, it is also possible that a third player joins the game to play hand and brain (i.e., one player plays against two players of which one appoints the chess piece to be played in a move and the other one thinks about how to move the piece).

Composite Featured Multiset Semirings. To combine and simultaneously evaluate different interpretations of weights for features into one behavioral model, multiple (independent) semirings can be composed into composite semirings [27]. For instance, we may combine the *max-max* and *min-min* semiring to track the maximum lower bound as well as minimum upper bound of instances for each feature. If the minimum upper bound weight for any feature is less than the maximum lower bound for that feature, then the word should be considered invalid. To generalize, we consider an arbitrary collection $\mathbb{K}_{F_1}, \mathbb{K}_{F_2}, \dots, \mathbb{K}_{F_n}$ of n different semirings \mathbb{K}_{F_i} , $1 \leq i \leq n$, each defined over a subset $F_i \subseteq F$. For the sake of plausibility, we require $F = \bigcup_{1 \leq i \leq n} F_i$, whereas we do not require the subsets to be mutually disjoint. This generalization is handled by *multi-weighted automata* [16] in which weights are tuples from the Cartesian product of multiple independent weight components. The weighted language is obtained by component-wise semiring operations.

Example: Encoding FTS. In the previous example, we used an *X-tropical* semiring to aggregate increments of numbers of feature instances depending on the length of words. This allows us to express that the number of feature instances required for accepting a word depends on the number of occurrences of particular actions, which is, in case of unbounded features, not expressible by FTS. Conversely, the *X-tropical* multiset semiring is not able to express feature constraints on words expressed by path constraints aggregated from the sequence of presence conditions over Boolean




Figure 8: Multi-Weighted Automaton for an Extract of the Multiplayer Game.

features along that path of a run. Multi-weighted automata over composite featured multiset semirings allow us to combine different types of aggregation operators for different types of features (e.g., Boolean vs. multi-instance features). We use a composite semiring combining the *max-max* semiring and *min-min* semiring both over the subset of Boolean features to encode Boolean presence conditions as composite weights.

Figure 8 shows an extract of this construction for our example for the choice between *Bluetooth* and *WiFi*. We denote both bounds in one line using sub-multiset operators to restrict multiset configuration M . We omit unrestricted features (e.g., *Player* has lower bound $-\infty$ and upper bound ∞). As feature *BT* has the upper bound 0 for the *addWiFi* transition, this transition excludes this feature, and the converse case holds for feature *WiFi* for the *addBT* transition, thus expressing logical exclusion between both features. The lower- and upper-bound weights of the *addWiFi* transition further specify that exactly 3 additional instances of the unbounded feature *WiFi* are required for every occurrence of this transition in a run.

Example: Even-Odd. Figure 7 shows another extract from the behavior of the multiplayer game. Initially, the number of teams is 1 (odd) when starting in state q_1 . During a game, the number of teams can be dynamically incremented by 1 without upper bounds, such that the current number of teams alternates between an even and an odd number. During a game, the teams frequently have to make collaborative choices between some alternatives A and B , represented by transitions of state q_1 (odd number of teams) and state q_2 (even number of teams) states. In case the number of teams is odd, the majority decision always wins, whereas in case of an even number, the decision may be inconclusive due to a draw. In this case, a processing module is required to mediate the decision process. In this example, we use the max-tropical semiring for feature *Team* and the max-max semiring for feature *ProcMod*.

4.3 Mapping Configuration Spaces to Weighted Languages

We next discuss various aspects of defining mappings between weighted words and multiset configurations.

Configuration-Space Mapping. Let F be a set of features, cm a CFM over F , and \mathcal{A} a weighted automaton over a multiset semiring \mathbb{K}_F on F . The weighted language accepted by \mathcal{A} defines a mapping $\mathcal{A} : \Sigma^* \rightarrow K$ from words $\ell \in \Sigma^*$ to weights k if $(\ell, k) \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{A})$, where k is a (composite) multiset M over F . Similar to path conditions of FTS, multiset M defines aggregated constraints to be satisfied by a configuration $M' \in \llbracket cm \rrbracket$ to be able to perform an accepting run for ℓ . If M aggregates the maximum lower bound

per feature, then we require $M' \supseteq M$ (i.e., M' contains at least the number of instances per feature as required by M). Conversely, if M aggregates the minimum upper bound per feature, then we require $M' \subseteq M$ (i.e., M' contains at most the number of instances per feature as required by M). In this way, we define a mapping of words to sets of multiset configurations accepting these words. The opposite direction is defined in terms of *projection*.

Solution-Space Projection. By $\mathcal{A}|_M$, we denote the weighted automaton projected from \mathcal{A} for multiset configuration $M \in \llbracket cm \rrbracket$. The weighted language of projection $\mathcal{A}|_M$ is restricted to those weighted words accepted by M . If we use min-/max-operators for aggregating weights along paths (e.g., min-min and max-max semiring), the projection can be constructed purely syntactically, by checking for each transition in \mathcal{A} individually whether M satisfies the weight constraint (and by removing the transition from $\mathcal{A}|_M$, otherwise). This is similar to FTS projection [8]. In case of the X-tropical semiring, however, such a purely local construction of a projection $\mathcal{A}|_M$ is not feasible. For example, using an X-tropical semiring, transition weights are added along paths. Hence, it is not sufficient to check whether M satisfies the weight constraint of each transition individually. Instead, one and the same transition in \mathcal{A} may be part of a path for which M satisfies the aggregated weight as well as of another path for which M does not satisfy the aggregated weight. Hence, the construction of $\mathcal{A}|_M$ would require to duplicate particular model parts of \mathcal{A} such as shown for the FTS example in Figure 3.

Solution-Space Analysis. When using FTS as behavioral variability model [8], there may exist paths in the transition graph having path conditions that contradict the feature model (e.g., the path contains one transition with presence condition f and another with presence conditions f' , where f and f' exclude each other in the feature model). Conversely, there may be valid configurations of the feature model for which no valid path exists in the transition graph (e.g., configurations in which some optional feature f is not selected although it is required on every non-empty path of the transition graph). Similar cases may arise when using weighted automata over featured multisets as behavioral variability model. Based on configuration-space mapping and solution-space projection, we characterize *mapping-consistency* in two directions:

- Given a word ℓ with an accepting run in \mathcal{A} , does there exist a valid configuration M satisfying the weight $k = \mathcal{A}(\ell)$?
- Given a valid configuration M , does there exist an accepting run in \mathcal{A} such that M satisfies the weight $k = \mathcal{A}(\ell)$?

An obvious advantage of weighted automata as target mapping formalism is their rich body of theoretical knowledge about canonical analysis problems and corresponding complexity/decidability properties [1]. For instance, the second problem coincides with the *non-emptiness problem* for weighted automata. Further interesting decision problems include:

- **Emptiness.** Does a given configuration M accept *no* words accepted by \mathcal{A} ?
- **Universality.** Does a given configuration M accept *all* words accepted by \mathcal{A} ?
- **Upper boundedness.** Does there exist a configuration M for which universality holds?

Table 2: Complexity Classes of Decision Problems on Deterministic and Non-Deterministic Weighted Automata over \mathbb{N}_0 [1].

Decision problem	Determ. \mathbb{N}_0 -WAs	Nondeterm. \mathbb{N}_0 -WAs
(Non-)Emptiness	PTIME	PSPACE-complete
Universality	PTIME	PSPACE-complete
Lower boundedness	PTIME	PSPACE-complete
Upper boundedness	PTIME	PSPACE-complete

- **Lower boundedness.** Does there exist a configuration M for which emptiness holds?

Complexity/decidability of these problems depend on the underlying semiring used and on whether the automaton is deterministic or non-deterministic. All semirings considered in this paper (see Table 1) have feasible complexity in this regard, at least in the deterministic case. This is mostly due to the discrete value domain \mathbb{N}_0 underlying multisets and the algebraic properties of all considered semirings. For deterministic weighted automata over the value domain \mathbb{N}_0 , the considered decision problems are in PTIME. For non-deterministic weighted automata over \mathbb{N}_0 (e.g., Example in Figure 4), the considered decision problems are PSPACE-complete (see Table 2). We refer to Almagor et al. for details about the complexity of these problems [1]. Droste and Gastin have also introduced model checking of properties based on weighted MSO logic going beyond the basic decision problems described here [13].

5 IMPLEMENTATION AND EVALUATION

5.1 Implementation

Our tool is able to check weighted automata (WA) over featured multiset semirings for (non-)emptiness, universality and upper/lower boundedness properties.

JAutomata Library. Our tool is built upon the *JAutomata* library [22] for weighted finite state automata in Java. The library includes various general purpose WA algorithms, which are based on computing the shortest paths using a path-traversal algorithm [14, 30].

The library has a generic API that allows to apply practically any semiring that can be defined in Java. WAs are defined using a Java API to select the semiring and instantiate the states and transitions with weights for the respective semiring. Implementations of Boolean, real, min-tropical and log semirings are included.

We modified the JAutomata library in two important ways. Firstly, the element ordering used for the path-traversal algorithm can now be specified explicitly instead of being derived from the semiring. This allows us to support additional semirings like max-tropical, which have not been usable until now due to termination problems of the path-traversal algorithm in case of loops. This extension allows us, for instance, to consider different orderings for individual features.

Secondly, a weight filter condition can be specified to determine when the path-traversal algorithm will skip a state/transition or terminate early. In the original version, the search only terminates after reaching a specified maximum number of paths. Furthermore, transitions were only skipped if this does not change the final

weight. This obstructs efficiency of property analysis, as the path-traversal algorithm would continue exploring paths even when the property has definitively been evaluated to true/false already.

Support for Multiset Semirings. We provide an implementation of multiset semirings, which allows mapping an arbitrary key type (features) to a value type from any other semiring. Features can be represented as Java Enumerations or Strings. Composite semirings are provided to combine arbitrary pairs of semirings, which can be used to represent any multi-weighted semirings as nested pair-wise composite semirings. We also provide implementations of min/max tropical semirings and min-min/max-max semirings both on *int* and *double* types. Our tool supports checks for non-emptiness, universality, lower boundedness and upper boundedness properties on multiset semirings defined on the max-tropical value semiring.

Bound Parameter. The path-traversal algorithm of the JAutomata library used in our tool first requires a semiring conversion into a k -tropical semiring over lists of paths including their weight. The k -tropical semiring represents lists of paths, limited to at most k paths. If an operation would result in more than k paths, then only the first k paths are considered. This *bound parameter* k must be set when calling the path-traversal algorithm. The correctness of the results thus depends on the choice of k being sufficiently large to cover all relevant paths, where larger values naturally increase the runtime. This parameter allows us to investigate trade-offs between scalability and precision of analyses in our evaluation.

5.2 Research Questions

- (RQ1) **Efficiency.** How does parameter k influence the computational effort for evaluating emptiness, universality, lower boundedness and upper boundedness of WA over featured multiset semirings?
- (RQ2) **Effectiveness.** How does parameter k influence the precision for evaluating emptiness, universality, lower boundedness and upper boundedness of WA over featured multiset semirings?

5.3 Methodology

We perform separate analysis runs for checking for *emptiness*, *universality*, *lower boundedness* and *upper boundedness* (see Section 4.3) for each subject system. Concerning *emptiness* and *universality*, some multiset configuration M must be given for which the respective property is evaluated. To obtain a finite number of configurations, we selected a set of 17 configurations and manually derived the ground truth for these configurations for the considered properties. These 17 configurations cover different combinations of feature assignments that were deemed interesting with respect to the WA. The properties *lower boundedness* and *upper boundedness*, instead, are global properties that require no further input. Concerning bound parameter k , we evaluate each experiment for **RQ1** using sample values $k \in \{500, 1000, \dots, 2500\}$. We do not consider $k < 500$ for **RQ1**, as the runtime for $k = 500$ is already too short (around 50ms per run) to allow for a proper visualization of measurements. For **RQ2**, we evaluate each experiment with more fine-grained sample values $k \in \{100, 200, \dots, 1500\}$ than for **RQ1** to investigate in more detail the influence of parameter k on the precision of analysis results. We consider the same order for prioritization and




Figure 9: Efficiency Results (RQ1) for the individual Weighted Automata and Total Average.

exploration of paths in all experiments. We consider an ordering for all experiments in which the number of instances of feature *Player* is minimized in the first stage, which means that the shortest paths considered first require as few players as necessary. In the next stages, the number of instances of features *Team* and, subsequently, the number of instances of feature *ProcMod* are minimized. The order for the remaining features is based on the generic multisubset relation.

Test Data. We consider as test data the Multiplayer Game example shown in Figure 5 in which we use the max-tropical featured multiset semiring. We also consider three different mutants of this WA in separate experiments. To obtain these mutants, we removed the following transitions: 1) *addWiFi*, 2) *addWiFi* and *addChess*, 3) *addWiFi*, *addChess* and *addProcMod*. The resulting WAs are presumably less complex to analyze than the original WA due to their reduced size. As these WAs are deterministic (i.e., every word corresponds to at most one path), the results for the min-tropical featured multiset semiring are identical as the max/min operations are never applied. We further created WAs for the Multiplayer Game, using max-max and min-min semirings to represent lower and upper bounds. We thereby investigate the feasibility of composite semirings and projection (see Section 4.3).

Data Collection. To evaluate effectiveness, each result reporting whether a property is satisfied or not is recorded and compared to a manually obtained ground truth. To evaluate efficiency, the runtime required for each analysis run is recorded. Each experiment is repeated 10 times in a row to reduce the impact of variations in the measuring environment. The 10 runs of each experiment are preceded by 3 unrecorded warm-up runs. The overall approach contains no non-deterministic steps. Hence, it is feasible to evaluate effectiveness without repetitions and warm-up phase.

Measuring Environment. All experiments were performed on a Windows 10 system with an Intel i7-5820K processor, OpenJDK 22.0.1 and a maximum of 2 GiB of Java Heap Space. Our modified and extended version of the JAutomata library is included in our artifact [32].

5.4 Results

RQ1. The results concerning efficiency are shown in Figure 9. The




Figure 10: Effectiveness Results (RQ2) for the individual Weighted Automata and Total Average.

x-axis denotes parameter k and the y-axis denotes the average runtime in milliseconds for the analysis of all four properties. One data series is shown for each variant of the WA (dashed, colored) as well as for the average of all variants (solid, black). With $k \leq 500$, the average runtime is below 50ms. The runtime for *original*, *no-wifi* and *no-wifi-chess* increases mostly linearly, up to 384ms, 362ms and 173ms, respectively, for $k = 2500$. The runtime for *original* and *no-wifi* is almost equal, with runtime for *no-wifi* being around 10% lower than *original* and runtime for *no-wifi-chess* being around 60% lower than *original* for all considered k . The runtime for *no-wifi-chess-procmod* is on average around 163% higher than for *original* and increases faster than for the other WAs, reaching 1510ms at $k = 2500$. The runtime for *no-wifi-chess-procmod* increases by a factor of 2.4 on average for each 500-increment of k , whereas the runtime for the other three WAs only increases by 1.7 on average.

RQ2. The effectiveness results are shown in Figure 10. The x-axis denotes parameter k and the y-axis denotes the percentage of correctly evaluated properties. One data series is shown for each variant of the WA (dashed, colored) and the average of all variants (solid, black). The percentage of correct properties increases for all WAs with increasing k values until it reaches 100%. All considered properties are evaluated correctly with $k \geq 1500$, hence larger values of k are not considered for this research question. The correctness for the WAs *original*, *no-wifi*, *no-wifi-chess* and *no-wifi-chess-procmod* with $k = 100$ starts at 88.89%, 91.67%, 97.22% and 100%, respectively. Hence, the properties are evaluated correctly with all considered values of k for *no-wifi-chess-procmod*. The properties on *no-wifi-chess* are evaluated correctly with $k \geq 400$. The properties on *no-wifi* are evaluated correctly with $k \geq 1400$. The properties on *original* are evaluated correctly only with $k \geq 1500$. Values of $k \leq 100$ were neglected to improve readability.

5.5 Discussion

RQ1. The *no-wifi* mutant only differs from *original* by the missing *addWiFi* transition. Thereby, removing the Boolean choice between Bluetooth and WiFi decreases runtime of all analyses. But, this effect is small as this transition can only be activated at most once in *original*. In *no-wifi-chess*, we also removed the *addChess* transition and thereby the choice between the two modes. This causes a significant reduction of the average runtime compared to *original*.

In *no-wifi-chess-procmod*, we further removed the *addProcMod* transition such that the only remaining loop is the *addPlayer* transition. However, the average runtime for this behavioral model is significantly higher than for the others, which leads us to the conclusion that there is no obvious relationship between size of the behavioral model and runtime of analysis. Another possible influence on runtime is whether a particular property is actually satisfied or not. As our implementation quickly terminates if a (monotone) property cannot be satisfied anymore, those properties requiring an exhaustive search of all possible paths presumably take longer. Upper boundedness is only satisfied for *no-wifi-chess-procmod* which explains why analyzing this property takes longer than for the other behavioral models.

We also have to take into account how many of the 17 sample configurations used for non-emptiness and universality are satisfied for the individual behavioral models. Universality is satisfied 9 times for *no-wifi-chess-procmod*, but only 5 times for *no-wifi-chess*. Evaluating universality takes longer if it is satisfied, as it requires checking all paths, whereas encountering one counter-example for universality will immediately terminate the search. However, this does not fully explain the increase in runtime also observed for non-emptiness checking, which is satisfied 13 times for *original* and 11 times for the other behavioral models. The increase in average runtime for all properties with *no-wifi-chess-procmod* is mostly caused by the ordering in which path exploration prioritizes transitions. We defined the ordering for all experiments such that the number of *Player* features is minimized in the first stage, which means that the shortest paths considered first require as few players as necessary. However, the only way to traverse different paths in *no-wifi-chess-procmod* is to add more players via the *addPlayer* loop. Only 3 out of 17 configurations used for evaluating non-emptiness and universality restrict the number of players such that evaluation of most properties took longer due to the additional irrelevant *addPlayer* paths.

RQ2. Increasing the value of k leads to an increase in the precision of the results, as correct evaluation requires traversals of specific paths. However, setting k practically to ∞ significantly increases runtime due to the combinatorial explosion of the number of paths. Results for *original* have the lowest average correctness, followed by *no-wifi* and *no-wifi-chess*. Finally, results for *no-wifi-chess-procmod* are correct for all values of k . Hence, as expected, average correctness as well as initial correctness decrease with increasing behavioral model size. The results for *original* and *no-wifi* have similar correctness values, as *no-wifi* requires less path traversals due to the missing final choice between Bluetooth and WiFi. Correctness for *no-wifi-chess* is higher than for *no-wifi* and 100% can be reached with a much lower value of k . This is due to the missing *addChess* transition, which halves the number of paths in every loop iteration, whereas removing *addWiFi* only halves the number of total paths once.

Lastly, correctness for *no-wifi-chess-procmod* is 100% for all values of k , as the *addProcMod* loop is missing such that only Solitaire can be selected with an arbitrary number of players. Out of the 17 configurations considered for universality, only 3 restrict the number of players. These were only evaluated correctly with higher k values than for the other behavioral models, which is due to the

prioritization that minimizes the number of *Player* features. For *no-wifi-chess-procmod*, the player-related universality configurations are evaluated correctly already with $k = 100$, as these sample configurations do not restrict the number of players above 100.

5.6 Threats to Validity

Internal Validity. Due to the novelty of the approach, the primary goal of the performed evaluation was to show feasibility and to demonstrate the usability of existing tools. As such, the experimental scope is currently limited to a few parameters and subject systems. Furthermore, model-theoretic restrictions of the approach are left as an open question for future work. Correctness of evaluation results depend on the bound parameter value k being sufficiently large such that all relevant paths are covered. The results for RQ2 show how correctness of some properties changes depending on k . This limitation stems from the utilization of the existing path-traversal algorithm from JAutomata. Our future goal is to implement property evaluation without explicit bound parameter k . The need to explicitly specify an order in which paths are explored is also a potential threat. This choice may also influence runtime (RQ1) and precision (RQ2). We expect the order during path exploration to influence the results which we plan to further investigate as a future work. Moreover, as the considered subject systems are all deterministic WAs, we did not encounter or evaluate the problem-intrinsic scalability issues due to non-determinism. In the examples considered so far, we have not yet seen any need to express nondeterministic behavior. We argue that restricting the modeling to only deterministic WAs might be expressive enough, so the scalability issues might be neglectable.

External Validity. We only investigated a small number of self-created subject systems in our evaluation due to the novelty of the proposed behavioral model, including four different variants of the Multiplayer Game. WAs over featured multisets are currently described directly in Java code which of course obstructs usability and adoption of the approach. We plan to develop a text-based description format as a future work. Moreover, we limited the number of manually chosen configurations for evaluating the emptiness and universality properties to 17, to ensure a reasonable limit for the overall preparation and execution time of the evaluation. The selection of 17 configurations is therefore also a potential threat. As previously discussed for RQ1, whether or not the non-emptiness and universality properties are satisfied for specific configurations influences the runtime of the approach, hence a biased selection of configurations may lead to skewed results. Finally, we did not compare our approach to any other approach. The most closely related approaches, FTS and FWA (see Section 6), are, however, conceptually too different to our approach to allow for any meaningful comparison.

6 RELATED WORK

To the best of our knowledge, no approaches for mapping CFMs to behavioral variability modeling in the solution space have been proposed so far. In fact, there is even neither a commonly agreed upon syntax nor semantics for CFMs yet. We split our overview

of related work into problem-space modeling formalisms including notions of multiplicity and solution-space variability modeling formalisms in general.

Variability Modelling with Cardinalities in the Problem Space.

Several works use multiset based configuration semantics for CFMs, as we do. For instance, Weckesser et al. show that multiset based configuration semantics are sufficient to automatically detect anomalies such as interval gaps and false bounds of intervals in CFMs [44]. Güthing et al. propose sampling criteria for CFM also based on a multiset based configuration semantics [20].

Semantic considerations about CFMs are mostly concerned with how to interpret cross-tree constraints. Using multiset based configuration semantics, a global interpretation is applied which takes the overall number of all feature instances into account [44]. Alternative interpretations use a local scope (i.e., considering the number of instances per cloned subtree) and so-called relative constraints in the literature [38]. However, the solution-space mapping proposed in the paper is orthogonal to these considerations.

Tool support for modeling and analyzing CFMs is sparse. Autonomous anomaly detection is implemented in the tool Cardy-GAn [37]. This tool also provides modeling capabilities for CFMs and generation of valid configurations as satisfiability witnesses. Clafer is another tool covering CFM modeling and analysis [3, 23] which unifies feature modelling with class models and supports variability modelling with cardinalities. However, both projects appear to be discontinued and none of them incorporate solution-space variability mapping for CFMs.

Behavioral Variability in the Solution Space. Annotation-based behavioral variability modeling formalisms in the solution space have been extensively studied and surveyed, but mostly for Boolean features only [6, 41]. As the most generic approach, featured transition systems (FTS) [8] annotate transitions with Boolean presence conditions to express behavioral variability. Featured Finite State Machines are very similar to FTS (i.e., also using Boolean presence conditions), yet providing richer syntactic constructs for behavioral modeling [21]. Another automata-based variability modeling approach are modal transition systems (MTS) [19], which distinguish between may- and must-transitions, thus reflecting mandatory and optional problem-space variability. Thereupon, many variations of modal transition systems have been proposed. Coherent modal transition systems with constraints [40] add constraints to make MTS equally expressive as FTS. Modal Interface Automata have been proposed for family-based conformance testing of product families [26] and Featured Modal Contract Automata [4] unify Service-Oriented Computing with variability. Parametric Modal Transition Systems [7] enable the expression of exclusive, conditional and persistent choices to ensure compliance with previously made variability decisions. All these MTS-based approaches are at most as expressive as FTS and thus not applicable as solution-space formalism for CFMs as discussed in Section 2. Featured variants of timed automata (TA) have been proposed, called featured timed automata [9] (FTA) and featured team automata [39]. Although the semantic domain of timed automata is inherently unbounded, both approaches are not able to express unbounded multiplicity and aggregated feature instances as provided by our approach. In Feature Nets, a Petri net variant [31], transitions are annotated by

so-called application conditions denoting for which configuration this transitions is enabled. Similar to FTS, application conditions are limited finite Boolean configurations.

The most closely related formalism to our approach are Featured Weighted Automata (FWA) [17, 18] which combine FTS and WA into one model. Thus, FWA are more expressive than FTS by extending configuration-specific words by weights, but the underlying variability and mapping is still purely Boolean. A naive extension of FWA by cardinality annotations for interfacing with CFMs, however, would still be restricted to presence/absence of single transitions which is not sufficient to handle unbounded cardinalities and aggregated feature instances (see Section 2).

7 CONCLUSION

We presented a novel formalism for behavioral variability modeling using weighted automata over featured multiset semirings to capture infinite and non-convex configuration spaces shaped by CFMs. Our experimental results show that the proposed behavioral model allows us to effectively evaluate essential semantic properties for those behavioral models, at least for small subject systems. Our tool implementation includes a bound parameter which allows adjustments to also scale to larger-scale behavioral models under reduced precision.

As a future work, we plan to extend and improve the formalism and the corresponding tool in various ways. We also plan to describe best practices, modeling patterns and workflows to support developers in manually creating models using the proposed approach. In addition, we aim for an approach for solution-space projection on multiset configurations that also supports monotone operators (e.g., max-tropical semiring). Second, we plan to refine our tool to implement weighted automata analyses without explicit bound parameters. Third, we plan to use our formalism to reason about multi-objective NFP optimization of multiset configurations using composite semirings in multi-weighted automata. This allows us to define novel sampling criteria for CFMs based on solution-space knowledge [20]. Finally, we wish to enlarge our collection of case studies to increase the corpus of weighted automata for future evaluation.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We thank our reviewers for their constructive feedback. This work has been funded by the German Research Foundation within the project *Co-InCyTe* (LO 2198/4-1).

REFERENCES

- [1] Shaull Almagor, Udi Boker, and Orna Kupferman. 2022. What’s decidable about weighted automata? *Information and Computation* 282 (2022), 104651.
- [2] Sven Apel, Don S. Batory, Christian Kästner, and Gunter Saake. 2013. Feature-Oriented Software Product Lines. In *Springer Berlin Heidelberg*. <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:28767337>
- [3] Kacper Bał, Zinovy Diskin, Michał Antkiewicz, Krzysztof Czarnecki, and Andrzej Wąsowski. 2016. Clafer: unifying class and feature modeling. *Software & Systems Modeling* 15 (2016), 811–845.
- [4] Davide Basile, Maurice H Ter Beek, Felicita Di Giandomenico, and Stefania Gnesi. 2017. Orchestration of dynamic service product lines with featured modal contract automata. In *Proceedings of the 21st International Systems and Software Product Line Conference-Volume B*. 117–122.
- [5] Don Batory. 2005. Feature Models, Grammars, and Propositional Formulas. In *Software Product Lines*, Henk Obbink and Klaus Pohl (Eds.). Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, Heidelberg, 7–20.

- [6] Fabian Benduhn, Thomas Thüm, Malte Lochau, Thomas Leich, and Gunter Saake. 2015. A survey on modeling techniques for formal behavioral verification of software product lines. In *Proceedings of the 9th International Workshop on Variability Modelling of Software-Intensive Systems*. 80–87.
- [7] Nikola Beneš, Jan Křetínský, Kim G Larsen, Mikael H Møller, and Jiří Srba. 2011. Parametric modal transition systems. In *Automated Technology for Verification and Analysis: 9th International Symposium, ATVA 2011, Taipei, Taiwan, October 11–14, 2011. Proceedings 9*. Springer, 275–289.
- [8] Andreas Classen, Maxime Cordy, Pierre-Yves Schobbens, Patrick Heymans, Axel Legay, and Jean-François Raskin. 2012. Featured transition systems: Foundations for verifying variability-intensive systems and their application to LTL model checking. *IEEE Transactions on Software Engineering* 39, 8 (2012), 1069–1089.
- [9] Maxime Cordy, Pierre-Yves Schobbens, Patrick Heymans, and Axel Legay. 2012. Behavioural modelling and verification of real-time software product lines. In *Proceedings of the 16th International Software Product Line Conference-Volume 1*. 66–75.
- [10] Krzysztof Czarnecki and Michał Antkiewicz. 2005. Mapping Features to Models: A Template Approach Based on Superimposed Variants. In *Generative Programming and Component Engineering*, Robert Glück and Michael Lowry (Eds.). Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, Heidelberg, 422–437.
- [11] Krzysztof Czarnecki, Simon Helsen, and Ulrich Eisenacker. 2005. Formalizing cardinality-based feature models and their specialization. *Software process: Improvement and practice* 10, 1 (2005), 7–29.
- [12] Krzysztof Czarnecki and Chang Hwan Peter Kim. 2005. Cardinality-based feature modeling and constraints: A progress report. In *International Workshop on Software Factories*. ACM San Diego, California, USA, 16–20.
- [13] Manfred Droste and Paul Gastin. 2009. Weighted automata and weighted logics. In *Handbook of weighted automata*. Springer, 175–211.
- [14] Manfred Droste, Werner Kuich, and Heiko Vogler. 2009. *Handbook of weighted automata*. Springer Science & Business Media.
- [15] Manfred Droste and Dietrich Kuske. 2021. Weighted automata.
- [16] Manfred Droste and Vitaly Perevoshchikov. 2016. Multi-weighted automata and MSO logic. *Theory of Computing Systems* 59, 2 (2016), 231–261.
- [17] Uli Fahrenberg and Axel Legay. 2017. Featured weighted automata. In *2017 IEEE/ACM 5th International FME Workshop on Formal Methods in Software Engineering (FormalSE)*. IEEE, 51–57.
- [18] Uli Fahrenberg and Axel Legay. 2019. Quantitative properties of featured automata. *International Journal on Software Tools for Technology Transfer* 21 (2019), 667–677.
- [19] Dario Fischbein, Sebastian Uchitel, and Victor Braberman. 2006. A foundation for behavioural conformance in software product line architectures. In *Proceedings of the ISSTA 2006 workshop on Role of software architecture for testing and analysis*. 39–48.
- [20] Lukas Güthing, Mathis Weiß, Ina Schaefer, and Malte Lochau. 2024. Sampling Cardinality-Based Feature Models. In *Proceedings of the 18th International Working Conference on Variability Modelling of Software-Intensive Systems (VaMoS '24)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 46–55. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3634713.3634719>
- [21] Vanderson Hafemann Fragal, Adenildo Simao, and Mohammad Reza Mousavi. 2016. Validated test models for software product lines: Featured finite state machines. In *International Workshop on Formal Aspects of Component Software*. Springer, 210–227.
- [22] Jasper Hoogland. 2024. JAutomata: An automata library in Java. <https://github.com/jasperhoogland/jautomata> [Accessed: April, 2024].
- [23] Paulius Juodisius, Atrisha Sarkar, Raghava Rao Mukkamala, Michał Antkiewicz, Krzysztof Czarnecki, and Andrzej Wasowski. 2018. Clafer: Lightweight modeling of structure, behaviour, and variability. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1807.08576* (2018).
- [24] K Kang, S Cohen, J Hess, W Nowak, and S Peterson. 1990. *Feature-Oriented Domain Analysis (FODA) Technical Report*. Technical Report. CMU/SEI-90-TR-21, Software Engineering Institute, Carnegie Mellon.
- [25] Jörg Liebig, Sven Apel, Christian Lengauer, Christian Kästner, and Michael Schulze. 2010. An Analysis of the Variability in Forty Preprocessor-Based Software Product Lines. *Proceedings - International Conference on Software Engineering* 1. <https://doi.org/10.1145/1806799.1806819>
- [26] Lars Luthmann, Stephan Mennicke, and Malte Lochau. 2015. Towards an I/O conformance testing theory for software product lines based on modal interface automata. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1504.03473* (2015).
- [27] Robert Manger. 2008. A catalogue of useful composite semirings for solving path problems in graphs. In *Proceedings of the 11th International Conference on Operational Research (KOI 2006)*.
- [28] Jens Meinicke, Thomas Thüm, Reimar Schröter, Fabian Benduhn, Thomas Leich, and Gunter Saake. 2017. *Mastering Software Variability with FeatureIDE*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-61443-4>
- [29] Marcílio Mendonça, Andrzej Wasowski, and Krzysztof Czarnecki. 2009. SAT-based analysis of feature models is easy. *SPLC*, 231–240. <https://doi.org/10.1145/1753235.1753267>
- [30] Mehryar Mohri et al. 2002. Semiring frameworks and algorithms for shortest-distance problems. *Journal of Automata, Languages and Combinatorics* 7, 3 (2002), 321–350.
- [31] Radu Muscoveci, José Proença, and Dave Clarke. 2016. Feature nets: behavioural modelling of software product lines. *Software & Systems Modeling* 15 (2016), 1181–1206.
- [32] Robert Müller, Mathis Weiß, and Malte Lochau. 2024. Mapping Cardinality-based Feature Models to Weighted Automata over Featured Multiset Semirings - Artifact. (6 2024). <https://doi.org/10.6084/m9.figshare.25976746.v2>
- [33] Jean-Eric Pin. 1998. Tropical semirings. *Idempotency (Bristol, 1994)* (1998), 50–69.
- [34] Hendrik Post and Carsten Sinz. 2008. Configuration Lifting: Verification meets Software Configuration. In *2008 23rd IEEE/ACM International Conference on Automated Software Engineering*. 347–350. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ASE.2008.45>
- [35] Clément Quinton, Daniel Romero, and Laurence Duchien. 2013. Cardinality-based feature models with constraints: a pragmatic approach. In *Proceedings of the 17th International Software Product Line Conference*. 162–166.
- [36] Björn Richerzhagen, Dominik Stingl, Ronny Hans, Christian Gross, and Ralf Steinmetz. 2014. Bypassing the cloud: Peer-assisted event dissemination for augmented reality games. In *14-th IEEE International Conference on Peer-to-Peer Computing*. IEEE, 1–10.
- [37] Thomas Schnabel, Markus Weckesser, Roland Kluge, Malte Lochau, and Andy Schürr. 2016. Cardygan: Tool support for cardinality-based feature models. In *Proceedings of the 10th International Workshop on Variability Modelling of Software-Intensive Systems*. 33–40.
- [38] Gustavo Sousa, Walter Rudametkin, and Laurence Duchien. 2016. Extending feature models with relative cardinalities. In *Proceedings of the 20th International Systems and Software Product Line Conference*. 79–88.
- [39] Maurice H ter Beek, Guillermina Cledou, Rolf Henmicker, and José Proença. 2021. Featured team automata. In *Formal Methods: 24th International Symposium, FM 2021, Virtual Event, November 20–26, 2021, Proceedings 24*. Springer, 483–502.
- [40] Maurice H ter Beek, Alessandro Fantechi, Stefania Gnesi, and Franco Mazzanti. 2016. Modelling and analysing variability in product families: Model checking of modal transition systems with variability constraints. *Journal of Logical and Algebraic Methods in Programming* 85, 2 (2016), 287–315.
- [41] Maurice H ter Beek and Axel Legay. 2019. Quantitative variability modeling and analysis. In *Proceedings of the 13th International Workshop on Variability Modelling of Software-Intensive Systems*. 1–2.
- [42] Thomas Thüm, Sven Apel, Christian Kästner, Ina Schaefer, and Gunter Saake. 2014. A Classification and Survey of Analysis Strategies for Software Product Lines. *ACM Comput. Surv.* 47, 1, Article 6 (jun 2014), 45 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2580950>
- [43] Markus Weckesser, Malte Lochau, Michael Ries, and Andy Schürr. 2018. Mathematical Programming for Anomaly Analysis of Clafer Models. In *Proceedings of the 21th ACM/IEEE International Conference on Model Driven Engineering Languages and Systems (Copenhagen, Denmark) (MODELS '18)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 34–44. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3239372.3239398>
- [44] Markus Weckesser, Malte Lochau, Thomas Schnabel, Björn Richerzhagen, and Andy Schürr. 2016. Mind the gap! Automated anomaly detection for potentially unbounded cardinality-based feature models. In *Fundamental Approaches to Software Engineering: 19th International Conference, FASE 2016, Held as Part of the European Joint Conferences on Theory and Practice of Software, ETAPS 2016, Eindhoven, The Netherlands, April 2–8, 2016, Proceedings 19*. Springer, 158–175.