



UNIL | Université de Lausanne

---

FACULTÉ DES HAUTES ÉTUDES COMMERCIALES  
DÉPARTEMENT DES SYSTÈMES D'INFORMATION

**PROCESS MINING-BASED CUSTOMER JOURNEY  
ANALYTICS**

THÈSE DE DOCTORAT

présentée à la

Faculté des Hautes Études Commerciales  
de l'Université de Lausanne

pour l'obtention du grade de  
Docteur ès Sciences en systèmes d'information

par

Gaël BERNARD

Directeur de thèse  
Prof. Kévin Huguenin

Co-directeur de thèse  
Prof. Periklis Andritsos

Jury

Prof. Felicitas Morhart, présidente  
Prof. Benoît Garbinato, expert interne  
Prof. Hajo Reijers, expert externe  
Prof. Andrea Burattin, expert externe

LAUSANNE  
2020

## IMPRIMATUR

---


Sans se prononcer sur les opinions de l'auteur, la Faculté des Hautes Etudes Commerciales de l'Université de Lausanne autorise l'impression de la thèse de Monsieur Gaël BERNARD, titulaire d'un bachelor en ingénierie des médias de la Haute Ecole d'Ingénierie et de Gestion du Canton de Vaud et d'un master en systèmes d'information de l'Université de Lausanne, en vue de l'obtention du grade de docteur ès Sciences en systèmes d'information.

La thèse est intitulée :

### PROCESS MINING-BASED CUSTOMER JOURNEY ANALYTICS

Lausanne, le 23 juin 2020

Le doyen



Jean-Philippe Bonardi

## **Members of the thesis committee**

### **Professor Kévin Huguenin**

Professor at the Faculty of Business and Economics of the University of Lausanne.  
Thesis Co-Supervisor.

### **Professor Periklis Andritsos**

Professor at the Faculty of Information (iSchool) of the University of Toronto.  
Thesis Co-Supervisor.

### **Professor Felicitas Morhart**

Professor at the Faculty of Business and Economics of the University of Lausanne.  
President of the Jury.

### **Professor Benoît Garbinato**

Professor at the Faculty of Business and Economics of the University of Lausanne.  
Internal Expert.

### **Professor Dr. Ir. Hajo Reijers**

Professor in the Department of Information and Computing Sciences of Utrecht  
University.  
External Expert.

### **Professor Andrea Burattin**

Professor at the Department of Applied Mathematics and Computer Science of  
the Technical University of Denmark.  
External Expert.



## **Abstract**

The series of interactions between service providers and customers are called customer journeys. These customer journeys, today, are highly personalized, due to the new devices and technologies that are available. At the same time, new methods are required to help businesses better understand customer behavior. In this dissertation, we investigate the ways in which process mining and business process management can help to increase businesses' comprehension of customer journeys. One of the key findings is that both the process mining framework and the XES standard for storing event logs in process mining settings are relevant for customer journeys. We show that some process mining activities can be applied as-is while other techniques need to take into account the specifics of customer journeys. In particular, we contribute by proposing new algorithms for discovering, enhancing, and exploring customer journeys. We also propose new techniques for predicting next customer interactions. Overall, we contribute by leveraging process mining know-how to improve customer journey analytics; two disciplines that were, to the best of our knowledge, never before considered together.



## Acknowledgements

I am extremely grateful to Prof. Periklis Andritsos for agreeing to supervise my thesis. You have always been supportive even when I have wanted to work on some crazy side projects. I am really proud to have you as my supervisor and I could not have made it without you. Special thanks must also go to Prof. Kévin Huguenin for having agreed to co-supervise my work and for the insightful and thorough feedback he provided. I would also like to express my deepest appreciation to the committee members who agreed to evaluate my dissertation, for their time, and for their invaluable comments: Prof. Hajo Reijers, Prof. Andrea Burattin, Prof. Benoît Garbinato, and Prof. Felicitas Morhart. Throughout these five years, I have had the opportunity to assist with Prof. Pius Bienz's course. I learned a lot from you. Thanks for your support and also for our regular Friday lunch.

Eliane, Pierre-Alain, Emilie—my dear parents and sister—thanks for everything you did for me and for always being there for me. Your support and love was key in the successful completion of my studies.

Laura, without doubt, you are the one that had to endure my ups and downs. Thanks for putting up with me, for your help, and your patience. I am looking forward to all the beautiful projects we have planned together. I love you.

I am also grateful to the MBBLF family and my friends—Adrien, Alexandre, Christophe, Damien, Fabio, Ludivine, Charlotte, Régis, Sonia, Cecilie, Malika, and Bruna; to my friends from the engineering school—Grégory, Yannick, Yann, Tania, Arnaud, Fabien, Cayan, Marouane, Daniel, Mugabo, Luciano, and Milad; and to the crazy friends I made in Finland—Olivier, Xavier, José, Ángel, Sander, Alex, Leandra, and Andrés.

Thanks must also go to my extended family: Edith Castella, Daniel, Pauline, Marie, Catherine, Rémy, Claudine, Edith Corbaz, Yann, Julianne, Clara, Mélissa, and Didier.

I cannot leave the University of Lausanne without mentioning my colleagues and friends there: Natasha, Dana, Dina, Michel, Matthieu, Vaibhav, Prof. Christine Legner, Prof. Thibault Estier, Prof. Yves Pigneur, Thomas, Kazem, Quentin, Endri, Gianluca, Louis, Nico, and all the DESI members.

To Helen, Philip, Zak, and all the Odaians: Thanks for your trust. I am really proud of our achievements and look forward to joining you in Toronto. To Pierre-Alain Steffen, Jon Martin, Xavier Mérour, Yan Borbën, and Leonard Studer: I thank you for your trust in me at various stages of my professional and academic career.

I feel truly blessed to have been surrounded by all these wonderful people.



# Table of contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1	Background . . . . .	2
1.1.1	Customer Journey . . . . .	2
1.1.2	Customer Journey Map . . . . .	3
1.1.3	Business Process Management . . . . .	6
1.1.4	Process Mining . . . . .	8
1.1.5	Process Mining Framework for CJM . . . . .	10
1.2	Problem Statement . . . . .	12
1.3	Thesis Structure . . . . .	12
<b>2</b>	<b>Contextual and Behavioral Customer Journey Discovery Using a Genetic Approach</b>	<b>17</b>
2.1	Introduction . . . . .	17
2.2	Customer Journey Discovery . . . . .	20
2.3	Related Work . . . . .	21
2.4	Genetic Customer Journey Discovery . . . . .	22
2.4.1	Preprocessing . . . . .	22
2.4.2	Initial Population . . . . .	23
2.4.3	Assignment of Actual Journeys . . . . .	23
2.4.4	CJM Evaluation Criteria . . . . .	23
2.4.5	Stopping Criterion . . . . .	25
2.4.6	Genetic Operations . . . . .	25
2.5	Evaluation Using Synthetic Datasets . . . . .	26
2.5.1	Datasets . . . . .	26
2.5.2	Metrics . . . . .	27
2.5.3	Settings . . . . .	29
2.5.4	Results . . . . .	30
2.6	Experiments Using Real Datasets . . . . .	32
2.7	Conclusion . . . . .	34

<b>3</b>	<b>CJM-ex: Goal-oriented Exploration of Customer Journey Maps using Event Logs and Data Analytics</b>	<b>35</b>
3.1	Motivations . . . . .	35
3.2	CJM-ex . . . . .	37
3.3	Implementation . . . . .	39
3.4	Discussion and Outlook . . . . .	41
<b>4</b>	<b>CJM-ab: Abstracting Customer Journey Maps using Process Mining</b>	<b>43</b>
4.1	Introduction . . . . .	43
4.2	Background . . . . .	45
4.2.1	Process Mining and Process Discovery . . . . .	45
4.2.2	Customer Journey Discovery . . . . .	46
4.3	Abstracting Customer Journeys using Process Trees . . . . .	47
4.4	Demonstration . . . . .	49
4.5	Conclusion . . . . .	50
<b>5</b>	<b>Truncated Trace Classifier. Removal of Incomplete Traces from Event Logs.</b>	<b>51</b>
5.1	Introduction . . . . .	51
5.2	Preliminaries . . . . .	53
5.2.1	Process Mining . . . . .	53
5.2.2	Truncated Traces . . . . .	53
5.3	Truncated Trace Classifier . . . . .	54
5.4	Benchmark . . . . .	56
5.4.1	Datasets . . . . .	57
5.4.2	Baseline: Decreasing Factor . . . . .	57
5.4.3	Evaluation . . . . .	58
5.5	Improving Discovered Process Models with a TTC . . . . .	59
5.6	Improving Next Event Prediction with a TTC . . . . .	62
5.7	Related Work . . . . .	65
5.8	Conclusion . . . . .	65
<b>6</b>	<b>Accurate and Transparent Path Prediction Using Process Mining</b>	<b>67</b>
6.1	Introduction . . . . .	67
6.2	Preliminaries . . . . .	68
6.3	Related Work . . . . .	70
6.4	LaFM: Loop-Aware Footprint Matrix . . . . .	71
6.4.1	LaFM Data Structure . . . . .	72
6.4.2	Training Phase: Building LaFM . . . . .	73

6.4.3	Prediction Phase: Using LaFM . . . . .	75
6.5	Evaluation Procedure . . . . .	76
6.6	LaFM: Evaluation . . . . .	77
6.7	c-LaFM: Clustered Loop-Aware Footprint Matrix . . . . .	79
6.8	c-LaFM: Evaluation . . . . .	81
6.9	Conclusion . . . . .	83
<b>7</b>	<b>Conclusion</b>	<b>85</b>
7.1	Contributions . . . . .	85
7.2	Limitations . . . . .	86
7.3	Positioning . . . . .	87
7.4	Outlook . . . . .	88
	<b>References</b>	<b>91</b>



# Chapter 1

## Introduction

**T**ODAY, companies often provide highly personalized services to their customers. For instance, when a customer books a flight, airlines companies often propose additional services like priority check-in, private lounges, extra luggage, insurance, special meals, extra legroom, and assistance, to name a few. These extra services might be ordered with the plane tickets. However, they can usually be added at a later stage through various channels, e.g., at the airport, by phone, by email, or through use of a web interface. These new highly personalized services are also increasingly made available to citizens by government services or to patients by healthcare services. Hence, ‘customers’ should be taken in the broad sense of the term.

The various combinations of services and channels provide customers options and freedom. To support such flexible business environments, complex processes need to be carefully orchestrated to craft a seamless customer journey. Making sure this journey results in a positive customer experience is crucial for customer retention and positive word-of-mouth. As highlighted by Edelman and Singer, “Journeys are [...] becoming central to the customer’s experience of a brand—and as important as the products themselves in providing competitive advantage” [38].

New methods and approaches are needed to support companies in their quest for the “perfect” customer journey. Among other insights, companies need to know if the order in which the customer interacts with the service has an impact on customer satisfaction, if some channels are more suited than others to a specific customer segment, or if the next predicted interaction with the customer is likely to be a complaint. Insights collected through data analysis can help companies take proactive measures or provide input when they are redesigning the service.

The fact that services can be consumed in various channels at any time is made possible by the recent development of Information and Communication

Technologies (ICTs), especially new mobile technologies and modern cloud infrastructures. Interestingly, the use of ICTs goes hand in hand with the ubiquitous availability of individual-level customer data [63]. That is, evidence of what the customers have experienced during their journey is available in information systems. However, these details need to be transformed into usable knowledge for value to be extracted from them. We argue that process mining, an emerging discipline that enables process models and event logs to be analyzed in various ways to deliver “fact-based insights” [94], is an ideal technology for extracting knowledge from customer journey data.

The aim of this thesis is to investigate the intersection between customer journeys, process mining, and business process management and propose novel ways to perform data-driven customer journey analytics. In the next section, we introduce the theoretical foundations of these disciplines. We then detail the objective of this thesis before describing the six component publications that constitute its main body.

## **1.1 Background**

We introduce the main concepts of this topic. Specifically, we discuss customer journeys, customer journey maps, business process management, and process mining. We then explore the link between these concepts.

### **1.1.1 Customer Journey**

At its most basic, a service is the application of specialized competencies for the benefit of another entity or the entity itself [99]. When consuming a service, a customer will interact with a service provider. The interactions between the customer and the service provider are called touchpoints. The whole sequence of touchpoints is called a journey. Although the term “customer journey” has gained momentum in recent years [31], the fact that customers interact with service providers is not new. So why has the customer journey concept become so popular lately? We first provide some context and then provide a potential answer to this question.

Approximately two decades ago, the goods-centered model of economic exchange shifted toward a service-centered paradigm. From a goods-centered perspective, economic activity is the process of making goods and selling them [99]. In contrast, a service-centered dominant logic entails “collaborating with and learning from customers and being adaptive to their individual and dynamic

needs” [99]. ICTs have been an enabler for this shift to take place [27]. In this new paradigm, the customer experience is of utmost importance. This implies that the customer journey does not stop when the service has been delivered, because the customer must learn to use the service, adapting it to their unique context [99]. As a consequence, several internal company functions are involved in every customer journey, making the alignment of previously unconnected corporate silos difficult [31].

New forms of ICTs, such as mobile phones, intelligent virtual assistants, or cloud services, have also allowed companies to develop new types of services or complement existing ones. As an example, traditional taxi services are now challenged by companies like Uber, which enables the customer to order and pay for a taxi from a mobile application. As another example, bricks-and-mortar retail businesses such as Ikea often have an online version of their physical stores where customers can order goods. Offering several integrated channels to customers is referred to as an omnichannel strategy. This strategy “expose[s] customers to a rich blend of offline sensory information and online content” [21] and has become the new norm [63]. Accordingly, there is an increasing trend of customers ordering online. For instance, the Swiss e-commerce market volume grew by 10% in 2018, reaching CHF 9.5 billion and is estimated to continue to grow by 10% annually for the next three years [54].

We are now coming back to the question posed at the beginning of this section: why the customer journey concept has gained so much attention recently. The service-centered context, the proliferation of ICTs, and the omnichannel strategy have collectively made customer journeys more complex and also more important for service providers to understand. It is then unsurprising that “customer journey analytics solutions continue to garner significant interest from organizations seeking to improve customer experience” [31].

In the next section, we introduce the Customer Journey Map (CJM), a visualization tool tailored to discuss and improve customer journeys.

### 1.1.2 Customer Journey Map

A CJM is a visual tool that supports discussions about improving the various types of journeys customers will experience. The idea of a CJM is to have simple visualization that can be interpreted by a broad audience. In opposition to business process models, it does not include advanced gateways such as choices, parallels or loops. Fig. 1.1 shows an example of a CJM. The x-axis represents the time, while




Fig. 1.1 Customer Journey Map that displays three variants for renting a car until a car accident happens.

the y-axis lists the touchpoints. In [6], we conducted a literature review to list the main components of a CJM. The main components are as follows.

**Customer.** A customer is the stakeholder experiencing a service [104]. A loose definition should be employed here as it includes people such as patients [104], students [1, 68], or software users [36, 58]. In [83], the authors highlight the importance of collecting sociodemographic information to ease CJMs users to put themselves in customers' shoes. When a customer is mentioned as a fictional character, the term "persona" is sometimes used [48, 71, 83, 88].

**Journey.** A CJM contains at least one journey, which is a typical sequence of touchpoints followed by a customer. Two types of CJMs exist. One is designed by internal stakeholders to describe what an ideal journey would look like [1], which identifies opportunities for novel services [71] or is employed as a diagnostic tool [83]. We refer to the latter as an *expected journey*. In contrast, an *actual journey* showcases how a journey is experienced by the customer, finds existing customers' problems or needs [1, 36, 71, 73], or pictures the consumption of services by customers [13].

**Mapping.** Mapping is a process consisting of tracking and describing customers' responses and experiences when using a service [1, 30, 48, 68]. Ultimately, these elements are reported on a map.

**Goal.** A customer journey should be mapped with a goal in mind [71, 88], which is also referred to as scenario [1], prompts [68], story [73], or main intention [71]. It triggers interactions with users [1], and streamlines the thought process for users [68]. The goal "connect a low-cost hardware device, such as an Arduino board, to a desktop computer" is a typical example from the literature [36].

**Touchpoint.** A touchpoint is an interaction between customers and companies' products or services [1, 56, 71, 104] such as "searching for a product" [36], or "finding seats" [56]. The arrangement of touchpoints can be cyclic: a customer can



iterate a few times over the same touchpoints [80]. Moreover, the arrangement is non-linear: (1) most of the time, the customer will not go through all the existing touchpoints [68, 80]; (2) the customer might miss a planned touchpoint; and (3) the customer can unexpectedly quit the journey.

**Timeline.** The timeline describes the duration of the journey from the first until the last touchpoint [58]. Due to the forecast nature of expected journeys, they typically do not have a timestamp. Yet, a number attached to an event (i.e., touchpoint) can depict the sequence within the timeline [68].

**Channel.** The channel is the method chosen by the customer to interact with the touchpoint [68, 77] such as a “reference desk” [68] or “social media” [83].

**Stage.** A stage, encompasses several touchpoints. Some authors used the splits: before, during, and after the experience, but employing domain-related steps is also possible. For instance, in [58], the stage refers to the waterfall model (i.e., software development). Some CJMs do not use stages at all [1, 36, 56, 73].

**Experience.** The experience encompasses customers’ feedback and emotions. We identified three elements to express the experience. The first one is the *emotion*. Using only one continuum of emotions—such as unhappy to happy—may fail to depict a customer’s experience [36]. Thus, describing the emotion requires some flexibility. Second, the scale measures how positive or negative the experience was for the customer [56]. Third, many studies use customers’ quotes to represent what customers have been through [30, 36, 73, 104].

**Lens.** Some components of CJMs are domain-specific. For instance, in [73], the authors appended a layer below the CJM to indicate the weather because it impacts customer satisfaction when using the service. We refer to a layer with the term lens to reflect that multiple views are possible on the same map [58]. Suggestions and opportunities [1, 68] are some other examples of lenses superposed on top of touchpoints. They are important because they promotes reflection and analysis of what happened during the journey [58].

**Multimedia.** The usage of multimedia makes a CJM engaging and simple to understand [68, 80, 83]. For instance, recording customers while they are filling out the CJM allows to better understand them [30, 36, 56]. Multiple types of multimedia are reported: audio [30], video [36, 56], photos [56], and sketches [80].

In the literature, we found that CJMs are used for different purposes, including to increase understanding [68, 104], to involve [36, 56], and to communicate [30]. In Fig. 1.2, we propose a model that shows the hierarchy between the components of a CJM [6].

Følstad et al. distinguish two uses of CJMs: one aiming to represent anticipated journeys, called the expected journey; and the second, the actual journey, aiming




Fig. 1.2 Proposed hierarchical presentation of CJMs' components [6].

to describe how the journey was “really” experienced by customers [41]. For instance, the CJM displayed in Fig. 1.1 could be used by internal stakeholders to discuss various available insurance packages and their relevance to service delivery when a rental car customer has a car accident. Typically, stakeholders can anticipate that a certain type of journey might not please a customer segment. The service could then be redesigned to improve the likelihood of that segment's satisfaction. In this context, we call these CJMs “expected” because they are designed by internal stakeholders. In contrast, “actual” CJMs reflect what the customers have experienced. Because they show the customers' point of view, actual CJMs provide company stakeholders a fresh perspective of the journey [1, 56]. For instance, traces of customer journeys available in information systems (e.g., logs from a customer navigating through a sales website) could be used to build a CJM from facts. This CJM can then be compared with an expected CJM—typically drawn on paper for strategic or ideation purposes—to highlight differences. As noted in [80], *“People don't behave like robots, and no matter how well we craft an experience, they will not perceive exactly as we anticipate or hope”*. Hence, a discrepancy might exist between expected and actual CJMs.

### 1.1.3 Business Process Management

To support customer journeys, companies need to define their business processes (BPs). Simply put, BPs are what companies do whenever they deliver a service to customers [37]. BPs comprise the activities and decision points that will impact the execution of service-related activities [37]. A BP is considered to be good if it contributes to meeting the strategic objectives of an organization [97]. Business Process Management (BPM) is the art and science of overseeing work performed in an organization to ensure consistent outcomes and to take advantage of improvement opportunities [37]. BPM is a broad discipline that combines knowledge from information technology, management, and industrial engineering [94, 97]. Managing business processes takes continuous effort; companies often evolve




Fig. 1.3 The Business Process Management Lifecycle [37].

so quickly that a process that was considered good several months ago might no longer be optimal today. The BPM lifecycle, shown in Fig. 1.3, is a particularly useful tool for assisting with this. The idea is that once a business process has been implemented, it should be monitored and analyzed regularly so that it can be redesigned, if needed, to meet the strategic objectives of the organization.

In a customer journey analytics context, mastering the whole BPM lifecycle is crucial for companies; ill-defined processes will impact customers, for instance, because they are sources of delay, error, and miscommunication. As noted by Tseng: “Organizations setting out to win customers, deliver good service, and survive vigorous competition have to engage in continuous improvement” [89]. Fundamentally, the goal of BPM is to find models that best describe how to handle processes, helping analysts and managers to attain high quality and efficiency [67]. It is, therefore, internally oriented. In contrast, customer journey management (CJM) is about helping internal stakeholders to put themselves in their customers’ shoes. Fig. 1.4 shows how these models convey different information.

CJM depicts journeys as experienced by customers while BPM shows the available combination of activities using advanced constructs such as XOR or parallel gateways. Different information is leveraged for CJM than is used for BPM. For instance, customers’ characteristics, levels of satisfaction, and emotions are all central pieces of information for CJM. Such information might sporadically




Fig. 1.4 Illustration of a process model (left) and a CJM (right) discovered from the same event logs.

be used to enhance BPM, but usually only once an optimal model has been discovered. Overall, CJM is used to supplement but not replace BPM [76].

In the next section, we introduce process mining, which is the bridge between data science and business process management.

#### 1.1.4 Process Mining

Process mining provides a set of tools to discover, monitor, and improve processes based on event logs [94]. In doing so, it enables a link to be established between process models and “reality” [94].

The first step before performing process mining activities is to transform the data captured in information systems into event logs. Event logs have a special data structure with three minimum requirements. First, activity names are used to identify events [94]. An *event* is the execution of an activity defined in a BP. It is equivalent to a touchpoint. Second, a case identifier should exist to link an event to a trace. A *trace* is a set of ordered events. It is equivalent to a journey. Third, the events must be available in an ordered manner—ideally with timestamps for the beginning and the end of the activity. The process mining analysis can be further extended by enriching the events with additional information, such as an indication of the resource performing the activity or any other relevant data related to the case.




Fig. 1.5 Process Mining framework [94].

The literature distinguishes two event data types: historic data refers to complete event logs from the past, while current data represents ongoing processes typically used to perform operational support. It is also worth mentioning that one can distinguish a “de jure” from a “de facto” model. The former is normative, since it intends to steer or control the “reality”, while the latter derives from event logs, which means that the model seeks to describe reality.

Process mining is employed for different purposes and is used with or without a priori process models. Altogether, the process mining framework, [94], includes the following activities (see Fig. 1.5):

1. Check                      ensuring that a trace fits a process model.
2. Compare                  finding discrepancies and commonalities between two process models.
3. Detect                     detecting deviation of a trace on a process model at runtime.
4. Diagnose                 analyzing the process models (without event logs), e.g., structural analysis of the petri net.
5. Discover                  mining a process model from an event log.
6. Enhance                 augmenting a process model with external information, e.g., adding timing information to highlight bottlenecks.
7. Explore                  exploring process models using a combination of event data and models.

- 
- |               |   |
|---------------|---|
| 8. Predict    | predicting how a running case will unfold (e.g., remaining time).                     |
| 9. Promote    | finding patterns that work well and updating the “de jure” model accordingly.         |
| 10. Recommend | recommending the best set of actions to fulfil a requirement (e.g., minimizing cost). |

These ten activities, applied on a combination of current data, historic data, “de jure” models, and “de facto” models, can inform and motivate a wide spectrum of actions made possible via process mining. For instance, one can use the activity ‘check’ to realize that the execution of the process often deviates from how it is defined in the business process model. After further investigation, one could realize that the deviation is beneficial for the company and use the activity ‘promote’ to update the process model and push more employees to execute the process in such a way. In the next section, we show how to link CJMs to process mining.

### 1.1.5 Process Mining Framework for CJM

We envision an opportunity to integrate customer journey analytics with the process mining framework introduced in the previous section. Indeed, we expect the knowledge acquired to combine data on top of models in the process mining and BPM disciplines to provide an ideal basis to discover, analyze, or replay customer journeys using a rigorous approach. Respectively, the *expected* and *actual* CJMs correspond to the “de jure” and “de facto” process models. The alignment between a CJM and the process mining framework can be reflected by updating the original process mining framework (Fig. 1.6).

In order to perform process mining analysis on customer journey data, one need to map the components of a CJM to the IEEE XES standard [47], which is the prominent format to import logs in process mining software. Throughout the thesis, we use the mapping visible in Table 1.1, which we propose in [6]. The updated process mining framework (see Fig. 1.6) and the mapping (see Table 1.1) are the cornerstones of this thesis because our contributions are built around them.

Table 1.1 Mapping between XES and the CJM model

Level	XES standard		CJM model
<b>log</b>	log	→	cjm
<b>log</b>	concept:name	→	cjm:goal
<b>trace</b>	trace	→	journey
<b>trace</b>	concept:name	→	customer:name
<b>event</b>	event	→	touchpoint
<b>event</b>	concept:name	→	touchpoint:name
<b>event</b>	timestamp:date	→	touchpoint:timestamp




Fig. 1.6 Process mining framework from [94] with the proposed extension for CJM.

## 1.2 Problem Statement

The core idea of this thesis is to leverage the concept and activities of the process mining framework to analyze customer journeys. To do so, we pursue two research questions.

RQ1 *How can customer journey maps be discovered, explored, and enhanced from event logs?*

The aim of this question is to propose a novel technique to build a CJM from event logs, similar to the process mining discovery technique that discovers a process model from event logs. In the same vein, we also seek to investigate how a CJM can be enhanced and explored using process mining techniques.

RQ2 *How can the touchpoints of a customer journey be predicted?*

Customer journeys are increasingly complex. As a consequence, it is difficult to anticipate how a running customer journey will unfold. However, knowing the next steps of the journey might be valuable to please the customer. For instance, if a customer success manager evaluates that the next predicted steps are not optimal for the customer, she or he could take proactive measures and propose personalized offers in an effort to positively influence the next steps.

## 1.3 Thesis Structure

This thesis is composed of five distinct publications. These publications are included as they appear in conference proceedings and hence each can be read independently. For this reason, there is some redundancy between chapters. Note that page numbers in the reference are given whenever available.

The papers are organized in two main streams that each corresponds to a research question. The first stream, RQ1, is addressed in Chapters 2 to 4, as these contributions focus on the discovery, enhancement, and exploration of CJMs from event logs. The second stream, RQ2, focuses on prediction techniques. The publications related to RQ2 appear in Chapters 5 and 6.



Chapter 2 Bernard, G. and Andritsos, P. (2019b). Contextual and behavioral customer journey discovery using a genetic approach. In *23rd European Conference on Advances in Databases and Information Systems (ADBIS)*, pages 251–266, Cham. Springer. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-28730-6\\_16](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-28730-6_16)

In Chapter 2, we mimic the genetic process to discover process models from event logs described in [22, 96, 103]. However, we discover CJMs instead of process models. This paper contributes by defining the customer journey discovery task and by proposing a genetic implementation that considers both the ordering of touchpoints and the potential contextual data attached to the touchpoints.

Chapter 3 Bernard, G. and Andritsos, P. (2017a). Cjm-ex: Goal-oriented exploration of customer journey maps using event logs and data analytics. In *BPM Demo Track and BPM Dissertation Award co-located with 15th International Conference on Business Process Management (BPM Demo)*. <http://ceur-ws.org/Vol-1920/>

In Chapter 3, we propose a technique to organize CJMs hierarchically so that we can offer a web interface to drill down into the CJMs. The exploration can optionally be done with an a priori goal. For instance, one can highlight journeys that concern a specific customer segment or journeys that contain a specific touchpoint. When a goal is set, areas of the hierarchical tree that fulfil the goal are highlighted. This contribution takes the form of a demonstration which is publicly available.<sup>1</sup>

Chapter 4 Bernard, G. and Andritsos, P. (2018). Cjm-ab: Abstracting customer journey maps using process mining. In *Forum and Doctoral Consortium Papers Presented at the 30th International Conference on Advanced Information Systems Engineering (CAiSE Forum)*, pages 49–56, Cham. Springer. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-92901-9\\_5](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-92901-9_5)

In Chapter 4, we reduce the complexity of very large CJMs by semi-automatically abstracting similar activities together. For instance, the two activities “paying by card” and “paying by cash” could be summarized using the activity “paying”. To measure the proximity between activities, we leverage process discovery techniques. By doing this, we contribute by showing how a process mining algorithm is used as a proxy to enhance an existing CJM.

---

<sup>1</sup>Available at: <http://customer-journey.unil.ch/cjm-ex/>

Chapter 5 Bernard, G. and Andritsos, P. (2020). Truncated trace classifier. removal of incomplete traces from event logs. In *21st International Working Conference on Business Process Modeling, Development, and Support (BPMDS)*, pages 150–165, Cham. Springer.

In Chapter 5, we tackle the task of predicting whether a journey has ended. Consider a case where a customer visits ten different products on a website within a one-hour time interval. No new activity from the customer is then observed for the next three hours following the last touchpoint. We contribute by proposing an algorithm that gives the likelihood of observing new touchpoints for this journey. This contribution is especially relevant in a customer journey context, as we do not have control or even influence over such customers' decisions. Hence, we argue that it is harder to predict the end of the CJM trace than to predict the end of a process model under the control of a company. We contribute by showing that this type of classifier can help increase the accuracy of predicting next events and can also improve the quality of the discovered process models.

Chapter 6 Bernard, G. and Andritsos, P. (2019a). Accurate and transparent path prediction using process mining. In *23rd European Conference on Advances in Databases and Information Systems (ADBIS)*, pages 235–250, Cham. Springer. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-28730-6\\_15](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-28730-6_15)

In Chapter 6, we do not predict whether a journey has ended, but rather how it will end. In other words, we predict the activities that will happen until the completion of the journey. Not only we can predict which activities will happen, but we can explain our prediction using a process model. Hence, we contribute by proposing an algorithm that outperforms neural network approaches like LSTM in terms of both accuracy and transparency. We received the best paper award for this contribution.

Table. 1.2 provides a complete picture of the nine papers that have been published as part of this work. Four papers were not included in the thesis for the following reasons. The paper “A Process Mining Based Model for Customer Journey Mapping”, [6] was partly integrated in the introduction of this thesis. We did not add it as an independent chapter to avoid heavy redundancies. The paper “When Sales Meet Process Mining: A Scientific Approach to Sales Process and Performance Management”, [12], emphasizes the relevance of process mining for sales rather than the customer experience. Although both topics are related, this contribution takes the perspective of the company rather than the customer.

The paper “Discovering Customer Journeys from Evidence”, [9], is a research-in-progress that was completed in the paper [9] visible in Chapter 2. The paper “Discovering Customer Journey Maps using a Mixture of Markov Models”, [49], is an alternative CJM discovery approach to [9] that would fit the thesis topic well. However, this research was mainly conducted by its first author, Matthieu Harbich, and thus is not included.

Table 1.2 Complete list of papers published during the thesis in chronological order.

Author	Year	Title	Conference	Type of publication	Thesis Chapter
Bernard, G., Boillat, T., Legner, C., & Andritsos, P.	2016	When sales meet process mining: A scientific approach to sales process and performance management.	International Conference on Information Systems (ICIS)	Research-in-progress	Not included
Bernard, G., & Andritsos, P.	2017	A Process Mining Based Model for Customer Journey Mapping.	International Conference on Advanced Information Systems Engineering (CAiSE)	Forum paper	1 (partly)
Bernard, G., & Andritsos, P.	2017	Cjm-ex: Goal-oriented exploration of customer journey maps using event logs and data analytics.	International Conference on Business Process Management (BPM)	Demo paper	3
Harbich, M., Bernard, G., Berkes, P., Garbinato, B., & Andritsos, P.	2017	Discovering Customer Journey Maps using a Mixture of Markov Models.	International Symposium on Data-Driven Process Discovery and Analysis (SIMPDA)	Short paper	Not included
Bernard, G., & Andritsos, P.	2018	Abstracting Customer Journey Maps using Process Mining.	International Conference on Advanced Information Systems Engineering (CAiSE)	Demo paper	4
Bernard, G., & Andritsos, P.	2019	Discovering Customer Journeys from Evidence: a Genetic Approach Inspired by Process Mining.	International Conference on Advanced Information Systems Engineering (CAiSE)	Forum paper	Not included
Bernard, G., & Andritsos, P.	2019	Accurate and Transparent Path Prediction Using Process Mining.	European Conference on Advances in Databases and Information Systems (ADBIS)	Conference paper	6
Bernard, G., & Andritsos, P.	2019	Contextual and Behavioral Customer Journey Discovery Using a Genetic Approach.	European Conference on Advances in Databases and Information Systems (ADBIS)	Conference paper	2
Bernard, G., & Andritsos, P.	2020	Truncated trace classifier. Removal of incomplete traces from event logs.	International Working Conference on Business Process Modeling, Development, and Support (BPMDS)	Conference paper	5

## Chapter 2

# Contextual and Behavioral Customer Journey Discovery Using a Genetic Approach

**Abstract.** With the advent of new technologies such as smartphones or virtual assistants and the increase in customers' expectations, services are becoming more complex. This complexity calls for new methods to understand, analyze, and improve service delivery. Summarizing customers' experience using representative journeys that are displayed on a Customer Journey Map (CJM) is one of these techniques. We propose a genetic algorithm that automatically builds a CJM from raw customer experience recorded in a database. Mining representative journeys can be seen a clustering task where both the sequence of activities and some contextual data (e.g., demographics) are considered when measuring the similarity between journeys. We show that our genetic approach outperforms traditional ways of handling this clustering task. Moreover, we apply our algorithm on a real dataset to highlight the benefit of using a genetic approach.

### 2.1 Introduction

A customer experience can be defined as a customer's journey with an organization. This journey spans over time and comprises multiple interactions called touchpoints [63]. Recent studies show that customer interactions are increasing [48], services are becoming more complex, and customers are often unpredictable [77]. In this context, understanding the main journeys that were followed by customers to consume a service is a complex task. According to Verhoef et




Fig. 2.1 Two CJMs: **1** uses actual journeys, and **2** uses representative journeys.

al., a strategy based on customer experience may provide a superior competitive advantage [63]. It is, therefore, not surprising that “*Characterizing the Customer Journey [...] and Strategies to Influence the Journey*” has been ranked as one of the most important research priorities for the coming years by the Marketing Science Institute [70]. A challenge faced by many practitioners is that of understanding the large number of combinations of activities that may exist when consuming a service. As a result, new methods employed to design, analyze, and understand customer journeys are emerging from the industry and are becoming popular among researchers. One of these conceptual methods that will be the focus of this work, is called the Customer Journey Map (CJM). By showing typical journeys experienced by customers across several touchpoints, a CJM helps to better understand customers’ journeys [6].

Fig. 2.1 shows CJMs derived from a real dataset.<sup>2</sup> In this dataset, a journey is all the activities that are performed by a citizen throughout the day. For instance being at home, attending class and going back home is one of the potential journeys. As can be seen in **1** of Fig. 2.1, displaying such actual journeys on the CJM without preprocessing the data results in an overwhelming chart. It becomes clear that when a company deals with very large numbers of actual journeys, it is necessary to reduce the complexity and to look at these journeys at a higher

<sup>2</sup>[www.cmap.illinois.gov/data/transportation/travel-survey](http://www.cmap.illinois.gov/data/transportation/travel-survey). Last visited: 11th of March 2020.




Fig. 2.2 Measuring the distance among three journeys with and without the context.

level of abstraction. Specifically, representative journeys address this issue by summarizing the dataset (using three journeys visible in ② of Fig. 2.1) [10].

The existing solutions to summarize collections of journeys [10, 43, 49] consider only the sequence of touchpoints when measuring the distance between journeys. Fig. 2.2 illustrates the process with 3 short journeys. Using a basic distance measure between sequences (e.g., edit-distance), we cannot say which one of ‘Journey 1’ or ‘Journey 3’ is closer to ‘Journey 2’ (top part of Fig. 2.2). We suggest that demographics and other contextual information might be equally important to measure the distance between journeys. Hence, in this paper, we propose to integrate such information when mining journeys. The bottom part of Fig. 2.2 shows that when we also consider the age group, it becomes clearer that the closest journey to ‘Journey 2’ is ‘Journey 1’.

We propose an algorithm that summarizes a customer journey using both the sequence of activities as well as the contextual information. We use a genetic approach which is an optimization procedure involving iterative search that mimics natural selection. Our genetic approach uses only three intuitive parameters: (1) the approximate number of representative journeys to use, (2) the weight of the sequence of activities, and (3) the weight of the contextual data. In the evaluation section, we demonstrate that we outperform existing techniques. Finally, we highlight the impact of the three parameters using a real dataset and illustrate the results with CJMs.

The chapter is organized as follows. Chapter 2.2 discusses the discovery of customer journeys. In Chapter 2.3, we outline the existing techniques. Chapter 2.4

depicts our genetic algorithm. In Chapter 2.5, we evaluate our approach using internal and external evaluation metrics. Chapter 2.6 illustrates CJMs produced by our algorithm. Finally, we conclude in Chapter 2.7.

## 2.2 Customer Journey Discovery

The goal of a customer journey discovery algorithm is to find a reasonable amount of representative journeys that summarize well the observed journeys.

**Definition 1** (Touchpoint): We define a touchpoint as the interaction between a company's products or services and a customer (see Chapter 1.1.2). 'Buying a product' or 'complaining about a product' are two examples of touchpoints in an online retail context. We define  $t$  as the touchpoint while  $T$  is the collection of all touchpoints. The touchpoints are visible in the y-axis of the CJMs (Fig. 2.1).

**Definition 2** (Actual Journey): An actual journey  $J_a$  is a sequence of touchpoints,  $S$ , and a set of contextual data  $C$  observed from customers. The contextual data,  $C$  is a set of key-value pairs, e.g., (salary:low, city:Toronto). The order of  $S$  is represented by the x-axis of the CJMs visible in Fig. 2.1. Note that only the ordering of the touchpoints matters and not their exact timestamps.

**Definition 3** (Representative Journey): A representative journey,  $J_r$ , is a journey that summarizes a subset of actual journeys. In Fig. 2.1, ❶, shows how a CJM would look like when we display actual journeys, while the bottom part, ❷, uses representative journeys. Clearly, as can be seen in Fig. 2.1, the use of representative journeys increases the readability of the CJM.

**Definition 4** (Event Logs): An event log is denoted by  $J_{\mathcal{A}}$ , which is the list of all journeys observed by customers.

**Definition 5** (Customer Journey Map): By using representative journeys, a CJM summarizes customer journeys. Let a customer journey map  $J_{\mathcal{R}}$  be the set of all the  $J_r$  summarizing  $J_{\mathcal{A}}$ .  $k_{\mathcal{R}}$  denotes the total number of journeys. Typically, Part ❷ of Fig. 2.1 is a CJM,  $J_{\mathcal{R}}$ , containing three representative journeys summarizing an event log.

*We define the discovery of customer journeys as a function that maps all members of  $J_{\mathcal{A}}$  to a member of  $J_{\mathcal{R}}$ ; i.e., that maps all the actual journeys to representative journeys ultimately displayed on a CJM. Discovering customer journeys from event logs can be seen as an unsupervised clustering task. This task has interesting challenges. First, choosing the number of representatives is difficult. When the goal is to have a general overview about a particular dataset, it seems reasonable to display only few journeys so the CJM is readable. However, discovering a few dozens of representative journeys might also be a relevant choice if*



the goal is to catch complex and less generic patterns. Finally, the sequence that best summarizes its assigned actual journeys needs to be found. It might be the case that an ideal representative journey was never observed but still summarizes the actual journeys well. These phenomena were observed by Gabadinho et al., and illustrated as follows: “We could imagine synthetic – not observed – typical sequences, in the same way as the mean of a series of numbers that is generally not an observable individual value” [44].

## 2.3 Related Work

There is a body of work in social sciences that is relevant to the summarization of customer journeys. Typically, in [43, 44], Gabadinho et al. are summarizing observed sequences with representatives. They define a representative as “*a set of non-redundant ‘typical’ sequences that largely, though not necessarily exhaustively, cover the spectrum of observed sequences*” [43]. The authors propose four ways to choose a representative. ‘*Frequency*’, (1), considers the most frequent sequence as the representative. ‘*Neighborhood density*’, (2), selects the sequence that has the most neighbors in a defined diameter. ‘*Centrality*’, (3), picks the most central object, i.e., the one having the minimal sum of distances from all other objects. Finally, ‘*sequence likelihood*’ takes the most likely sequence according to a first-order Markov model.

Since Process Mining operates in a bottom-up fashion, from data all the way to the discovery of conceptual patterns, it is another discipline closely related to the topic of customer journey discovery. The link between customer journey maps and process mining was highlighted in the introduction of this thesis (Chapter 1.1.5). However, business process models and CJMs are not built for the same purpose. While a business process model captures how a process was or should be orchestrated, a CJM is built for the purpose of better understanding what customers have experienced.

In [5] (Chapter 3 in this thesis), we propose CJM-ex, an online tool to explore CJMs.<sup>3</sup> Because it uses a hierarchical structure, it allows to efficiently navigate the space of journeys in CJMs. In [49], it was shown that customer journey maps can be discovered using Markov models. In [10], we suggested a genetic approach to discover representative journeys that uses only the sequence of touchpoints to measure the distance between journeys. Hence, this current work can be seen

---

<sup>3</sup>Available at: <http://customer-journey.unil.ch/cjm-ex/>




Fig. 2.3 Proposed genetic steps to generate a CJM.

as an extension of [10] to allow taking both the sequence of touchpoints and the contextual information into account when building CJMs.

## 2.4 Genetic Customer Journey Discovery

Our work is inspired by existing genetic approaches to discover business process models from event logs [22, 96, 103]. These approaches produce random process models that are then evaluated by replaying event logs on them. Then, genetic operations such as crossover or mutation are applied on the best process models to create alternative process models that are, in turn, evaluated. The process continues until the process reaches a quality threshold or after a fixed number of generations. The advantage of such approach is the flexibility offered when measuring the quality of a process model. For instance, we can favor simple process models (i.e., composed of few elements) or we can favor process models with higher fitness (i.e., more traces can be replayed on the process models).

Our approach is similar but we tailored it towards CJMs by introducing specific evaluation metrics suited for them. Fig. 2.3 depicts the main phases of genetic algorithms: (1) a preprocessing phase, (2) a phase for the generation of the initial population, (3) the assignment of each actual journey to its closest representative, (4) the evaluation of the quality of the CJMs, (5) the stopping criterion evaluation, and (6) the creation of new CJMs by applying some genetic operations. We introduce these phases in details while the Fig. 2.4 illustrates how it works.

### 2.4.1 Preprocessing

We assume that the representative journeys will be similar to the journeys with the most frequent patterns of activities. Hence, to reduce computation time, we extract the most frequent patterns that we use to create new journeys and generate the initial population. Let  $Top_{\ell_n}$  be the  $n$  most occurring patterns of activities of length  $\ell$  and  $Top_n$  be the list of all the most occurring patterns of lengths 2 to  $m$ . By using  $Top_n$ , we reduce the execution time by two without impairing the quality of the final output.




Fig. 2.4 Illustration of the genetic process for the discovery of the best CJMs.

## 2.4.2 Initial Population

We start by generating a set of random CJMs. They are created by picking journeys from  $Top_n$ . In our running example, depicted in Fig. 2.4, the initial population is visible in column ‘Generation 1’. In Fig. 2.4, the population size is 3. In our experiments, we set the population size to 100.

## 2.4.3 Assignment of Actual Journeys

In order to evaluate the quality of the generated CJMs, it is required to assign each actual journey to its closest representative. The closeness between  $J_a$  and  $J_r$  is measured using the Levenshtein distance [65]. This metric counts the number of edit operations (i.e., deletions, insertions, and substitutions) required to match two sequences. Typically, the distance between  $\langle XYZ \rangle$  and  $\langle XYYW \rangle$  is 2 (1 insertion of  $y$ , 1 substitution of  $z \rightarrow w$ ). The closest representative is the one being of the smallest Levenshtein distance to the actual journeys. We break ties by assigning the actual journey to the representative having the less journeys already assigned to it. When the actual journeys have been assigned to their respective closest representative, we can start evaluating the quality of the CJMs.

## 2.4.4 CJM Evaluation Criteria

We define three criteria to evaluate the quality of CJMs: (1) the fitness, (2) the number of representatives, and (3) the contextual distance. These metrics measure different aspects of a CJM. Hence, we define that the final average quality of a CJM

is the weighted mean of these three metrics. Next, we introduce these metrics and define them.

**Fitness.** Using the Levenshtein distance [65], fitness quality measures the distance between the representative sequence and the actual journeys assigned to it.

$$Fitness(J_{\mathcal{A}}, J_{\mathcal{R}}) = 1 - \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{|J_{\mathcal{A}}|} \min_{j=1}^{|J_{\mathcal{R}}|} (Levenshtein(\sigma_{\mathcal{A}_i}; \sigma_{\mathcal{R}_j}))}{\sum_{i=1}^{|J_{\mathcal{A}}|} Length(\sigma_{\mathcal{A}_i})} \quad (2.1)$$

where

- $\sigma_{\mathcal{A}_i}$  :  $i^{\text{th}}$  actual (observed) sequence in  $J_{\mathcal{A}}$
- $\sigma_{\mathcal{R}_j}$  :  $j^{\text{th}}$  representative contained in  $J_{\mathcal{R}}$
- $Length(x)$  : Number of touchpoints in the sequence  $x$

When an actual journey is strictly identical to its representative journey, the fitness measure is equal to 1.

**Number of Representatives.** The more the representative journeys we use, are the more likely the fitness to be high. Hence, without a metric that allows a low number of representatives, we would obtain a final CJM with several thousands of representative journeys. Therefore, the goal of this metric is to keep a low number of representatives. To guide the algorithm towards an ‘ideal’ number of representatives, we employ a clustering technique that helps in choosing the number of clusters. More specifically, we used the Calinski-Harabasz index [24]. Let  $k_h$  be the optimal number of clusters returned by the Calinski-Harabasz index. To evaluate the quality, we measure the distance between  $k_{\mathcal{R}}$  and  $k_h$  using the following distribution function:

$$NumberOfRepresentatives(k_{\mathcal{R}}, k_h, x_0) = \frac{1}{1 + \left(\frac{|k_{\mathcal{R}} - k_h|}{x_0}\right)^2} \quad (2.2)$$

where

- $k_{\mathcal{R}}$  : number of journeys in  $J_{\mathcal{R}}$  (i.e.,  $|J_{\mathcal{R}}|$ )
- $k_h$  : ideal number of journeys according to the Calinski-Harabasz index
- $x_0$  : x value of the midpoint

We set the value of the midpoint,  $x_0$ , to 5 for all our experiments. The intuition behind this parameter is the following: if we have 11 representative journeys on a CJM and the ideal number of journeys is 6, we would have a quality of 0.5 (midpoint) because the absolute distance between 11 and 6 is 5. Often, the final output will have a number of representative journeys that differs from  $k_h$ . This is due to the fact that there are other evaluation criteria.

**Contextual Distance.** The contextual distance allows us to consider the set of contextual data  $C$  when grouping similar journeys. The more distant the set of contextual data is between distinct representative journeys, the better the quality is. To measure the distance, we first build a value frequency table which counts the number of key:pair per representative. Let define that  $v_i$  is the value frequency counter for  $J_{r_i}$ . For instance,  $v_1$  (salary:low:4, salary:high:20, city:Toronto:3, city:Lausanne:2) means the representative journey  $J_{r_1}$  contains 4  $J_a$  with low salary, 20 with high salary, 3 from the city of Toronto and 2 from the city of Lausanne. Then, for each pair of representative journeys, we calculate the cosine similarity, which is defined as:

$$\text{ContextualDistance}(v_1, v_2) = \frac{v_1 \cdot v_2}{\|v_1\| \cdot \|v_2\|} \quad (2.3)$$

Finally, the cosine distances are averaged to get the overall contextual distance.

**Average Quality.** We get the average weighted quality by getting the arithmetic mean of: the fitness, the number of representatives, and the contextual-distance.

### 2.4.5 Stopping Criterion

Once we assess the quality of generated CJMs, we assess the stopping criterion. Inspired by the process mining genetic algorithms, [22, 96], we found three stopping criteria: (1) a certain amount of generations has been reached, (2) the quality does not substantially improve anymore, or, (3), a quality threshold has been reached. Predicting the quality that will be reached by a CJM is difficult. Hence, we believe that the latter stopping criterion is not advisable. If a stopping criterion is met, the algorithm stops, returning the best  $J_{\mathcal{R}}$ . If none of the stopping criteria is met, we generate new candidates by recursively calling a function that generates the next population, described in the next section.

### 2.4.6 Genetic Operations

Before transforming the CJMs, we evaluate and rank them by average quality. We copy a fraction (i.e.,  $e$ ) of the best CJMs in a set named *elite*. In Fig. 2.4, the elite size is 1. In our experiments, we set the elite size to 5.

By keeping the best CJMs as-is, we ensure that the quality will increase or stay unchanged. We also generate  $p - e$  new CJMs using the following operators. (1) Addition of a random journey (mutation): A sequence from  $Top_n$  is added to  $J_{\mathcal{R}}$ . (2) Addition of an existing journey (crossover): A journey from the elite population is added to  $J_{\mathcal{R}}$ . (3) Deletion of a journey (mutation): A journey is removed from




Fig. 2.5 Illustration of how actual journeys are generated from generative journeys.

$J_{\mathcal{R}}$ . Nothing happens if  $J_{\mathcal{R}}$  contains only one journey. (4) Addition of a touchpoint (mutation): A touchpoint is inserted in one of the existing journeys. (5) Deletion of a touchpoint (mutation): A touchpoint is removed from  $J_{\mathcal{R}}$ .

We loop over each of these 5 types of transformations three times. Each time, the probability of applying the transformation is 10%. It means that the same transformation might be applied up to three times (with a probability of 0.1%). At the very least, one transformation has to be applied. If it is not the case, we loop over each transformation three times again until at least a transformation is performed.

In Fig. 2.4,  $J_{\mathcal{R}5}$  has been produced by taking  $J_{\mathcal{R}2}$  and adding a journey picked from  $Top_n$  (defined in Sect. 2.4.1). Once new  $J_{\mathcal{R}}$ s have been created, we return to the evaluation phase as shown in Fig. 2.3.

## 2.5 Evaluation Using Synthetic Datasets

In order to evaluate the quality of our approach to return the best set of representative journeys in  $J_{\mathcal{R}}$ , we evaluate the results using a collection of synthetic customer journeys that includes some contextual data. We first describe how we generated the dataset. Then, using this synthetic dataset, we evaluate and compare our algorithm with existing techniques.

### 2.5.1 Datasets

In order to evaluate the results of our algorithm, we generated synthetic event logs that simulate journeys using generative journeys. A generative journey is a known sequence of activities with a known set of characteristics from which we

generate the event logs. These generative journeys represent the ground truth and ideally the algorithm should return these as representatives. If we used only those known generative journeys to produce the dataset, we would get only  $k_g$  distinct journeys. From a business point of view, this would describe an ideal situation where each group of customers behaves in an homogeneous way. However, we know that this is not the case. Having group of similar journeys that slightly differ from a representative is a more realistic setting. To achieve this, we add some noise to the generated journeys. Typically, when the noise level is set to 50%,  $J_a = J_g$  is true for half of the journeys. Fig. 2.5 illustrates how six journeys are generated from two generative journeys. If we assume that the noise level is defined to be 50%, three actual journeys in the event logs deviate from the original generative journeys. The goal of our experiments is to retrieve the set of generative journeys, as representatives, from the produced actual journeys. The 40 generated datasets as well as details on how we produced them are made publicly available.<sup>4</sup>

### 2.5.2 Metrics

To evaluate and compare the quality of representative journeys, we rely both on external and internal evaluations. External evaluations uses the ground truth. Since we add some random noise, it might be the case that the ground truth is not the best solution. For this reason, we also use internal evaluation measures which are not using the ground truth but rely on cluster analysis techniques. These metrics are described in [44].

**External Evaluation - Distance in the Number of Journeys.** Measures the distance between the number of generative journeys and the number of representative journeys. We evaluate this metric using the following equation:

$$NbJourneysDistance(k_g, k_{\mathcal{R}}) = |k_g - k_{\mathcal{R}}| \quad (2.4)$$

**External Evaluation - Jaccard Distance.** We use the Jaccard distance to measure the intersection of the generative journeys and the representative journeys. A generative and a representative journey need to have exactly the same sequence to be considered in the intersection.

$$JaccardDistance(\sigma_{\mathcal{R}}, \sigma_g) = 1 - \frac{|\sigma_{\mathcal{R}} \cap \sigma_g|}{|\sigma_{\mathcal{R}} \cup \sigma_g|} \quad (2.5)$$

<sup>4</sup><http://customer-journey.unil.ch/datasets/>

**Internal Evaluation - Mean distance [44].** This metric measures the distance between the actual journeys and their respective representative.

$$MeanDistanceScore_i = \frac{\sum_{j=1}^{k_i} D(S_i, S_{ij})}{k_i} \quad (2.6)$$

where

$D(x_1, x_2)$  : Levenshtein distance between two sequences

$k_i$  : Number of journeys attached to the representative  $i$

$S_i$  : Representative sequence  $i$

$S_{ij}$  : Sequence of journeys  $j$  attached to the representative  $i$

**Internal Evaluation - Coverage [44].** This metric represents the density of journeys in the neighborhood  $n$  of a representative. In other words, what is the ratio of journeys that have less than  $n$  edit distance with the representative journey.

$$Coverage_i(n) = \frac{\sum_{j=1}^{k_i} (D(S_i, S_{ij}) < n)}{k_i} \quad (2.7)$$

where

$D(x_1, x_2)$  : Levenshtein distance between two sequences

$k_i$  : Number of journeys attached to the representative  $i$

$S_i$  : Representative sequence  $i$

$S_{ij}$  : Sequence of journeys  $j$  attached to the representative  $i$

**Internal Evaluation - Distance gain [44].** This metric quantifies the gain in using representative journeys rather than the medoid of the dataset.

$$DistGain_i = \frac{\sum_{j=1}^{k_i} D(C(\sigma_{\mathcal{A}}), S_{ij}) - \sum_{j=1}^{k_i} D(S_i, S_{ij})}{\sum_{j=1}^{k_i} D(C(\sigma_{\mathcal{A}}), S_{ij})} \quad (2.8)$$

where

$D(x_1, x_2)$  : Levenshtein distance between two sequences

$k_i$  : Number of journeys attached to the representative  $i$

$S_i$  : Representative sequence  $i$

$S_{ij}$  : Sequence of journeys  $j$  attached to the representative  $i$

$C(x)$  : True center of the set of actual journeys






Fig. 2.6 Approach used to evaluate our clustering algorithm from traditional approaches.

### 2.5.3 Settings

We test two settings of the algorithm against traditional approaches. The traditional approaches are state-of-the-art techniques that are used to cluster and summarize sets of sequential and categorical data. Fig. 2.6 depicts the approach at a high-level. As can be seen, with traditional approaches, we first build a distance metric. We use the Levenshtein distance with a constant cost operation set to 1. Once the distance matrix is built, we create  $k$  clusters. Because we do not know the number of representative journeys to be found, we test using from 2 to 12 clusters (above 12 it becomes hard to read the CJM) and use the squared Calinski-Harabasz index described in [24] to return the most statistically relevant. Next, we get the best representatives using the neighborhood density, the centrality, the frequency, or the likelihood using Traminer [42]. These techniques do not use the contextual data. Hence, to allow for a fair comparison, we compare these techniques with a version of our genetic algorithm that does not use contextual data and which was presented in [10]. We call this version *Genetic<sub>1</sub>*. We also test our genetic algorithm with a version that considers the contextual data, called *Genetic<sub>2</sub>*. Note that both the traditional and genetic approaches use the same techniques to find  $k_h$  and the distance is measured using the Levenshtein distance with a constant cost operation. To account for the fact that the genetic algorithm is non-deterministic, we run the algorithm ten times for each setting.




Fig. 2.7 External evaluation. The genetic algorithm that uses the contextual information (i.e., *Genetic*<sub>2</sub>) performs best.

## 2.5.4 Results

Fig. 2.7 shows the external evaluation metrics. It can be seen that the best solution is the *Genetic*<sub>2</sub>, highlighting that considering the contextual information when grouping journeys improves the quality. Next, the best solution that does not use contextual data is *Genetic*<sub>1</sub> proposed in [10].

The internal evaluation of Fig. 2.8 shows that not only does the genetic algorithm outperform the traditional approaches, it also proposes a better solution than the ground truth. This can be explained by the fact that when we inject noise, we potentially change the optimal solution.

The execution time for one thousand journeys is improved using Traminer [42] compared to our genetic approach. We compare how the different algorithms scale when the number of journeys increases. Hence, we ran each configuration five times with the 40 different datasets. Fig. 2.9 summarizes the results. As can be seen, the algorithms implemented in Traminer are orders of magnitude faster




Fig. 2.8 Internal evaluation. The *Genetic<sub>2</sub>* has the best coverage and mean distance while *Genetic<sub>1</sub>* has the best distance gain.




Fig. 2.9 CPU time for 100, 1'000, and 10'000 journeys.

than our approach when dealing with 100 or 1,000 journeys. However, note that our algorithm has a better scaling potential when the number of journeys grows. All the algorithms tested tend to be slow and will not scale when dealing with several thousand journeys.

## 2.6 Experiments Using Real Datasets

This section reports on the experiments with a real dataset, the goal being to illustrate how a change in the settings impacts the results. We used a publicly available dataset<sup>5</sup> describing the activities performed throughout the day by Chicago's citizens. There are 15 types of activities, such as, 'being at home', 'attending class', 'going shopping', or 'doing households errands'. In the context of this dataset, a journey is the sequence of activities starting from the morning until the night. Typically, 'being at home' → 'attending class' → 'being at home' is a journey consisting of three activities. The total number of journeys is 29,541 and there are 123,706 activities (with an average of 4.82 activities per journey). This dataset is interesting not only for the relatively large number of data points describing life trajectories, but also because of the available detailed contextual data, such as information on the citizens' demographics.

The goal of this experiment is to show the influence of taking the citizen's age in consideration when measuring the distance between journeys. Fig. 2.10 shows the results using three different configurations. In Configuration 1, we did not leverage the contextual data (i.e., the contextual distance weight is set to 0). We interpret the resulting CJM as follows. The first journey represents people going to 'work', going back 'home' at noon, and returning to 'work' in the afternoon. The second journey is close to the first one, the main difference being that people do not seem to go back 'home' at noon. The third journey shows citizens being at 'home', going 'shopping' twice in the afternoon, and going back 'home'.

In Configuration 2, we test the effect on the resulting CJM when considering the ages of the customers. Therefore, we changed the weight assigned to the contextual distance from 0 to 1. As can be seen in Fig. 2.10, three representative journeys were generated. Each of these journeys has three touchpoints. They start from 'home' and finish at 'home'. In between, the first journey has the activity 'work', the second one has the activity 'shopping', and the last one the activity 'attending class'. It is interesting to note the effect of the configuration on the contextual data (the distribution charts on the right side of Fig. 2.10). Indeed,

<sup>5</sup>[www.cmap.illinois.gov/data/transportation/travel-survey](http://www.cmap.illinois.gov/data/transportation/travel-survey). Last visited: 11th of March 2020.




Fig. 2.10 Results with real dataset using three configurations.

while the age was equally distributed for each journey in Configuration 1, we can observe that the age is discriminant in Configuration 2. For instance, more than half of the citizens in the journey  $j_3$  are under 16 years old, while this population represents only 8.7% of the entire dataset.

In Configuration 3, we show the effect when we increase the weight put on the contextual distance parameter. Journeys  $j_1$  and  $j_3$  are identical to those in Configuration 2. However, a new and rather complex journey  $j_2$  emerges. We observe that the distribution is impacted when giving more weight to homogeneity. We interpret the result as follows: Citizens younger than 29 years old tend to have two typical patterns of activities involving either ‘school’ or ‘entertainment’ while the most typical journeys for the other citizens involve ‘work’.

Of course, this is an extremely simplified overview of the data. For the almost 30,000 actual journeys in the event logs, there are numerous unique actual journeys that differ from the representative journeys we get from these three configurations. By letting the business analyst choose the weight for each parameter, we let them explore different perspectives of the data. We claim that the best parameters depend on the dataset, the business context, and the goal of the exploration.

## 2.7 Conclusion

Our genetic approach to summarizing a set of customer journeys with the purpose of displaying them on a CJM offers an interesting alternative to approaches used in social sciences for three reasons. First, the quality of the results is better, which is true using both internal and external evaluation metrics. Second, the weights of the three quality criteria are a flexible way to analyze a dataset under different perspectives. All the other parameters, such as the number of representative journeys to display or the length of the representative journeys are left entirely to the genetic algorithm. Third, in addition to the sequence of activities, our genetic algorithm can leverage contextual data to group similar journeys. By doing so, we provide a way to summarize insights from customers that are hidden in the data.

We tackle the challenging task of building a CJM from event logs as a single-objective optimization problem so that a single ‘best’ CJM is returned. Due to the inherent conflicting objectives of the quality criteria, we acknowledge that a multi-objective approach might be a relevant choice that we did not investigate.

## Chapter 3

# CJM-ex: Goal-oriented Exploration of Customer Journey Maps using Event Logs and Data Analytics

**Abstract.** Customer Journey Mapping (CJM), is an emerging area of research tackling issues related to customer behavior and customer journeys when consuming a service. The increasing complexity of the service industry makes this type of tools popular amongst practitioners. However, to date, it is not clear how a CJM can be used to depict hundreds or thousands of customer journeys. Inspired by process discovery techniques – borrowed from Process Mining – we present *CJM-explorer* (CJM-ex). CJM-ex is a web interface that uses hierarchical clustering and statistical indexes to allow interactive navigation, with or without a-priori information, through numerous journeys stored in standard event log formats. The exploration of the underlying journeys can be done in the whole set of data available or driven by user goals in order to examine events and patterns in specific areas of interest.

### 3.1 Motivations

In order to deliver great service, companies need to have an understanding of the quality of customer experience at an end-to-end level [12, 50]. The ever growing amount of services offered to users for consumption has made the ability to understand their behavior very important [63]. Similarly important is the knowledge extracted by the increasing number of ways organizations interact with their customers; e.g., a customer might visit a physical store, purchase a product online, and provide feedback on social media. As a response, new customer-

centric approaches have surfaced. The *customer journey map* (CJM) is an example of such new techniques. CJMs allow for better understanding of a customer's end-to-end experience when using a service by mapping any interactions with the company (called touchpoints) on a map that ultimately contributes to better understanding and serving customer needs.

In our previous work, [6] (Chapter 1 of this thesis), we discussed the benefit of bringing customer journey mapping and process mining together by proposing a CJM model that can be used with process mining techniques. More specifically, CJM-ex aims at providing a solution to explore numerous customer journeys at the same time. Similar to discovery techniques used in process mining, our algorithm takes event logs as input, without using any a-priori information [94]. However, instead of outputting a business process model (BPM), we display the journeys onto a CJM. For a complete definition of process mining and event logs, the reader is referred to the well known Process Mining Manifesto [95]. Visualizing event logs on CJMs, instead of BPMs, exhibits two interesting features. First, CJMs focus more on personal customer activities (e.g., by incorporating customer emotions), rather than the “internally-focus problem-solving approach” of BPMs, [90]. Second, contrary to BPMs, CJMs can incorporate customer journeys that are deemed exceptional behaviors, rather than removing them to increase model readability.

Despite these interesting features, representing many customer journeys onto a CJM in an intelligible manner remains a challenge. Current research typically limits the number of journeys to be compared to less than ten, making the overall process relatively straightforward. However, we argue that companies in the service industries tend to deal with hundreds or thousands of journeys. To overcome this challenge and identify different areas of interest, a hierarchical clustering algorithm is employed to segment the original data. The hierarchical nature allows for a top-down navigation of automatically generated groups of similar journeys. Once the clusters are formed, CJM-ex is able to leverage the contextual information that comes along a typical customer journey such as the customers' characteristics, or the emotions, [6]. It does so in two different ways. First, we employ statistical indexes in order to explain why the different clusters were generated. Second, we let the users define their own exploration goals, making CJM-ex the first goal-oriented tool that allows analysts to set a-priori goals to guide their journey exploration.

We implemented CJM-ex, which aims to: 1) show how numerous event logs can be displayed onto CJMs; and 2) let users navigate into these journeys. The






Fig. 3.1 Hierarchical clustering of journeys.

next section introduces our tool, while the third section highlights the key parts of its technical implementation. We conclude by providing an outlook.

## 3.2 CJM-ex

The main objective of CJM-ex is to let business analysts upload and explore their own dataset using a customer journey map layout. To limit the number of journeys displayed on the same CJM and allow their intuitive exploration, we took a hierarchical clustering approach, as illustrated in Fig. 3.1. Each letter represents an activity and the tree is built bottom up by merging the activities that are most similar at each iteration. By default, our hierarchical algorithm uses a proximity measure that takes into account the order of activities and is a variant of the Jaccard similarity based on shingles [20]. In our clustering tree (or dendrogram), the journeys seen in the event logs are at the leaf level and as they get merged they form “representative” journeys (defined in Chapter 2). A *representative journey* is a single pattern of activities whose purpose is to summarize the patterns contained in a cluster. Because the representative journeys at the top of the tree summarize many – potentially distant – journeys, it will tend to show only few activities shared by many. In contrast, the representative journeys closer to the leafs will show more details. Borrowing a cartographic metaphor from [94], the first layers show general patterns and hide less important activities – like a world map would omit small cities. However, our application allows a drill-down into ‘countries’ of interest (i.e., pattern of activities), which would redirect to new CJMs where the previously hidden ‘cities’ (i.e., omitted activities) will be shown.

CJM-ex is accessible at <http://customer-journey.unil.ch/cjm-ex/>, where we also provide a screencast explaining its usage. The screenshot visible in Fig. 3.2 points out three views that are available to navigate the clusters. Each of these views fullfills specific objectives. First, the CJM view ❶ shows journeys that are in the same cluster. This representation allows to easily compare the *pattern of activities*.




Fig. 3.2 Interface pointing to three views: ① CJM, ② tree and, ③ textual boxes.

Second, the tree ② displays the hierarchical structure of the journey clusters – useful in providing a holistic view of the clusters and where we currently are. Third, a box per cluster ③ provides a convenient means to display statistical indexes that we named “salient characteristics”. The salient characteristics is the top 5 results of a chi-square test applied on all the contextual information. For instance, if at a global level (the entire dataset) the number of women is equal to the number of men, it might be surprising to find a cluster with large minority / majority of women. Therefore, this information might come up as one of the top 5 salient characteristics.

Moreover, the user might be interested in specific characteristics occurring during the journey. For this reason, we allow user-defined goals. For instance, one might be interested in journeys that started by the activity “attending class” experienced by young people. The top part ① of Fig. 3.3 displays the goal which is typically set by a business analyst, while the bottom part ② shows that some branches of the tree are interesting with regards to the goal (red “hot” area at the top). Hence, our application allows navigation without using any a-priori information, but also setting navigation goals, and guidance by the resulting colors.




Fig. 3.3 Interface to add a goal, ①, and impact on the tree, ②.

Finally, when moving from one view to the others, the three views are updated synchronously, allowing a smooth exploration amongst journeys.

### 3.3 Implementation

CJM-ex is build around four main elements: (1) a web interface; (2) the XES-parser; (3) Hcluster; and (4) a data warehouse. We will describe the main parameters and choices we made for each of them.

**Web interface.** The web interface leverages bootstrap,<sup>6</sup> jQuery,<sup>7</sup> and d3js<sup>8</sup> to provide a user-friendly interface to upload and navigate journeys. Both the CJM view and the tree view are implemented in d3js. The CJM view is our own implementation, while the tree is an adaptation of existing code.<sup>9</sup>

**XES Parser.** CJM-ex works with event logs. More specifically, we leverage the XES (eXtensible Event Stream) standard born within the process mining taskforce. The XES Parser is a Java implementation that encapsulates the OpenXES library<sup>10</sup>

<sup>6</sup><http://getbootstrap.com/>. Last visited: 18th of March 2020.


<sup>7</sup><https://jquery.com/>. Last visited: 18th of March 2020.

<sup>8</sup><https://d3js.org/>. Last visited: 18th of March 2020.


<sup>9</sup><http://bl.ocks.org/robschmuecker/7880033>. Last visited: 11th of March 2020.

<sup>10</sup><http://www.XES-standard.org/openXES/start>. Last visited: 18th of March 2020.

### 1. Hierarchical clustering



### 2. Recursive cuts



### 3. Finding Representative




Fig. 3.4 Data preprocessing phase.

to parse XES file. Use of this open source software ensures that our application is strictly compatible with the XES standard.

**Hcluster.** Hcluster is a Python implementation containing the three steps illustrated in Fig. 3.4. The first one is the hierarchical clustering implemented using Scipy.<sup>11</sup> Two parameters should be provided as inputs: the distance measure between event sequences and the methods for calculating the distance between clusters. They can both be chosen by the user when uploading a dataset (see Fig. 3.5). While further research is needed to understand why these differences exist, it seems that using shingles, [20], as a distance metric provides a more intuitive way to navigate through journeys. Once the hierarchical cluster is formed, the next step consists of cutting the clustering to form layers. A *layer* is a set of predetermined number of journeys that will be grouped together and will ultimately appear on the same CJM. To achieve this, we developed an algorithm that recursively cuts the dendrogram returned by Scipy. A small number of journeys will lead to a simple CJM that is easy to visualize, but in more complex tree structures (i.e., trees with larger height). Finally, the last step consists of finding the representative journey using a frequent sequences mining algorithm.<sup>12</sup>

**Data Warehouse.** Each dataset is saved in its own database schema designed as a star schema. It stores all the information required to use the application (e.g., clusters, journeys, events) as well as some precomputations. For instance, we

<sup>11</sup><https://docs.scipy.org/doc/scipy/reference/generated/scipy.cluster.hierarchy.linkage.html>. Last visited: 18th of March 2020.

<sup>12</sup><https://github.com/bartdag/pymining/blob/master/pymining/seqmining.py>




Fig. 3.5 Preview of the parameters when uploading a dataset.

count the number of occurrences for each characteristic at each cluster, so the goals and the salient characteristics can be retrieved quickly.

Altogether, the parameters visible in Fig. 3.5 allow users to explore the exact same dataset from different perspectives.

### 3.4 Discussion and Outlook

With CJM-ex, we have demonstrated that many journeys can be displayed onto CJM in an intelligible and efficient manner, offering an alternative to a BPM representation. As Gartner highlighted, CJMs should be used to complement, but not to replace, BPMs, [76]. By leveraging a standard born within the process mining taskforce (i.e., XES) and by mimicking a typical process mining activity (i.e., discovery), we bring these techniques closer together. However, further research is required to fully understand how they can complement each other. This is a call to the process mining and business process management communities to consider CJMs as an integral part of the process management toolkit.

Note that we discuss the limitation in terms of evaluation of this chapter in the conclusion of the thesis (page 86).



## Chapter 4

# CJM-ab: Abstracting Customer Journey Maps using Process Mining

**Abstract.** Customer journey mapping (CJM) is a popular technique used to increase a company's understanding of their customers. In its simplest form, a CJM shows the main customer journeys. Complex customers' journeys are difficult to apprehend, losing the benefit of using a CJM. We propose CJM-ab (for CJM abstractor) a solution that leverages the expertise of process discovery algorithms from the process mining discipline to abstract CJMs. Our tool, CJM-ab, can leverage process mining models, namely process trees, and business owners' knowledge to semi-automatically build a CJM at different levels of granularity. We applied our approach to a dataset describing a complex process, and shows that our technique can abstract it in a meaningful way. By doing so, we contribute by showing how process mining and CJM can be put closer together.

### 4.1 Introduction

A customer journey map (CJM) is a conceptual tool used to visualize typical customers' journeys when using a service. In their simplest form, CJMs show the interactions between a customer and a service provider through time. A series of interactions is called a journey. Because CJMs give a company a better understanding of their customers, they are becoming increasingly popular amongst practitioners. A CJM can be used as a design thinking tool by internal stakeholders to anticipate the best – or worst – journeys possible. Such journeys, displayed on a CJM, are called the *expected journeys*. However, customers might experience a different journey from the one anticipated. For this reason, in chapters 2 to 3,




Fig. 4.1 Three possible ways of displaying the handling of reviews for a journal from [92] on a CJM: ❶ projecting the actual journeys (only the first 100 – out of 10,000 – journeys are displayed); ❷ using two representative journeys; and, ❸ using two representative journeys and abstracting the activities using the technique presented in this paper.

we propose leveraging traces left by customers in information systems to build CJMs from evidence. Because the journeys that will be displayed on the CJM are produced from facts, we refer to them as the *actual journeys*. Such approaches are in line with the urgent call from the authors Lemon and Verhoef to take a data-driven approach to map the customer journey [63].

However, when dealing with numerous journeys, it becomes unrealistic to display all the actual journeys on a single CJM. For illustration purposes, Fig. 4.1 depicts 10,000 instances of the traces related to the handling of reviews for a journal, a synthetic dataset available in [92]. In the context of this dataset, *the service provider* is the conference’s organizing committee, *the customers* are the researchers submitting their papers, and *a journey* describes the handling of the reviews, from the submission until the final decision. In Fig. 4.1, part ❶, it is difficult to apprehend the typical journeys of the reviewing process. To this end, *representative journeys* have been introduced as a means of reducing the complexity. Indeed, the central CJM (❷) uses two representative journeys to summarize 10,000 actual journeys. Although representative journeys decrease the complexity by reducing the number of journeys, a CJM might still be difficult to apprehend when it is composed of many activities. Indeed, even though only representative journeys are used, quickly spotting the main differences between the two journeys visible in ❷ (Fig. 4.1) is not straightforward due to the high number of activities and the length of the journeys.

We propose CJM-ab (for CJM abstractor) a solution that leverages the expertise of process discovery algorithms from the process mining discipline to abstract CJMs. More precisely, we take as an input a process tree, we parse it, starting from the leaves, and iteratively ask the end-user if it is relevant to merge the activities






Fig. 4.2 One of the possible process trees given the event log  $T = \{\langle BDCEF \rangle, \langle ACDEFG \rangle, \langle BCDEFGG \rangle\}$ .

that belong to the same control-flow, and, if so, to provide a name for this group of activities. By doing so, we let the end-user decide which activities should be merged and how they should be renamed. Then, one can visualize the same CJMs at different levels of granularity using a slider, which is visible in Fig. 4.1, part ③. At a certain level of granularity, we clearly observe, given the end activities, that one representative journey summarizes the accepted papers, while the other one depicts the rejected papers. The importance and originality of CJM-ab is that it explores, for the first time, a seamless integration of business process models with customer journeys maps.

The chapter is organized as follows. Chapter 4.2 introduces process mining and the process discovery activity. Chapter 4.3 describes our algorithm, and Chapter 4.4 provides a demonstration. Finally, Chapter 4.5 opens a discussion and concludes the chapter.

## 4.2 Background

### 4.2.1 Process Mining and Process Discovery

Our approach is a seamless integration of Process Mining with Customer Journey Mapping and showcases the impact that the latter can have in the analysis of journeys. Process mining is an emerging discipline sitting between machine learning and data mining on the one hand, and process modeling and analysis on the other [94]. In this research, we focus on the discovery of process models, one of the three types of process mining along with conformance and enhancement.

The idea behind the discovery of process models is to leverage the evidence left in information systems to build process models from event logs. The resulting process models are, therefore, based on factual data, showing how the process was really executed. To build such a model, process mining uses an input data format called event logs. An event log is a collection of traces, a trace being a single execution of a process composed of one or multiple activities.

For illustration purposes, let  $T = \{\langle \text{BDCEF} \rangle, \langle \text{ACDEFG} \rangle, \langle \text{BCDEFGG} \rangle\}$  be an event log composed of 3 traces and 7 distinct activities. Regardless of the notation, the resulting models can express the control-flow relations between activities. For instance, for the event log,  $T$ , the model might express the following notation: (1) A and B are in an XOR relation ( $\times$ ); i.e., only one of them is executed; (2) C and D are executed in parallel ( $+$ ); i.e., both activities are executed in any order; (3) E and F are in a sequence relation ( $\rightarrow$ ); i.e., F always follows E; (4) G is in a XOR loop (Combination of  $\times$  and  $\odot$ ); i.e., it can be executed 0 or many times. Note that  $\tau$  denotes a silent activity. It is used to correctly execute the process but it will not result in an activity which will be visible in the event logs. Fig. 4.2 displays the five aforementioned relations using a process tree.

Discovering a process model from event logs is challenging. Indeed, process mining algorithms need to be robust enough to generalize (to avoid overfitting models) without being too generic. They should also try to build process models that are as simple as possible [2]. Many representations exist to express the discovered process models: Petri nets, process trees, or bpmn models, to name a few. The next section introduces the notation used by our algorithm: process trees.

**Process Tree.** A process tree is an abstract hierarchical representation of a process model introduced by Vanhatalo et al. [98], where the leaves are annotated with activities and all the other nodes are annotated with operators such as  $\times$  [59]. One interesting characteristic of process trees is that they guarantee the soundness of the models, i.e., all activities can be executed and the end of the process can be reached. The soundness guarantee is one reason that we choose the process tree notation. There are also three other reasons. First, process models in block structure achieve best performance in terms of fitness, precision, and complexity [2]. Second, the hierarchical structure of process trees is ideal to derive multiple levels of granularity. Finally, according to Augusto et al. [2], process trees are used by top-performing process model algorithms, such as the inductive miner [60–62] or the Evolutionary Tree Miner [23].

### 4.2.2 Customer Journey Discovery

In [6] (Chapter 1), we proposed a process mining based model that allows us to map a standard event log from process mining (i.e., XES [47]) to store customer journeys, a first attempt to bring customer journeys and process mining closer together.

Similar to how process discovery algorithms discover process models, we aim to discover a CJM from event logs. Instead of describing the control flows of activities using a business process model, the main journeys (i.e., the representative journeys) are shown using a CJM. It encompasses three important challenges.

First, the number of representative journeys needs to be set ( $k$ ). Looking at ❶ from Fig. 4.1, it is difficult to say how many representative journeys should be used to summarize the data. We identify two ways to solve this challenge. The number of representative journeys can be set manually, or it can also be set using standard model selection techniques such as the Bayesian Information Criterion (BIC) penalty [81], or the Calinski-Harabasz index [24].

Second, once  $k$  has been defined, actual journeys should be split in  $k$  clusters and a representative journey per cluster must be found. One of the ways, presented in Chapter 3, is to first define a distance function between actual journeys, such as the edit distance, or shingles, and to build a distance matrix; then, to split the actual journeys in  $k$  groups using hierarchical clustering techniques.

Third, one needs to define the  $k$  representative journeys. They can be found using a frequent sequence mining algorithm [5], by counting the density of sequences in the neighborhood of each candidate sequence [44], by taking the most frequent sequences [44], or by taking the medoid [44]. Instead of inferring the representative from the distance matrix, it is also possible to obtain it using statistical modeling [44]. We can employ an Expectation-Maximization algorithm on a mixture of  $k$  Markov models, and then for each Markov model the journey with the highest probability becomes the representative [49].

The next section describes a novel way to leverage business process models to abstract customer journey maps.

### 4.3 Abstracting Customer Journeys using Process Trees

CJM-ab uses four steps to render a CJM at different levels of abstraction. They are depicted in Fig. 4.3. This chapter introduces each step. In the first step, the goal is to build a process tree given an event log. This can be done using the technique introduced in Chapter 4.2.1. Next, using the same event log, the goal is to build a CJM using the technique introduced in Chapter 4.2.2.

The third step consists of parsing the tree obtained in step 1. We use a reverse breadth-first search, i.e., we traverse the operators in the tree from the lowest ones to the root in a level-wise way. At each operator of the process tree, we offer the opportunity to the end-user to merge the leaves under the operator. If the user chooses to merge the activities, she should provide a new name and the operator




Fig. 4.3 Rendering a CJM at different levels of abstraction in four steps.

virtually becomes a leaf. If the end-user chooses not to merge the activities, we keep the leaves intact. Otherwise, we keep the activities separated at all levels of granularities, and we also disable the parents' steps. Indeed, we postulate that if a user does not want to merge two activities at a low level of granularity, it does not make sense to merge them later at a higher level of granularity.

```

Input :  $cjm$ , customer journey map
          $\lambda$ , level of abstraction
          $pt$ , process tree annotated with merging decisions
Output:  $cjm_\lambda$ , cjm at the level of abstraction  $\lambda$ 
1 Function  $GetLevelAbstraction(cjm, \lambda, pt)$ 
2   for  $i \leftarrow 0$  to  $\lambda$  do
3      $cjm \rightarrow Abstract(cjm, pt.operator_i)$  // Renaming the activities according to the
4     return  $cjm$ 
5 Function  $Abstract(cjm, op)$ 
6   foreach  $journey$  in  $cjm$  do
7      $journey.replace(op.leaves, op.new\_name, removeSeqRepeats=True)$ 
8   return  $cjm$ 

```

**Algorithm 1:** Function to get to the level of complexity  $\lambda$ .

Finally, in step 4, we transform the CJM at different levels of abstraction. Let  $\lambda$  be the number of abstractions which will be available for a CJM. It can be seen as the number of steps that will be included in the sliders visible in Fig. 4.1, part ③. Note that  $\lambda$  is equal to the number of times the end-user decides to merge the activities. Let  $operator_\lambda$  be the  $\lambda^{th}$  operator to be merged. Let  $GetLevelAbstraction(cjm, \lambda, pt)$  be a function that returns a CJM at the  $\lambda^{th}$  level of abstraction. Algorithm 1 shows how the function  $Abstract$  is recursively called to get to the level of abstraction  $\lambda$ . The parameter  $removeSeqRepeats$  in Algorithm 1 in line 7 emphasizes that continuous sequence of activities that are to be replaced, will be replaced by only one instance of the new name given for this operator. For instance, if the journey is "AABCBCBAC", the leaves that are to be replaced, are "A" and "B" and the new name is "X", the journey will become "XCXC". This reduces the length of the journeys and, thus, increases the abstraction. One can




Fig. 4.4 Process tree annotated with the order in which the operators are parsed (i.e., ‘iter. step’) and the decisions to merge the activities or not (i.e., colors red and green).

go back from more abstract to fine granular again by calling `GetLevelAbstraction()` again with a smaller  $\lambda$ . The next section illustrates these four steps with a running example.

## 4.4 Demonstration

This section provides a running example of our developed tool. The running example is based on synthetic event logs describing the handling of reviews for a journal (from [92]) cited in the introduction. It contains 10,000 journeys and 236,360 activities. This demonstration is available on <http://customer-journey.unil.ch/cjm-ab/>. In the first step, we obtained a process tree by using the inductive miner [59] with default parameters.<sup>13</sup> It results in the process tree visible in Fig. 4.4. In the second step, we obtain a CJM by: (1) measuring the distance between actual journeys using the edit distance; (2) building a dendrogram using a hierarchical clustering algorithm; (3) finding  $k$  using the Calinski-Harabaz Score ( $k=2$ ); (4) finding representative journeys using the function ‘seqrep’ available in Traminer, a R package.<sup>14</sup> It results in a CJM which is visible in ② (Fig. 4.1). In the third step, we parse the XML in javascript. To traverse the tree, we are using a tree-like data structures<sup>15</sup>. The order in which the operators are parsed is depicted in Fig. 4.4 (i.e., ‘step’). Fig. 4.4 shows that we decided to merge 7 out of the 9 operators (in green in Fig. 4.4). Note that we decided not to merge the activities ‘reject’ and

<sup>13</sup>Using the software ProM available at <http://www.promtools.org/doku.php>. Last visited: 18th of March 2020.

<sup>14</sup>Available at: <http://traminer.unige.ch/doc/seqrep.html>. Last visited: 18th of March 2020.

<sup>15</sup>Available at: <https://github.com/joaonuno/tree-model-js>. Last visited: 11th of March 2020.

## Make CJM simpler with process tree

According to the process tree, the following activities are in a **xor** relation:

- get review 3
- time-out 3

Does it make sense to merge them into a single activity ?

No

review 3

Yes

Fig. 4.5 Screen shot of the application during the merging process at 'step 1'.




Fig. 4.6 Results at the levels of abstraction 1, 3, and 7.

'accept', which disabled the option of merging all the activities below step 9. The Fig 4.5 shows a screenshot of the application when merging the activities during step 1. Finally, the Fig. 4.6 shows the resulting CJMs at three levels of abstraction.

## 4.5 Conclusion

CJMs are being used more and more to help service providers put themselves in their customers' shoes. However, very little research has investigated automated ways of building them. We contribute by showing how a process mining model can be used to guide the abstraction of a CJM. By answering few questions about the merging of the activities and by playing with the abstraction sliders, we anticipate that our tool allows practitioners to gain new insights about their data. By leveraging process trees – a format built within the process mining community – we can bring customer journey analytics and process mining closer together. We expect that many algorithms and works from process mining are relevant for the discovery of customer journeys.

Note that we discuss the limitation in terms of evaluation of this chapter in the conclusion of the thesis (page 86).

## Chapter 5

# Truncated Trace Classifier. Removal of Incomplete Traces from Event Logs.

**Abstract.** Process mining can analyze event logs to extract fact-based insights about business processes. However, performing analysis on event logs that contain truncated (also called incomplete) traces is problematic because their presence negatively impacts the process mining outcomes. We propose the Truncated Trace Classifier (TTC), an algorithm that distinguishes truncated traces from completed ones. We benchmark 5 TTC implementations that use either LSTM or XGBOOST on 13 real-life event logs. Accurate TTCs have great potential. In fact, filtering truncated traces before applying a process discovery algorithm greatly improves the precision of the discovered process models, by 9.1%. Moreover, we show that TTCs increase the accuracy of a next event prediction algorithm by up to 7.5%.

### 5.1 Introduction

The execution of a business process often leaves trails in information systems called event logs. Using these event logs, process mining techniques can extract data-driven insights about business processes. For example, it is possible to discover process models from event logs [62], to predict the next event [8, 85], or to assess whether an ongoing process will fulfill a time constraint [35].

A truncated trace is a trace where the last events are missing. In fact, these events happened or will happen, but they are not available at the time of the analysis. The presence of truncated traces in event logs is acknowledged by

researchers [16, 40, 94, 100]. Interestingly, organizers of the latest edition of the Process Discovery Contest [25]—a contest where participants have to infer process models from event logs—have included truncated traces to make the synthetic event logs more realistic.

We propose a Truncated Trace Classifier (TTC) that distinguishes truncated traces from the ones that are not truncated. We refer to the latter as the ‘complete trace’. We foresee three benefits of using a TTC. First, a TTC can filter truncated traces. This is important because the success of process mining depends on the quality of the input event logs [18, 29, 84, 93]. Second, a TTC helps to increase operational efficiency. For instance, a ticket in a call center might stay open for several days because an agent forgot to close it or because the customer did not follow up on a requested action. Using a TTC, we could avoid the manual task of closing them by doing it in an automated manner. Third, a TTC has potential that goes beyond filtering techniques. For instance, we show in this work that a TTC can improve the accuracy of predicting the next event.

It is not uncommon to read that truncated traces can be filtered out by looking at the very last event [16, 40, 94, 100]. For example, a ticket is complete only when the activity ‘closing the ticket’ happens. However, such a closing event might not exist. Instead, a recurring one might occur [82]. For instance, the event ‘delivering package’ might be a good indicator to predict that an order is fulfilled, but it might reoccur if some items are being shipped separately. In such a case, relying on the very last event will result in a poorly performing TTC. This observation is in line with the conclusion drawn by Conforti et al. that existing techniques to filter traces are often simplistic [29].

To the best of our knowledge, we are the first work focusing on building an accurate TTC. Our contributions are the following: (1) We propose five machine learning-based TTC implementations. (2) We benchmark these five implementations and a baseline approach using 13 event logs. (3) We highlight the benefit of using a TTC for two process mining tasks, that of process discovery and next event prediction.

The rest of this chapter is organized as follows. In Chapter 5.2, we provide an overview of process mining and define truncated traces. In Chapter 5.3, we propose several approaches to building a TTC, which we benchmark in Chapter 5.4. Chapters 5.5 and 5.6 demonstrate the value of a TTC by showing how it can increase the process model precision and next event prediction, respectively. In Chapter 5.7, we discuss related work and we conclude in Chapter 5.8.



## 5.2 Preliminaries

In this section, we briefly introduce the process mining discipline. Then, we define truncated traces.

### 5.2.1 Process Mining

Process mining brings data science and business process management closer together [94]. As stated in the process mining manifesto, the starting point of process mining is an event log [93]. An event log contains traces, which are sequences of events. Event logs often contain additional information such as a timestamp or the resource. We will use the simple event log definition introduced in [94]. A simple trace  $\sigma$  is a sequence of events. A simple event log  $L$  is a multi-set of traces. For example,  $L = [\langle abc \rangle^3, \langle ab \rangle^2]$  is an event log containing 5 traces and 13 events. Taking an event log as input, several process mining techniques are available. Typically, a process discovery algorithm such as the inductive miner, [60], can infer the most likely business process model behind an event log. To ensure that process mining works well, event logs need to be noise-free [29, 84, 93]. Truncation is one type of noise [33], which we introduce in the next section.

### 5.2.2 Truncated Traces

A truncated trace is an ongoing trace where the end of the process is missing. Truncated traces are sometimes referred to as ‘incomplete cases’ [40, 100], ‘incomplete traces’ [16], or ‘missing heads’ [84]. We favor the term truncated over the term incomplete as the latter is often used for the concept of ‘event log incompleteness’, referring to the fact that an event log will most likely not contain all the combinations of behaviors that are possible because there are too many of them [93]. For instance, when there is a loop in the process model, the number of unique combinations is infinite. Event logs will most likely be incomplete while they may not contain truncated traces.

There are several reasons to explain the existence of incomplete traces. They might exist because of a flawed event log extraction process that cuts the traces at a fixed date, leaving the traces that finish after truncated. This issue—named ‘the snapshots challenge’—has been identified by van der Aalst as one of the five challenges that occurs when extracting event logs [94, chapter 5.3]. This type of truncated trace could be avoided by extracting only the traces where no event happens after the extraction date. However, once the data is extracted, we cannot know which traces are truncated. As another example, incomplete traces can

Trace	#	Input Sample	Target: (Truncated?)
<abc>	1	a	true
	2	ab	true
	3	abc	false
<acadd>	4	a	true
	5	ac	true
	6	aca	true
	7	acad	true
	8	acadd	false

Fig. 5.1 The traces  $\langle abc \rangle$  and  $\langle acadd \rangle$  result in eight samples.

exist because the events have not happened yet. This is especially relevant when working with streaming data. Finally, truncated traces can result from a wrong execution (e.g., the ticket was supposed to be closed but the agent forgot to do it) or when the information system fails. In the next section, we introduce a classifier to automatically detect truncated traces.

### 5.3 Truncated Trace Classifier

A TTC inputs the current execution of a trace and predicts whether it is truncated. As shown in Table 5.1, we generate one input sample and one target for each prefix length of each trace. The input sample represents the current state of the process on which we apply a TTC. The target is a binary label that is ‘true’ when the trace is truncated or ‘false’ otherwise.

This setting implies that ‘real’ truncated traces that we would like to identify as such using the TTC would be labeled as complete. However, our intuition is that the model will also learn from similar complete traces where the truncated parts will be labeled as ‘truncated’. For illustration purposes, let us define the following event logs:  $\langle abc^3, ab \rangle$ . During the training phase, the sequence  $ab$  appears three times as ‘truncated’ and once as ‘complete’. Hence, during the prediction phase, the sequence  $ab$  would most likely be predicted as ‘truncated’.

To build a classifier, we need to map the input sample to a feature space. There are several options to do so, covered in depth in [64, 100–102]. We provide non-exhaustive examples that are illustrated in Fig. 5.2.

**Last Event.** Relying only on the last event to predict that a trace is truncated is one option often mentioned in the literature [16, 40, 94, 100]. For example, the input for sample #3 from Fig. 5.1 would be ‘c’.



Fig. 5.2 Illustration of the feature spaces for the input samples  $\langle aca \rangle$  and  $\langle acad \rangle$ .

Fig. 5.3 Five implemented TTCs.

**Frequency.** The ‘frequency’ feature space counts the occurrences of each event. As shown in Fig. 5.2,  $\langle aca \rangle$  becomes  $\{a:2, b:0, c:1, d:0\}$ . This feature space does not record the order in which the events appear.

**Sequence Tensor.** A sequence tensor contains an extra ‘timestep’ dimension. Each timestep is a matrix similar to the ‘last event’; i.e., it describes which event happens. The extra dimension allows to describe the full sequence of timesteps in a lossless way. The number of timesteps is equal to the longest sequence in the event logs.

Once the input samples have been mapped into a feature space, it can be fed together with the target to a classifier. We propose five TTC implementations depicted in Fig. 5.3. As can be seen in Fig. 5.3, We also add a few base features: (1) the number of activities in the prefix, (2) the number of seconds since the first event in the trace, and (3) the number of seconds since the previous event in the trace. Such extra features were also added in the predictive business process monitoring proposed by Tax et al. [85]. The five TTCs are described below.

**1 LA** (Last Activity). This TTC relies on the last activity to predict that the trace is truncated.

**2 FB** (Frequency Based). This TTC uses the ‘frequency’ feature space described in Section 5.3.

**3 FB&LA**. This TTC concatenates the TTCs ‘1 LA’ and ‘2 FB’ because they both convey complementary information.

**4 Soft** (Softmax). This TTC corresponds to a next event prediction algorithm. In fact, the implementation is similar to the predictive business process monitoring from Tax et al. [85]. Predicting which event will occur is a multi-class prediction problem. Thus, we rely on the Softmax function because it transforms the output to a probability distribution. The end of the process is treated as any other event. If the latter is predicted as the most likely next event, we predict that the trace is complete. If not, we predict that the trace is truncated.

**5 Sig** (Sigmoid). The TTC ‘5 Sig’ turns the multi-class problem into a binary one by using a one-vs-all strategy with the special ‘end’ event. We implemented both TTCs to compare the accuracy when the neural network is specially trained to recognize truncated traces (‘5 Sig’) or when the task is to predict the next event (‘4 Soft’).

TTCs 1 to 3 use XGBoost<sup>16</sup> [26], which stands for eXtreme Gradient Boosting. It relies on an ensemble of decision trees to predict the target. This technique is widely used among the winning solutions in machine learning challenges [26]. For the main settings, we set the number of trees to 200 and the maximum depth of the trees to 8. The last two TTCs rely on a neural network implemented in Keras [28]. As shown in Fig. 5.3, the architecture has two inputs. First, the sequence tensor is passed to a Long Short-Term Memory (LSTM) network. LSTM is a special type of Recurrent Neural Network (RNN) introduced in [52]. Compared to RNN, LSTM possesses a more advanced memory cell that gives LSTM powerful modeling capabilities for long-term dependencies [85]. The output of the LSTM network and the base features are provided to a fully connected layer. Both the LSTM network and the fully connected layer have 16 cells. We use Adam [55] as an optimizer and we set the number of epochs to 100.

## 5.4 Benchmark

In this section, we benchmark the five TTCs described in the previous section, in addition to a baseline approach.

<sup>16</sup>Available at <https://github.com/dmlc/xgboost/tree/master/python-package>

### 5.4.1 Datasets

We used 13 event logs<sup>17</sup> well known in the process mining literature. The event logs come from “real-life” systems, offering the advantage of containing complex traces and a wide range of characteristics visible in Table 5.1.

To the best of our knowledge, these event logs do not contain truncated traces. However, this is difficult to confirm. For instance, exceptional events might happen several months after the event log extraction date. In general, without having a deep expertise of the domain under analysis and direct access to the person in charge of the dataset extraction, it is not possible to guarantee that all traces are complete. We use the term ‘false complete’ to refer to traces that we wrongly consider complete during the training phase but that are in fact truncated because more events will happen. We claim that a TTC should be resilient to ‘false complete’. In other words, a TTC should not overfit on a single ‘false complete’ and wrongly classify all similar traces as complete.

To test the resilience of the TTCs, we generated 0%, 10%, and 20% of ‘false complete’ traces by randomly cutting them. The setting with 0% of ‘false complete’ reflects how the TTC should be used with a real dataset, i.e., considering all the traces as complete. For the two other settings, we kept track of the traces that are truncated and refer to them as ‘ground truth’. To benchmark the various TTCs, we use the ground truth. For instance, let us define that  $\langle abc \rangle$  is a complete trace that we randomly cut to become the following ‘false complete’:  $\langle ab \rangle$ . During the training phase, we train the classifier to consider  $\langle ab \rangle$  as a complete trace, while during the evaluation  $\langle ab \rangle$  should be classified as truncated to be well classified.

### 5.4.2 Baseline: Decreasing Factor

Standard process mining tools and libraries such as the plugin ‘Filter Log using Simple Heuristics’ in ProM<sup>18</sup>, the software Disco<sup>19</sup> or the Python library PM4Py [14] offer some options to remove truncated traces. Typically, a set of ending activities is selected by the end-user and the traces that do terminate with the ending activities are considered truncated and removed. It is also possible to automatically determine the set of ending activities. Let  $S$  be the set of ending activities that we will use to filter the truncated traces. As a baseline, we use the method implemented in PM4Py which works as follows: First, the number of occurrences of each activity as a last activity is counted. Let  $C_i$  be the count of the

<sup>17</sup>Downloaded from [https://data.4tu.nl/repository/collection:event\\_logs\\_real](https://data.4tu.nl/repository/collection:event_logs_real)

<sup>18</sup><http://www.promtools.org>

<sup>19</sup><https://fluxicon.com/disco/>

Table 5.1 Characteristics of the 13 datasets.

Dataset	# $\sigma$	#activities	Unique activities	Max Length( $\sigma$ )	Min Length( $\sigma$ )	Mean Length( $\sigma$ )
BPI_12	13.1K	164.5K	23	96	3	12.6
BPI_13_CP	1.5K	6.7K	7	35	1	4.5
BPI_13_i	7.6K	65.5K	13	123	1	8.7
BPI_15_1	1.2K	52.2K	398	101	2	43.6
BPI_15_2	0.8K	44.4K	410	132	1	53.3
BPI_15_3	1.4K	59.7K	383	124	3	42.4
BPI_15_4	1.1K	47.3K	356	116	1	44.9
BPI_15_5	1.2K	59.1K	389	154	5	51.1
BPI_17	31.5K	561.7K	26	61	8	17.8
BPI_18	2.0K	123.3K	129	680	35	61.9
BPI_19	251.7K	1.6M	42	990	1	6.3
Env_permit	0.9K	38.9K	381	95	2	41.6
Helpdesk	3.8K	13.7K	9	14	1	3.6

$i^{th}$  most frequent end activity. We start by adding the most frequent end activity,  $C_1$ , to  $S$ . Then, we calculate the decreasing factor of the next most frequent activity using the following formula:  $C_i/C_{i-1}$ . If the decreasing factor is above a defined threshold we add  $C_i$  to  $S$  and move to next most frequent activity. If the threshold is not met, we stop the process. We tried the following thresholds: 0.40, 0.45, 0.50, 0.55, 0.60, 0.65, and 0.70. We report the results obtained using a threshold of 0.60 as it is the one that yields the best accuracy to detect truncated traces. Interestingly, it is also the default value in PM4Py.

### 5.4.3 Evaluation

The first 80% of the traces were used to train the model, and the evaluation was done on the remaining 20%. Out of the 80% of training data, 20% was used to validate the parameters. To compare the ground truth with the output of the TTC, we used the Matthews Correlation Coefficient (MCC) [69]. The MCC has the nice property of using all the quantities of the confusion matrix, i.e., True Positive (TP), True Negative (TN), False Positive (FP), and False Negative (FN). Its value lies between -1 and 1, where 0 represents a random prediction, 1 a perfect score, and -1 an inverse prediction. It is defined as:

$$MCC(\sigma) = \frac{TP \cdot TN - FP \cdot FN}{\sqrt{(TP + FN)(FP + FN)(TN + FP)(TN + FN)}}$$

Fig. 5.4 aggregates the results per TTC, while Fig. 5.5 contains the detailed results. In Fig. 5.5, we can see a large MCC score gap per dataset. This gap highlights the various levels of complexity involved in detecting truncated traces. Also, none of the techniques always outperforms the others. This is in line with a similar conclusion that was drawn from large predictive business process monitoring experiments [34]. Nonetheless, when looking at Fig. 5.4, we observe that the TTC ‘3 FB&LA’ has the highest median MCC score. Interestingly, the performance of the baseline is comparable to the best implementations for the following five datasets: BPI\_13\_CP, BPI\_13\_i, BPI\_18, Env\_permit, Helpdesk (see Fig. 5.5). For the other eight datasets, there is a clear drop in performance between the baseline and more sophisticated methods. Looking at Table 5.1, we do not see any clear dataset characteristics to explain the performance gap. We conclude that looking at the last activity might work well, but for some datasets it is better to use a more sophisticated TTC.

We also tested the null hypothesis that the results from different TTCs come from the same distribution. To do this, we ran a permutation test with 100,000 random permutations and a p-value of 0.05. The results are visible in Fig. 5.6. As can be seen, ‘3 FB&LA’ outperforms the baseline approach with strong statistical significance. We also observe that transforming a multi-class problem into a binary classifier—using the ‘4 Soft’ instead of the ‘5 Sig’—does not seem to improve the ability of the TTC to detect truncated traces, as the MCC scores of Fig. 5.4 are comparable.

Fig. 5.7 compares the execution time per TTC. The baseline takes in the order of milliseconds to run. TTCs that are based on XGboost take in the order of seconds or minutes to run, while approaches that rely on neural networks take from minutes to hours to run. In fact, the ‘4 Soft’ and ‘5 Sig’ are on average 112 times slower than the other TTCs that rely on XGBoost.

The full benchmark implementations, the parameters, and the event logs, as well as the results are available online<sup>20</sup>. The machine used for the experiment has 61GB of RAM, 4 CPUs, and a GPU that speeds up the neural network training phase.

## 5.5 Improving Discovered Process Models with a TTC

A process discovery algorithm discovers a process model from an event log [94]. Because the discovered process model is based on event logs, it offers the advan-

<sup>20</sup><https://github.com/gaelbernard/truncated-trace-classifier>




Fig. 5.4 Boxplot showing the MCC scores per technique. Each dot depicts an individual value. The median is written on top.

tage of being a data-driven approach that shows how the process is really executed. However, discovering a process model from an event log is a challenging task. Typically, process discovery algorithms are sensitive to noise [84, 29, 93, 18]. Applying process mining techniques on traces that must supposedly be complete but are instead truncated is no exception. The quality of a process model is commonly measured using four competing metrics [93]: (1) The *precision* measures to what extent behaviors that were not observed can be replayed on the process model. (2) The *fitness* measures to what extent the traces from the event logs can be replayed on the model. (3) The *generalization* ensures that the model does not overfit. Finally, (4) the *simplicity* measures the complexity involved to read the process model. When facing truncated traces, a process discovery algorithm will wrongly infer that the process can be stopped in the middle. This will negatively impact the precision of the discovered process model. To solve this issue, researchers advocate removing truncated traces [16, 94, 100]. As highlighted by Conforti et al., “[t]he presence of noise tends to lower precision as this noise introduces spurious connections between event labels” [29].

We ran an experiment to measure the impact of removing truncated traces on the quality of the process models using PM4Py [14], a process mining library in Python. We used the default metrics in PM4Py which are described in the following papers: precision [72], fitness [94, p. 250], generalization [23], and simplicity [17]. To start, we randomly generated 100 process models with the PM4py implementation of PTandLogGenerator [53], using the default parameters<sup>21</sup>. For each process model, we produced an event log containing 1,000 traces. We produced 20 variations of each event log with a level of noise ranging from 0 to 1, where 0 means that no traces were truncated and 0.05 means that 5% of the traces were

<sup>21</sup>Visible at: <https://pm4py.fit.fraunhofer.de/documentation#process-tree-generation>






Fig. 5.5 Detailed MCC score.

	0 Baseline	1 LA	2 FB	3 LA&FB	4 Sig	5 Soft
0 Baseline		.147	.141	.008	.146	.151
1 LA	.147		.986	.204	.929	.974
2 FB	.141	.986		.206	.941	.959
3 LA&FB	.008	.204	.206		.268	.188
4 Sig	.146	.929	.941	.268		.906
5 Soft	.151	.974	.959	.188	.906	

Fig. 5.6 P-values of the permutation tests between the MCC scores per techniques.




Fig. 5.7 Execution time for the five TTCs. The vertical axis uses a logarithmic scale.

truncated, and so on. Altogether, this process produced 20,000 event logs. For each of the 20,000 event logs, we ran the following experiment: (1) We applied the Inductive Miner [60] on the event logs to discover a process model, and (2) then we replayed the original event log—that did not contain the truncated traces—on the process model to measure the quality of the discovered process models. This was the experiment without a TTC. For the experiment with a TTC, we applied the exact same steps, but, beforehand, we automatically removed the truncated traces with the TTC ‘3 FB&LA’ described in Section 5.3.

In Fig. 5.8, the results are averaged. As can be seen, the precision and the generalization metrics are greatly improved, while the simplicity and the fitness dimensions are negatively impacted. Table 5.9 shows that the average process quality is improved by 1.7%. Fig. 5.8 shows the link between the ratio of truncated traces in the event logs and the quality of the resulting process models. The average process quality visible at the top of Fig. 5.8 shows that when there are some truncated traces in the event logs, applying the TTC is always beneficial. In the next section, we show that a TTC can also increase the prediction of the next events.

## 5.6 Improving Next Event Prediction with a TTC

The goal of a next event algorithm is to predict the most likely event that will follow a truncated trace. As shown with the ‘4 Soft’ TTC, we can turn a next event algorithm into a TTC. Looking at the benchmark in Fig. 5.4, we show that the TTC




Fig. 5.8 Impact of the truncated traces on the process model qualities.

Fig. 5.9 Mean process quality of the discovered process models with and without the TTC.

Process Quality Dimension	without ttc	with ttc	increase
Precision	0.4829	0.5267	9.1%
Generalization	0.7413	0.8112	9.4%
Fitness	0.9687	0.9523	-1.7%
Simplicity	0.6328	0.5833	-7.8%
Average	0.7064	0.7184	1.7%

Table 5.2 Comparing the accuracy of predicting the next event and the execution time, without and with a TTC.

Dataset	Accuracy			Execution time (in seconds)		
	without ttc	with ttc	increase	without ttc	with ttc	increase
BPI_12	0.6899	0.6896	-	1060	1066	0.6%
BPI_13_CP	0.5559	0.5559	-	172	172	-
BPI_13_i	0.6478	0.6486	0.1%	519	521	0.4%
BPI_15_1	0.0851	0.0915	7.5%	324	347	6.6%
BPI_15_2	0.1509	0.1584	5.0%	606	628	3.5%
BPI_15_3	0.1364	0.1364	-	851	873	2.5%
BPI_15_4	0.1385	0.1394	0.6%	366	383	4.4%
BPI_15_5	0.0873	0.0884	1.3%	634	663	4.4%
BPI_17	0.7642	0.7689	0.6%	2318	2342	1.0%
BPI_18	0.6277	0.6323	0.7%	786	804	2.2%
BPI_19	0.4755	0.4855	2.1%	8674	8797	1.4%
Env_permit	0.2325	0.2324	-	373	388	3.9%
Helpdesk	0.8226	0.8226	-	116	116	-

'3 FB&LA' outperforms the TTC '4 Soft'. We have the intuition that combining the best TTC with a next event algorithm will increase the prediction accuracy. The rationale is that we will more accurately predict the end of the process with a TTC because it has been trained for this purpose. Hence, we first rely on the TTC to predict if more events are expected. If not, we do not need to call the next event algorithm. Overall, we should improve the results as we avoid predicting a next event when the trace is not truncated. The goal of this section is to validate this hypothesis.

As it is initially a next event prediction algorithm, we use the TTC '4 Soft' for the prediction of the next event. In the setting without a TTC, it is the only algorithm involved. In the version with a TTC, we complement the architecture with the TTC '3 FB&LA' in the following way. First, we assess if the trace is truncated using the TTC. If the trace is truncated, we predict the next event. Conversely, if the trace is already complete, we do not need to predict the next event. The results are visible in Table 5.2. Including a TTC improves the accuracy by up to 7.5% and on average by 1.4%. In the experiment, building the TTC took an extra 2.4% of duration. We claim that including a TTC is beneficial for the accuracy while having a limited negative execution time impact. A TTC solves one problem noted by Tax et al.: "We found that LSTMs have problems [...] to predict overly long sequences of the same activity, resulting in predicted suffixes that are much longer than the ground truth suffixes" [85].

## 5.7 Related Work

To the best of our knowledge we are the first to focus on the task of distinguishing truncated from complete traces. Still, existing works—especially in the area of predictive process monitoring—are relevant to uncover truncated traces.

Predictive process monitoring anticipates whether a running process instance will comply with a predicate [35]. For instance, a predicate might be about the process execution time, the execution of a specific event, or the total amount of sales. As highlighted by Verenich et al., techniques in this space differ according to their object of prediction [101]. A TTC is a specific type of predictive process monitoring task where the predicate is whether we will observe more events. In [66], Maggi et al. propose a generic predictive process monitoring approach. Once the predicate is set, the most similar prefixes are selected based on the edit distance. Finally, a classifier is used to correlate the goal with the data associated with the process execution. Insights are then provided to the end-user to optimize the fulfillment of the goal while the process is being executed. It was later extended with a clustering step to decrease the prediction time [35]. Tax et al. propose a neural network that leverages LSTM that could serve as another generic predictive process monitoring algorithm capable of fitting different predicates [85]. In our work, we use the approach from Tax et al. as a baseline (i.e., TTC ‘4 Soft’). Despite the advantage of being generic, we show that a tailor-made algorithm to detect a TTC outperforms such an approach.

The goal of a business process deviance mining algorithm is to assign a binary class—normal or deviant—to a trace. In this sense, it shares similarities with predictive process monitoring. This is especially true because of their overlapping inputs and feature extraction methods [74]. However, deviance mining works on completed instances and focuses on the why [74].

Finally, Bertoli et al. propose a reasoning-based approach to recover missing information from event logs [15]. Ultimately, it would allow us to turn a truncated trace into a complete one. To work, this technique requires a reference process model as input. Therefore, it is not applicable if the task at hand is to discover a process model.

## 5.8 Conclusion

Event logs are often noisy, which makes the application of process mining sometimes difficult in a real setting [18]. Typically, the existence of truncated traces is known. Still, there is a research gap in systematically detecting them. In this

chapter, we treat the identification of truncated traces as a predictive process monitoring task and we benchmark several TTCs using 13 complex event logs. We show that building a TTC that consistently achieves high accuracy is challenging. This finding highlights the importance of conducting further research to build an efficient TTC. Typically, for some event logs, using a baseline approach that relies solely on the last activity works well. Still, we show that the TTC ‘3 FB&LA’ outperforms such baseline approach with strong statistical significance.

We also measure the process model quality impact when a process discovery algorithm is run on event logs that contain truncated traces. We show that only a few truncated traces can greatly decrease the process model quality and that a TTC can alleviate this problem by automatically removing truncated traces. Finally, we highlight the unexplored potential of a TTC to increase the accuracy of predicting the next event. We expect that more benefits of TTCs are yet to be discovered, especially in the predictive business process monitoring area.

In this chapter, we use the sequence of activities as well as some timing information. Using more information such as the name of the resource, the day of the week or any other event attributes could further improve the accuracy of the TTCs. Higher accuracy could also be achieved by using different classifiers, trying new neural network architecture, or implementing alternative feature spaces. This is an area for future research where our work can serve as a baseline.

## Chapter 6

# Accurate and Transparent Path Prediction Using Process Mining

**Abstract.** Anticipating the next events of an ongoing series of activities has many compelling applications in various industries. It can be used to improve customer satisfaction, to enhance operational efficiency, and to streamline health-care services, to name a few. In this work, we propose an algorithm that predicts the next events by leveraging business process models obtained using process mining techniques. Because we build the predictions from business process models, it allows business analysts to interpret and alter the predictions. We tested our approach with more than 30 synthetic datasets as well as 6 real datasets. The results have superior accuracy compared to using neural networks while being orders of magnitude faster.

### 6.1 Introduction

After observing a few events of an incomplete sequence of activities, it is possible to predict the next events until process completion by learning from historical event logs, an activity coined path prediction [79]. Anticipating the next events is valuable in a wide range of scenarios. For instance, when a service desk team predicts the paths taken by open tickets, the results can be used in many different ways. One proposition is to cut the number of predicted complaints due to delays by changing the priority of tickets. Another is to reduce the negative impact on customer satisfaction by preemptively informing them about a delay. One more is to align the expertise of service desk agents with the events predicted for a ticket. The predictions could also be used by inexperienced agents to anticipate the next events better, allowing them to communicate more accurate information to

the customers. Overall, predicting paths can help improve worker and customer satisfaction, as well as improve operational efficiency.

There are two main approaches to making predictions for a series of events. The first uses process mining while the second relies on neural networks [85]. Both approaches have their strengths and limitations. Process mining is more transparent because it relies on models that can be inspected by business analysts. This is important, as business analysts may have knowledge that will influence their confidence in the prediction which might not be available in the data. Furthermore, “business stakeholders are not data scientists [...] they are more likely to trust and use these models if they have a high-level understanding of the data that was used to train these models” [3]. In contrast, reasoning about predictions made by artificial neural networks is complex, if not impossible. Furthermore, a neural network requires a long training time [79]. However, in terms of performance, the most recent research shows that predictions using long short-term memory (LSTM) in a neural network achieves high accuracy [85].

We address the research gap that exists between accurate, but black-box, techniques and transparent, but less accurate, process mining techniques. Indeed, we aim to make predictions that are accurate, fast, and interpretable by business analysts. We propose a matrix named the loop-aware footprint matrix (LaFM), which captures the behaviors of event logs when replayed on a business process model obtained automatically using process mining techniques. The captured behaviors are then retrieved from LaFM to make predictions about uncompleted traces. We also propose a clustered version of LaFM (c-LaFM) that can cope with the inherent complexity of real datasets. We evaluate the prediction accuracy of LaFM with 30 synthetic datasets and the accuracy of c-LaFM with 6 real datasets. We show that our technique outperforms the LSTM approach introduced in [85].

The chapter is organized as follows. In Chapter 6.2, we introduce the main definitions and discuss process mining. Chapter 6.3 provides an overview of existing works. Chapter 6.4 presents the main idea behind LaFM. In Chapter 6.5, we present the evaluation procedure. In Chapter 6.6 evaluates and compares the accuracy of the method using synthetic datasets. In Chapter 6.7, we introduce the clustered version of LaFM, coined c-LaFM, which is evaluated in Chapter 6.8. We conclude in Chapter 6.9.

## 6.2 Preliminaries

In this section, we lay out the main definitions and concepts of our approach. They are part of the well-established process mining discipline. In this paper, we






Fig. 6.1 Process tree obtained by the inductive miner with traces:  $\{\langle ABDEF \rangle, \langle BDAEGEF \rangle, \langle DCEFEG \rangle, \langle CDEG \rangle\}$ .

consider only the sequence of events, disregarding the timestamps or any other contextual information in the data. By doing so, we present a simplified view of process mining, to be complemented with the foundational book about process mining [94].

**Events.** An event is a discrete type of data representing the activities executed in a process. For instance, ‘transferring a ticket’ is an event in a ticket’s lifecycle. Let  $e$  be an event (equivalent to a ‘touchpoint’ in customer journey term) and  $E$  be the set of all distinct events; i.e.,  $e \in E$ .

**Trace.** A trace is an instance of a process execution. In a service desk context, a trace is a ticket (equivalent to a ‘journey’ in customer journey term). Let  $t = \{e_1, e_2, \dots; e \in E\}$  be a trace: a list of events. For instance  $\langle ABBC \rangle$  is a trace with three distinct events of length 4 ( $|t| = 4$ ).

**Prefix.** Let a prefix  $p_n = \{e_1, e_2, \dots, e_n; e \in t\}$  be the first  $n$  events of a trace. Typically, if  $t = \langle ABBC \rangle$ , then  $p_3 = \langle ABB \rangle$ . A prefix represents the few events observed from an uncompleted trace that we use to make a prediction.

**Suffix.** A suffix represents the  $n$  last events of a trace. Formally,  $s_n = \{e_{|t|-n}, \dots, e_{|t|-1}, e_{|t|}; e \in t; e \notin p_n; |p_n| + |s_n| = |t|\}$ , i.e., the suffix is the complement of the prefix. The suffix is the set of events that we are trying to predict.

**Event logs.** An event log  $L = \{t_1, t_2, \dots\}$  is a collection of traces.

By looking only at the event log, process discovery techniques allow us to infer the business process model that describes well the behavior of the traces. This is a challenging task because the algorithm should be able to generalize behaviors even if only a subset of them is observed, to exclude noise and outliers, and to discover a model that is simple enough that it can be analyzed by a business analyst but also precise enough to reflect the behaviors of the event logs. Several techniques and approaches have been proposed to tackle this task. In this work, we use the inductive miner [60].

The inductive miner works by finding the best split in an event log and seeing how the two parts are related. It does this recursively on both parts. The output is a process tree (Fig. 6.1), which is a representation of a process model that was introduced in [98]. A process tree uses four operators: (1) the exclusive choice operator, `xor`, expresses that only one of the branches is executed; (2) the parallel operator, `and`, indicates that all the branches should be executed, in any order; and (3) a sequence, `seq`, forces the execution of the branches from left to right. Finally, (4) a loop has a more complex execution scheme: the first branch is executed at least once. Then, either we enter the loop by executing the second branch and the first branch again (which can be done once or multiple times), or we execute the third branch to exit the loop. As can be seen in Fig. 6.1, except for the leaves, these four operators fill the whole tree. The leaves of the tree are composed of the events  $E$  as well as silent activities. Silent activities,  $\tau$ , can be executed like any other events in the model, but they will not be seen in the traces.

We have now introduced the main terminology, the inductive miner, and the process tree. Path prediction is concerned with predicting the suffix for a given prefix by learning from event logs. It differs from process model discovery in which the goal is to discover a process model from event logs. While the output is different, both methods are about understanding the control flow of traces. We leverage this by using the inductive miner as a first step in making predictions.

### 6.3 Related Work

The area of predictive analytics is wide as trace predictions can be time-related (e.g., predicting the remaining time), outcome-oriented (e.g., success vs. failure), or control-flow oriented (e.g., next event(s) prediction). In this work, we specifically focus on the latter type of prediction.

A widely adopted approach to prediction is to build a Markov chain that describes the transition probabilities between events. These transition probabilities are used to make predictions. A prediction depends only on the previously observed event. In the all- $K$ -order Markov model, [78], the number of levels in the Markov chain is increased, but this increases the execution time. While the accuracy of the prediction increases, it suffers from rigidity in terms of the “patterns that it can learn” [46]. As another approach, Gueniche et al, propose the compact prediction tree [46]. It uses three data structures that can be used efficiently to retrieve the most probable event that might occur after having observed a prefix. While it predicts with high accuracy which events might occur in the suffix, it does

not return the order in which they will be executed. Hence, compact prediction trees are not suitable for predicting paths.

There are several process mining approaches for predicting paths. In [57], Lakshmanan et al. propose a method that estimate the likelihood of the next activities using a process model and Markov chain. Breuker et al. propose in [19] a predictive framework that uses grammatical inference and an expectation-maximization algorithm to estimate the model parameters. Among its predictions, it can predict the next event. Improving the comprehensibility of the predictions is one of the design goals of their approach, so that “users without deep technical knowledge can interpret and understand” [19]. In [79], Polato et al. propose a labeled transition system and methods for several predictive analytic tasks. Path prediction can be done by finding a path in the transition system that minimizes the sum of the weights between the edges.

Recently, neural networks have been studied for predicting the next events. To the best of our knowledge, Evermann et al. were the first to use a LSTM neural network approach to predict the next event of an ongoing trace [39]. LSTM, [52], is a special type of neural network for sequential inputs. It can learn from long-term dependencies using a sophisticated memory system. The sophisticated memory system is a double-edged sword: it achieves high accuracy; however, its inherent complexity makes the inspection of the reasoning behind the predictions difficult. In [85], Tax et al. generalize the approach of [39]. They evaluate—amongst other methods—the performance of the algorithm in path prediction and show that it is more accurate than [19, 39, 79]. Because it achieves the best accuracy, we use it as a baseline when evaluating the accuracy of LaFM.

Overall, two streams of research dominate path prediction. On one hand, using process mining techniques, we can make predictions using models that can be inspected by business analysts. On the other hand, neural networks attain better performance in terms of accuracy. Our contribution is an algorithm that utilizes the best aspects of both methods.

## 6.4 LaFM: Loop-Aware Footprint Matrix

We designed LaFM to store the behavior of traces efficiently when replayed on business process models. The goal is that the behaviors can be retrieved when predicting a suffix of events. First, we present the LaFM data structure. Next, we explain how to build it. Finally, we detail how to use it to make predictions.

Traces	Terminology								
	and2(1)	and2(2)	and2(3)	and4(1)	and4(2)	loop5	xor7 loop5{1}	xor7 loop5{2}	xor3
ABDEF	1	1	2	1	2	1	F	∅	and4
BDAEGEF	1	2	1	2	1	2	G	F	and4
DCEFEG	2	1	∅	∅	∅	2	F	G	C
CDEG	1	2	∅	∅	∅	1	G	∅	C

Fig. 6.2 Result of LaFM when the traces  $\langle ABDEF \rangle$ ,  $\langle BDAEGEF \rangle$ ,  $\langle DCEFEG \rangle$ , and  $\langle CDEG \rangle$  are replayed on top of the process tree of Fig. 6.1.

### 6.4.1 LaFM Data Structure

LaFM records the behavior of traces when replayed on top of a business process model. An illustration of LaFM is shown in Fig. 6.2. Each row corresponds to a trace and each column describes the behavior of an operator. LaFM captures the execution orders of parallel branches, the exclusive choices, and the number of iterations of each loop. We next describe in more detail the information recorded by LaFM as well as the used terminology.

**Parallel branches.** LaFM stores the order in which parallel branches are executed. An incremental index is assigned to each outgoing branch of the and operators and then propagated to the events and silent activities underneath. For instance, and2 in Fig. 6.1 has two outgoing branches. The index 1 is assigned to the first branch, which is propagated to the events below, i.e., 1 is assigned to A, B, and C. Similarly, task D has index 2. The index is recorded in LaFM for each and operator

**Exclusive choices.** The decision made for each exclusive choice is recorded in LaFM. For example, at xor3 in Fig. 6.1, a choice must be made between and4 and C. For the trace  $\langle CDEG \rangle$ , the choice is C. Hence, C is recorded in LaFM.

**Loops.** LaFM stores the number of times loops are executed. In Fig. 6.1 for the trace  $\langle CDEG \rangle$ , the value recorded for loop5 is 1 because it was executed once.

**Terminology.** An operator might be executed multiple times during a single process execution. For instance, when the trace  $\langle BDAEGEF \rangle$  is replayed on the process tree in Fig. 6.1, we execute the operator xor7 twice because loop5 above it is also executed twice. The name ‘loop-aware footprint matrix’ reflects that the matrix can store all behaviors, regardless of the number of times a loop is executed. The terminology used for columns in LaFM allows us to retrieve the behaviors of an operator using a standardized name: operator|loop. Each operator is assigned a unique name. For example, in Fig. 6.1, loop5 is an operator. For parallel

gateways, we also append the execution order inside parentheses. For instance, the second execution of `and4` is `and4(2)`. If there are loops, a single operator can be executed many times, resulting in multiple pieces of information that must be recorded. Adding the loop position to the terminology allows us to distinguish this information. Let  $L$  be a list of loops that are in the path starting from but excluding the operator itself to the root of the process tree.  $L$  can be empty if an operator is not contained in a loop. Then, we concatenate  $\forall l \in L$  the following strings:  $l_{name}(l_{index})$ , i.e., for each loop above an operator, we include its name. In parentheses, we add the index of the loop. As an example, `xor7|loop5{2}` points to the column returning the decisions that are made when the operator `xor7` is executed for the second time.

Three behaviors are captured in the LaFM in Fig. 6.2. Columns 1 to 5 retain the execution order of parallel gateways; column 6 records the number of times a loop was taken, and columns 7 to 9 store the decisions made at exclusive choice gateways.

### 6.4.2 Training Phase: Building LaFM

To record the decisions made for each operator in the discovered process tree, we replay the traces we want to learn from a Petri net version of the process tree. Petri nets can easily be derived from process trees using simple transformation rules [60]. Petri nets have a strong and executable formalism, which means we can replay a trace on a Petri net by playing the token game [59]. The token game takes as input a trace and a Petri net. Then, using a particular set of rules (see Chapter ‘3.2.2 Petri Nets’ in [94]), the game indicates if the trace fits into the process model (i.e., the Petri net). Algorithm 2 defines few extra operations that are performed during the token game to build LaFM. The next section explains how predictions can be made from LaFM.

```

/* Map the parallel operators above the events using a list of tuples (andOperator,
   branchIndex). Return an empty list if the event is not included in a parallel operators. */
/* e.g.,: {a: [(and4,0), (and2,0)], b: [(and4,1), (and2,0)], c: [(and2,0)]...} */
1 tsToAnds = getTransitionToAnds(processTree)

/* Map the transitions that occur right after an exclusive gateway. */
/* e.g.,: {and4: Xor3, c: Xor3, f: Xor7, g: Xor7} */
2 tsToXors = getTransitionToXor(processTree)

/* Map the second branch of loops to tsIncrementLoops and the third one to
   tsLeavingLoops */
/* e.g., tsIncrementLoops: {τ4: loop5}; tsLeavingLoops: {τ5: loop5} */
3 tsIncrementLoops = getTransitionToIncrementLoop(processTree)
4 tsLeavingLoops = getTsToLeaveLoop(processTree)

5 laFM = Matrix[]
6 foreach trace in logs do
7   counter = initializeCounters()
8   foreach tsFired in tokenGame do
9     manageCounter(tsFired)
10    foreach andOperators in tsToAnds[tsFired] do
11      foreach andOperator, branchIndex in andOperators do
12        record(trace, andOperator, branchIndex)
13    if tsFired in tsToXors then
14      record(trace, tsToAnds[tsFired], tsFired)
15    if tsFired in tsToLeaveLoop then
16      record(trace, tsLeavingLoops[tsFired], counter[tsFired])

17 function manageCounter(tsFired):
18   if tsFired in tsToAnds then
19     foreach andOperator in tsToAnds[tsFired] do
20       counter[andOperator].increment()
21   if tsFired in tsIncrementLoops then
22     counter[tsFired].increment()
23     foreach dependentTransition in dependentTransitions[tsFired] do
24       counter[tsFired].reset()

25 function record(trace, transition, value):
26   laFM[trace][getTerminology(transition)] = value

```

**Algorithm 2:** Set of extra operations performed during the token game to build LaFM.




Fig. 6.3 Five steps in making prediction using LaFM.

### 6.4.3 Prediction Phase: Using LaFM

Making predictions using LaFM is a five step recursive process, illustrated in Fig. 6.3.

**Step 1.** We play the token game with the prefix to get a list of active tokens.

**Step 2.** From the tokens, we get the list of active transitions, i.e., the activities that are currently allowed by the business process model. If only one transition is active, we skip steps 3 and 4 to fire the transition (step 5). Otherwise, we recursively eliminate transitions that are less likely (steps 3 and 4).

**Step 3.** We find the highest (closest to the root) operator in the process tree common to at least two transitions. For example, in Fig. 6.1, if the active transitions are A, B, and D, the highest common operator is and2.

**Step 4.** We make a decision about the operator selected in step 3. Depending on the operator type, we select the branch to execute next, what decision to make at an exclusive gateway, or whether to stay in or leave a loop. Fig. 6.4 details how we retrieve the information in LaFM. In Fig. 6.2, in order to know which one of F and G is the transition most likely to be chosen the first time we are at xor7, we look at LaFM for xor7 | loop5{1} and observe that F occurs more often (three times out of four). When a tie occurs, we pick the first one. The number of loops in the prefix might exceed the number of loops that were observed in the data. Alternatively, we might have a particular order in the prefix that was never observed in the event logs. We define three levels of abstraction that we apply consecutively when the previous abstraction fails. The first level of abstraction is to use LaFM as is. The second level of abstraction is to drop the loop part of the terminology and stack the columns for the same operator. For example, if xor7 | loop5{3} does not exist in LaFM, we stack the two columns starting with xor7|. If there is still not enough information, the third abstraction is to make a decision by looking only at the Petri net. For parallel and exclusive choice transitions, we pick the first branches with active transitions. For a loop, the decision is to always to leave the loop. Using these three abstractions, we can always make a prediction. If the list of potential

	Parallel $+$	Exclusive choice $\times$	Loop $\circlearrowright$
Abstraction 1	Using LaFM, check which branch (that contains at least one active transition) occurs the most. When a tie occurs, return the first one.	Using LaFM, return the most occurring active transition. When a tie occurs, return first one.	Using LaFM, return the median number of times loops are executed. If current number of loop < median: stay in loop. Otherwise, leave loops.
Abstraction 2	Same as abstraction 1, but dropping the loop part from the terminology.		
Abstraction 3	Return first branch that contains at least one active transition.	Return the first active transition	Return the transition that leaves the loop

Fig. 6.4 Decisions for each operator type at three level of abstractions.

transitions has been reduced to 1, we go to step 5. Otherwise, we recursively go back to step 3 where the highest common operator will inevitably be lower.

**Step 5.** We fire the transition. If it is a task  $\in E$ , we add it to the suffix. Then, we check to see if we have reached the end of the Petri net. If yes, we return the suffix. If not, we go back to step 3.

Having defined how to build and use LaFM, we detail in the next section the evaluation procedure used to assess the quality of the predictions.

## 6.5 Evaluation Procedure

The evaluation procedure is the same as that described by Tax et al. in [85]. Two-thirds of the traces in the event logs are added to the training set. Each trace in the evaluation is tested from a prefix length of 2 to a prefix length of  $l - 1$ ,  $l$  being the length of the trace. For instance, the trace  $\langle ABCD \rangle$  is decomposed into: prefix:  $\langle AB \rangle$ , suffix:  $\langle CD \rangle$  and prefix:  $\langle ABC \rangle$ , suffix:  $\langle D \rangle$ . The extracted prefix is added to the evaluation set and the suffix is added to the ground truth set. After learning from the training set, we use the evaluation set to make predictions about the prefix. The accuracy is obtained by measuring the Damerau-Levenshtein similarity between the predicted suffix and the ground truth set. The Damerau-Levenshtein distance, [32], is an edit-distance-based metric that minimizes the number of substitutions, deletions, or additions that are needed to align two sequences. In contrast with the Levenshtein distance, the Damerau-Levenshtein distance allows us to swap two adjacent activities. Let  $e$  be the evaluation set,  $p_i$  the  $i^{\text{th}}$  predicted suffix, and  $t_i$  the  $i^{\text{th}}$  ground truth suffix. We evaluate a whole evaluation set using the following formula:



$$DamerauSimilarity(e) = 1 - \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{|e|} \frac{DamerauDistance(p_i, t_i)}{\max(\text{length}(p_i), \text{length}(t_i))}}{|e|} \quad (6.1)$$

A Damerau similarity of 1 means that the predicted suffix is identical to the ground truth. We use the evaluation procedure in the next section to evaluate the performance of LaFM on synthetic datasets as well as in Chapter 6.8 where the performance of c-LaFM is tested on real datasets.

All evaluations were processed on a Mac Pro with the following configuration: 3.5 GHz 6-Core Intel Xeon E5, 64 GB 1866 MHz DDR3. We slightly updated LSTM<sup>22</sup> so that it does not predict the time remaining. We confirmed that this change does not impact the accuracy of the next event predictions and slightly reduces the execution time. LaFM and c-LaFM, as used in the evaluations, are available at: <http://customer-journey.unil.ch/lafm>.

## 6.6 LaFM: Evaluation

To evaluate LaFM, we used a collection of 30 synthetic datasets<sup>23</sup> that were created from process trees of varying shapes and complexities. These datasets were initially created and used in [59] for testing process discovery and conformance checking techniques.

There are three rounds of evaluation. In each round, 10 process trees were generated. The complexity of the process trees as well as the number of traces generated increase with the round. Overall, 64 traces were generated in round 3, 256 traces in round 4, and 1025 in round 5. We compared the predictions obtained using LaFM, Markov chains, and LSTM. We ran the evaluation five times. The arithmetic means of these five runs is shown in Fig. 6.5. LaFM is deterministic, therefore, its variance is null. The predictions made using LaFM are closest to the ground truth (21 times), followed by LSTM (8 times), and Markov chains (4 times).

There are important differences in the execution times of the three techniques (see Fig. 6.6). Because its predictions rely only on the previous observed event, it is not surprising that the fastest predictions are made using Markov chains, followed by LaFM. To put the duration into perspective, the average execution time per dataset is approximately 111 times slower for LaFM compared to a Markov chain, and 6140 times slower for LSTM compared to a Markov chain.

<sup>22</sup>available here: <https://verenich.github.io/ProcessSequencePrediction/>. Last visited: 13th of March 2020

<sup>23</sup> <https://data.4tu.nl/repository/uuid:745584e7-8cc0-45b8-8a89-93e9c9dfab05>, sets '1 - scalability', 'round 3 to 5'. Last visited: 13th of March 2020

	treeSeed	1	2	3	4	5*	6	7	8	9	10
Round 3	LaFM	1.00	1.00	0.58	0.31	n/a*	0.70	0.57	0.46	0.66	0.91
	Istm	1.00	1.00	0.50	0.29	n/a*	0.60	0.42	0.44	0.50	0.92
	markov	0.60	1.00	0.20	0.37	n/a*	0.60	0.15	0.33	0.46	0.92
	treeSeed	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Round 4	LaFM	0.84	0.90	0.39	0.30	0.66	0.54	0.39	0.34	0.51	0.52
	Istm	0.81	0.85	0.43	0.35	0.83	0.51	0.35	0.36	0.50	0.24
	markov	0.55	0.89	0.26	0.31	0.72	0.43	0.17	0.32	0.45	0.50
	treeSeed	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Round 5	LaFM	0.51	0.48	0.24	0.50	0.86	0.63	0.36	0.21	0.48	0.54
	Istm	0.56	0.36	0.21	0.42	0.85	0.62	0.30	0.14	0.22	0.29
	markov	0.28	0.42	0.13	0.41	0.45	0.56	0.17	0.17	0.50	0.47
Variance		Max	Arithmetic mean	Median							
	LaFM	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	*not enough data for the evaluation because 84% of the traces have a length of 1.						
	Istm	0.0146	0.0018	0.0002							
	markov	0.0120	0.0009	0.0000							

Fig. 6.5 Comparing LaFM, LSTM and Markov Chains using the Damerau similarity metric. The closer to 1, the closer the predictions are to the ground truth.

	round	3	4	5
Training	LaFM	~24 sec	~28 sec	~2.5 min
	Istm	~2.5 min	~18 min	~6 hours
	markov	< 1 sec	< 1 sec	< 1 sec
	round	3	4	5
Prediction	LaFM	~3 sec	~1 min	~27 min
	Istm	~1 min	~5 min	~22 hours
	markov	< 1 sec	< 1 sec	~17 sec

Fig. 6.6 Performance comparison of the training and predictions times.




Fig. 6.7 Overview of the 4 steps approach of c-LaFM.

## 6.7 c-LaFM: Clustered Loop-Aware Footprint Matrix

The accuracy of the predictions made using LaFM is dependent on the quality of the discovered process tree. While the previous section showed that LaFM performs well with synthetic datasets generated from well-structured process trees, the accuracy will drop with real datasets, which often have very complex behaviors and noise that cannot be described well using a single model. Our intuition is that we should group similar traces using clustering techniques and, for each group, discover a process tree that well describes a subset of similar traces. Hence, we propose an updated version of LaFM with a clustering step, named c-LaFM for clustered LaFM.

We propose a four-step clustering method, as shown in Fig. 6.7. In step 1, we extract the features that will be used to group similar traces. Thus, we count the number of ngrams ranging in size from 1 to 2. For instance, the trace  $\langle ABA \rangle$  becomes:  $\{A:2, B:1, AB:1, BA:1\}$ . Then, we cluster the traces using HDBSCAN,<sup>24</sup> which has the advantage of having only one intelligible parameter to set, the minimum number of traces per cluster. According to our experiment, from 2 to 10 traces per cluster yields the best results. However, it is difficult to anticipate the best minimum cluster size. Hence, we perform a hyperparameter optimization of a type grid search by using 10% of the training data set to evaluate the accuracy of the minimum cluster size and retain the best-performing one. Instead of attributing each trace to a single cluster, we rely on a soft clustering approach, which returns, for each trace, the probability of it belonging to all the clusters.

Fig. 6.8 illustrates the soft clustering approach. Each point represents a trace. The closer two traces are, the more ngrams they share. The strong representatives are used to discover the process tree, while the weak and the strong representatives

<sup>24</sup><https://github.com/scikit-learn-contrib/hdbscan>. Last visited: 13th of March 2020




Fig. 6.8 Illustration of the soft clustering concept.

will be replayed over the process tree and are available in LaFM. The strong representatives are the traces that have a probability higher than 80% of belonging to a cluster and the weak representatives have a probability higher than 20% but less than 80%. Using a soft clustering approach has two main advantages. First, the inductive miner is sensitive to noise. Hence, we want to learn only from the strong representatives (i.e., with a high probability of belonging to the clusters) with the aim of capturing only the main behaviors. Second, although we do not use them to build the process trees, borderline traces might contain interesting behaviors for several clusters. By using a soft clustering approach, we can assign these single traces to several clusters.

In step 2, the strong representatives are used to build the process tree. Then, the process tree is transformed to a Petri net so that the weak representatives can be replayed on it to build a local LaFM, a mechanism that is described in Chapter 6.4.2.

In step 3, we train a stochastic gradient descent classifier<sup>25</sup> to predict which cluster a prefix belongs to. Although the clustering is done only once for the entire complete traces, we build one classifier for each prefix length. If an unexpected prefix length comes from a never-seen-before instance, we select the classifier that was built with the largest prefix length.

In step 4, we predict the suffix of a given prefix using the cluster returned by the classifier. Altogether, these four steps allow us to make predictions in the presence of noise and outliers, which are often found in real datasets. This is what we evaluate in the next section.

<sup>25</sup> <http://scikit-learn.org/stable/modules/sgd.html>. Last visited: 13th of March 2020

Table 6.1 Datasets used for the evaluation.

	Name (doi)	Description	#traces	#events	#unique events
1	helpdesk (10.17632/39bp3vv62t.1)	Events from a ticketing system	3'804	13'710	9
2	bpi12 (10.4121/uuid:3926db30-f712-4394-aebc-75976070e91f)	Loan process for a financial industry. Note: keeping only manual task and lifecycle: complete as described in [85]	9'658	72'413	23
3	bpi13 closeP (10.4121/c2c3b154-ab26-4b31-a0e8-8f2350ddac11)	Closed problem - management system from Volvo IT Belgium	6'660	1'487	7
4	bpi13 incidents (10.4121/3537c19d-6c64-4b1d-815d-915ab0e479da)	Incidents - management system from Volvo IT Belgium	7'554	65'533	13
5	bpi13 openP (10.4121/500573e6-accc-4b0c-9576-aa5468b10cee)	Open problems - management system from Volvo IT Belgium	819	2'351	5
6	envPermit (10.4121/uuid:26aba40d-8b2d-435b-b5af-6d4bfd7a270)	Execution of a building permit application process. Note: we pick the Municipality 1	937	38'944	381




Fig. 6.9 Comparing c-LaFM to LSTM using real datasets. Each datasets was evaluated 10 times.

## 6.8 c-LaFM: Evaluation

To test our approach, we used six publicly available event logs, as described in Table. 6.1. Because the event logs reflect activities performed in real life, making predictions is a complex task. Typically, for the event logs describing the execution of a building permit application (envPermit), “almost every case follows a unique path” [85].

In contrast to LaFM, c-LaFM is non-deterministic due to the clustering step. Hence, we ran the experiment 10 times with c-LaFM and LSTM using the procedure described in Chapter 6.5. Fig. 6.9 compares the accuracy of LSTM and c-LaFM. c-LaFM is more accurate for five datasets out of six. We compare the execution times in Fig. 6.10. On average, c-LaFM is 9 times faster than LSTM. Overall, we have shown that the clustered version of LaFM is accurate and fast.

Dataset	bpi12	bpi13 closedP	bpi13 incidents	bpi13 openP	envPermit	helpdesk
<b>Execution time</b> LaFM	~45 min	~2 min	~47 min	~1 min	~3.1 hours	~2 min
LSTM	~15.4 hours	~35 min	~20.6 hours	~18 min	~5.6 hours	~41 min

Fig. 6.10 Comparing the total execution time to obtain predictions using c-LaFM and LSTM. The value reported is the average of 10 executions.




Fig. 6.11 Displaying an actual prediction from the dataset envPermit next to the business process model that was used to make the prediction.

Fig. 6.11 shows one of the predictions for the execution of a building permit using a business process model, which was derived from the process tree that was used to make the prediction. This is an illustration of how we can provide, not only the predictions itself, but a way to express the reasoning behind the prediction. For instance, a business worker could—after investigating traces like those used to make the prediction—decide not to trust the prediction because they have knowledge about the context that is not available in the event logs.

## 6.9 Conclusion

We propose an algorithm that relies on process models to make future path prediction. More specifically, we propose a matrix coined LaFM that retrieves the most likely next events. We also propose c-LaFM, a version which is more suited to deal with the inherent complexity of real datasets. The algorithm shows promising results in terms of accuracy and execution time.

The results showcase the value of the process models discovered using a process discovery algorithm. Indeed, not only are these business models intrinsically interesting for business process analysts, but we also show that they can be used to make predictions. A limitation of this work is that we choose to rely on the inductive miner. In our future work, we plan to measure how the use of different process discovery techniques may impact the accuracy of the predictions. We anticipate that mining hidden rules between LaFM columns will yield interesting results, especially if we consider extending LaFM with contextual information. This would allow us to detect long-term dependencies that could be used to improve the accuracy further.

Business analysts can be reluctant to trust predictions they do not understand [19]. Because in our work the predictions are made with business process models, the predictions can be manually inspected by business analysts. Currently, our algorithm returns only the predictions, limiting the explainability of the results. However, we envision a framework that includes an advanced visualization system that explains how the predictions are made and allows business analysts to alter the predictions if they have knowledge that is not in the data. This type of system would display the process model, the traces on which the predictions were made, and the reasoning behind the predictions. Gartner has urged us to move toward explainable artificial intelligence that gives visibility to business stakeholders “by leveraging historical data, explaining model inputs, simplifying results or exposing underlying data in human understandable ways” [3]. Our work contributes by providing the foundation on which a fully comprehensible prediction system

can be built. Interestingly, in the same report, [3], Gartner states that there is a trade-off between explainability and accuracy. Our results highlight that this trade-off does not necessarily hold here as we can provide results that are both transparent and more accurate than state-of-the-art neural network approaches.



# Chapter 7

## Conclusion

We conclude this dissertation in three parts. First, we highlight how our contributions link back to the two research questions. Second, we position our contributions with related works. Third, we conclude by providing an outlook.

### 7.1 Contributions

This dissertation contributes in the following ways. To start, we bring process mining and customer journeys closer together in Chapter 1, by showing that the process mining framework and the related XES standard are relevant to customer journeys. As such, this chapter can be seen as a foundational pillar supporting the contributions that follow.

In Chapter 2, we propose a genetic approach to discovering customer journey maps, similar to process discovery techniques that can discover process models from event logs. In Chapter 3, we propose a novel way of navigating customer journey maps hierarchically, with the option of adding a goal (e.g., journeys that concern people above 40 years old). Next, Chapter 4 contributes by showing how a process tree produced by the inductive miner can help to semi-automatically abstract related activities (e.g., “paying by card” and “paying by cash” become “paying”). Together, Chapters 2 to 4 answer the first research question posed in the introduction: *How can customer journey maps be discovered, explored, and enhanced from event logs?* A short answer is that the XES standard from process mining can be used as-is: existing process mining algorithms can be leveraged to enhance CJM (e.g., the inductive miner can abstract CJM), while the peculiarities of a CJM visualization call for specific customer journey discovery algorithms to replace the process discovery ones.

The last part of the dissertation, Chapters 5 and 6, address the second research question: *How can the touchpoints of a customer journey be predicted?* In Chapter 5, we propose an autonomous truncated trace classifier that can predict, given a prefix of events, whether more events are expected (i.e., truncated) or not (i.e., complete). Finally, in Chapter 6, we propose an algorithm that takes as input a prefix of events and returns the most likely sequence of events that will follow until the trace is complete. In contrast to Chapters 2 to 4, which relate specifically to customer journeys, Chapters 5 and 6 are more generic; indeed, their contributions can be used as-is by the process mining community. However, they fit this dissertation well because they address prediction techniques that are especially needed for customer journeys. In fact, events that belong to customers (e.g., “buying a product”) cannot be controlled from a company perspective. Hence, we anticipate that the level of uncertainty will be higher and that predicting whether a journey will be completed or how it will be completed are challenging but insightful tasks. The answer to the second research question is that existing next events prediction algorithms from process mining can also be used to predict the next touchpoints of a customer journey.

## 7.2 Limitations

The tools CJM-explorer and CJM-abstractor, presented in Chapters 3 and 4, are submitted as demos. As such, they are not as strongly evaluated as the tools presented in other chapters.

One way to strengthen these chapters would be to study the use of these tools by practitioners in several industries and to build a taxonomy of insights that can be extracted from them. Exposing the tools to practitioners might highlight some drawbacks, missing features, or misunderstandings that can be improved. Design science approaches could be the perfect candidate to carry such iterative work (e.g., [51]). This would be an ambitious project that would require several case studies within multiple companies. However, it would validate the type of insight that can be extracted from such tools and close the gaps between practitioners and academics.

Another approach could be to make the tools available for the industry and to collect feedback using surveys. The goal would be to validate some hypothesis, e.g., ‘using a customer journey analysis approach I get a new perspective compare to a business process analysis approach’. Again, designing a relevant survey and making the tool available for several companies are challenging tasks but with a high potential to close the gaps between academy and industry.

## 7.3 Positioning

Several studies by Hassani et al. leverage the mapping we propose in [6] to extend the link between process mining and customer journey analysis. First, Terragni and Hassani [86, 87] propose a recommender system for customer journeys. Their research shows an interesting interplay between process mining, which is used to define key performance indicators and customer journeys, which are used as implicit recommendation feedbacks. Second, in [45], Goossens et al. propose an alternative recommender system that takes into account the order of the touchpoints. Third, Nooyen [75] focuses on the task of predicting a customer complaint in a customer journey. This is made possible by using process mining to measure the similarities among journeys. These works further highlight the potential of bringing customer journeys and process mining closer together.

Some authors propose domain-specific graphical representations of customer journeys. In [4], Berendes et al. propose a customer journey modeling language for which they have coined the name High Street Journey Modeling Language (HSJML). Because it is retail-specific, its notation imposes a list of predetermined phrases (e.g., “pre-purchase,” “post-purchase”) and touchpoints (e.g., “customer has published a review”). Ultimately, this standardization allows for adequate comparison of journeys from multiple stores. In [91], van den Bos proposes an extension to Archimate, an enterprise architecture modeling language. The aim of the extension is to create user journeys that ensure alignment between user experience designers and enterprise architects.

In this dissertation, we choose to stick to the main components of the customer journey to stay domain-agnostics. However, this does not prevent someone else from extending the mapping we proposed in the introduction (Fig. 1.1, page 11) to meet the specific needs of a particular industry. Our work differs from other approaches for the reasons that follow. First, the link between process mining and customer journeys was not existing before the publication of our related paper, [6]. The subsequent papers that follow, [45, 75, 86, 87], nicely illustrate the generalizable nature of this contribution. Second, our contributions [5, 7, 10] differ from existing works because, to the best of our knowledge, we show how to automatically build and transform CJMs using event logs. Existing works (e.g., [4, 91]) that deals with CJMs are working with expected CJMs, they are not inferred from the data.

## 7.4 Outlook

In Chapter 1, we present the ten process mining activities from the process mining framework. We repeat them here, as they will serve as an outlook for future work: (1) explore, (2) predict, (3) recommend, (4) detect, (5) check, (6) compare, (7) promote, (8) discover, (9) enhance, and (10) diagnose. In this dissertation, we propose techniques related to the following activities: discover (Chapters 1 and 2), enhance (Chapter 4), explore (Chapter 3), and predict (Chapters 5 and 6). Other researchers have shown the relevance of the activity “recommend” for process mining [86, 87, 45], while Nooyen proposes a solution to predict customers’ complaints [75]. Clearly, there are more spaces for further research that investigates the relevance of process mining activities for customer journey analytics.

Coming back to the BPM lifecycle introduced in Fig. 1.3 (page 7), we claim that we contribute to the discovery and analysis of the customer process, i.e., the customer journey. According to the lifecycle, the insights extracted from these steps should be used as input to redesign the customer journey; this could be done using an expected CJM. We believe that the most interesting premise for future work is contributions that will allow closing of the BPM lifecycle, i.e., linking expected CJMs back to actual CJMs. To achieve this, one has to answer the following question: *How can we best implement and monitor customer journeys?* One idea to explore would be a framework for running marketing campaigns on top of expected customer journeys. Another idea, which is similar to conformance analysis in process mining, would be to check discrepancies between expected and actual customer journeys; feedback could be collected from customers who have experienced unexpected journeys.

One of the key challenges of customer journeys is that they exist from customers’ perspectives and are outside the control of companies. For instance, some touchpoints along the journey could happen on external systems (e.g., social media) or even offline (e.g., interaction in a store). Collecting such interactions is still an open challenge that needs to be resolved to capture the full customer journey. Being able to extract events logs from sparse information systems is a well-recognized dilemma within the process mining community [94]. Because CJMs are intrinsically linked with context data, such as customers’ emotions, an even higher level of complexity is expected. However, we argue that CJMs built from event logs can also be used to complement existing CJMs built “by hand”. For instance, the former can be used to validate the activities’ ordering of the latter. In other words, we can at least confront the sequence of activities expected with the reality captured in the logs. Some activities may not be recorded at all (e.g.,

visiting concurrent websites). Superposing both models should help pinpoint which activities are not available in the logs.

Clearly, there are more spaces for further research that investigates the relevance of process mining activities for customer journey analytics. For instance, Nooyen propose the customer journey specific activity of predicting a customer complaint [75]. Are there any other activities that are relevant for customer journeys that do not exist in the process mining framework? Similar to the discover of representative journeys (Chapters 2 and 3), we believe that it would be interesting to discover representative customers. In other words, are there some groups of customers that behave in similar way which could be explained using demographic information? In the dissertation, we put a large emphasis on the behaviors of customers. However, in a customer journey analytics context, demographic information is also very important. Another area for further research might consist of offering a way to translate an expected journey into demographic information and the other way around. Simply put: “give me a typical journey and I would tell you, by analyzing the event logs, what is the most likely characteristic of the customer”, or “give me some customer information I will return the most likely customer journey”. We believe that such ‘fact-checking’ tool would greatly help during workshops.

To conclude, tools such as the BPM lifecycle and the process mining framework from the process mining and BPM fields are highly relevant when analyzing customer journeys. However, as shown in this dissertation, the switches in perspective, the new types of visualization, and the fact that customers cannot be controlled impose new challenges that need to be tackled.



# References

- [1] Andrews, J. and Eade, E. (2013). Listening to students: Customer journey mapping at birmingham city university library and learning resources. *New Review of Academic Librarianship*, 19(2):161–177.
- [2] Augusto, A., Conforti, R., Dumas, M., La Rosa, M., Maggi, F. M., Marrella, A., Mecella, M., and Soo, A. (2017). Automated discovery of process models from event logs: Review and benchmark. *IEEE Transactions on Knowledge and Data Engineering*, 31(4):686–705.
- [3] Baker, V., Clark, W., and Alaybeyi, S. (2018). Build trust with business users by moving toward explainable ai. Technical report, Gartner. <https://www.gartner.com/doc/3891245/build-trust-business-users-moving> (Last visited: 3rd of June 2020).
- [4] Berendes, C. I., Bartelheimer, C., Betzing, J. H., and Beverungen, D. (2018). Data-driven customer journey mapping in local high streets: A domain-specific modeling language. In *39th International Conference on Information Systems (ICIS, Research-in-Progress)*.
- [5] Bernard, G. and Andritsos, P. (2017a). Cjm-ex: Goal-oriented exploration of customer journey maps using event logs and data analytics. In *BPM Demo Track and BPM Dissertation Award co-located with 15th International Conference on Business Process Management (BPM Demo)*.
- [6] Bernard, G. and Andritsos, P. (2017b). A process mining based model for customer journey mapping. In *Forum and Doctoral Consortium Papers Presented at the 29th International Conference on Advanced Information Systems Engineering (CAiSE Forum)*, pages 49–56. CEUR workshop proceedings.
- [7] Bernard, G. and Andritsos, P. (2018). Cjm-ab: Abstracting customer journey maps using process mining. In *Forum and Doctoral Consortium Papers Presented at the 30th International Conference on Advanced Information Systems Engineering (CAiSE Forum)*, pages 49–56, Cham. Springer.
- [8] Bernard, G. and Andritsos, P. (2019a). Accurate and transparent path prediction using process mining. In *23rd European Conference on Advances in Databases and Information Systems (ADBIS)*, pages 235–250, Cham. Springer.
- [9] Bernard, G. and Andritsos, P. (2019b). Contextual and behavioral customer journey discovery using a genetic approach. In *23rd European Conference on Advances in Databases and Information Systems (ADBIS)*, pages 251–266, Cham. Springer.

- [10] Bernard, G. and Andritsos, P. (2019c). Discovering customer journeys from evidence: A genetic approach inspired by process mining. In *Forum and Doctoral Consortium Papers Presented at the 31st International Conference on Advanced Information Systems Engineering (CAiSE Forum)*, pages 36–47, Cham. Springer.
- [11] Bernard, G. and Andritsos, P. (2020). Truncated trace classifier. removal of incomplete traces from event logs. In *21st International Working Conference on Business Process Modeling, Development, and Support (BPMDS)*, pages 150–165, Cham. Springer.
- [12] Bernard, G., Boillat, T., Legner, C., and Andritsos, P. (2016). When sales meet process mining: A scientific approach to sales process and performance management. In *37th International Conference on Information Systems (ICIS, Research-in-Progress)*.
- [13] Berre, A. J., Lew, Y., Elvesæter, B., and de Man, H. (2013). Service innovation and service realisation with vdm1 and servicem1. In *IEEE 17th International Enterprise Distributed Object Computing Conference Workshops (EDOC)*, pages 104–113. IEEE.
- [14] Berti, A., van Zelst, S. J., and van der Aalst, W. M. (2019). Process mining for python (pm4py): Bridging the gap between process-and data science. In *ICPM Demo Track 2019 co-located with 1st International Conference on Process Mining (ICPM)*, pages 13–16. CEUR workshop proceedings.
- [15] Bertoli, P., Di Francescomarino, C., Dragoni, M., and Ghidini, C. (2013). Reasoning-based techniques for dealing with incomplete business process execution traces. In *13th International Conference of the Italian Association for Artificial Intelligence (AI\*IA)*, pages 469–480, Cham. Springer.
- [16] Bezerra, F., Wainer, J., and van der Aalst, W. M. (2009). Anomaly detection using process mining. In *Enterprise, Business-Process and Information Systems Modeling*, pages 149–161, Berlin, Heidelberg. Springer.
- [17] Blum, F. R. (2015). Metrics in process discovery. Technical report, Universidad de Chile. [https://www.dcc.uchile.cl/TR/2015/TR\\_DCC-20151221-007.pdf](https://www.dcc.uchile.cl/TR/2015/TR_DCC-20151221-007.pdf) (Last visited: 5th of June 2020).
- [18] Bose, R. J. C., Mans, R. S., and van der Aalst, W. M. (2013). Wanna improve process mining results? In *IEEE Symposium on Computational Intelligence and Data Mining (CIDM)*, pages 127–134. IEEE.
- [19] Breuker, D., Matzner, M., Delfmann, P., and Becker, J. (2016). Comprehensible predictive models for business processes. *MIS Q.*, 40(4):1009–1034.
- [20] Broder, A. Z., Glassman, S. C., Manasse, M. S., and Zweig, G. (1997). Syntactic clustering of the web. *Computer Networks and ISDN Systems*, 29:1157–1166.
- [21] Brynjolfsson, E., Hu, Y. J., and Rahman, M. S. (2013). Competing in the age of omnichannel retailing. *MIT Sloan Management Review*, 54(4):23.



- [22] Buijs, J. C., van Dongen, B. F., and van der Aalst, W. M. (2012). A genetic algorithm for discovering process trees. In *IEEE Congress on Evolutionary Computation (CEC)*, pages 1–8.
- [23] Buijs, J. C., van Dongen, B. F., and van der Aalst, W. M. (2014). Quality dimensions in process discovery: the importance of fitness, precision, generalization and simplicity. *International Journal of Cooperative Information Systems*, 23(1).
- [24] Caliński, T. and Harabasz, J. (1974). A dendrite method for cluster analysis. *Communications in Statistics - Theory and Methods*, 3(1):1–27.
- [25] Carmona, J., de Leoni, M., and Depaire, B. (2019). Process discovery contest 2019 co-located with the international conference on process mining (icpm). Technical report. <https://icpmconference.org/2019/process-discovery-contest> (Last visited: 9th of June 2020).
- [26] Chen, T. and Guestrin, C. (2016). XGBoost: A scalable tree boosting system. In *22nd ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining*, pages 785–794, New York, NY, USA. Association for Computing Machinery.
- [27] Chesbrough, H. and Spohrer, J. (2006). A research manifesto for services science. *Communications of the ACM*, 49(7):35–40.
- [28] Chollet, F. et al. (2015). Keras. <https://github.com/fchollet/keras> (Last visited: 5th of June 2020).
- [29] Conforti, R., La Rosa, M., and ter Hofstede, A. H. (2017). Filtering out infrequent behavior from business process event logs. *IEEE Transactions on Knowledge and Data Engineering*, 29(2):300–314.
- [30] Crosier, A. and Handford, A. (2012). Customer journey mapping as an advocacy tool for disabled people: A case study. *Social Marketing Quarterly*, 18(1):67–76.
- [31] Daigler, J., Davies, J., Manusama, B., and Bharaj, G. (2019). Market guide for customer journey analytics. Technical report, Gartner. <https://www.gartner.com/en/documents/3900263/market-guide-for-customer-journey-analytics> (Last visited: 3rd of June 2020).
- [32] Damerau, F. J. (1964). A technique for computer detection and correction of spelling errors. *Communications of the ACM*, 7(3):171–176.
- [33] de Medeiros, A. K., Weijters, T. A., and van der Aalst, W. M. (2007). Genetic process mining: an experimental evaluation. *Data Mining and Knowledge Discovery*, 14(2):245–304.
- [34] Di Francescomarino, C., Dumas, M., Federici, M., Ghidini, C., Maggi, F. M., Rizzi, W., and Simonetto, L. (2018). Genetic algorithms for hyperparameter optimization in predictive business process monitoring. *Information Systems*, 74:67–83.

- [35] Di Francescomarino, C., Dumas, M., Maggi, F. M., and Teinemaa, I. (2019). Clustering-based predictive process monitoring. *IEEE Transactions on Services Computing*, 12(6):896–909.
- [36] Dove, L., Reinach, S., and Kwan, I. (2016). Lightweight journey mapping: The integration of marketing and user experience through customer driven narratives. In *34th ACM Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems (CHI Extended Abstracts)*, pages 880–888. ACM.
- [37] Dumas, M., La Rosa, M., Mendling, J., and Reijers, H. A. (2013). *Fundamentals of business process management*, volume 1. Springer.
- [38] Edelman, D. C. and Singer, M. (2015). Competing on customer journeys. *Harvard Business Review*, 93(11):88–100.
- [39] Evermann, J., Rehse, J.-R., and Fettke, P. (2017). A deep learning approach for predicting process behaviour at runtime. In *Business Process Management Workshops, in conjunction with the 15th International Conference on Business Process Management (BPM Workshops)*, pages 327–338, Cham. Springer.
- [40] Fluxicon (2020). Deal with incomplete cases, process mining in practice. Technical report. <http://processminingbook.com/incompletecases.html> (Last visited: 4th of June 2020).
- [41] Følstad, A., Kvale, K., and Halvorsrud, R. (2013). Customer journey measures-state of the art research and best practices. Technical report, SINTEF. <https://sintef.brage.unit.no/sintef-xmlui/handle/11250/2390670> (Last visited: 3rd of June 2020).
- [42] Gabadinho, A. and Ritschard, G. (2013). Searching for typical life trajectories applied to childbirth histories. *Gendered life courses between individualization and standardization. A European approach applied to Switzerland*, pages 287–312.
- [43] Gabadinho, A., Ritschard, G., Studer, M., and Müller, N. S. (2009). Summarizing sets of categorical sequences: selecting and visualizing representative sequences. In *International Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Information Retrieval, in conjunction with the 1st International Joint Conference on Knowledge Discovery, Knowledge Engineering and Knowledge Management (IC3K 2011)*, pages 62–69. Springer.
- [44] Gabadinho, A., Ritschard, G., Studer, M., and Müller, N. S. (2011). Extracting and rendering representative sequences. In *3rd International Joint Conference on Knowledge Discovery, Knowledge Engineering and Knowledge Management (IC3K)*, pages 94–106, Berlin, Heidelberg. Springer.
- [45] Goossens, J., Demewez, T., and Hassani, M. (2018). Effective steering of customer journey via order-aware recommendation. In *IEEE International Conference on Data Mining Workshops (ICDMW)*, pages 828–837. IEEE.
- [46] Gueniche, T., Fournier-Viger, P., and Tseng, V. S. (2013). Compact prediction tree: A lossless model for accurate sequence prediction. In *9th International Conference on Advanced Data Mining and Applications (ADMA)*, pages 177–188, Berlin, Heidelberg. Springer.

- [47] Günther, C. W. and Verbeek, E. (2016). IEEE standard for extensible event stream (XES) for achieving interoperability in event logs and event streams. <https://xes-standard.org/> (Last visited: 27th of May 2020).
- [48] Gürvardar, İ., Rızvanoğlu, K., Öztürk, Ö., and Yavuz, Ö. (2016). How to improve the overall pre-purchase experience through a new category structure based on a compatible database: Gittigidiyor (ebay turkey) case. In *5th International Conference on Design, User Experience, and Usability (DUXU)*, pages 366–376, Cham. Springer.
- [49] Harbich, M., Bernard, G., Berkes, P., Garbinato, B., and Andritsos, P. (2017). Discovering customer journey maps using a mixture of markov models. In *7th International Symposium on Data-driven Process Discovery and Analysis*, volume 2016 of *CEUR Workshop Proceedings*, pages 3–7. CEUR workshop proceedings.
- [50] Haugstveit, I. M., Halvorsrud, R., and Karahasanovic, A. (2016). Supporting redesign of c2c services through customer journey mapping. In *Conference on Service Design Geographies (ServDes 2016)*, number 125, pages 215–227. SINTEF, Linköping University Electronic Press.
- [51] Hevner, A. R., March, S. T., Park, J., and Ram, S. (2004). Design science in information systems research. *MIS Q.*, 28(1):75–105.
- [52] Hochreiter, S. and Schmidhuber, J. (1997). Long short-term memory. *Neural Computation*, 9(8):1735–1780.
- [53] Jouck, T. and Depaire, B. (2016). Ptdloggenerator: a generator for artificial event data. In *BPM Demo Track co-located with 14th International Conference on Business Process Management (BPM Demo)*, page 23.
- [54] Kessler, P. and Giuriato, L. (2019). *Marché suisse du commerce en ligne et à distance*. Technical report, L'Association Suisse de vente à Distance. <https://www.vsv-versandhandel.ch/wp-content/uploads/2019/02/F-Version-finale-2018.pdf> (Last visited: 5th of June 2020).
- [55] Kingma, D. P. and Ba, J. (2015). Adam: A method for stochastic optimization. In *3rd International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*.
- [56] Kojo, I., Heiskala, M., and Virtanen, J.-P. (2014). Customer journey mapping of an experience-centric service by mobile self-reporting: Testing the qualiwall tool. In *3rd International Conference on Design, User Experience and Usability (DUXU)*, pages 261–272, Cham. Springer.
- [57] Lakshmanan, G. T., Shamsi, D., Doganata, Y. N., Unuvar, M., and Khalaf, R. (2015). A markov prediction model for data-driven semi-structured business processes. *Knowledge and Information Systems*, 42(1):97–126.
- [58] Lane, S., O’Raghallaigh, P., and Sammon, D. (2016). Requirements gathering: the journey. *Journal of Decision Systems*, 25:302–312.
- [59] Leemans, S. J. (2017). *Robust process mining with guarantees*. PhD thesis, Eindhoven University of Technology.

- [60] Leemans, S. J., Fahland, D., and van der Aalst, W. M. (2013a). Discovering block-structured process models from event logs - a constructive approach. In *34th International Conference on Application and Theory of Petri Nets and Concurrency (PETRI NETS)*, pages 311–329, Berlin, Heidelberg. Springer.
- [61] Leemans, S. J., Fahland, D., and van der Aalst, W. M. (2013b). Discovering block-structured process models from event logs containing infrequent behaviour. In *11th International Conference on Business Process Management (BPM)*, pages 66–78. Springer.
- [62] Leemans, S. J., Fahland, D., and van der Aalst, W. M. (2014). Discovering block-structured process models from incomplete event logs. In *35th International Conference on Application and Theory of Petri Nets and Concurrency (PETRI NETS)*, pages 91–110, Cham. Springer.
- [63] Lemon, K. N. and Verhoef, P. C. (2016). Understanding customer experience throughout the customer journey. *Journal of Marketing*, 80(6):69–96.
- [64] Leontjeva, A., Conforti, R., Di Francescomarino, C., Dumas, M., and Maggi, F. M. (2016). Complex symbolic sequence encodings for predictive monitoring of business processes. In *14th International Conference on Business Process Management (BPM)*, pages 297–313. Springer.
- [65] Levenshtein, V. I. (1966). Binary codes capable of correcting deletions, insertions, and reversals. In *Soviet physics doklady*, volume 10, pages 707–710.
- [66] Maggi, F. M., Di Francescomarino, C., Dumas, M., and Ghidini, C. (2014). Predictive monitoring of business processes. In *26nd International Conference on Advanced Information Systems Engineering (CAiSE)*, pages 457–472, Cham. Springer.
- [67] Malik, S. and Bajwa, I. S. (2012). Back to origin: Transformation of business process models to business rules. In *Business Process Management Workshops, in conjunction with the 10th International Conference on Business Process Management (BPM 2012)*, volume 132, pages 611–622.
- [68] Marquez, J. J., Downey, A., and Clement, R. (2015). Walking a mile in the user’s shoes: Customer journey mapping as a method to understanding the user experience. *Internet Reference Services Quarterly*, 20(3-4):135–150.
- [69] Matthews, B. (1975). Comparison of the predicted and observed secondary structure of t4 phage lysozyme. *Biochimica et Biophysica Acta (BBA) - Protein Structure*, 405(2):442–451.
- [70] Mela, C. F. (2018). Research priorities 2018-2020. Technical report, Marketing Science Institute (MSI). <https://www.msi.org/articles/marketers-top-challenges-2018-2020-research-priorities/> (Last visited: 3rd of June 2020).
- [71] Moon, H., Han, S. H., Chun, J., and Hong, S. W. (2016). A design process for a customer journey map: A case study on mobile services. *Human Factors and Ergonomics in Manufacturing & Service Industries*, 26(4):501–514.

- [72] Muñoz-Gama, J. and Carmona, J. (2010). A fresh look at precision in process conformance. In *8th International Conference on Business Process Management*, pages 211–226. Springer.
- [73] Nakatani, T. and Sato, K. (2013). Mulsa: Multi-layered scenario analysis for an advanced driver assistance system. In *8th International Joint Conference on Software Technologies (ICSOFT)*, pages 83–91.
- [74] Nguyen, H., Dumas, M., La Rosa, M., Maggi, F. M., and Suriadi, S. (2016). Business process deviance mining: review and evaluation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1608.08252*.
- [75] Nooyen, J. (2020). Predicting the occurrence of complaints within the customer journey based on process mining techniques. Master's thesis, Eindhoven University of Technology.
- [76] Olding, E., Cantara, M., Robertson, B., Dunie, R., Huang, O., and Searle, S. (2015). Predicts 2016: Business transformation and process management bridge the strategy-to execution gap. Technical report, Gartner. <https://www.gartner.com/doc/3173020/predicts--business-transformation-process> (Last visited: 3rd of June 2020).
- [77] Peltola, S., Vainio, H., and Nieminen, M. (2015). Key factors in developing omnichannel customer experience with finnish retailers. In *HCI in Business*, pages 335–346, Cham. Springer.
- [78] Pitkow, J. and Pirolli, P. (1999). Mining longest repeating subsequences to predict world wide web surfing. In *2nd Conference on USENIX Symposium on Internet Technologies and Systems (USITS)*, page 13, USA. USENIX Association.
- [79] Polato, M., Sperduti, A., Burattin, A., and de Leoni, M. (2018). Time and activity sequence prediction of business process instances. *Computing*, 100(9):1005–1031.
- [80] Richardson, A. (2010). Using customer journey maps to improve customer experience. *Harvard business review*, 15(1):2–5.
- [81] Schwarz, G. (1978). Estimating the dimension of a model. *Annals of Statistics*, 6(2):461–464.
- [82] Selig, H. (2017). Continuous event log extraction for process mining. Master's thesis, School of Information and Communication Technology. KTH Royal Institute of Technology in Stockholm.
- [83] Stickdorn, M., Schneider, J., Andrews, K., and Lawrence, A. (2011). *This is service design thinking: Basics, tools, cases*, volume 1. Wiley.
- [84] Suriadi, S., Andrews, R., ter Hofstede, A. H., and Wynn, M. T. (2017). Event log imperfection patterns for process mining: Towards a systematic approach to cleaning event logs. *Information Systems*, 64:132–150.
- [85] Tax, N., Verenich, I., La Rosa, M., and Dumas, M. (2017). Predictive business process monitoring with lstm neural networks. In *29th International Conference on Advanced Information Systems Engineering (CAiSE)*, pages 477–492, Cham. Springer.

- [86] Terragni, A. and Hassani, M. (2018). Analyzing customer journey with process mining: From discovery to recommendations. In *IEEE 6th International Conference on Future Internet of Things and Cloud (FiCloud)*, pages 224–229. IEEE.
- [87] Terragni, A. and Hassani, M. (2019). Optimizing customer journey using process mining and sequence-aware recommendation. In *Proceedings of the 34th ACM/SIGAPP Symposium on Applied Computing (SAC)*, pages 57–65, New York, NY, USA. Association for Computing Machinery.
- [88] Tholath, D. I. and S.J., F. C. (2016). Customer journey maps for demographic online customer profiles. *International Journal of Virtual Communities and Social Networking (IJVCSN)*, 8(1):1–18.
- [89] Tseng, M. M., Qin Hai, M., and Su, C.-J. (1999). Mapping customers' service experience for operations improvement. *Business Process Management Journal*, 5(1):50–64.
- [90] van den Bergh, J., Işik, O., Viaene, S., and Helsen, E. (2015). Re-positioning business process management: Exploring key capabilities for successful business transformation. Technical report. <https://repository.vlerick.com/handle/20.500.12127/5349> (Last visited: 5th of June 2020).
- [91] van den Bos, L. (2019). A bridge between ux design and enterprise architecture. Master's thesis, University of Utrecht.
- [92] van der Aalst, W. M. (2010). Synthetic event logs - review example large.xes.gz. <https://doi.org/10.4121/uuid:da6aafef-5a86-4769-acf3-04e8ae5ab4fe> (Last visited: 27th of May 2020).
- [93] van der Aalst, W. M. (2011). *Process Mining: Discovery, Conformance and Enhancement of Business Processes*. Springer, 1st edition.
- [94] van der Aalst, W. M. (2016). *Process Mining: Data Science in Action*. Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg.
- [95] van der Aalst, W. M., Adriansyah, A., de Medeiros, A. K., Arcieri, F., Baier, T., Blickle, T., Bose, J. C., et al. (2012). Process mining manifesto. In *Business Process Management Workshops, in conjunction with the 10th International Conference on Business Process Management (BPM Workshops)*, pages 169–194, Berlin, Heidelberg. Springer.
- [96] van der Aalst, W. M., de Medeiros, A. K., and Weijters, T. A. (2005). Genetic process mining. In *26th International Conference on Application and Theory of Petri Nets and Other Models of Concurrency (ICATPN)*, pages 48–69, Berlin, Heidelberg. Springer.
- [97] van der Aalst, W. M., La Rosa, M., and Santoro, F. M. (2016). Business process management. don't forget to improve the process! *Business & Information Systems Engineering*, 58(1):1–6.

- [98] Vanhatalo, J., Völzer, H., and Koehler, J. (2009). Refined process structure tree. *Data & Knowledge Engineering*, 68(9):793–818. Five selected and extended papers from the 6th International Conference on Business Process Management (BPM 2008).
- [99] Vargo, S. L. and Lusch, R. F. (2004). Evolving to a new dominant logic for marketing. *Journal of Marketing*, 68(1):1–17.
- [100] Verenich, I. (2018). *Explainable predictive monitoring of temporal measures of business processes*. PhD thesis, School of Information Systems. Science and Engineering Faculty. Queensland University of Technology.
- [101] Verenich, I., Dumas, M., La Rosa, M., Maggi, F. M., Chasovskyi, D., and Rozumnyi, A. (2016a). Tell me what’s ahead? predicting remaining activity sequences of business process instances.
- [102] Verenich, I., Dumas, M., La Rosa, M., Maggi, F. M., and Di Francescomarino, C. (2016b). Complex symbolic sequence clustering and multiple classifiers for predictive process monitoring. In *Business Process Management Workshops, in conjunction with the 14th International Conference on Business Process Management (BPM Workshops)*, pages 218–229, Cham. Springer.
- [103] Vázquez-Barreiros, B., Mucientes, M., and Lama, M. (2015). Prodigen: Mining complete, precise and minimal structure process models with a genetic algorithm. *Information Sciences*, 294:315–333. Innovative Applications of Artificial Neural Networks in Engineering.
- [104] Wheelock, A., Miraldo, M., Parand, A., Vincent, C., and Sevdalis, N. (2014). Journey to vaccination: a protocol for a multinational qualitative study. *BMJ Open*, 4(1).

