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Abstract—For large-scale distributed systems, it is crucial to efficiently diagnose the root causes of incidents to maintain high system availability. The recent development of microservice architecture brings three major challenges (i.e., operation, system scale, and monitoring complexities) to root cause analysis (RCA) in industrial settings. To tackle these challenges, in this paper, we present GROOT, an event-graph-based approach for RCA. GROOT constructs a real-time causality graph based on events that summarize various types of metrics, logs, and activities in the system under analysis. Moreover, to incorporate domain knowledge from site reliability engineering (SRE) engineers, GROOT can be customized with user-defined events and domain-specific rules. Currently, GROOT supports RCA among 5,000 real production services and is actively used by the SRE team in a global e-commerce system serving more than 185 million active buyers per year. Over 15 months, we collect a data set containing labeled root causes of 952 real production incidents for evaluation. The evaluation results show that GROOT is able to achieve 95\% top-3 accuracy and 78\% top-1 accuracy. To share our experience in deploying and adopting RCA in industrial settings, we conduct survey to show that users of GROOT find it helpful and easy to use. We also share the lessons learned from deploying and adopting GROOT to solve RCA problems in production environments.

I. INTRODUCTION

Since the emergence of microservice architecture [1], it has been quickly adopted by many large companies such as Amazon, Google, and Microsoft. Microservice architecture aims to improve the scalability, development agility, and reusability of these companies’ business systems. Despite these undeniable benefits, different levels of components in such a system can go wrong due to the fast-evolving and large-scale nature of microservices architecture [1]. Even if there are minimal human-induced faults in code, the system might still be at risk due to anomalies in hardware, configurations, etc. Therefore, it is critical to detect anomalies and then efficiently analyze the root causes of the associated incidents, subsequently helping system reliability engineering (SRE) team takes further actions to bring the system back to normal.

In the process of recovering a system, it is critical to conduct accurate and efficient root cause analysis (RCA) [2], the second one of a three-step process. In the first step, anomalies are detected with alerting mechanisms [3]-[5] based on monitoring data such as logs [6]-[10], metrics/key performance indicators (KPIs) [11]-[15], or a combination thereof [16], [17]. In the second step, when the alerts are triggered, RCA is performed to analyze the root cause of these and additional events and propose recovery actions from the associated incident [6], [13], [19]. RCA needs to consider multiple possible interpretations of potential causes for the incident, and these different interpretations could lead to different mitigation actions to be performed. In the last step, the SRE team performs those mitigation actions and recovers the system.

Based on our industrial SRE experiences, we find that RCA is difficult in industrial practice due to three complexities, particularly under microservice settings:

- **Operational Complexity.** For large-scale systems, there are typically centered (aka infrastructure) SRE and domain (aka embedded) SRE engineers [20]. Their communication is often ineffective or limited under the microservice scenarios due to a more diversified tech stack, granular services, and shorter life cycles than traditional systems. The knowledge gap between the centered SRE team and the domain SRE team gets further enlarged and makes RCA much more challenging. Centered SRE engineers have to learn from domain SRE engineers on how the new domain changes work to update the centralized RCA tools. Thus, adaptive and customizable RCA is required instead of one-size-fits-all solutions.

- **Scale Complexity.** There could be thousands of services simultaneously running in a large microservice system, resulting in a very high number of monitoring signals. A real incident could cause numerous alerts to be triggered across services. The inter-dependencies and incident triaging between the services are proportionally more complicated than a traditional system [15]. To detect root causes that may be distributed and many steps away from an initially observed anomalous service, the RCA approach must be scalable and very efficient to digest high volume signals.

- **Monitoring Complexity.** A high quantity of observability data types (metrics, logs, activities) needs to be monitored, stored, and processed, such as intra-service and inter-service metrics. Different services in a system may produce different types of logs or metrics with different patterns. There are also various kinds of activities, such as code deployment or configuration changes. The RCA
tools must be able to consume such highly diversified and unstructured data and make inferences.

To overcome the limited effectiveness of existing approaches [2], [3], [14], [16], [21]–[31] (as mentioned in Section II) in industrial settings due to the aforementioned complexities, we propose GROOT, an event-graph-based RCA approach. In particular, GROOT constructs an event causality graph, the basic nodes are monitoring events such as performance metrics deviation events, status change event and developer activity events. Events carry detailed information to enable accurate RCA. The events and the causalities between them are constructed using specified rules and heuristics (reflecting domain knowledge). In contrast to the existing fully learning-based approaches [3], [10], [23], GROOT provides better transparency and interpretability. This is critical in our industrial settings because a graph-based approach can offer visualized reasoning with causality links to the root cause and details of every event instead of just listing the results. Besides, our approach can enable effective tracking of cases and targeted detailed improvements, e.g., by enhancing the rules and heuristics used to construct the graph.

GROOT has two salient advantages over existing graph-based approaches:

- **Fine granularity** (events as basic nodes). Unlike existing graph-based approaches, which directly use services [23] or hosts (VMs) [30] as basic nodes, GROOT constructs the causality graph by using monitoring events as basic nodes. Graphs based on events from the services can provide more accurate results to address the monitoring complexity. For the scale complexity, GROOT can dynamically create hidden events or additional dependencies based on the context, such as adding dependencies to the external service providers and their issues. Furthermore, to construct the causality graph, GROOT takes the detailed contextual information of each event into consideration for analysis with more depth. Doing so also helps GROOT incorporate SRE insights with the context details of each event to address the operational complexity.

- **High diversity** (a wide range of event types supported). The causality graph in GROOT supports various event types such as performance metrics, status logs, and developer activities to address the monitoring complexity. This multi-scenario graph schema can directly boost the RCA coverage and precision. For example, GROOT is able to detect a specific configuration change on a service as the root cause instead of performance anomaly symptoms, thus reducing live efforts and time-to-recovery (TTR). GROOT also allows the SRE developers to introduce different event types that are powered by different detection strategies or from different sources. For the rules that decide causality between events, we design a grammar that allows easy and fast implementations of domain-specific rules, narrowing the knowledge gap of the operational complexity. Lastly, GROOT provides a robust and transparent ranking algorithm that can digest diverse events, improve accuracy, and produce results interpretable by visualization.

To demonstrate the flexibility and effectiveness of GROOT, we evaluate it on an industrial e-commerce system that serves more than 185 million active users and features more than 5,000 services deployed over three data centers. We conduct experiments on a labeled and validated data set to show that GROOT achieves 95% top-3 accuracy and 78% top-1 accuracy for 952 real production incidents collected over 15 months. Furthermore, GROOT is deployed in production for real-time RCA, and is used daily by both centered and domain SRE teams, with the achievement of 73% top-1 accuracy in action. Finally, the end-to-end execution time of GROOT for each incident in our experiments is less than 5 seconds, demonstrating the high performance of GROOT.

We report our experiences and lessons learned when using GROOT to perform RCA in the industrial e-commerce system. We survey among the SRE users and developers of GROOT, who find GROOT easy to use and helpful during the triage stage. Meanwhile, the developers also find GROOT design to be desirable to make changes and facilitate new requirements. We also share the lessons learned from adopting GROOT in production for SRE in terms of technology transfer and adoption.

In summary, this paper makes four main contributions:

- An event-graph-based approach named GROOT for root cause analysis tackling challenges in industrial settings.
- Implementation of GROOT in an RCA framework allows the SRE team to instill domain knowledge.
- Evaluation with an industrial e-commerce system that serves more than 185 million active users and consists of more than 5,000 services, for demonstrating GROOT’s effectiveness and efficiency.
- Experiences and lessons learned when deploying and applying GROOT in production.

### II. RELATED WORK

**Anomaly Detection.** Anomaly detection aims to detect potential issues in the system. Anomaly detection approaches using time series data can generally be categorized into three types: (1) batch-processing and historical analysis like Surus [32], (2) machine learning-based, such as Donut [12], (3) usage of adaptive concept drift, like StepWise [33]. GROOT currently uses a combination of manually written thresholds, statistical models, and machine learning algorithms to detect the anomalies. Since our approach is event-driven, as long as fairly accurate alerts are generated, GROOT is able to incorporate them.

**Root Cause Analysis.** Traditional RCA approach includes finding the multi-dimensional combination of attribute values that would lead to certain QoS anomalies. This kind of attribute-based approaches include Acriptor [34] and HotSpot [35]. These approaches are effective at discrete static data. Once there are continuous data introduced by time series information, these attribute-based approaches would be much less effective.
To tackle such difficulties, there are two categories of approaches: machine learning-based and graph-based.

Machine Learning RCA. Machine learning approaches use features like time series information [23], [30] or features extracted using textual and temporal information [3]. There are also deep learning approaches that first construct the dependency graph of the system and then try to represent the graph in a neural network to perform deep learning [12]. However, these ML-based approaches are facing the challenge of a lack of training data. Gan et al. [10] proposed Seer to make use of historical tracking data. Although it is also focused on the microservice scenario, it is designed to detect QoS violations while lacking support for other kinds of errors. There is also an effort to use unsupervised learning such as GAN [12], but it is generally hard to simulate large, complicated distributed systems to give meaningful data.

Graph-based RCA. Sole et al. [2] has done a great job in surveying and analyzing different RCA approaches. They categorized more than 20 RCA algorithms by more than 10 theoretical models to represent the relationships between components. Nguyen et al. proposed FChain [21], which introduces time series information into the graph, but they still use server/VM as nodes in the graph. Chen et al. proposed CauseInfer [22], which constructs a two-layered hierarchical causality graph. It applies metrics as nodes that advance service-level dependency. Schoenfisch et al. [24] proposed to use Markov Logic Network to express conditional dependencies in the first-order logic. However, their approaches still build dependency on the service level. Jinjin et al. proposed Microscope [36], which targets microservice scenario. It only builds the graph on service-level metrics so that it cannot get full use of other information and lacks customization. Brandon et al [25] proposed an approach that builds the system graph using metrics, logs, and anomalies and then uses pattern matching against a library to identify the root cause. However, it’s difficult to update the system to facilitate the changing requirements. Li et al. proposed MicroRCA [15], which models both services and machines in the graph and tracks the propagation among them. It would be hard to extend the graph from machines to the concept of other resources like DB in our paper.

As mentioned in Section I by using event-graph, GROOT mainly overcomes the limitation of existing graph-based approaches in two aspects: (1) build more accurate and precise causality graph use event-graph-based model; (2) allow adaptive customization of link construction rules to incorporate domain knowledge in order to facilitate the rapid requirement changes in the microservice scenario. Our approach uses a customized page rank algorithm in the event ranking, which can also be seen as an unsupervised machine learning approach. Therefore our framework is complementary to other machine learning approaches as long as they can accept our event causality graph as a feature.

Settings and Scale. The operational, scale, and monitoring complexity challenges are observed and more extensive in the industrial settings. Hence, we believe the RCA approaches should be validated at enterprise scale and against actual incidents for effectiveness.

We summarize the experiment settings and scale in existing RCA approaches’ evaluations in Table I. All approaches listed are evaluated in a relatively small scenario. In contrast, our experiments are performed upon a system containing 5,000 production services on hundreds of thousands of VMs. On average, the sub-dependency graph (constructed in Section IV-A) of our service-based data set is already 77.5 services, which is more than the total number in any of the listed evaluations. Moreover, 7 out of 8 are tested under simulative fault injection on top of existing benchmarks like RUBiS, which can’t represent real-world incidents; and Seer [10] only collects the real-world results with no validations. Our data set contains 952 actual incidents collected from real-world settings.

III. MOTIVATING EXAMPLE

In this section, we demonstrate the effectiveness of event-based graph and adaptive customization strategies with two motivating examples.

Figure 1 shows an abstracted real incident example with the dependency graph and the corresponding causality graph constructed by GROOT. The Checkout service of our e-commerce system suddenly gets an additional latency spike due to a code deployment on the Service-E. The service monitor is reporting API Call Timeout detected by the ML anomaly detection system. The simplified sub-dependency graph consisting of 6 services is shown in Figure 1a. The initial alert is triggered on the Checkout (entrance) service. The other nodes Service-* are the internal services that the Checkout service directly or indirectly depends on. The color of the nodes in Figure 1a indicates the severity/count of anomalies (alerts) reported on each service. We can see that Service-B is the most severe one as there are two related alerts on it. The traditional graph-based approach [23], [30] usually takes into account only the graph between services in addition to the severity information on each service. If the traditional approach got applied on Figure 1a either Service-B, Service-D, or Service-E could be a potential root cause, and Service-B would have the highest possibility since it has two related alerts. Such results are not useful to the SRE team.

In GROOT, the event-based causality graph constructed is shown in Figure 1b. The events in each service are used as the nodes here. We can see that the API Call Timeout issue in Checkout is possibly caused by API Call Timeout in Service-A, which is further caused by Latency Spike in DataCenter-A of Service-C. GROOT further tracks back to see and finds it is

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approach</th>
<th>Total Scale</th>
<th>Validated on Real Incidents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FChain</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>&lt;= 30 VMs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CauseInfer</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>&lt;= 70 services, ~600 QPS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MicroRCA</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>&lt;= 20 services on 3 servers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MicroScope</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>&lt;= 56 services, ~3000 QPS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APG</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>&lt;= 10 VMs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seer</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>&lt;= 50 services on 3 servers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MicroRCA</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>&lt;= 13 services, ~1000 QPS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCA Graph</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>&lt;= 70 services on 8 VMs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real-time Anomaly Detection</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>&lt;= 600 QPS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE I: The target architecture and scale of experiments in recent proposed RCA approaches.
likely caused by Latency Spike in Service-E, which happens in the same data center. Finally, GROOT figures out that the most probable root cause is a recent Code Deployment event in Service-E. The SRE team then could quickly locate the root cause and roll back this code deployment, followed by further investigations.

There are no casual links between events in Service-B and Service-A, since no causal rules are matched. The API Call Timeout event is less likely to depend on the event type High CPU and High GC. Therefore the inference can eliminate Service-B from possible root causes. This elimination shows the benefit of the event-based graph. Note that there is another event Latency Spike in Service-D, but not connected to Latency Spike in Service-C in the causality graph. The reason is that the Latency Spike event happens in DataCenter-A, not DataCenter-B.

Figure 2 and 3 show how developers can easily change GROOT to adapt new requirements, by updating the events and rules. In Figure 2 the SRE team wants to add a new type of deployment activity, ML Model Deployment. Usually, the users first need to select the anomaly detection model or set their own alerts and provide alert/activity data sources for the stored events. In this example, the event can be directly fetched from the ML model management system. Then GROOT also requires related properties (e.g., the detection time range) to be set for the new event type. Lastly, the rules are added for building the causal links between the new event type and existing ones. The blue box in Figure 2 shows the rule, which denotes the edge direction, target event, and target service (self, upstream, and downstream dependency).

Figure 3 shows a real-world example of how GROOT is able to incorporate SRE insights and knowledge. More specifically, SRE developers would like to change the rules to allow GROOT to distinguish the latency spikes from different data centers. As example in Figure 1b, Latency Spike events only propagate within the same data center. During GROOT development, SRE developers could easily add new property DataCenter to the Latency Spike event. Then they add the corresponding “conditional” rules to be differentiated with the “basic” rules in Figure 3. In conditional rules, links are only constructed when additional conditions are met.
TABLE II: List of example events used in GROOT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Detection Method</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Performance Metric</td>
<td>High GC (Garbage Collection Overhead)</td>
<td>Role-based</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status Logs</td>
<td>Error reports HTTP Status Code (5xx)</td>
<td>Statistical Model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developer Activity</td>
<td>Code Deployment</td>
<td>De Facto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Timeouts</td>
<td>De Facto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High CPU Usage</td>
<td>De Facto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LB Connection Stalling</td>
<td>Statistical Model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TPS Spike</td>
<td>Statistical Model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unreliable Metric Anomaly</td>
<td>De Facto</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IV. APPROACH

Figure 4 shows the overall workflow of GROOT. The triggers of GROOT are usually the automated anomaly detection alert(s), or sometimes SRE engineer’s suspicion. There are three major steps: service dependency graph construction, event causality graph construction, and root cause ranking. The outputs are the root causes ranked by the likelihood. To support fast human investigation experience, we build an interactive UI as shown in the Figure 8: the application dependency, events with causal links and additional details such as raw metrics or developer contact (of code deployment event) are presented to the user for next steps. As the offline part of human investigation, we label/collect data set, perform validation and summarize the knowledge for further improvement on all incidents on a daily basis.

A. Constructing Service Dependency Graph

The service dependency construction starts with the initial alerted or suspicious service(s), noted as I. For example, in Figure 1a, I = {Checkout}. I can contain multiple services based on the range of the trigger alerts or suspicions. We maintain domain application lists to trigger by the domain-level alerts because there is no clear service-level indications.

At the back end, GROOT maintains a global service dependency graph G_{global} via distributed tracing and log analysis. The directed edge from A to B (two services or system components) in the dependency graph indicates a service invocation or other forms of dependency. In Figure 1a, the black arrows indicate such edges. Bi-directional edges and cycles between the services are possible and exist. In this work, the global dependency graph is updated daily.

The service dependency (sub)graph G is constructed using G_{global} and I. An extended service list L is firstly constructed by traversing each service in I over G_{global} for a radius range r. Each service u ∈ L can be traversed by at least one service v ∈ I within r steps: L = {u|∃v ∈ I dist(u, v) ≤ r or dist(v, u) ≤ r}. Then, the service dependency subgraph G is constructed by the nodes in L and the edges between them in G_{global}. In our current implementation, r is set to 2, since this dependency graph may be dynamically extended in the next steps based on events’ detail for longer issue chains or additional dependencies.

B. Constructing Event Causality Graph

In the second step, GROOT collects all supported events for each service in G and constructs the causal links between events.

1) Collecting Event: Table [II] presents some example event types and detection methods for GROOT’s production implementation. For detection methods, “De Facto” means the event can be directly collected via a specific API or storage. The detections either run passively at the back end to reduce delay, improve accuracy; or run on the fly within the dependency graph range for depth and save computing resources. There are three major types of events: performance metric, status log and developer activity:

- **Performance metric** represent an anomaly of monitored time series metrics. For example, high CPU usage indicates the service is causing high CPU usage on a certain machines. In this category, most events are continuously and passively detected and stored.
- **Status log** are caused by abnormal system status, such as HTTP error code metrics spike while accessing services’ endpoints. Different types of error metrics are important and supported in GROOT, including third-party APIs. Markdown means that the whole service is down. Bad Host indicates abnormal patterns on some machines running the service detected by clustering-based ML approach.
- **Developer activity** are the events generated when the certain activity of developers is triggered, such as code deployment and config change.

Each event is defined as a set of property-value pairs. Formally, an event type is defined as eT = {pairi ∈ (propertyi, possible_valuei)} and each event is defined as e = {pairi = (Propertyi, valuei)}. Each event type serves as a template for the event instantiation. Property would be an arbitrary string. possible_value can be any primitive data types like a string, an integer, a float or a set of primitive types while value is limited to primitive data types. All event types are required to have following properties: Type indicates the meta-type of the event; Name indicates the name of this event type; Lookback period indicates the time range to collect event. All events are required to have the following properties: Service indicates the service name that the events belong to; Type indicates the event type’s name and StartTime indicates the time when the event happened.

For example, in Figure 1 the generated event for Latency Spike in DataCenter-A in Service-C would be {“Service” : “Service-C”, “Type” : “Latency Spike”, “DataCenter” : “DC-1”, “StartTime” : YYYY, “EndTime” : YYYY,...}.

2) Constructing Causal Link: After collecting all events on all services in G, in the this step, causal links between these events are constructed for RCA ranking. The causal links (red arrows) in Figure 1a are examples. A causal link represents that the source event can possibly be caused by the target event. SRE knowledge is engineered into rules and used to create causal links between the pairs of events.
Similar to the definition of events, rules are also defined as a set of property-value pairs. Rules are required to have the following properties: Event indicates the event type we need to build the link by using this rule; Target-Service indicates service level causal directions, the value can be: self means that the target event would be within the same service; Outgoing and Incoming means to build links to the events of the downstream/upstream services in G. Target-Events indicates the target event types as the causal link’s target. The causal link’s direction is always from Event to Target – Events, and means “possibly caused by.”

There are two special properties for rules. The first one is Target-Type property, which can be either Static or Dynamic. The Static rule is for the basic causal link, which only requires the previously introduced properties. Dynamic rule is introduced to support dynamic dependencies. For example, live DB dependencies are not available due to different tech stacks and high volume. In Figure 5, a DB issue (DB Markdown) is shown in Service – A. Based on the event property and dynamic rule, GROOT creates a new dependency from Service – A to DB – 1 in G; a new event “Issue” belongs to DB – 1; and a causal link between the two events. The Target – Service property is a property in the source event type(Source DB here). In practice, the SRE team uses dynamic rules to cover lots of third-party services and database issues since the live dependencies are not easy to maintain.

The second special type is condition property. This property is a boolean predicate that may include other properties in the source/target event or constant values. It’s used when some prerequisite conditions are required for an accurate causal link. As shown in Figure 3, the SRE team believes Latency Spike events from different applications are only directly related (for a causal link), when both are from the same data center(s). In this case, GROOT would first evaluate the condition predicate and only build the causal link when it’s true. Conditional rule overwrites the basic rule on the same source-target event pair.

To construct the causal links, the dynamic dependencies and events are firstly created at once. Then for every event in the initial services (I), if the rule conditions are met, one or many causal links are created from itself to other events from the same or upstream/downstream services. When a link is created, the step will repeat recursively for the target event (as a new origin) to search for the next possible “causes”. After the graph traversal, all potential causal links/chains are created, and the event graph is ready for ranking.

C. Root Cause Ranking

Lastly, GROOT ranks and recommends the most probable root causes from the event causality graph. Similar to how search engines infer the importance of pages by page links, we customize the PageRank [37] algorithm to calculate the root cause ranking, where we call GrootRank. The input is the event causality graph from the previous step. Each edge is associated with a weighted score for weighted propagation. The default value is 1, and set it lower for the alerts with high false-positive rates.

Based on the observation that dangling nodes are more likely to be the root cause, we customized the personalization vector as: \( P_n = f_n \) or \( P_d = 1 \), where \( P_d \) is the personalization score for dangling nodes, and \( P_n \) is for the rest nodes; and \( f_n \) is a value smaller than 1 to enhance the propagation between dangling nodes. In our work, the parameter setting is: \( f_n = 0.5 \), \( \alpha = 0.85 \), \( maxiter = 100 \). Figure 6 illustrates an example. The grey circles are the events collected from three services and one database. The grey arrows are the dependency links and the red ones are the causal links with a weight of 1. Both algorithms detect event5 (DB issue) as the root cause, which is expected and correct. However, the vanilla algorithm ranks event4 higher than event3. But event3 of Service-C is more likely to be the second possible root cause (besides event5). Because the scores on dangling nodes are propagated to all others equally in each iteration. We can see that the event3 is correctly ranked as second using the GrootRank algorithm.

The second step of GrootRank is to break the tied results from the previous step. The tied results are due to the fact that the event graph can contain multiple disconnected sub-graphs with the same shape. We designed two approaches to untie the ranking:

1) For each joint event, the access distance (sum) is calculated from the initial anomaly service(s) to the service.
where it belongs to. If any “access” is not reachable - the distance is set as \(d_m + 1\) where \(d_m\) is the maximum possible distance. The one with shorter access distance (sum) would be ranked higher and vise versa. Figure 7 presents an example, where Service-A and Service-B are both initial anomaly services. Since GROOT suspects the event2 is caused by either event3 or 1 with the same weight. The scores of event3 and 1 are tied. Then, event3 has a score of 1 (0+1) and event1 has a score of 2 (0+2, since it’s not reachable by Service-B). Therefore, event3 is ranked first and logical.

2) For the remaining joint results with the same access distances, GROOT continues to unite by using the history root cause frequency of the event types under the same trigger conditions (e.g., checkout domain alerts). This is generated from the manually labeled dataset. The more frequently occurred root cause type is ranked higher.

D. Rule Customization Management

While creating or updating the rules offline, there could be overlaps, inconsistencies, or even conflicts being introduced like the example in Figure 3. We use two graphs to manage the rule relationships and avoid conflicts for users. One graph is to represent the link rules between events in the same service (Same-Graph) while the other is to represent links between different services (Diff-Graph). The nodes in these two graphs are the event types we defined in Section V-B. There are three statuses between each (directional) pair of event types: (1) No rule. (2) Only basic rule. (3) Conditional rule (since it overwrites basic rule). In the Same-Graph, we don’t allow self-loop as we don’t build links between an event with itself.

When rule change happens, existing rules are enumerated to build edges in the Same-Graph and Diff-Graph based on the Target-Events and Target-Service properties. Based on the following users’ operations: (1) "Remove a rule": will remove the corresponding edge on the graphs; (2) "Add/update a rule": check if there are existing edges between the given event types, then alert for the possible overwrites. If there are no conflicts, we just add/update edges between the event types.

After all changes, we extract the rules from the graphs by converting each edge to a single rule. These rules will be then used to manage the overlaps, inconsistencies, or even conflicts being introduced by owners without records. On the other hand, the infra-level incidents in the data set, respectively. For each incident, the root cause manually labeled by SRE engineers. To create this data set, we evaluated over 1500 incidents and around 40% cases are missing supported events or caused by external issues (e.g., regional network provider failures). These incidents are categorized as:

- **Business domain incident.** This is detected mainly due to its business impact. For example, end-users have failed interactions, and business or customer experience is impacted, similar to the Figure 1 example.
- **Service-based incident.** This is detected mainly due to its impact on the service level, likely internal issues, as the example shown in Figure 5.

An internal incident may get detected early, then likely get categorized as a service-based incident or even solved directly by owners without records. On the other hand, the infra-level issues or the issues of external service providers (e.g., checkout and shipping services) may not get detected until business impact is caused.

There are 782 business domains and 170 service-based incidents in the data set, respectively. For each incident, the root cause is manually labeled, validated, and collected by the SRE teams who handle the site incidents everyday. For the cases with multiple interacting causes, we only label the most actionable/influential event as root cause for each. These actual root causes and incident contexts serve as the ground truth in our evaluations.

2) **GROOT Set Up:** The Groot production system is deployed as three microservices and federated in two data centers, and each has nine 8-core, 20GB RAM pods on Kubernetes.

3) **Baseline Approach:** In order to make fair comparisons of our approach against others, we design and implement two baseline approaches for the validation.

- **RQ2.** How does the adaptive event-driven approach improve the accuracy of GROOT compared with baseline approaches?
- **RQ3.** What is the RCA accuracy and performance of GROOT in end-to-end real time scenario?

A. System Evaluation Setting

To allow us to evaluate GROOT in a real-world scenario, GROOT is deployed and tested in an e-commerce system that serves more than 185 million active users. The GROOT tool is built upon a complete microservice ecosystem that contains over 5,000 services on 3 data centers. The distributed tracing of the ecosystem generates 147B traces with 2.8T spans on average per day. These services are built on different tech stacks with different programming languages, including Java, Python, Node.js, and so on. Furthermore, these services interact with each other by using different types of service protocols, including HTTP, Grpc, Message Queue, and so on.

1) **Data Set:** The SRE teams support us to build a labeled data set containing 952 incidents over 15 months (Jan 2020 - Apr 2021). Each incident data contains the input required by GROOT (e.g., dependency snapshot and events with details) and the root cause manually labeled by SRE engineers. To create this data set, we evaluated over 1500 incidents and around 40% cases are missing supported events or caused by external issues (e.g., regional network provider failures). These incidents are categorized as:

- **Business domain incident.** This is detected mainly due to its business impact. For example, end-users have failed interactions, and business or customer experience is impacted, similar to the Figure 1 example.
- **Service-based incident.** This is detected mainly due to its impact on the service level, likely internal issues, as the example shown in Figure 5.

In order to make fair comparisons of our approach against others, we design and implement two baseline approaches for the validation.
• **Naive Approach.** This directly uses the GROOT service dependency graph constructed in Section [IV-A]. Then, the events are assigned a score by the severity of the anomaly. Then a normalized score for each service is calculated summarizing all the events related to it. Lastly, the vanilla Pagerank algorithm is used to calculate the root cause ranking.

• **Non-adaptive Approach.** This approach is not context-aware. It replaces all special type (conditional and dynamic) rules as the basic rule versions in Section [IV-B].

The other steps are identical to GROOT.

We believe the non-adaptive approach can be seen as a baseline of a class of graph-based approaches (e.g., Causeliner [22] and Microscope [36]). These works also specify certain service-level metrics but lack the context-aware capabilities of GROOT. Due to the unavailability of their tools, this approach is built only as an approximation.

### B. System Evaluation

1) **RQ1:** We run GROOT on the data set collected in Section [V-A1]. The results are presented in Table [III]. We measure both top-1 and top-3 accuracy. The top-1 accuracy is calculated as: the count of cases where its ground-truth root cause is also ranked top one over the count of total cases. The top-3 accuracy is calculated if the ground-truth root cause is ranked in the top 3. All joint rankings must be untied first for fairness. GROOT achieves much high accuracy for both incident types. It is noticeable that in business domain incidents, GROOT achieves 96% top-3 accuracy.

For the cases that GROOT ranks the root cause after top-3, they are mostly caused by missing event(s), so the causality graph is short of the causal link(s) or the root cause itself. More than one-third of these failures are improved by adding new necessary events and rules over time. For example, initially, we only have an overall error spike anomaly which has a high false-positive rate. We then build active and deep detection models for each different type of error metrics (such as various internal and client API errors). We include these cases to reflect a fair setting in production. For many non-top-1 cases, they failed because detected root causes are for other co-existing issues, but we only allow a single root cause label in each case for fairness. According to the SRE team feedback, GROOT still facilitates the process for such cases.

Our result shows the execution of GROOT is relatively efficient. For service-based incidents, the average execution time of GROOT is 1.06s while the maximum is 1.69s. On business domain incidents, the average execution time is 0.98s while the maximum is 1.14s. We designed every step as lightweight as possible, for providing timely results in action.

### Table III: Accuracy of RCA by GROOT and Baseline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Top-1 Accuracy</th>
<th>Top-3 Accuracy</th>
<th>Average Execution Time</th>
<th>Maximum Execution Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Naive</strong></td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>1.06s</td>
<td>1.69s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non-adaptive</strong></td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>3.16s</td>
<td>4.56s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Business Domain</strong></td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>1.14s</td>
<td>1.14s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Service-based</strong></td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>3.61s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2) **RQ2:** The baseline approaches described in Section [V-A1] are implemented and tested on the same data set. The results are also presented in Table [III]. We can see the accuracy of GROOT is substantially higher than the baseline approaches. In general, GROOT is 75% and 45% more in top-1 accuracy comparing with Naive and Non-adaptive baseline. It has even larger advantages in top-3 accuracy, which are 89% and 57%. Noticeably, GROOT achieves 81% in top-1 accuracy comparing with 26% accuracy of non-adaptive approach in business domain incidents.

The accuracy of the **Naive** and **Non-adaptive** approaches perform much worse in business domain incidents. The reason is that for business domain incidents, it often takes a longer propagation path since it’s triggered by a group of services and new dynamic dependencies may be introduced during the events collection. As showed in Section [V-B1], the causality construction helps to locate the root cause more effectively. The **Naive** approach performs worst in all scenarios, due to it blindly propagates the score at the service levels. There can be many non-critical or irrelevant anomalies in actual production use cases., aka “soft” errors. We suspect these errors may be ranked high in most related approaches since they are similar to the injected faults and hard to be distinguished from the actual ones. GROOT uses dynamic and conditional rules to discover actual relationships and leave such errors with fewer links for better accuracy.

3) **RQ3:** To evaluate the end-to-end performance of GROOT under live scenarios, GROOT is validated against actual incidents in action. The results are presented in Table [IV]. The accuracy drop ranges from 0% to 9% in the end-to-end scenarios, some failures are caused by production issues such as missing data and service/storage failures. Also, the execution time is increased by nearly 3 seconds due to the time spent on fetching data from different data sources, for example, querying the events for a certain time period.

### Table IV: Comparison of GROOT performance on dataset and end-to-end

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Top-1 Accuracy</th>
<th>Top-3 Accuracy</th>
<th>Average Execution Time</th>
<th>Maximum Execution Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dataset</strong></td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>1.69s</td>
<td>4.56s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Business Domain</strong></td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>1.14s</td>
<td>3.61s</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### VI. Experience

GROOT currently supports daily SRE work. Figure [VIII] shows a live GROOT’s “bird’s eye view” UI for an actual simple checkout incident. Service C has the root cause (ErrorSpike) and belongs to an external provider. Although the domain service A also carries an error spike and gets impacted, GROOT correctly ignores the irrelevant deployment event, which has no bad impact. The events on C are virtually created based on the dynamic rule, an API error spike of B, and a business alert. Note that all causal links (yellow) in the UI are reversed for the users to better understand. They now mean “cause to”.

---

**Table III:** Accuracy of RCA by GROOT and Baseline

**Table IV:** Comparison of GROOT performance on dataset and end-to-end
GROOT visualizes the dependency and event causality graph with extra information such as an error message. The SRE teams can quickly comprehend the incident context and root cause calculated to investigate GROOT further. A mouseover can trigger "event enrichment" based on the event type to present details such as raw metrics and other additional information.

In the rest of this section, we share the following two kinds of experiences:

- **Feedback from GROOT users and developers**, reflecting two SRE groups’ general experience while using GROOT: (1) domain SRE teams who use GROOT to find the root cause to investigate and mitigate; (2) a centered SRE team that maintains GROOT to facilitate new requirements. GROOT is designed to be SRE-centric, and directly addressing the requirements of both centered and domain SRE teams is important.

- **Lessons Learned**, representing the experience learned from deploying and adopting GROOT in production for the real-world RCA process.

A. Feedback from GROOT Users and Developers

We invite the SRE members who use GROOT for RCA in their daily work to the user survey. We call them users in this section. We also invite different SRE members responsible for maintaining GROOT, to the developer survey. We call them developers in this section. In total, there are 14 users and 6 developers who respond to the survey.

For the user survey, we ask 14 participants the following 5 questions with 4 or 5 choices each (Question 4-5 have the same choices as Question 1):

- **Question 1.** When Groot correctly locates the root cause, how does it help with your triaging experience? Answer choices: Helpful(4), Somewhat Helpful(3), No Help(2), Misleading(1).

- **Question 2.** When Groot correctly locates the real root cause, how does it save/extend your or the team’s triaging time? (Detection and remediation time not included) Answer choices: More than 50%(4), 25-50%(3), 10-25%(2), 0-10%(1), N/A(0).

- **Question 3.** (If your choice of Q2 is positive) Based on your estimation, how much triage time Groot would save on average when it is correct? (Detection and remediation time not included) Answer choices: More than 50%(4), 25-50%(3), 10-25%(2), 0-10%(1), N/A(0).

- **Question 4.** When Groot correctly locates the root cause, do you find the result “graph” provided by Groot helps you understand how and why the incident happens?

- **Question 5.** When Groot does not present the precise root cause, does the result “graph” make it easier for your investigation of the real root cause?

Figure 9a shows the result of the user survey. We can see that most users find GROOT very useful to locate the root cause. The average score for Question 1 is 3.79, i.e., 11 out of 14 participants find GROOT very helpful. As for Question 3, GROOT saves the triage time by 25-50%. Even in cases that GROOT cannot locate the precise root cause, it is still helpful to provide information for further investigation with an average score of 3.43 in Question 5.

For the developer survey, we ask the 6 participants the following 5 questions with 4 choices each (Question 2-5 have the same choices as Question 1):

- **Question 1.** Overall, how convenient do you find it to change and customize events/rules/domains while using the Groot framework? Answer choices: Convenient(4), Somewhat Convenient(3), Not Convenient(2), Difficult(1).

- **Question 2.** How convenient do you find it to change/customize event models while using the Groot framework?

- **Question 3.** How convenient do you find it to add new domains while using the Groot framework?

- **Question 4.** How convenient do you find it to change/customize causality rules while using the Groot framework?

- **Question 5.** How convenient do you find it to change/customize GROOT compared to other SRE tools?

Figure 9b shows the result of the developer survey. Overall, all questions have very positive responses on average. 5 out of 6 participants find it convenient to make changes on events/rules/domains in GROOT, while one finds it somewhat convenient (here domain denotes adding services from differ-

---

1The GROOT researchers and developers who are authors of this paper are excluded.
ent function fields).

B. Lessons learned

In this section, we share the lessons learned on using GROOT in production environments in terms of technology transfer and adoption.

**Embedded in Practice.** To build a successful RCA tool in practice, it is important to embed the R&D efforts in the live environment with SRE experts and users. We have a 30-minute routine meeting daily with an SRE team to manually test and review every site incident. Also, we actively reach out to the end users for feedback. For example, the users found our initial UI hard to understand. Based on their suggestions, we introduced alert enrichment with the detailed context of most events, raw metrics, and links to other tools for the next steps. We also make the UI interactive and build user guides, training videos, and sections. As a result, GROOT has become increasingly practical and well-adopted in practice. We believe that R&D work on observability should be incubated and grown within daily SRE environments. It is also vital to bring developers with rich RCA experience into the R&D team.

**Vertical Enhancements.** High-confidence and automated vertical enhancements can empower great experiences. GROOT is enhanced and specialized in critical scenarios such as grouped related alerts across applications or critical business domain issues, and large-scale scenarios such as infrastructure changes and database issues are supported. Furthermore, the end-to-end automation is also built for integration and efficiency with anomaly detection, RCA, and notification. For notification, domain business anomalies and diagnostic results are sent through communication apps (e.g., slack, email, and ServiceNow) for better reachability and experience. Within 18 months of R&D, GROOT now supports 18 business domains and sub-domains of the company. On average, GROOT UI supports more than 50 active internal users, and the service sends thousands of results every month. Most of these usages are around the vertical enhancements.

**Data and Tool Reliability.** Reliability is critical to GROOT itself and requires a lot of attention and effort. For example, if a critical event is missing, the whole causality of an incident may be affected. In this case, the user can only assume the related metrics/status are fine which is not helpful. Our roughly estimated alert accuracy (f1) requirement is greater than 0.6 to be useful, and recall is more important since the approach can effectively eliminate false positive alerts based on the casual ranking. Since there are hundreds of different metrics supported in GROOT, we spend time to ensure a robust back end, such as adding partial and dynamic retry logic and high-efficiency cache. GROOT’s failures can be caused by imperfect data, flawed algorithms, or simply code defects. To better trace the reason behind each failure, a tracing component is added. Every GROOT request can be traced back to atomic actions such as retrieving data, data cleaning, and anomaly detection via algorithms.

**Trade-off among Models.** The accuracy and scalability trade-off among anomaly detection models should be carefully considered and tested. In general, some algorithms such as deep-learning-based or ensemble models are more adaptive and accurate than typical ones such as ML or statistical models. However, the former requires more computation resources, operations efforts, and additional system complexities such as pertaining, model store, and drift detection. Due to the actual complexities and fast-evolving nature of our context, it is not possible to scale each model (e.g., deep-learning-based models), nor have it deeply customized for every metric at every level. Therefore, while selecting models, we must make careful trade-off in aspects such as accuracy, scalability, performance, effort and robustness. In general, we first set different “acceptance” levels by analyzing each event’s impact and frequency, and then test different models in staging and pick the one that is good enough. For example, a few alerts such as “high thread usage” are defined by thresholds and work just fine even without a model. Some alerts such as “service client error” are more stochastic and require coverage on every metric of every application, and thus we select fast and robust statistical models and actively conduct detection on the fly.

**Phased Incorporation of ML.** In the current industrial settings, ML-powered RCA products still require effective knowledge engineering. Due to the higher complexity and lower “signal to noise ratio” of real production incidents, many existing approaches cannot be applied in practice. We believe that the knowledge engineering capabilities can facilitate intelligent adoptions such as AIOPs. Therefore, GROOT is designed to be highly customizable and easy to infuse SRE knowledge and to achieve high effectiveness and efficiency. Moreover, a multi-scenario RCA tool requires various and interpretable events from different detection strategies. Auto ML anomaly detection or unsupervised RCA for large service ecosystems is not yet ready in such a context. As for the supervised learning path, the training data is tricky to label and risky to potential cognitive bias. Lastly, the end users often require complete understanding to fully adopt new solutions, because there is no guarantee of correctness. Many recent ML algorithms (e.g., ensemble or deep learning) lack interpretability. Via the knowledge engineering and graph capabilities, GROOT is able to explain diversity and causality between ML-model-driven and other types of events. Moving forward, we are building a white-box deep learning approach with causal graph algorithms where the causal link weights are parameters and derivable.

VII. Conclusion

In this paper, we have presented our work around root cause analysis (RCA) in industrial settings. To tackle three major RCA challenges (operation, scale, and monitoring complexities), we have proposed a novel event-graph-based approach that constructs a real-time causality graph for allowing adaptive customizations. We have implemented our approach as an RCA tool named GROOT. It can handle diversified anomalies and activities from the system under analysis and extensible to different approaches of anomaly detection or RCA. We have integrated GROOT into a large-scale distributed
system that serves more than 185 million active users. The system containing more than 5,000 microservices. We have evaluated GROOT on a data set consisting of 952 real production incidents collected from the system deployment and equipped with manually-labeled root causes. The evaluation results show that our approach achieves great performance in both accuracy and efficiency across different scenarios and also largely outperforms the baseline graph-based approaches. We also share the lessons learned from deploying and adopting GROOT to solve RCA problems in production environments.
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