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Abstract. This article discusses the problem of data synchronization methods using microservice architecture. Microservices is a popular and widespread software architecture today. The article investigates three main ways of interaction of microservices. They are event-based communication, interaction through direct HTTP requests and messaging, and also highlights and analyzes their advantages and disadvantages. The main purpose of the article is to analyze and make offer of the optimal option for solving the problem of synchronizing interacting microservices in real time. The optimal solution involves using the Apache Kafka message broker. It publishes data streams and subscriptions to them, as well as stores and processes them. Mathematical modeling of the proposed data synchronization method was described by constructing its state machine, as well as a system of canonical equations.
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1. Introduction

At the moment, microservice is the most popular way to develop software. This approach involves splitting the application into separate microservices, each of which fulfills its own separate business purpose. For each microservice, there are the following characteristic requirements [1-6]. For example, it should be small and independent, should fulfill a certain business requirement, interact with other microservices using a pattern of smart endpoints and dumb pipes and also adhere to decentralized management [7]. One of the main parts of the microservices is the interaction of microservices. This means data exchange between them. An important element of the microservice paradigm is the decentralization of data. It is often implemented by allocating its own database for each microservice. This allows you to isolate data from other services, thereby maintaining data stability and security [8]. Let's consider a specific problem: we need to synchronize user data between different microservices. For example, data about the full name, address, contacts and date of birth. At the same time, there are the following requirements. Namely, it should be real time synchronization, the correctness of the data and their delivery to the consumer microservice of the data should be guaranteed [9]. There are several different ways of such exchange, but each of them has its advantages and disadvantages.

The first way is to interact through direct HTTP-requests. At the same time, requests can be executed both synchronously and asynchronously, but it should be understood that using synchronous HTTP-requests, we violate the concept of weak connectivity of services [10]. This method is the simplest in execution, but it is not suitable for scaling, since if several services need to
receive the same data from this service, then it will be necessary to implement all communication channels. This approach will require more and more resources to maintain the correct operation of all information channels in case of big number of services in the application. (figure 1).

Figure 1. HTTP communication

The second way of communication of microservices is event communication [11]. In this case, a message broker is used for interaction. At the same time, records of events that were produced by separate services are sent between services. Services must explicitly know how to respond to each of the incoming events. Depending on the event, the service performs the necessary logic. It allows you to maintain a weak connection between services and at the same time track only significant events. With this method, useful data is not transmitted between services, then using event communication is an impossible solution [12]. (figure 2).

Figure 2. Event communication

The third method is messaging. In this case, the services do not interact with each other directly, but use message broker is a special mechanism. All services have access to the broker. Broker is the central link between microservices [13]. Services produce data in the corresponding topics, while others receive this data. The messaging approach uses publish-subscribe pattern in which multiple services can receive data from a single publisher [14]. The difficulties of this method are the lack of a guarantee of message delivery [15], as well as the coordination of the structure of the messages sent (figure 3).

Figure 3. Message communication

2. Methods

The problem of data synchronization between services can be solved by using optimal messaging method. You may use Apache Kafka to minimize the disadvantages of this method (figure 4) [10]. Apache Kafka is a streaming platform that publishes data streams and subscriptions to them, as well as stores and processes them. Kafka provides huge scaling capabilities and provides a centralized platform for microservices to interact. Another advantage of Kafka is the possibility of customizing the storage time of messages, which ensures replication, integrity and data storage for any period of time. And finally, streaming processing increases the level of abstraction, which in turn allows Kafka to calculate derived streams and datasets dynamically based on data streams [16].
Thus, having considered the main options for microservices interaction, we can conclude that the messaging method is most suitable for solving the problem of data synchronization between different services. At the same time, the best implementation of this method is using message broker [17-20]. For example, Apache Kafka, it provides real time message sending and processing, and can also guarantee message delivery [21].

In order to efficiently and quickly implement an application using a programming language, first you need to build a mathematical model describing the system [22]. In our case, we will use a finite deterministic machine (figure 5).

Figure 5 – Automatic model of the algorithm for receiving messages by the consumer application

- S0 – initial state of the system;
- S1 – receiving messages by the consumer;
- S2 – message package conversion;
- S3 – converting a specific message;
- S4 – deleting a message from a package during conversion;
- S5 – validation of the message package;
- S6 – validation of a concrete message;
- S7 – recording a validation error message and deleting a message from a package during validation;
- S8 – generating a message map for processing;
- S9 – distribution of message handlers;
- S10 – processing a batch of messages;
- S11 – processing a concrete message and saving the message data;
- x1 – the presence of messages in the package;
- x2 – the presence of messages for conversion in the package;
- x3 – successful conversion of a concrete message;
- x4 – availability of validation messages in the package;
- x5 – successful validation of a concrete message;
- x6 – availability of messages to be issued to the handler.

Let's construct a system of canonical equations for this state machine [23-25]:

Formula 1 - System of canonical equations
Using the constructed automaton model, we can build an algorithm for processing incoming messages using the Java programming language and the spring framework. Before starting the development of the application, it is necessary to decide and approve exactly what data we should receive from the message broker, in what format this data will be transmitted. After that, it is necessary to develop an algorithm for processing this data in accordance with business requirements and design a database table for their final storage in our system [26-30].

3. Results

The sequence of data synchronization from the producer service to the consumer service consists of the algorithm shown in Figure 6.

Figure 6 – Application activity diagram

Initially, the service producer, in accordance with certain requirements, performs the formation and processing of data on its side. After that, it converts them into JSON format and sends this message to the Kafka broker. The message is saved to the commit log. Each record contains additional information, such as the partition name, topic name, message offset. It allows further manipulation of data collection from the broker. At this time, the service consumer listens to the topics to which he is subscribed for the presence of new messages. From this moment, message processing begins in the consumer service.

As soon as new messages are published, the listener subtracts a message packet, the size of which is configurable, and passes it for processing to the Message Service message processing service. Messages are divided into Linked Hash Map < Integer, Person>, where the key is the global identifier of the person in system, and the value of map is the person with all her data by addresses
and contacts. Each message is converted from JSON to person, address, and contact objects. After that, using the Validator class, the person is checked for the correctness of the data, if the data is incorrect, then a corresponding message is output to the log, and this message is not processed. Later, the person’s data is placed in the card [31]. This algorithm makes it possible not to process intermediate data of a person within a given message package. This allows you to reduce the number of calculations, because if there are 10 records in the message package concerning the same person, it will be processed only 1 time.

As soon as the final map of all processed messages is formed, it is passed to Thread Pool Task Executor, a class implementing parallel data processing management. Each message from the map is passed to the Message Processor, where it is processed, in parallel with the processing of other messages. The size of the Thread Pool Task Executor is set via the settings file [32-34].

In Message Processor, all further processing of the message takes place, matching the global attributes of the person and the local ones, calculating some parameters, etc. At the end, the final data is stored in the database of our system. As soon as processing of all messages of the packet is finished, the listener is ready to receive a new packet of messages.

In order to get maximum efficiency, we need to choose the most suitable work parameters, both from the point of view of the effectiveness of the solution and from an economic point of view (see figure 7)

Let’s consider the main parameters that will appear in the testing process:

- Number of threads – the number of threads processing a batch of incoming messages;
- Time (ms) – the time taken to process the entire message pool;
- Queue size – the maximum number of messages in the queue (async.max.pool.records parameter);
- Batch size – the number of messages deducted in one poll operation (max.poll.records parameter);
- Relative gain ratio – the performance gain ratio relative to the previous result;
- Absolute gain coefficient – the performance gain coefficient relative to the base value.

In order to calculate the relative and absolute growth rate, we use the following formulas:

Formula 2 – Calculation of the relative growth rate

\[
K_i^{OTH} = \frac{T_{i+1}}{T_i}, \quad i \geq 1, aK_i^{OTH} = 1
\]  

\(K_i^{OTH}\) – relative growth rate;  
\(T_i\) – the time spent processing the message pool.

Formula 3 – Calculation of the absolute growth rate

\[
K_i^{acr} = \frac{T_0}{T_i}, \quad i \geq 1, aK_i^{acr} = 1
\]
\( K_{abc} \) - absolute growth rate;
\( T_i \) – the time spent processing the message pool.

We will perform testing with the number of processed messages equal to 10000 (table 1).

Table 1: processor messages

![Graph of message processing time depending on the number of handler threads](image7)

![Graph of the relative growth rate](image8)

![Graph of the absolute growth rate](image9)

As a result, we get that the best performance under real resource and technology constraints is observed when working on 64 threads (figures 8 and 9). At the same time, acceptable performance is also observed when working on 32 threads. Let's consider possible variants of processors on the market for January 2021.

![Price chart of processors with 32 threads](image10)

![Price chart of processors with 56 or 64 threads](image11)

As shown in figures 10 and 11, thus, the difference in the average cost of processors with 32 and 64 threads is 303,248 rubles, and the ratio of the cost of a processor for 64 threads and 32 is 2.849.

This means that with a 1.602-fold increase in productivity, we spend 2.849 times more in resources. This amount of financial costs is impractical, and therefore it turns out that the best processor option for the task of synchronizing data between services, taking into account the price-performance ratio, is a 32-stream processor. This processor meets the performance limitations and performs the required task in full for the time we need, while it is an adequate option on the part of financial costs for the company.

4. Conclusion

In the course of the research work, the analysis of existing methods of data synchronization in the microservice architecture in real time was carried out. The optimal method for solving the problem was identified, a mathematical model was constructed describing the mechanism of data synchronization using the messaging approach using the Apache Kafka message broker, and a range of parameters acceptable for the effective operation of the application was selected, both from the point of view of system performance and from an economic point of view.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of threads</th>
<th>Time (ms)</th>
<th>Messages</th>
<th>Queue size</th>
<th>Batch size</th>
<th>Relative growth rate</th>
<th>Absolute growth rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>126239/0</td>
<td>1000/0</td>
<td>12/8</td>
<td>51/2</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>636132/0</td>
<td>1000/0</td>
<td>12/8</td>
<td>51/2</td>
<td>1,984</td>
<td>1,984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>320190/0</td>
<td>1000/0</td>
<td>12/8</td>
<td>51/2</td>
<td>1,987</td>
<td>3,943</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>199883/0</td>
<td>1000/0</td>
<td>12/8</td>
<td>51/2</td>
<td>1,602</td>
<td>6,316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>162848/0</td>
<td>1000/0</td>
<td>12/8</td>
<td>51/2</td>
<td>1,227</td>
<td>7,752</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128</td>
<td>83221/0</td>
<td>1000/0</td>
<td>12/8</td>
<td>51/2</td>
<td>1,957</td>
<td>15,169</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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