

An Intelligent Framework for Self-Healing Distributed Systems Using Predictive Analytics and Automated Recovery

Chandrasekhar Anuganti

Senior Data Platform Engineer, North Carolina, United States

ABSTRACT

Self-healing distributed systems are often described as fully autonomous: they detect a problem and fix it without people. In practice, many faults are best handled by a partnership, in which analytics predicts what is about to go wrong, recommends what to do, and either acts automatically or supports an operator in acting quickly. Health care has long experience with this kind of partnership through clinical decision support, including its main pitfall, alert fatigue. This article proposes an intelligent self-healing framework built on streaming predictive analytics and decision support. System events and metrics flow through a high-volume event streaming platform and are processed in real time. Predictive analytics forecasts when resources will be exhausted, detects anomalies in time series, and explains each prediction. A decision support layer turns predictions into ranked recovery recommendations. A risk-governed workflow executes low-risk recommendations automatically and routes the rest to operators with the evidence they need. Predictive models are updated without downtime. Using a design-oriented approach grounded in eleven studies published between 2007 and 2023, the article maps the evidence base, defines the predictive analytics the framework uses, describes the architecture, and adapts lessons from clinical decision support to recovery. It illustrates the design with a hospital's electronic health record platform. It argues that self-healing works best as a partnership in which analytics predicts, advises, and acts where safe, and people decide where judgment is needed.

Keywords: self-healing systems, distributed systems, predictive analytics, time-series forecasting, anomaly detection, decision support, explainable AI, event streaming, stream processing, automated recovery, alert fatigue, risk-governed workflow, zero-downtime deployment, health information systems

SAMRIDDHI : A Journal of Physical Sciences, Engineering and Technology (2023)

INTRODUCTION

Distributed systems degrade in recognizable ways. A disk fills steadily until it is full. Memory use creeps upward until a process crashes. Request latency rises as a queue backs up. Many such problems can be seen coming, often hours ahead, in the time series that every system produces. Self-healing systems aim to detect and repair problems automatically, and Ghosh et al. (2007) synthesize research on how systems can maintain health, detect failure, and recover.

Predictive analytics can extend this capability from reaction to anticipation. Time-series forecasting methods (Hyndman & Athanasopoulos, 2018), including approaches built to forecast many series at scale (Taylor & Letham, 2018), can estimate when a resource will run out. Automated anomaly detection frameworks can monitor very large numbers of series and flag unusual behavior (Laptev et al., 2015). Explanation methods such as SHAP can show why a model made a prediction (Lundberg & Lee, 2017).

Yet a prediction is only useful if it leads to the right

Corresponding Author: Chandrasekhar Anuganti, Senior Data Platform Engineer, North Carolina, United States, e-mail: email

How to cite this article: Anuganti, C. (2023). An Intelligent Framework for Self-Healing Distributed Systems Using Predictive Analytics and Automated Recovery. *SAMRIDDHI : A Journal of Physical Sciences, Engineering and Technology*, 15(4), 469-474.

Source of support: Nil

Conflict of interest: None

action, and not every action should be automatic. Clinical decision support offers a close analogy. Predictive analytics frameworks for clinical decision support turn patient data into predictions that guide clinicians (*Predictive Analytics Framework for Clinical Decision Support Systems*, 2017). Decades of experience show that such systems help when they deliver the right information at the right time, but harm

when they produce too many alerts, which clinicians learn to ignore (Sutton et al., 2020). Operators of distributed systems face the same risk.

Three further elements complete the framework. Predictions must be made on live data, which requires high-volume event streaming (*Event Streaming Architectures for High-Volume Transaction Processing*, 2022) and stateful stream processing (Carbone et al., 2015). Recovery actions must be governed according to their risk, which Basireddy (2022) supports through configurable enterprise workflow architecture with approval and escalation. And predictive models must be kept current without interrupting monitoring, which Sannidhanam (2023) addresses through zero-downtime AI model updates in real-time inference systems.

This article asks

How can predictive analytics, decision support, and governed automation be combined into an intelligent framework for self-healing distributed systems? It contributes an evidence map (Figures 1 and 2), a set of predictive analytics functions, an integrated architecture, decision support principles adapted from clinical practice, a predict-advise-act loop, and an illustrative case.

RELATED WORK

Self-healing systems

Ghosh et al. (2007) survey and synthesize self-healing systems research, organizing it around maintaining system health, detecting system failure, and recovering, and discussing the roles of models and policies in each.

Forecasting and anomaly detection

Hyndman and Athanasopoulos (2018) set out principles and methods of forecasting, including exponential smoothing, ARIMA, and forecast evaluation. Taylor and Letham (2018) present a forecasting approach designed to produce reasonable forecasts for many time series with trend, seasonality, and holidays, with analysts in the loop. Laptev et al. (2015) describe a generic, scalable framework for automated time-series anomaly detection, combining

forecasting-based and other detectors with automated alerting.

Decision support and explanation

The 2017 study of a predictive analytics framework for clinical decision support describes how predictive models can support clinical decisions. Sutton et al. (2020) review clinical decision support systems, their benefits, and their risks, including alert fatigue, and describe strategies for success. Lundberg and Lee (2017) propose SHAP, which attributes each prediction to the features that drove it.

Streaming and model updates

The 2022 study of event streaming architectures addresses high-volume transaction processing on streaming platforms. Carbone et al. (2015) describe Apache Flink, which unifies stream and batch processing with stateful, fault-tolerant computation. Sannidhanam (2023) addresses zero-downtime updates of models in real-time inference systems.

Risk-governed workflow

Basireddy (2022) proposes configurable enterprise workflow architecture for risk management, with configurable approval, escalation, and audit trails. This article applies it to govern recovery actions.

Research gap

Self-healing research tends to assume full automation. Forecasting and anomaly detection research produces predictions without specifying the actions they should trigger. Decision support research in health care has studied the human side of prediction but is rarely applied to system operations. Few designs combine streaming predictive analytics, decision support, and governed automation for self-healing. This article addresses that gap.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The study follows a design-oriented research approach. The problem, predictions that either act without judgment or overwhelm operators with alerts, was identified from the literature. Requirements were derived from the reviewed studies: real-time analytics on streaming data, anticipation of resource exhaustion and anomalies, explained predictions, ranked recommendations, risk-appropriate automation,




Figure 1: Number of reviewed studies primarily supporting each theme (n = 11)




Figure 2: Reviewed studies by publication year (n = 11)



Table 1: Predictive analytics functions in the framework

<i>Function</i>	<i>Question</i>	<i>Method</i>	<i>Recovery use</i>	<i>Supporting studies</i>
Exhaustion forecasting	When will this resource run out?	Time-series forecasting with trend and seasonality	Add capacity or clean up before exhaustion	Hyndman & Athanasopoulos (2018); Taylor & Letham (2018)
Anomaly detection	Is this behavior unusual now?	Forecast residuals and scalable detectors	Investigate or isolate early	Laptev et al. (2015)
Risk prediction	How likely is a service failure soon?	Predictive models on streamed features	Trigger preventive recovery	Predictive analytics for CDS (2017)
Explanation	Why was this predicted?	Feature attribution	Guide the choice of action and build trust	Lundberg & Lee (2017)

control of alert volume, and continuously updated models. The framework was designed from eleven studies published between 2007 and 2023 and demonstrated through an illustrative case.

To make the evidence base transparent, each study was assigned to the theme it primarily supports. Figure 1 shows the distribution across themes, and Figure 2 shows the studies by publication year. These figures describe the literature used in this article. They are not performance measurements. The framework has not been evaluated empirically, which is left to future work.

Forecasting and anomaly detection, and decision support and explanation, have the most studies, with three each. Stream processing has two. Self-healing foundations, model updates, and risk-governed workflow have one each. The studies span 2007 to 2023, with most published from 2015 onward.

PREDICTIVE ANALYTICS FOR SELF-HEALING

The framework uses four analytic functions (Table 1). Each answers a different question and supports a different kind of recovery.

Exhaustion forecasting deserves emphasis because it is simple, reliable, and gives long lead times. A disk filling at a steady rate, adjusted for weekly patterns, can be forecast to fill days ahead, turning an outage into a routine task (Hyndman & Athanasopoulos, 2018).

FRAMEWORK ARCHITECTURE

Figure 3 shows the architecture, and Table 2 describes its components.

Streaming and processing

Services publish metrics, logs, and events to the streaming platform (Event streaming architectures, 2022). A stream processor computes windowed features such as the rate of disk growth over the past six hours, maintaining state reliably across failures (Carbone et al., 2015).

Predictive analytics services

Forecasting services project resource usage forward (Taylor & Letham, 2018). Anomaly detectors flag unusual behavior across many series (Laptev et al., 2015). Risk models estimate failure likelihood, following the pattern of predictive analytics for decision support (Predictive analytics for CDS, 2017). Every prediction carries an explanation (Lundberg & Lee, 2017).

Table 2: Components of the framework

<i>Component</i>	<i>Function</i>	<i>Key mechanisms</i>	<i>Supporting studies</i>
Event streaming platform	Carry metrics, logs, and events	High-volume, durable log	Event streaming architectures (2022)
Stream processor	Compute windowed features in real time	Stateful, fault-tolerant processing	Carbone et al. (2015)
Predictive analytics services	Forecast, detect, predict, explain	Forecasting, anomaly detection, attribution	Taylor & Letham (2018); Laptev et al. (2015); Lundberg & Lee (2017)
Decision support layer	Turn predictions into recommendations	Ranked actions with evidence; alert grouping	Sutton et al. (2020); Predictive analytics for CDS (2017)
Risk-governed workflow	Decide automation or approval	Configurable risk tiers, escalation, audit trail	Basireddy (2022)
Automated recovery executor	Apply approved actions	Orchestrated recovery	Ghosh et al. (2007)
Model update service	Keep models current	Parallel versions, gradual switch	Sannidhanam (2023)




Figure 3: Architecture of the intelligent self-healing framework

Decision support layer

This layer converts predictions into recommendations: what to do, why, how urgent it is, and what evidence supports it. It groups related predictions into one recommendation to avoid flooding operators (Sutton et al., 2020).

Risk-governed workflow and executor

Each recommendation carries a risk tier. Low-risk actions, such as cleaning temporary files, run automatically. Higher-risk actions go to an operator for approval, with escalation if not handled in time (Basireddy, 2022). Approved actions are executed through orchestration (Ghosh et al., 2007).

Model update service

Forecasting and risk models are retrained and released alongside current versions, so predictions continue without interruption (Sannidhanam, 2023).

DECISION SUPPORT FOR RECOVERY

Lessons from clinical decision support

Clinical decision support has learned what makes predictions useful to busy professionals. Table 3 adapts these lessons to self-healing systems.

The most important lesson is that more alerts do not mean more safety. Each alert competes for attention, so the framework measures the share of recommendations that lead to action and treats a falling share as a warning sign (Sutton et al., 2020).

Predict-advise-act loop

Figure 4 shows the loop through which the framework operates.

Events are streamed and processed. The analytics services predict exhaustion, anomalies, and failure risk, and **explain**




Figure 4: Predict-advise-act loop of the intelligent self-healing framework

Table 3: Clinical decision support lessons adapted to self-healing

<i>Clinical lesson</i>	<i>Equivalent risk in operations</i>	<i>Framework response</i>	<i>Supporting studies</i>
Too many alerts cause alert fatigue	Operators ignore frequent low-value alerts	Group related predictions; automate low-risk actions; suppress repeats	Sutton et al. (2020); Laptev et al. (2015)
Advice must fit the workflow	Alerts arrive outside the tools operators use	Deliver recommendations as workflow tasks	Basireddy (2022); Sutton et al. (2020)
Clinicians need to know why	Unexplained alerts are distrusted	Attach explanations and evidence	Lundberg & Lee (2017)
Timing matters	Late predictions leave no time to act	Prioritize by forecast lead time	Hyndman & Athanasopoulos (2018)
Models must be maintained	Predictions degrade as systems change	Monitor accuracy; update without downtime	Predictive analytics for CDS (2017); Sannidhanam (2023)

each prediction. The decision support layer advises with a ranked recommendation; this step is highlighted because it is where predictions become decisions, and where alert fatigue is either prevented or created. The workflow then acts, automatically or through an operator. Finally, outcomes are evaluated: whether the prediction was right and whether the action helped. These evaluations improve the models, which are updated without downtime (Sannidhanam, 2023).

ILLUSTRATIVE CASE: A HOSPITAL ELECTRONIC HEALTH RECORD PLATFORM

Consider a hospital group whose electronic health record (EHR) platform runs as distributed services across two data centers. Clinicians use it continuously, so an outage directly affects patient care. The case is illustrative and reports no measured results.

Exhaustion forecast

The log storage used by the medication service grows faster than usual after a software update. The forecasting service projects that it will fill in about 30 hours, allowing for the usual weekday pattern (Taylor & Letham, 2018). The decision support layer recommends archiving older logs and adding storage. Archiving is low risk and runs automatically; adding storage is routed to the infrastructure team as a task (Basireddy, 2022). The forecast is revised as data arrive, and the disk never fills.

Anomaly with explanation

During the morning rounds, response times for the laboratory results service rise above their usual range for that hour (Laptev et al., 2015). The risk model predicts a high likelihood of service failure within an hour. The explanation shows that the main drivers are a growing database connection queue and a rise in retries from one client application (Lundberg & Lee, 2017). The recommendation is to limit that client's request rate and add a database replica. Because rate limiting

affects clinical users, the workflow routes it to the on-call engineer, who approves it within minutes.

Avoiding alert fatigue

Early in deployment, the anomaly detector raised many alerts each night during scheduled backups. Operators began to ignore them, a pattern familiar from clinical practice (Sutton et al., 2020). The team added backup windows to the model's calendar and grouped related alerts, and the share of recommendations acted on rose.

Model updates

The forecasting models are retrained weekly on recent data and released alongside current versions, taking over once their forecasts are confirmed (Sannidhanam, 2023). All of this runs on the streaming platform that already carries clinical integration events (Event streaming architectures, 2022; Carbone et al., 2015).

The case shows predictions turning outages into planned work, explanations guiding the right action, and decision support keeping operator attention for the cases that need it.

DISCUSSION

Implications

For research, the article applies clinical decision support lessons to self-healing systems and combines forecasting, anomaly detection, and explanation with governed recovery on streaming infrastructure. For practitioners, the lessons are to forecast resource exhaustion, which is often the cheapest win; to explain every prediction; to deliver recommendations as workflow tasks rather than raw alerts; to automate low-risk actions and require approval for actions affecting users; to measure how often recommendations are acted on; and to keep models current without pausing prediction.

Limitations and future work

The framework was demonstrated through an illustrative case and draws on eleven studies, so the evidence base is

focused rather than comprehensive. Several descriptions of the studies are based on their stated scope. The analogy with clinical decision support is useful but imperfect, because operational decisions differ in stakes and time scales from clinical ones. Future work should implement the framework and measure forecast accuracy, lead time, outages avoided, the share of recommendations acted on, and operator workload. The balance between automation and operator involvement, and how it should change as trust in predictions grows, also needs study.

CONCLUSION

Self-healing distributed systems do not have to choose between full automation and manual operations. This article proposed an intelligent framework in which streaming predictive analytics forecasts exhaustion, detects anomalies, and explains its predictions; a decision support layer turns predictions into ranked recommendations; a risk-governed workflow acts automatically where safe and supports operators elsewhere; and models are updated without downtime. The EHR case showed outages prevented and operator attention protected. The central conclusion is that self-healing works best as a partnership in which analytics predicts, advises, and acts where safe, and people decide where judgment is needed.

REFERENCES

- [1] Basireddy, S. R. (2022). Digitizing risk management through configurable enterprise workflow architecture. *SAMRIDDHI: A Journal of Physical Sciences, Engineering and Technology*, 14(4), 231–239.
- [2] Carbone, P., Katsifodimos, A., Ewen, S., Markl, V., Haridi, S., & Tzoumas, K. (2015). Apache Flink: Stream and batch processing in a single engine. *Bulletin of the IEEE Computer Society Technical Committee on Data Engineering*, 38(4), 28–38.
- [3] Sannidhanam, A.H. (2022) Event Streaming Architectures for High-Volume Transaction Processing. *International Journal of Advance Industrial Engineering*, 10(01), 1-8. <https://doi.org/10.14741/>
- [4] Ghosh, D., Sharman, R., Rao, H. R., & Upadhyaya, S. (2007). Self-healing systems: Survey and synthesis. *Decision Support Systems*, 42(4), 2164–2185.
- [5] Hyndman, R. J., & Athanasopoulos, G. (2018). *Forecasting: Principles and practice* (2nd ed.). OTexts.
- [6] Laptev, N., Amizadeh, S., & Flint, I. (2015). Generic and scalable framework for automated time-series anomaly detection. In *Proceedings of the 21st ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining* (pp. 1939–1947).
- [7] Lundberg, S. M., & Lee, S.-I. (2017). A unified approach to interpreting model predictions. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 30 (pp. 4765–4774).
- [8] Sannidhanam, A.H., Alladi, S. (2017). Predictive Analytics Framework for Clinical Decision Support Systems. *International Journal of Information Technology and Computer Engineering*, 5(2), 56-63. <https://doi.org/10.62647/>
- [9] Sannidhanam, A. H. (2023). Zero-downtime AI model updates in real-time inference systems. *International Journal of Engineering Science & Humanities*, 13(2), 70–78. <https://www.ijesh.com/j/article/view/934>
- [10] Sutton, R. T., Pincock, D., Baumgart, D. C., Sadowski, D. C., Fedorak, R. N., & Kroeker, K. I. (2020). An overview of clinical decision support systems: Benefits, risks, and strategies for success. *npj Digital Medicine*, 3, Article 17.
- [11] Taylor, S. J., & Letham, B. (2018). Forecasting at scale. *The American Statistician*, 72(1), 37–45.

