Where Microfrontends with Module Federation Are Required: Advantages, Disadvantages, and the Risk of Overengineering

Justin Davis

Abstract: As web applications grow in scale and complexity, frontend architectures have evolved to accommodate scalability, team autonomy, and maintainability. Microfrontends, particularly when implemented with Webpack's Module Federation, offer a distributed and modular approach to frontend development. However, their application is not universally advantageous. This paper explores the contexts in which microfrontends with module federation are most suitable, outlines the advantages and disadvantages of this architecture, and critically analyzes scenarios where their adoption may result in overengineering.

Keywords: Microfrontends, Module Federation, Webpack, Frontend Architecture, Team Autonomy, Independent Deployment, Overengineering, Scalability, Runtime Integration, Incremental Migration

1. Introduction

The concept of microfrontends extends the principles of microservices to the frontend. This architectural style allows large applications to be divided into independently developed and deployed frontend units, which are integrated at runtime. Module Federation, introduced in Webpack 5, has emerged as a powerful mechanism to implement microfrontends, enabling dynamic code sharing between separate builds without duplicating dependencies.

While this architectural paradigm can significantly enhance development agility in large organizations, it also introduces considerable complexity. This paper investigates when microfrontends with module federation are required and when they might unnecessarily complicate application architecture.

2. Microfrontends and Module Federation: An Overview

Microfrontends

Microfrontends are a way of breaking up a monolithic frontend into smaller, semi - independent "fragments" that can be owned and operated by different teams. These fragments may be composed using iframes, JavaScript integration, or client - side routing.

Module Federation

Webpack's Module Federation allows independently compiled modules to be dynamically loaded at runtime, without requiring a central deployment pipeline. This technique enables shared dependencies, version negotiation, and on - demand loading of remote modules.

3. When Microfrontends with Module Federation Are Required

The use of microfrontends with module federation is particularly suitable under the following conditions:

Large and Distributed Development Teams

Organizations with multiple teams working on different features in parallel benefit from clear code ownership and

deployment independence. Module federation allows teams to ship features autonomously without coordination bottlenecks.

Multiple Product Verticals or Domains

Applications that span distinct business domains—e. g., dashboards, e - commerce, and admin interfaces—can be naturally segmented into microfrontends. This enables domain - driven design on the frontend.

Incremental Upgrades and Tech Stack Migration

Microfrontends allow legacy systems to coexist with modern frameworks. Module federation can load both legacy and new components during a gradual migration from, say, AngularJS to React.

Need for Independent Deployment and CI/CD Pipelines

When different parts of the application need to be deployed independently—perhaps due to regulatory compliance or development velocity—microfrontends with module federation provide a practical solution.

4. Advantages of Microfrontends with Module Federation

Advantage	Explanation
Scalability	Teams can independently scale and manage
	separate parts of the application.
Autonomous	Features can be released independently without
Deployment	full application redeployment.
Technology	Teams can use different frameworks (e. g., React
Diversity	for one feature, Angular for another).
Code Sharing	Module Federation allows shared libraries to be
	reused at runtime, reducing duplication.
Incremental	Legacy systems can be modernized piecemeal
Migration	without big - bang rewrites.

5. Disadvantages of Microfrontends with Module Federation

Volume 14 Issue 6, June 2025 Fully Refereed | Open Access | Double Blind Peer Reviewed Journal www.ijsr.net

International Journal of Science and Research (IJSR) ISSN: 2319-7064 Impact Factor 2024: 7.101

Disadvantage	Explanation
Increased	Requires careful orchestration of routing, state,
Complexity	and shared dependencies.
Higher Bundle	Initial loads may be larger due to remote entry
Size	files and duplicate dependencies.
Runtime	Runtime integration is less deterministic than
Errors	compile - time, increasing the chance of failure.
Testing	End - to - end and integration tests become more
Challenges	difficult across distributed parts.
Steep	Teams need to understand Webpack internals,
Learning	module federation, and new deployment
Curve	strategies.

6. Overengineering with Microfrontends: When Not to Use Them

Microfrontends may introduce more problems than they solve if misapplied. The following scenarios often signal overengineering:

Small to Medium - Scale Applications

Applications maintained by a single team or a small group do not benefit from the distributed nature of microfrontends. The added complexity outweighs any gains in independence or scalability.

Lack of Organizational Readiness

Without mature DevOps practices, decentralized ownership, and CI/CD infrastructure, the benefits of microfrontends are hard to realize and may lead to fragmented and unstable systems.

Homogeneous Technology Stack

If the entire application is built using a single frontend framework and doesn't require isolation or migration, then a monolithic SPA architecture is simpler and more performant.

Synchronization Overhead Exceeds Benefit

If frequent coordination between microfrontend teams is required, the intended decoupling benefits are lost, leading to duplication, inconsistent UX, and brittle integrations.

7. Recommendations and Best Practices

- Use in Domain Driven Applications: Align microfrontend boundaries with business domains.
- Adopt Shared Design Systems: Use common component libraries to enforce consistent UI/UX.
- Limit the Number of Microfrontends: Avoid breaking the application into too many granular fragments.
- **Centralize Configuration:** Use orchestration layers or container apps to manage routing and integration.
- **Optimize for Performance:** Lazy load microfrontends and minimize shared dependency duplication.

8. Conclusion

Microfrontends with module federation represent a powerful architecture for large - scale, distributed frontend development. When used judiciously, they enable independent deployment, technological heterogeneity, and scalable development processes. However, they are not a one - size - fits - all solution. In smaller applications or under immature organizational structures, they may result in avoidable complexity and maintenance overhead. A careful analysis of team structure, application scale, and long - term goals is essential before adopting microfrontends with module federation.

References

- [1] Zack Jackson et al., "Module Federation, " *Webpack Documentation*, 2021.
- [2] Cam Jackson, "Micro Frontends," *MartinFowler. com*, 2019.
- [3] Luca Mezzalira, *Building Micro Frontends*, O'Reilly Media, 2021.
- [4] ThoughtWorks Technology Radar, "Micro Frontends," 2020.
- [5] Garlan, D. and Shaw, M., "An Introduction to Software Architecture, " *CMU Software Engineering Institute*, 1994.

Volume 14 Issue 6, June 2025 Fully Refereed | Open Access | Double Blind Peer Reviewed Journal www.ijsr.net