

Macroprogramming: Concepts, State of the Art, and Opportunities of Macroscopic Behaviour Modelling

Roberto Casadei
Alma Mater Studiorum—Università di Bologna
roby.casadei@unibo.it

January 11, 2022

Abstract

Macroprogramming refers to the theory and practice of conveniently expressing the macro(scopic) behaviour of a system using a single program. Macroprogramming approaches are motivated by the need of effectively capturing *global/system-level* aspects and the *collective behaviour* of a set of interacting components, while abstracting over low-level details. In the past, this style of programming has been primarily adopted to describe the data-processing logic in *wireless sensor networks*; recently, research forums on *spatial computing*, *collective adaptive systems*, and *Internet-of-Things* have provided renewed interest in macro-approaches. However, related contributions are still fragmented and lacking conceptual consistency. Therefore, to foster principled research, an integrated view of the field is provided, together with opportunities and challenges.

1 Introduction

Macroprogramming refers to the theory and practice of conveniently expressing the macro(scopic) behaviour of a system using a single program, often leveraging macro-level abstractions (e.g., collective state, group, or spatiotemporal abstractions). This is not to be confused with the use of macros (abbreviation for *macroinstructions*), mechanisms for compile-time substitution of program pieces, available in programming languages ranging from C and Common Lisp to Scala and Rust. Macroprogramming is a paradigm driven by the need of designers and application developers to capture *system-level behaviour* while abstracting, in part, the behaviour and interaction of the individual components involved. It can be framed as a *paradigm* since it embodies a (*systemic*) view or perspective of programming, and accordingly provide *lenses* to the programmer for understanding and working on particular aspects of systems—especially those related to collective behaviour, interaction, and global, distributed properties.

In the past, this style of programming has been primarily adopted to describe the behaviour of *wireless sensor networks (WSN)* (Mottola and Picco, 2011), where data

gathered from sensors are to be processed, aggregated, and possibly moved across different parts or regions of the network in order to be consolidated into useful, actionable information. More recently, certain research trends and niches have provided renewed interest in macro approaches. Research in the contexts of *Internet of Things (IoT)* and *cyber-physical systems (CPS)* has proposed macroprogramming approaches (cf. (Mizzi *et al.*, 2018; Azzara *et al.*, 2014)) to simplify the development of systems involving a multitude of connected sensors, actuators, and smart devices. In the *spatial computing* thread (Beal *et al.*, 2012), space can represent both a means and a goal for macroprogramming. Indeed, declaring *what* has to be done *in* a spatiotemporal region allows systems to self-organise to effectively carry out the task at hand, dynamically adapting to the specifics of the current deployment and spatial positions of the components involved. Similarly, one can program a system, such as a drone fleet, in a high-level fashion to make it seek and maintain certain shapes and connectivity topologies. Indeed, swarm-level programming models have been proposed in robotics research (Pinciroli and Beltrame, 2016). In *distributed artificial intelligence (DAI)* and *multi-agent systems (MAS)* research (Adams, 2001), an important distinction is made between the *micro* level of individual agents and the *macro* level of an “agent society”, sometimes explicitly addressed by *organisation-oriented* programming approaches (Boissier *et al.*, 2013). In the field of *collective adaptive systems (CAS)* engineering (Ferscha, 2015; De Nicola *et al.*, 2020), macroprogramming abstractions can promote collective behaviour exhibiting self-* properties (e.g., self-organising, self-healing, self-configuring) (Kephart and Chess, 2003; Lemos *et al.*, 2010). In software-defined networking (SDN), the logically centralised view of the control plane has promoted a way of programming the network as “*one big switch*” (Kang *et al.*, 2013).

This work draws motivation from a profusion of macroprogramming approaches and languages that have been proposed in the last two decades, aiming to capture the aggregate behaviour of certain classes of distributed systems. However, contributions are sparse, isolated in research niches, and tend to be domain-specific as well as technological in nature. This survey aims to consolidate the state of the art, provide a map of the field, and foster research on macroprogramming.

This article is organised as follows. Section 2 covers the method adopted for carrying out the survey. Section 3 provides an overview of the research fields where macroprogramming techniques have been proposed. This overview helps to trace a historical development and the motivations for the approach. Section 4 defines a conceptual framework and taxonomy for macroprogramming. Section 5 is the core of the survey: it classifies and presents the selected primary studies. Section 6 provides an analysis of the surveyed approaches and discusses opportunities and challenges of macroprogramming. Section 7 covers related work, discussing the contributions of other secondary studies. Finally, Section 8 provides a wrap-up.

2 Survey Method

This section briefly describes how the survey has been carried out. It focusses on motivation, research questions, data sources, presentation of results, and terminology.

2.1 Survey Method

Though this is not a systematic literature review (SLR), parts of its development process have been inspired by guides for conducting SLRs in software engineering, such as (Kitchenham and Charters, 2007). More details follow.

Review motivation

As anticipated in Section 1, the survey draws motivation by the emergence of a number of works that more or less explicitly identify themselves as macroprogramming approaches. Related secondary studies have been carried out in the past: they are reviewed in Section 7. However, they focus on particular perspectives or domains (e.g., spatial computing, or WSN programming), are a bit outdated, and consider macroprogramming as a particular class of approaches in their custom scope. Critically, *macroprogramming has never been investigated as a field per se*, yet. Another major motivation lies in the *fragmentation* of macroprogramming-related works across disparate research fields and domains. Therefore, a goal of this very survey is to provide a *map* of macroprogramming-related literature, promoting interaction between research communities and development of the field. More motivation is given by the urge of the following research questions.

Research goals and questions

The goal of this article is to explore the literature on macroprogramming *in breadth*, synthesise the major contributions, and provide a basis for further research. The focus is on the *programming* perspective, rather than e.g. modelling formalisms for analysis and prediction; namely, the contribution can be framed in *language-based software engineering* (Gupta, 2015). To better structure the investigation, we focus on the following research questions, inspired by the “six honest serving men” (Kipling, 1902) as e.g., in (Flood, 1994).

- RQ0) *Why, where, and for who is macroprogramming most needed?*
- RQ1) *What is macroprogramming and, especially, what is not?*
- RQ2) *How is macroprogramming implemented? Namely, what are the main macroprogramming approaches and abstractions?*
- RQ3) *What opportunities can arise from research on macroprogramming?*

RQ4) *What are the key challenges in macroprogramming systems?*

RQ0 is addressed in Section 3. RQ1 is addressed in Section 4. RQ2 is addressed in Section 5. Finally, RQ3 and RQ4 are addressed in Section 6.

Identification, selection, and quality assessment of primary research

Primary research studies have been identified by searching literature databases (such as Google Scholar, DBLP, IEEEExplore, ACM DL) for keywords such as “macroprogramming”, “global-level programming”, “network-wide programming”, and “swarm programming”. Terminology is fully covered and discussed in Section 2.2. Additional sources include other secondary and primary studies, which are surveyed in Section 7 and Section 5, respectively.

The survey scope is wide and includes PhD theses, technical reports, and papers presented at workshops, conferences, and journals as well as across different domains and research communities. Works that are deemed too preliminary (e.g., position papers), not enough “macro” (refer to Section 4), or neglecting the “programming” aspects (e.g., describing a middleware but no programming language) have been excluded, after being manually inspected.

Data extraction, synthesis, and dissemination

For each primary study, notes are taken regarding its *self-positioning* (i.e., how the authors define their contribution), its *programming model* (i.e., what main abstractions are provided), its *implementation* (i.e., how macro-abstractions are mapped to micro-level operations), and *source-code examples*. The data is synthesised using the conceptual framework introduced in Section 4. When covering and summarising the primary works in the survey (Section 5), we tend to keep and report the terminology originally used in the referenced papers, possibly explained and compared with the terminology used in this manuscript. This should help to preserve the richness and nuances of each work while the common perspective is ensured by proper selection and emphasis of the information included in the descriptions. Examples – adapted from those already included in the primary studies or created anew from composing code snippets described in those papers – are provided when they are reasonably “effective” or “diverse” from those already presented: i.e., they are brief and simple in transmitting how the reviewed approach looks like and works.

2.2 A Note on Terminology

A first issue in macroprogramming research is the fragmentation and ambiguity of terminology, which – together with domain fragmentation (see Section 3) – leads to (i) difficulty when searching for related work, and (ii) obstacles in the formation of a common understanding. Across literature, multiple terms such as macroprogramming, system-level programming,

and global-level programming are used to refer to the same or similar concepts: this does not promote a unified view of the field and hinders progress by preventing the spread of related ideas. At the same time, there is a problem of usage of both over- and under-specific terms. Overly general terms both witness the lack and prevent the formation of a common ground. On the other hand, overly specific terms, mainly due to domain specificity of research endeavours, fail at recognising the general contributions or at advertising the effort in the context of a bigger picture.

In the following, we list some terms that have been used (or might be used) – with more or less good reason – when referring to macroprogramming, and analyse their semantic precision (by reasoning on their etymology and other common uses) as well as alternative meanings in literature (for conflicts with more or less widespread acceptations).

Macroprogramming, macro-programming, macro programming, macro-level programming These are the premier terms for the subject of this article and may indeed refer to *programming macroscopic aspects of systems* (often, by leveraging macro-level abstractions). However, these terms are sometimes also used in other computer programming-related contexts. The potential ambiguity stems from word “macro”, which is and can be used to abbreviate both term “macroscopic” and term “macroinstructions”—often used in the sense of *macros*, i.e., the well-known programming language mechanism for compile-time substitutions of program pieces. Indeed, it is common to say that macros are written using a macro (programming) language. The result is that searching for these terms leads to a mix of results from both worlds. Unfortunately, being macros a very common mechanism (Lilis and Savidis, 2020), macroscopic programming-related entries remain relatively little visible in search results, unless other keywords are used to narrow the context scope—but then, only a fragment of the corpus can be located.

System programming, system-level programming, system-oriented programming All these terms are also ambiguous. Indeed, they strongly and traditionally refer to *low-level programming*, i.e., programming performed at a level close to the (computer) system (i.e., to the machine) (Appelbe and Hansen, 1985). System programming languages include, e.g., C, C++, Rust, and Go. A better name for these would probably be, as suggested by Dijkstra, *machine-oriented* languages, but such a “system” acceptance is a sediment of the field by now. The scarce accuracy of the term was also somewhat acknowledged by researchers in the object-oriented programming community (Nygaard, 1997). However, in some cases, system-level programming is contrasted with device-level programming, to mean approaches that address “a system as a whole” (Liang *et al.*, 2016).

Centralised programming This term (Gude *et al.*, 2008; Lima *et al.*, 2006) commonly refers to programming a distributed system through a single program where distribution is

(partially (Waldo *et al.*, 1996)) abstracted away, i.e., like if the distributed system were a centralised system, namely a software system on a single computer deployment. An example of centralised programming is *multi-tier programming* (Weisenburger *et al.*, 2020). This notion is certainly related to macroprogramming, since a “centralised perspective” where several distributed components can be addressed at once is a macroscopic perspective. However, as discussed in Section 4, programming the macro level often implies *more* than programming the individual components from a centralised perspective.

High-level programming This term, identifying a style of programming that abstracts many details of the underlying platform, lacks of precision. Macroprogramming is a form of high-level programming, but not all the high-level programming is macroprogramming (for a conceptual framework for macroprogramming, refer to Section 4).

Global programming, global-level programming, global computation These terms may be related to macroprogramming because, in general, a global view is also a macroscopic view (though the reverse is not always true). Global computation (Cardelli, 1997; Thomsen and Thomsen, 2001) refers to the computation performed by “global computers” made of “global communication and computation infrastructure”—essentially, distributed systems on the Internet. A “global computer” may be a target of macroprogramming. Moreover, in computer science, terms “global programming” and “global-level programming” also sometimes (Carbone *et al.*, 2007) refer to *choreographic programming* (Cruz-Filipe and Montesi, 2020), i.e., a form of programming addressing the interaction between services in service compositions by a global perspective, through so-called *choreographies*. Outside computer science, these more commonly refer to planning in organisational management.

Domain-specific or alternative terminology: network-wide programming, organisational programming, swarm programming, aggregate programming, ensemble programming, global-to-local programming, team-level programming, organisation-oriented programming etc. These terms will be explained and properly organised in the following sections. From this list of terms, however, it is already possible to get a sense of (i) an intimate need, from different research communities, to linguistically emphasise a focus on macroscopic aspects of systems, and (ii) the urge for a common conceptual framework where such disparate contributions can be framed.

3 Historical Development and Scope of Macroprogramming

In this section, we provide an overview of the main research fields and application domains where macroprogramming techniques have been proposed, also tracking elements of historical

development of the paradigm.

3.1 Wireless Sensor and Actuator Networks (WSAN)

WSANs are networks of embedded units capable of processing, communication, and sensing and/or acting (Mottola and Picco, 2011). They are a technology providing relatively low-cost monitoring and control of physical environments. Given the large number of involved devices, and the reasonable levels of heterogeneity and dynamicity for a given application, it became apparent that a benefit could be provided by high-level programming models abstracting from a series of low-level network details while still seeking to preserve efficiency. When a system consists of a large number of rather homogeneous entities, individuals tend to become less important to the functionality (while may well contribute to non-functional aspects): a WSN with 50 devices might perform worse than a 100-devices network, but these two networks can be programmed the same. Additionally, developers and researchers started realising that the individual sensors are actually a *proxy* or a *probe* for more important application abstractions such as information, streams, and events. At a next step, those abstractions started to become more high-level, and to address larger portions of the system beyond individual sensors, such as neighbourhoods (Whitehouse *et al.*, 2004), or regions (Welsh and Mainland, 2004); accordingly, abstractions related to those more coarse-grained entities emerged, denoting contexts, aggregate views, fields—increasingly non-local abstractions. Among the high-level approaches, languages providing a *centralised view* of the WSN emerged; then, the step to macroprogramming was short. This is, indeed, one of the first domains where macroprogramming was introduced.

Early works like TinyDB (Madden *et al.*, 2002), Pieces (Liu *et al.*, 2003), Abstract Regions (Welsh and Mainland, 2004), and Regiment (Newton *et al.*, 2007) are among the first contributions explicitly defining themselves as macroprogramming. A survey on macroprogramming for WSNs can be found in (Mottola and Picco, 2011).

3.2 Spatial Computing

Space is generally important in ICT systems. This has been especially motivated and investigated in the *Computing Media and Languages for Space-Oriented Computation* seminar in Dagstuhl (*Computing Media and Languages for Space-Oriented Computation, 03.09. - 08.09.2006* 2007), where three key issues are found to be recurrent in many computer-based applications: (i) *coping with space*, for efficiency in computation; (ii) *embedding in space*, as in embedded and pervasive computing; and (iii) *representing space*, for spatial awareness. What became apparent, also from WSN programming research, is that devices situated in space can become *representatives* of the spatial region they occupy and of the corresponding context. In this view, distributed systems and networks can be seen as *discrete approximations of continuous space-time regions and behaviours* (Bachrach *et al.*,

2010). Therefore, macroprogramming abstractions may abstract individual devices and rather focus on spatial patterns that such devices should cooperatively (re-)create—e.g., for morphogenesis (Jin and Meng, 2011). In general, dealing with *situated systems* (Lindblom and Ziemke, 2003) – namely, systems where components have a location in and coupling with (logical or physical) space, with typical corresponding consequences such as partial observability and local (inter)action – is simplified when recurring to spatial abstractions such as, e.g., computational fields (Mamei *et al.*, 2004).

Spatial computing approaches are extensively surveyed in (Beal *et al.*, 2012) (see Section 7 for details on the study) and include exemplars of macroprogramming such as Regiment (Newton *et al.*, 2007) and MacroLab (Hnat *et al.*, 2008).

3.3 Internet of Things, Cyber-Physical Systems, Edge-Fog-Cloud Computing Systems

The *Internet of Things (IoT)* (Atzori *et al.*, 2010) refers to a paradigm and set of technologies supporting interconnection of smart devices and the bridging of computational systems with physical systems—the latter element being emphasised also through term *Cyber-Physical Systems (CPS)* (Serpanos, 2018). IoT systems share many commonalities with WSAWs, so it is not surprising that contributions from the latter field have been extended to address IoT application development. Actually, the IoT can be considered as a superset of WSAWs, with additional complexity due to the exacerbation of issues like heterogeneity, mobility, topology, dynamicity, infrastructural complexity, as well as functional and non-functional requirements. However, an IoT system can still be considered as a collective of interconnected smart devices, amenable to being considered by a macroscopic perspective.

Moreover, IoT systems tend to be more heterogeneous and infrastructurally rich, comprising edge, fog, and cloud computing layers (Yousefpour *et al.*, 2019) to support various requirements including low-latency and low-bandwidth consumption. Interestingly, also the edge, the fog, and the cloud can be considered as computational (eco-)systems programmable at the macro-level (Pianini *et al.*, 2021). This idea also underlies orchestration approaches based on Infrastructure-as-Code (Morris, 2016), which can be considered a form of centralised, declarative programming.

Examples of IoT/CPS macroprogramming approaches include PyoT (Azzara *et al.*, 2014), DDFlow (Noor *et al.*, 2019), and MacroLab (Hnat *et al.*, 2008), whereas preliminary approaches also considering edge/fog/cloud comprise ThingNet (Qiao *et al.*, 2018).

3.4 Swarm robotics

A set of interacting robots can work as a collective, also known as a *swarm*. In this case, the focus of external observers tends to shift from the activity of individual robots to the activity of the swarm as a whole. Various tasks make sense at such a macro-perspective.

For instance, we could ask a swarm to: move in flock formation towards a destination; split and later merge for avoiding a large obstacle; use, in a coordinated way, the sensing capabilities to estimate physical quantities (e.g., the mean temperature in a certain area) or other indicators (e.g., the risk of fire in a forest); or use, in a coordinated way, sensing and actuation capabilities to efficiently perform actions and tasks (e.g., quickly collecting toxic waste in industrial plants) possibly going beyond individual capabilities (e.g., moving heavy objects). Another prominent sub-field in robotics with emphasis on macroscopic features is modular, morphogenetic robotics (Jin and Meng, 2011; Zykov *et al.*, 2007), which considers collections of building-block modules that should dynamically self-reconfigure into functional shapes in order to address tasks, change, or damage. Indeed, the overall morphology of a modular swarm is a macro-level structure that must be dynamically sought through activity and cooperation of the individual robots. The traditional question is: how can the individual robots be programmed such that the desired overall shape is produced? By a macroprogramming perspective, this question turns into: how can a swarm *as a whole* be programmed such that the overall shape is produced? Of course, this ultimately entails a definition of the behaviour of the individuals as well; however, the idea is to encapsulate the complexity of such a collective behaviour at the middleware level, behind proper macroscopic abstractions.

Examples of macroprogramming languages for swarm robotics include Meld (Ashley-Rollman *et al.*, 2007) (for modular robotics), Voltron (Mottola *et al.*, 2014) (for drone teams), Buzz (Pinciroli and Beltrame, 2016), TeCoLa (Koutsoubelias and Lalis, 2016), and WOSP (Varughese *et al.*, 2020) (for elementary robots).

3.5 Complex and Collective Adaptive Systems

Complex and collective adaptive systems (CAS) are collectives (i.e., collections of individuals) exhibiting a non-chaotic behaviour that is adaptive to the environment and cannot be (easily) reduced to the behaviour of the individuals, but that rather *emerges* from complex networks of situated interactions. These kinds of systems were originally observed in nature, but researchers have tried to bring those principles and ideas for development artificial, ICT-based CASs (Ferscha, 2015; De Nicola *et al.*, 2020). The field of CAS engineering emerges from swarm computational intelligence (Kennedy, 2006) and autonomic, self-adaptive computing (Kephart and Chess, 2003; Lemos *et al.*, 2010). The goal of CAS programming is to program the collective adaptive behaviour of a system. In general, two approaches are possible: *local-to-global*, where local behaviour is specified in order to promote emergence of a target global behaviour; or *global-to-local*, where the idea is to specify the intended global behaviour and come up with a mechanism to synthesise the corresponding local behaviour.

Since the notion of a *collective* (also known as *ensemble*) is per se a macro-level abstraction, it is natural to adopt macroprogramming techniques. Examples are provided

in Section 5 and include ensemble-based approaches such as DEECo (Bures *et al.*, 2013) and SCEL (Nicola *et al.*, 2014), and aggregate programming (Beal *et al.*, 2015).

3.6 Other domains

In the following domains, macroprogramming has not actually been proposed explicitly, but similar needs can be perceived and very related ideas have indeed been considered.

Software-defined networking

Software-defined networking (SDN) (Kreutz *et al.*, 2015) is an approach for the management of computer networks based on the idea of separating the data plane (forwarding) and the control plane (routing). Thanks to this separation, network devices become just entities responsible for forwarding, whereas control logic can be logically centralised in a single component. This logical centralisation directly leads to centralised programming (cf. Section 2.2) and hence to a macroprogramming viewpoint. This is also visible in the editorial note (Beckett *et al.*, 2019), which provides a brief historical reflection on the development of such a vision, also known as *network-centric* or *network-wide programming* (Martins and McCann, 2017).

Examples of network-wide programming include NetKAT (Anderson *et al.*, 2014) and SNAP (Arashloo *et al.*, 2016).

Parallel Programming and High-Performance Computing (HPC)

Literature on parallel programming includes some germs of macroprogramming ideas as well, even though the focus on performance and low-level system programming arguably has been hindering adoption of high-level abstractions. However, these can be found in parallel, *global-view* languages, such as those implementing the Partitioned Global Address Space (PGAS) model (Wael *et al.*, 2015), where, e.g., directives have been proposed to represent “*high-level expressions of data distributions, parallel data movement, processor arrangements and processor groups*”. Indeed, addressing the behaviour of multiple processors in terms of macroscopic patterns rather than in terms of micro-instructions could simplify programmability and still reach good performance through smart global-to-local mapping.

Other elements of similarities can be traced between Valiant’s *Bulk Synchronous Parallel (BSP)* model (Valiant, 1990) and the execution model of macroprogramming approaches such as aggregate computing (Beal *et al.*, 2015), where multiple parallel processors work in *supersteps* involving communication and computation as specified by a single global program. Moreover, this tendency towards programming by a macroscopic perspective has been witnessed by some BSP-based models. For instance, in the domain of graph-processing, as discussed in the paper *From “Think Like a Vertex” to “Think Like a Graph”* (Tian *et al.*,

2013), the Giraph++ framework has been proposed by replacing the vertex-centric model of Giraph with a *graph-centric model* to provide efficiency benefits by directly exposing graph partitions and optimising communications.

3.7 Final remarks

It is evident from the domains covered in this section that the target of macroprogramming is often a *collective*, namely a (largely homogeneous, usually (Brodaric and Neuhaus, 2020)) collection of physical or computational entities—e.g., a collection of sensors, a collection of drones, a collection of routers in a network, a collection of partially-autonomous agents. In these contexts, the goal of macroprogramming is usually that of defining how such collectives should behave as a whole, while abstracting from certain low-level details, for instance: how sensor data is to be processed and diffused by a WSN, without specifying routing details (Gummadi *et al.*, 2005); how a fleet of drones should organise into teams to explore an environment, without specifying how the different spatial locations are assigned to individual robots and the specific fleet-aware movements of individual robots (Mottola *et al.*, 2014); how a set of network nodes should monitor or control network activity, without specifying micro-level node decisions such as where to place, how to distribute, and optimise access to network state variables (Arashloo *et al.*, 2016); and how to specify the self-organisation logic of a collection of agents, without specifying how activity is scheduled, how individuals interact in terms of message-passing, and how agents fully behave (Viroli *et al.*, 2019).

The aforementioned examples show both commonalities and specific traits. First of all, we always have a (possibly dynamic) *collection* of entities. Concerning autonomy, the target entities may range from fully passive (like routers, which act only upon reception of packets) to fully autonomous (like agents, which encapsulate control). Concerning interaction, the entities of the system may interact using diverse mechanisms like message-passing or shared state (including stigmergy (Pinciroli *et al.*, 2016)). Concerning system structure, the system may have a static, regular network topology (as in a WSN) or a dynamic, ad-hoc network topology (as in a system of mobile agents).

Regarding the application tasks commonly addressed by macroprogramming, we observe that they are typically tasks amenable to macroscopic evaluation (e.g., moving a fleet of drones to cover a spatial area), often considering a multiplicity of inputs and outputs (e.g., the starting and final configurations of the fleet), or tasks that require a collaboration of several entities to be carried out (e.g., computing the routing path for a given packet request sent to an individual network node). For instance, in network applications, it is not the routing decisions made by an individual network node that matter, but rather how such individual routing decision relates with those of other nodes, that make for a “good” overall network activity. While traditional approaches address the issue by providing each entity of the system with different programs, or with a same program assuming the individual

perspective (in case of homogeneous entities), macroprogramming adopts a change of perspective whereby a system behaviour or its outputs can be specified as a whole, by a conceptually centralised point of view. Indeed, regarding the goals of macroprogramming, we can find three recurrent general objectives: (i) *abstraction*, namely expressing a certain global behaviour in a convenient way, while keeping low overhead; (ii) *optimisation*, namely moving the problem of realising efficient micro-level activity from the programmer to the runtime system; and (iii) *adaptivity*, namely promoting collective adaptation to change in the environment.

4 A Conceptual Framework and Taxonomy

In this section, after some preliminaries (Section 4.1), we define macroprogramming, describe its essential elements and concepts (Section 4.2), characterise it in terms of abstraction, and distinguish it from other related notions like *centralised programming* (Section 4.3). Then, we propose a taxonomy and conceptual framework (Section 4.4) for classifying and studying the macroprogramming approaches surveyed in Section 5.

4.1 Preliminaries

Consider the problem of programming the behaviour of a computational system \mathcal{S} composed of multiple computational entities (namely Turing-equivalent machines able to process information and possibly interact with other entities) (Horsman *et al.*, 2013). Let A and B be two different entities of that system. We have the following main *modes* for *affecting* their behaviour in order to affect the behaviour or properties ascribable to the overall system \mathcal{S} (which, as we will shortly see, is essentially the goal of macroprogramming).

1. *Change their context (e.g., inputs)*. The entities will be indirectly influenced by the different context. For instance, if A is a sensor, it might sense a different value, which may in turn affect B and so on.
2. *Interaction (e.g., trigger/orchestrate their behaviour)*. For instance, if A is an actuator, it might be commanded to act upon the environment, which may in turn affect B and so on.
3. *Set their behaviour*. Part of the behaviour of A and B may be set or changed such that, when activated (e.g., in a reactive or proactive way), certain global outcomes will be produced.

Let us use term *program* to mean an (abstract) description that can be *executed* by some (abstract) computational entity. Notice that the modes (1) and (2) allow a program to affect

Ref.	Definition
(Bakshi and Prasanna, 2005)	<i>“The objective of macroprogramming is to allow the programmer to write a distributed sensing application without explicitly managing control, coordination, and state maintenance at the individual node level. Macroprogramming languages provide abstractions that can specify aggregate behaviors that are automatically synthesized into software for each node in the target deployment. The structure of the underlying runtime system will depend on the particular programming model.”</i>
(Whitehouse et al., 2006)	<i>“Macroprogramming is a term often used to refer to the process of writing a program that specifies global network behavior as opposed to the behavior of individual nodes.”</i>
(Wada et al., 2008)	<i>“Macroprogramming is an emerging programming paradigm for wireless sensor networks (WSNs). It allows developers to implement each WSN application from a global viewpoint as a whole rather than a viewpoint of sensor nodes as individuals. A macro-program specifies an application’s global behavior. It is transformed to node-level (micro) programs, and the micro-programs are deployed on individual nodes. Macroprogramming aims to increase the simplicity and productivity in WSN application programming.”</i>
(Mamei, 2011)	<i>“Macro programming [...] is the ability to specify application tasks at a global level while relying on compiler-like software to translate the global tasks into the individual component activities.”</i>
(Awan et al., 2007)	<i>“ Macroprogramming specifies aggregate system behavior, as opposed to device-specific programs that code distributed behavior using explicit messaging. [...] Composing applications with reusable components allows the macroprogrammer to focus on application specification rather than low-level details or inter-node messaging.”</i>
(Sugihara and Gupta, 2008)	<i>“Network-level abstractions, or equivalently macroprogramming, share the approach with group-level abstractions, but go further by treating the whole network as a single abstract machine.”</i>
(Bai et al., 2009)	<i>“Network-level programming languages, also called macro-programming languages, treat the whole network as a single machine. Lower-level details such as routing and communication are hidden from programmers.”</i>
(Sookoor, 2009)	<i>“Macroprogramming provides the user with the illusion of programming a single machine by abstracting away the low-level details of message passing and distributed computation.”</i>
(Hnat and Whitehouse, 2010)	<i>“Macroprogramming systems addresses the difficult problem of how to program a system of devices to perform a global task without forcing the programmer to develop device-specific implementations”</i>
(Pathak and Prasanna, 2011)	<i>“In macroprogramming, abstractions are provided to specify the high-level collaborative behavior at the system level, while intentionally hiding most of the low-level details concerning state maintenance or message passing from the programmer”</i>
(Martins and McCann, 2017)	<i>“[...] the behavior of a CPS is better understood at a global system level. In order to reflect this from a programming language abstraction standpoint we rely on network-wide programming, or macroprogramming [...] This paradigm of programming allows the system developer to write one piece of code for the network, specifying the application at a global semantic level. The task of the compiler is then to not only produce a machine translation of the code, but also decide how to split this code into several images to run on many devices. These images should set up the necessary communication channels, buffering and orchestration between processing devices. In this way, the role of the compiler is not to produce an executable but to produce a set of deployable software images, along with their deployment requirements.”</i>

Table 1: Some descriptions of macroprogramming from the literature.




Figure 1: The general idea of macroprogramming.

A or B , and hence \mathcal{S} , by having it executed by another entity, say C , that is assumed to be external to the arbitrary boundary of \mathcal{S} .

4.2 Macroprogramming: Definition and Basic Concepts

We define macroprogramming as *an abstract paradigm for programming the (macro)scopic behaviour of systems of computational entities*¹. As a paradigm (see Section 4.3 for a discussion on this), it is “an approach to programming based on a mathematical theory **or a coherent set of principles**” (Van Roy, 2009) (bold is added). Macroprogramming is based on the following principles, which can be partially extracted from the various definitions given in literature (cf. Table 1):

- P1 *Micro-macro distinction*. Two main levels of a system are considered: a *macro* level (of global structures, of state, of behaviour) and a *micro* level (of computational entities).
- P2 *Macroscopic perspective*. The programming activity tends to focus on macroscopic aspects of a *system*, which may include summary observations and views whereby micro-level entities are considered by a *global* (or *non-local*) and conceptually centralised perspective.
- P3 *Macroprogram*. The output of the macroprogramming activity is a program that is conceptually executed by the system as a whole and whose intended meaning adopts the macroscopic perspective.

¹Possibly corresponding to physical devices through a notion of *digital twin* (Rasheed *et al.*, 2020) or *physical computation* (Horsman *et al.*, 2013).

P4 *Macro-to-micro mapping*. A macroprogramming implementation has to define *how* a macro-program is executed, by the system as a whole, which entails defining a *macro-to-micro mapping* logic—sometimes also known as *global-to-local* mapping (Hamann, 2010). In other words, from a macroprogram, micro-level programs or behaviours are derived or affected (see Section 4.1).

Figure 1 shows the general idea of the approach, graphically. The following sections detail on the above principles.

On micro-macro and local-global distinction

The micro-macro levels and the local-global scales usually used as equivalent concepts to distinguish smaller elements/scopes and larger elements/scopes somewhat “containing” or “being implied by” the former. The micro-macro distinction (Alexander, 1987) (sometimes also space out by an intermediate, or *meso* level) is typical in many scientific areas including social sciences, systemics, and distributed artificial intelligence (Schillo *et al.*, 2000) (cf. multi-agent systems (Wooldridge, 2009)). For the sake of programming, just like a system (as an ontological and epistemological element) can be *defined* according to a boundary condition (Mobus and Kalton, 2014), the distinction between two dimensions, micro and macro, is similarly made through a design-oriented boundary or membership decision defining what belongs to one level or the other.

The intended meaning of macroprograms, and hence the ultimate goal of macroprogramming, seems to be related to the notion of *emergence* (Holland, 1998; Wolf and Holvoet, 2004; Gignoux *et al.*, 2017; Kalantari *et al.*, 2020). In (Gignoux *et al.*, 2017), the authors use graph theory to provide formal definitions of macroscopic states and microscopic states, and characterise emergence by analysing the general relationships between microscopic and macroscopic states.

What can we say, in general, about the entities at the micro and macro levels in macroprogramming? Micro entities have a computational behaviour, which may be autonomous (proactive), active, or reactive; and may or may not interact with other micro entities. So, for instance, data elements do not make for micro entities (they have no behaviour), while agents, actors, objects, and microservices do².

Regarding the macro level, we can distinguish between macro-level observables and macro-level constructs. A *macro-level observable* is a high-level observation of the system behaviour, i.e., a macro state as defined in (Gignoux *et al.*, 2017), which is associated to the system as a whole and might be difficult to derive from micro state (the set of observations about the micro-level entities). The intended meaning, or goal, of a macroprogram, is generally a function of macro-level observables over some notion of time. A *macro-level*

²Possibly, even humans and other physical entities (Horsman *et al.*, 2013).

construct or *abstraction* is, instead, a description that can be mapped down to affect the behaviour of two or more micro-level entities (cf. Section 4.1). The problem of implementing the logic for such a mapping is the macro-to-micro problem of macroprogramming.

On collectives

Macroprogramming usually targets so-called *collectives*—see Section 3. Term “collective” derives from Latin *colligere*, which means “to gather together”. Typically (Brodaric and Neuhaus, 2020), a collective is an entity that gathers multiple *congeneric* elements together by some notion of *membership*. “Congeneric” means “belonging to the same genus”, namely, of related nature. In other words, a collective is a group of similar individuals or entities that share something (e.g., a trait, a goal, a plan, a reason for unity, an environment, an interface) which justifies seeing them as a collective, overall. A group of co-located workers, a swarm of drones, the cells of an organ are examples of collectives, whereas a gathering of radically different or unrelated entities such as cells, rivers, and monkeys is not, intuitively. Being congeneric, the elements of a collective generally share goals and mechanisms for interaction and hence collaboration. The differences among the elements, often promoting larger collective capabilities by collaboration, may be due to genetic factors, individual historical developments, and the current environmental contexts driving diverse responses on similar inputs.

Heterogeneous collectives also exist (e.g., aggregates involving humans, autonomous robots, and sensors) and can be addressed by macroprogramming (Scekic *et al.*, 2020). However, heterogeneity tends to complicate macroprogramming by posing more importance on individuals’ perspectives or widening the macro-to-micro gap—see Section 6.4 for a discussion. Finally, we observe that a precise characterisation of groups and collections of entities is subject to research (Brodaric and Neuhaus, 2020), in philosophical and mathematical fields like applied ontology (the study of being in general), and mereology (the study of parts and the wholes they form).

On declarativity

A typical aspect of macroprogramming is *declarativity*. *Declarative programming* (Lloyd, 1994b) is a paradigm which focusses on expressing *what* the goal of computation is rather than *how* it must be achieved. Common and concrete aspects of a computation that can be abstracted away include the order of function evaluation (cf. functional programming), proving theorems from facts (cf. logic programming), and the specifics of data access (cf. query plans in databases and SQL). The general idea is to provide high-level abstractions capturing system-wide concerns by making assumptions promoting convenient mapping to component-level concerns. As such assumptions tend to be specific to an application

domain, macroprogramming languages typically take the form of *domain-specific languages (DSLs)* (Beal *et al.*, 2012).

4.3 What Macroprogramming Is (Not)

Programming essentially always deals with multiple interacting software elements, be them functions, objects, actors, or agents. Even though paradigms are more a matter of *mindset* and *abstractions*, rather than a matter of strict demarcation, a *demarcation issue* may be considered to better delineate a (nevertheless, fuzzy) boundary of macroprogramming.

Macroprogramming is often centred around *macro-abstractions*: informally, constructs that involve, in some abstract way, (the context, state, or activity of) two or more micro-level entities. For instance:

- *macro-statements* (or *macro-instructions*), for imperative macroprogramming languages (e.g., “move the entire swarm to that target location”, or “update the WSN state history to record the current temperature of the area”);
- *macro-expressions*, evaluating to a macro-value (e.g., “the direction vector of the swarm towards the target location”, “the mean temperature of the area covered by the network”);

Other examples of macro-abstractions can be found in Section 6.2.

Consider the following artificial Scala program:

```
1 // Library code (non-macroprogramming)
2 object swarm {
3   def robots = // ...
4   def move(target: Pos): Unit = robots.foreach(robot => robot.move(target))
5   def energyLevel(): Double = robots.map(_.energyLevel).sum / robots.size
6   def positions(): Set[Pos] = robots.map(_.position)
7   def monitor(area: Area): Unit = // ...
8   // ...
9 }
10
11 // User code (macroprogramming)
12 if (swarm.energyLevel() < WARNING_ENERGY_LEVEL) {
13   swarm.move(rechargingStation())
14 } else {
15   swarm.monitor(targetArea())
16 }
```

The `swarm` object provides a macro-abstraction over the set of underlying `robots`. Indeed, such a code might be written to abstract from a series of low-level details: the obstacle avoidance behaviour of individual robots; the fact that robots of the swarm move collectively in flock formation; the way sensors and actuators perceive distances to other robots, obstacles, and acceleration, to control stability and speed of each moving robot. The intended meaning of the program may refer to macro-observables that may or not may accessible by the program (cf. side-effects). The library code provides an implementation of the macroprogramming system. It maps the expressions of the user macro-program down to micro-level behaviour.

Here, the macro-to-micro approach may be interpreted as an interaction mode – it is the running thread that interacts with the micro-level entities through the program control flow – or an execution mode – the macro-program is executed by the micro-level entities. This simplified example shows a macroprogramming language as an library/API within an existing host language (Scala), also called an internal DSL; actual examples of internal macroprogramming DSLs include Chronus (Wada *et al.*, 2010) and ScaFi (Casadei *et al.*, 2020b).

Doing macroprogramming is very much a matter of perspective. If the micro-macro distinction we are considering is robots vs. a swarm, then the library code (Lines 1-9), individually addressing each robot of the swarm with a specific instruction, is not macroprogramming, properly; vice versa, the user code (Lines 11-16), addressing the swarm as a whole, does represent an example of macroprogramming. However, the library code could be considered macroprogramming under a micro-macro viewpoint of sensors/actuators vs. a robot.

Weak vs. strong macroprogramming

In a nutshell, the central idea of macroprogramming is considering *the entire system as the abstract machine* for the operations. Notice that adopting a *centralised perspective* to programming, where a centralised program has access to all the individual entities, is not generally sufficient for effective macroprogramming: there should typically be *at least one intermediate level of indirection*³, where macro-operations turn into micro-operations. In the example above, while the library code can directly access the individual robots, the user code indirectly accesses them through the `swarm` macro-abstraction.

Essentially, *directly* feeding micro-operations to the micro-level entities or specifying the individual behaviours of the parts breaks the macroprogramming abstraction, or makes it *leaky* (Spolsky, 2004; Kiczales, 1992). This is one reason (in addition to limited emphasis on behaviour) for which, e.g., formalisms for concurrent systems such as process-algebraic approaches (Baeten, 2005), certain component-based approaches, and multi-tier programming (Weisenburger *et al.*, 2020) are not generally considered macroprogramming. However, several approaches in literature defined themselves as macroprogramming despite basically embodying merely a form of centralised programming. Some of these may provide some macroprogramming abstractions (e.g., an object from which individual entities can be dynamically retrieved), but would nevertheless appear as a *weak* form of macroprogramming. We may consider the *macroscopic stance* as a degree, and hence define *strong* macroprogramming approaches those where *only* macro-abstractions are provided. For demarcation purposes, we propose to call those centralised programming approaches that inherently

³Informally, indirection refers to the ability to reference some object through another object; it can be interpreted, e.g., based on static or dynamic scope.

adopt a macro-level, global perspective but directly address individuals through micro-level instructions as *weak macroprogramming* or *meso-programming*. Considering the macro perspective as a continuum, and hence admitting that languages can be “more macro” or “less macro”, somewhat allow us to avoid defining clear boundaries and be comprehensive (which may be important at these early stages, as well as for the sake of this survey). For sure, however, we can state that writing separate programs for different entities of the system from their individual perspectives is *not* macroprogramming.

Macroprogramming as a Paradigm

(Van Roy, 2009) defines a *programming paradigm* as “*an approach to programming a computer[-based system] based on a mathematical theory **or a coherent set of principles***” (bold is added). Van Roy classifies paradigms according to (i) whether or not they can express observable nondeterminism and (ii) how strongly they support state (e.g., according to whether it is named, deterministic, and concurrent). Also interesting is Van Roy’s view of computer programming as a way to deal with complexity (e.g., number of interacting components) and randomness (non-determinism) to make aggregates (unorganised complexity) and machines (organised simplicity) into systems (organised complexity). Macroprogramming effectively deals with aggregates, turning them into programmable systems.

We argue the principles outlined in this section form sufficient ground for macroprogramming to be considered a paradigm, and hence aggregate multiple approaches under its umbrella. It is a paradigm in a way similar to *declarative programming* (Lloyd, 1994b), which is “concerned with writing down *what* should be computed and much less with *how* it should be computed” (Finkelstein *et al.*, 2003). Then, paradigms like functional and logic programming are considered as more specific forms of declarative programming. As shown in Section 5, also concrete macroprogramming languages can adopt a specific paradigm (e.g., functional, logic, or object-oriented). The interpretation of macroprogramming as a property degree is also coherent with the property degree of “declarativity”: a language may be more or less declarative according to the amount of details it allows to omit for a same semantic element.

The notion itself of a paradigm has sometimes been criticised in teaching programming (Krishnamurthi and Fisler, 2019) for its fuzziness and coarse grain, preferring epistemological devices like notional machines (Fincher *et al.*, 2020). However, our stance is that the notion of a paradigm may still be useful as a lens or perspective for observing, comparing, and relating several concrete programming approaches, and as a core notion around which researchers on disparate topics can self-identify and connect through shared terms and ideas.




Figure 2: Taxonomy

4.4 Taxonomy

We propose to classify and analyse macroprogramming approaches according to the following elements, succinctly represented in Figure 2.

- 1) *Target domain*. It refers to the application domain explicitly addressed by a macroprogramming approach. This is relevant since domain-specific abstractions and assumptions are typically leveraged to properly deal with the abstraction gap induced by declarativity. Label “General” is used to indicate that an approach addresses distributed systems in general, whereas “Other” means that the approach addresses a specific domain different from the others.
- 2) *Approach*. We propose to classify macroprogramming languages according to the main approach they follow.
 - *Control-oriented*. Emphasis is on specification of control flow and instructions for the system.
 - *Data-oriented*. Emphasis is on specification of data and data flow.
 - *Space-time-oriented*. Emphasis is on specification spatial, geometric, or topological aspects and their evolution over time.
 - *Ensemble-oriented*. Emphasis is on specification of organisational structures as well as tasks and interaction between groups of components.
 - *Ad-hoc*. The followed approach is peculiar and cannot be easily related with the previous ones.
- 3) *Characteristics*.
 - 3a) *Paradigm*. The paradigm upon which macroprogramming abstractions are supported (the main one in case of multi-paradigm languages).
 - 3b) *Macroprogramming design*. Elements characterising a particular macroprogramming language.
 - *Micro-level*: the individual components and aspects that collectively make up the system.
 - *Macro-level*: the system as a whole and its macroscopic aspects.
 - *Macro-to-micro*: the approach followed by macro-programs to affect micro-level behaviour. We distinguish four main modalities based on the discussion in Section 4.1: (i) *context*, where global state, inputs, or node parameters are set; (ii) *interaction*, where a process is used to orchestrate micro-level entities; (iii)

compilation, where the macroprogram is translated into the micro-programs;
(iv) *execution*, where the macro-program is executed by the micro-level entities according to some (ad-hoc) execution model. .

- *Macro-goals*: the objectives that macro-programs are meant to reach (typically, abstraction, flexibility, and optimisability—as a result of declarativity).
- *Macro-abstractions*: the abstractions provided by a macroprogramming approach that are instrumental for achieving or capturing macroscopic aspects or goals of the system.
- *Micro-level dependency*: the extent to which the macroprogramming language depends on micro-level components or aspects. We consider three levels: (i) **D**ependent (if micro-level elements are always visible), (ii) **I**ndependent (if micro-level elements are abstracted away), or (iii) **S**calable (if micro-level elements can be abstracted away as well as accessed, in case).

Elements of this taxonomy integrate and are partially inspired by some perspectives of previous work covered in Section 7.

Table 2: Summary of the surveyed macroprogramming approaches. The first column indicates whether the manuscript explicitly advertises the approach as macroprogramming.

	Name/Ref.	Domain	Approach	Paradigm	Micro-level	Macro-level	Macro-to-micro	Macro-abstractions	Micro-dependency
•	Market-Based Macroprogramming (Mainland <i>et al.</i> , 2004)	WSANs	ad-hoc	specification	nodes	WSN	context	virtual markets; good price	independent
•	ENM (Mamei, 2011)	General	ad-hoc	specification	nodes	network	execution	Bayesian network tasks	dependent
	Graph-centric programming, Giraph++ (Tian <i>et al.</i> , 2013)	Other	ad-hoc	imperative	nodes	graph	execution	subgraph	dependent
	NetKAT (Anderson <i>et al.</i> , 2014); SNAP (Arashloo <i>et al.</i> , 2016)	Other	ad-hoc	imperative	switches	network	compilation	network state; network slices	dependent
	WOSP (Varughese <i>et al.</i> , 2020)	Robotics	ad-hoc	specification	robots	swarm	execution	common behaviour	dependent
	PIECES (Liu <i>et al.</i> , 2003)	Other	control-oriented	object-oriented	(sensor) nodes	WSAN	interaction	global state; state pieces; groups	dependent
•	Kairos (Gummadi <i>et al.</i> , 2005)	WSANs	control-oriented	imperative	nodes	WSN	compilation	centralised view; node iterators; neighbourhoods; remote data access	dependent
•	PyoT (Azzara <i>et al.</i> , 2014)	IoT/CPS	control-oriented	object-oriented	resources	IoT system	interaction	resource groups	dependent
	Buzz (Pinciroli and Beltrame, 2016)	Robotics	control-oriented	imperative	robots	swarm	execution	swarm; neighbourhood; virtual stigmergy	dependent
	Dolphin (Lima <i>et al.</i> , 2018)	Robotics	control-oriented	imperative	vehicles	vehicle network	interaction	vehicle sets; vehicle selection expressions	dependent
•	makeSense mPL (Mottola <i>et al.</i> , 2019)	WSANs	control-oriented	object-oriented	nodes	WSN	compilation	distributed actions (report, tell, collective actions)	dependent
	Warble (Saputra <i>et al.</i> , 2019)	IoT/CPS	control-oriented	object-oriented	things	IoT system	interaction	things selectors; bindings	dependent
	TinyDB (Madden <i>et al.</i> , 2002)	WSANs	data-oriented	specification	nodes	WSN	compilation	database	independent
•	ATaG (Bakshi <i>et al.</i> , 2005)	WSANs	data-oriented	specification	nodes	WSN	compilation	data flow graph	independent
•	Semantic Streams (Whitehouse <i>et al.</i> , 2006)	WSANs	data-oriented	logic	nodes	WSN	execution	event streams; semantic services; inference units; regions	independent
•	Regiment (Newton <i>et al.</i> , 2007)	WSANs	data-oriented	functional	nodes	WSN	compilation	time-varying signals; regions	scalable
•	COSMOS (Awan <i>et al.</i> , 2007)	WSANs	data-oriented	specification	nodes	WSN	compilation	data flow graph	independent
•	Flask (Mainland <i>et al.</i> , 2008)	WSANs	data-oriented	functional	nodes	WSN	execution	nfold macroprogramming combinator	independent
•	SOSNA (Karpinski and Cahill, 2008)	WSANs	data-oriented	functional	nodes	WSAN	execution	streams of spatial values	scalable

Table 2: Summary of the surveyed macroprogramming approaches. The first column indicates whether the manuscript explicitly advertises the approach as macroprogramming.

Name/Ref.	Domain	Approach	Paradigm	Micro-level	Macro-level	Macro-to-micro	Macro-abstractions	Micro-dependency
• MacroLab (Hnat <i>et al.</i> , 2008)	IoT/CPS	data-oriented	imperative	nodes	CPS	compilation	macroctof; neighbourhoods	scalable
• Nano-CF (Gupta <i>et al.</i> , 2011)	WSANs	data-oriented	specification	nodes	WSN	execution	services; jobs	dependent
• Pico-MP (Dulay <i>et al.</i> , 2018)	WSANs	data-oriented	logic	nodes	WSAN	compilation	global formula on network data	dependent
• D'Artagnan (Mizzi <i>et al.</i> , 2018); Porthos (Mizzi <i>et al.</i> , 2019)	IoT/CPS	data-oriented	functional	IoT devices	IoT system	compilation	data streams	independent
DDFlow (Noor <i>et al.</i> , 2019)	IoT/CPS	data-oriented	specification	IoT devices	IoT system	execution	data flow graph	independent
MOISE (Hübner <i>et al.</i> , 2007)	General	ensemble-oriented	specification	agents	multi-agent system	execution	organisations; roles; groups; missions	dependent
Scopes (Jacobi <i>et al.</i> , 2008)	WSANs	ensemble-oriented	specification	nodes	WSN	execution	scope (ensemble); scope membership	independent
• EcoCast (Tu <i>et al.</i> , 2011)	WSANs	ensemble-oriented	object-oriented	nodes	WSN	compilation	group handles; group-wide operations	dependent
DEECo (Bures <i>et al.</i> , 2013)	General	ensemble-oriented	specification	components	distributed system	execution	ensemble	dependent
SCEL (Nicola <i>et al.</i> , 2014); AbC (Alrahman <i>et al.</i> , 2015); CARMA (Loreti and Hillston, 2016); AErLang (Nicola <i>et al.</i> , 2018)	General	ensemble-oriented	specification	components	self-* system	execution	ensembles; group-oriented communication	dependent
• Voltron (Mottola <i>et al.</i> , 2014)	Robotics	ensemble-oriented	imperative	drones	swarm	compilation	teams; spatially situated tasks	dependent
Comingle (Lam <i>et al.</i> , 2015)	General	ensemble-oriented	logic	app nodes	distributed system	compilation	collective information; system state evolution	dependent
TECOLA (Koutsoubias and Lalis, 2016)	Robotics	ensemble-oriented	object-oriented	robots	robotic team	execution	team-level services; mission groups; membership rules	dependent
PaROS (Dedousis and Kalogeraki, 2018)	Robotics	ensemble-oriented	object-oriented	robots	swarm	execution	abstract swarms; path planning; task partitioning	dependent
Aggregate Programming (Viroli <i>et al.</i> , 2019); Proto (Beal and Bachrach, 2006); Protelis (Pianini <i>et al.</i> , 2015); ScaFi (Casadei <i>et al.</i> , 2020b)	General	ensemble-oriented	functional	devices	distributed system	execution	computational fields; neighbourhoods; macro-behaviour functions	scalable

Table 2: Summary of the surveyed macroprogramming approaches. The first column indicates whether the manuscript explicitly advertises the approach as macroprogramming.

Name/Ref.	Domain	Approach	Paradigm	Micro-level	Macro-level	Macro-to-micro	Macro-abstractions	Micro-dependency
SmartSociety (Seekic <i>et al.</i> , 2020)	General	ensemble-oriented	object-oriented	human and machine peers	socio-technical system	interaction	collectives; collective-based tasks	independent
Abstract Regions (Welsh and Mainland, 2004)	WSANs	space-time-oriented	imperative	nodes	WSN	compilation	regions; region-aware data access	independent
SpatialViews (Ni <i>et al.</i> , 2005)	General	space-time-oriented	imperative	devices	MANET	interaction	spatial views (virtual networks)	dependent
• STOP (Wada <i>et al.</i> , 2007); Chronus (Wada <i>et al.</i> , 2010)	WSANs	space-time-oriented	object-oriented	nodes	WSN	interaction	space-time slices	independent
Meld (Ashley-Rollman <i>et al.</i> , 2007)	Robotics	space-time-oriented	logic	modular robots	robot ensemble	compilation	collective information; collective deduction	independent
• Sense2P (Choochaisri <i>et al.</i> , 2012)	WSANs	space-time-oriented	logic	nodes	WSN	execution	logical rule	independent
PLEIADES (Bouget <i>et al.</i> , 2018)	General	space-time-oriented	functional	nodes	distributed system	execution	shape templates	dependent

5 Macroprogramming Approaches

This section provides a survey of macroprogramming languages, which are analysed as per the conceptual framework of Section 4. The contributions are classified and organised as per the approach classes proposed in Section 4.4. A summary of the survey is provided in Table 2.

5.1 Control-oriented approaches

Control-oriented approaches emphasise an *imperative* macroprogramming style where control flow is specified and/or explicitly controlled for the system and instructions are issued to query or act on system components. This contrasts with data-driven approaches where control flow is a consequence of relationships among data. With control orientation, implicit or explicit sequences, conditionals, and loops may be used to describe what the macro-system or its components have to perform.

Kairos (Gummadi *et al.*, 2005) It is a procedural macroprogramming language for WSNs that assumes loose synchrony and leverages eventual consistency to keep low overhead. The approach is *control-driven* and *node-dependent*—i.e., nodes and node state are explicitly manipulated at the programming level. In Kairos, the programmer writes a centralised program expressing the global specification of a distributed computation, which is compiled to a node-specific program. Kairos exposes three main abstractions: addressing of arbitrary nodes (e.g., by names or iterators like `node_list`), inspection of one-hop neighbour nodes (e.g., via function `get_neighbors`), and remote data access at nodes (e.g., with expressions `variable@node`). As an example, consider a simple self-healing hop-gradient computation, i.e., an algorithm that makes each node in the system yield the corresponding hop-by-hop distance towards a root node (Audrito *et al.*, 2017).

```
1 node_list nodes = get_available_nodes();
2 int dist;
3
4 for(node n = get_first(nodes); n!=NULL; n=get_next(nodes)){
5     // Initialisation
6     if(n==root){ dist = 0 } else { dist = INF };
7
8     // Event loop
9     for(;;){
10        sleep(sleep_interval);
11        node_list nbrs = get_neighbors(n);
12        for(node nbr = get_first(nbrs); nbr!=NULL; nbr=get_next(nbrs){
13            if(dist@nbr+1 < dist){ dist = dist@nbr+1; }
14        }
15    }
16 }
```

Concerning macro-to-micro mechanics and implementation, during the translation of the macro-program into node-level programs, references to remote data are expanded into calls

to the *Kairos runtime*, a software component which is assumed to be available in every node of the system. Specifically, the Kairos runtime deals with *managed objects* (objects owned by a node that are to be made available to remote nodes) and *cached objects* (local views of managed objects owned by remote nodes), through asynchronous hop-by-hop communication—contrast this with synchronous data access calls in Kairos programs. Issues at the middleware level include supporting end-to-end reliable routing and management of dynamic topologies.

PyoT (Azzara *et al.*, 2014) PyoT is defined as a Python-based macroprogramming framework for the IoT and WSNs. A simple example adjusted from the paper is the following.

```

1 temperatures = Resource.objects.filter(title='temp')
2 results = [temp.GET() for temp in temperatures]
3 avg = sum(results) / len(results)
4 TEMP_THRESHOLD = 24
5 if avg > TEMP_THRESHOLD:
6     Resource.objects.get(title='fan').PUT('on')
```

This is just a script that collects values from temperature sensors, computes the mean of the temperature, and turns the fan device on if the mean exceeds a certain threshold. Notice the imperative approach and the global perspective by which resources are accessed. The only relevant abstraction is that of a *resource*, inherited by its RESTful design which is typical in IoT platforms. Architecturally, PyoT has one or more worker nodes managing corresponding sets of sensors (i.e., entire IoT systems or WSNs) and executing tasks issued from Pyot programs by the users through shells or virtual control rooms.

Buzz (Pinciroli and Beltrame, 2016) Buzz is an imperative swarm-oriented macroprogramming language and system. In Buzz, a *swarm* consists of a set of robots equipped with the Buzz virtual machine and running the same Buzz script in a step-by-step fashion. In each step, a robot (i) collects sensor readings and incoming messages; (ii) executes a portion of the Buzz script; (iii) sends output messages; and (iv) applies actuators on actuator values hold in the state. Robots can share information through *virtual stigmergy* (Pinciroli *et al.*, 2016) (i.e., communication via distributed tuples spaces, inspired by environment-mediated interaction of social insects) or by querying neighbours. The following example of Buzz code shows how swarm behaviour is programmed imperatively at the swarm-level.

```

1 function init(){ # this function is run for initialisation
2     s1 = swarm.create(1) # a newly created, empty swarm with ID=1
3     s2 = swarm.create(2) # another swarm
4     s1.select(id % 2 == 0) # join the swarm based on robot's id
5     s2.join # every robot joins the swarm 2 unconditionally
6     s3 = swarm.difference(3, s2, s1) # a new swarm with robots in s2 but not in s1
7 }
8
9 function step(){ # this function is run at each time step
10 # ...
```

```

11  s3.exec( function() { ... }) # every robot in swarm s3 runs the given function
12  if(...){ s1.leave() } # conditionally leaving a swarm
13  # ...
14  n = neighbors.count() # number of neighbours
15  nbrs = neighbors.kin() # neighbours in the same swarm
16  temperatures = nbrs.map( function(robotId,data){
17      return data.temperature # data provides access to the attributes of a robot
18  }) # map every neighbour robot in nbrs with the corresp. temperature
19  # ...
20 }

```

Notice the language comprises both single-robot and swarm-based primitives. Within the step function, the point of view is of an individual robot; however, swarm abstractions enable selective addressing of individuals and multiple dispatch of operations, and neighbourhood abstractions promote local coordination. In the implementation, each robot keeps track of memberships in swarms and data from neighbours; optimisations are applied to reduce the communication overhead.

Dolphin (Lima *et al.*, 2018) Dolphin is an open-source Groovy-based task-oriented macroprogramming language per autonomous vehicle networks. Lima *et al.* describe it as an “extensible task orchestration language [...] delegating platform-dependent networked operations to the platform”. The macro-level abstraction in Dolphin is the *vehicle set*, a dynamic group of vehicles which can be manipulated through set operations and by pick/release operators. An example of a Dolphin program, slightly adapted from the paper and commented, for coordinating three unmanned underwater vehicles (UUVs) surveying a region and one unmanned aerial vehicle (UAV) for collecting those surveys is as follows.

```

1  // (1) configuration
2  r = ask 'Radius of operation area? (km)' // ask radius to user
3  APDL = (location 41.18500, -8.70620) ^ r.km // geo-referenced area
4  // (2) Vehicle selection
5  UUVs = pick { count 3; type 'UUV'; payload 'DVL', 'Sidescan' ; region APDL }
6  UAV = pick { type 'UAV'; region APDL }
7  // (3) function yielding UUV task i
8  def UUVTask(i) {
9      imcPlan('survey' +i) >> // the actual survey task
10     action { post ready:i } >> // signal readiness for rendez-vous
11     imcPlan { planName 'sk' + i; skeeping duration: 600 }
12 }
13 // (4) Execute tasks
14 execute UUVs: UUVTask(1) | UUVTask(2) | UUVTask(3), // concurrent composition
15     UAV: allOf {
16     when { consume ready: 1 } then imcPlan('rv1')
17     when { consume ready: 2 } then imcPlan('rv2')
18     when { consume ready: 3 } then imcPlan('rv3')
19     }
20 // (5) End
21 release UUVs + UAV // + is for union of two vehicle sets

```

Single-vehicle tasks are expressed through *IMC plans*, i.e., task specifications based on a message-based interoperability protocol called *Inter-Module Communications (IMC)* (Pinto *et al.*, 2013). The program asks a radius r to the user, defines a geographical region *APDL*, then defines two vehicle sets, *UUVs* (with three UUVs) and *UAV* (a singleton set with a single

UAV), which are tasked via `execute` and finally `released`. In summary, macroprogramming in Dolphin is concerned with “grouping” and “tasking”; however, the different vehicles are given specific micro programs (IMC plans) not obtained from the global specification, which is only responsible for orchestrating the system.

Warble (Saputra *et al.*, 2019) Warble is another macroprogramming framework for the IoT. The following example adapted from the paper shows how to select the three light or thermostat things closest to `myLocation` and perform a one-time operation on them.

```

1 Warble warble = new Warble(); // for discovery of things
2 List<Selector> template = new ArrayList<Selector>();
3 template.add(new TypeSelector(LIGHT, THERMOSTAT));
4 template.add(new NearestThingSelector(myLocation));
5 List<Thing> things = warble.fetch(template, 3);
6 for(Thing thing : things){
7     if(thing instanceof Light) ((Light) thing).on();
8     if(thing instanceof Thermostat) ((Thermostat) thing).setTemperature(24);
9 }

```

Warble also support “dynamic binding” for continuous discovery and operations.

```

1 Plan plan = new Plan();
2 plan.set(Plan.Key.LIGHTING_ON, true);
3 plan.set(Plan.Key.AMBIENT_TEMPERATURE, 30);
4
5 DBinding dBind = warble.dynamicBind(template, 3);
6 dBind.bind(plan); // start binding based on plan

```

Warble is quite similar to PyoT; essentially, differences are mainly in the API and in the architecture and implementation, and therefore in the non-functional properties of the system.

makeSense mPL (Mottola *et al.*, 2019) makeSense is a framework for WSN application development. It comprises a two-step compilation process where (i) a Business Process Modelling Notation (BPMN) (Zarour *et al.*, 2020) model is compiled into a macro-program expressed in a macroprogramming language called mPL; and (ii) the mPL program is then compiled to the target underlying WSN platform such as TinyOS (Levis *et al.*, 2005) or Contiki (Dunkels *et al.*, 2004). The mPL language comprises the following meta-abstractions: *local* actions that affect a single device and *distributed* actions that affect multiple devices and include *report* actions (modelling many-to-one interactions), *tell* actions (modelling one-to-many interactions), and *collective* actions (modelling many-to-many interactions). These meta-abstractions

5.2 Data-oriented and database abstraction approaches

Data-oriented approaches define the macro-level behaviour of a system in terms of goals and activities of data gathering and processing. Sometimes, this is taken to the extreme, consid-

ering the system as a kind of distributed database keeping spatiotemporal or aggregated data.

TinyDB (Madden *et al.*, 2002) It is a query processing system that considers a WSN as a database. TinyDB supports an SQL-like language for expressing queries and actuations. A query looks like the following:


```

1 SELECT nodeId, temperature WHERE temperature > k FROM sensors
2 SAMPLE PERIOD 5 minutes

```

Therefore, the approach is fully declarative and the system must find itself a strategy to map the global goal to local behaviour of the sensor nodes. We remark that the *behaviour* of the individual nodes is driven partly by the query-like macroprogram and partly by a basic “execution protocol” (providing a structure for the emergence of global behaviour) which is the same for all the nodes. Nodes work in *epochs*, corresponding to sampling periods, in a synchronised fashion. They sleep for most of the time; they wake up to sample sensors, gather neighbour data, process data, and send results to their parent node. This execution protocol is very similar to those used by other macroprogramming approaches, such as aggregate computing (Viroli *et al.*, 2019) which is a paradigm for self-organising systems of agents.

ATaG (Abstract Task Graph) (Bakshi *et al.*, 2005) ATaG is a data-driven macro-programming approach for sensor networks where macro-programs take the form of annotated dataflow graphs. In these graphs, abstract channels connect abstract data with abstract tasks. Then, the graph is augmented with annotations specifying (i) how tasks are to be instantiated on the network nodes (e.g., on a specific node, anywhere, once every N nodes, on every node in a spatial area), (ii) how tasks are to be scheduled (e.g., periodically, or when any or all of the inputs are available), and (iii) information flow patterns (e.g., through particular kinds of channels modelling neighbourhood interaction, parent-child interaction, and task-wide broadcast). For instance, a temperature monitoring application could be designed as follows.



Semantic Streams (Whitehouse *et al.*, 2006) Semantic Streams is a logic-based, declarative language for expressing semantic queries over WSN data. It builds on two main abstractions: *event streams* and *inference units* (processes on event streams). For instance, the following program

```

1 stream (Y), isa (Y, histogram), % histogram events
2 property (Y , X, stream),      % a histogram event has a stream X
3 property (Y , time, property), % and a time property
4 stream (X), isa(X, objectDetected), % stream X consists of object detection events
5 property (X, [[0,0,0],[50,50,0]], region). % ... within a given region

```

can be used to query for and plot `objectDetected` events in a given area across time. The macroprogramming system implementation is based on service composition and embedding. The query planner builds a task graph to be deployed to individual nodes, which will dynamically instantiate services, resolve conflicts between tasks and resources, and execute the queries.

COSMOS (Awan *et al.*, 2007) COSMOS is a macroprogramming system for heterogeneous sensor networks. It consists of a *dataflow* macroprogramming language, called *mPL*, and an operating system, called *mOS*. Macroprograms specify the aggregate behaviour of a sensor network in terms of typed *functional components* (mapping inputs into outputs) and *interaction assignments* describing how functional components are connected to form an asynchronous dataflow graph. Constraints can be used to affect instantiation of components in the physical nodes. Constructs called *contracts* can be applied to dataflow paths to provide higher-level abstractions such as region-scoped/neighbourhood broadcasts or load-aware resource management. An adapted excerpt of mPL code from the paper follows.

```

1 // Functional Component (FC) declarations
2 mcap = MCAP_FAST_CPU, // execution is possible only in nodes with fast CPU
3 fcid = FCIS_FFT,      // ID of the FC
4 in[craw_t],           // input type of the FC
5 out[freq_t]           // output type of the FC
6 }
7
8 // Logical instances
9 fft_fc : fft;
10 device : source;
11 device : sink;
12
13 // Interaction Assignment (IA)
14 IA {
15     source -> fft[0];
16     fft[0] -> sink;
17     ctrl[0] --> thresh[1]; // first output of ctrl is connected to the second input of thresh
18 }
19
20 // FC implementations (in C)
21 cp_ret_t fft_fc(cp_param_t*param, bq_node_t*pbqn, num_conn_t ind) { /*...*/ }
22 // ...

```

The COSMOS compiler takes a macro-program as input and produces an annotated dataflow graph which is communicated on the network nodes hosting mOS.

MacroLab (Hnat *et al.*, 2008) MacroLab is a vector-based macroprogramming framework where the global behaviour of a CPS is specified through a macro-program consisting of Matlab-like operations. It exposes a *macrovector* abstraction which is an unordered data structure where each element is associated with a system node. As an example, consider a MacroLab program inspecting a collection of temperature sensor nodes.

```

1 RTS = RunTimeSystem();
2 temperatureSensors = SensorVector('Temperature', 'uint16');
3 temperatureValues = Macrovector('uint16');
4 neighborTemperatureValues = neighborReflection(temperatureValues)
5 CRITICAL_TEMP = uint8(50);
6
7 every(1000) {
8     temperatureValues = sense(temperatureSensors);
9     maxTemperatureOverall = max(temperatureValues);
10    meanTemperatureInNbrhood = smean(neighborTemperatureValues);
11    criticalNodes = find(meanTemperatureInNbrhood > CRITICAL_TEMP);
12    % ...
13 }

```

As we see, the program consists of a loop where temperature sensors are queried to populate a macro-vector `temperatureValues`; then, vector operations are used to get the maximum temperature in the sensor network, to aggregate neighbourhood-wide temperatures in a mean value, and to find the node where that mean temperature is higher of a threshold. Both synchronised (e.g., `smean`—with the `s` prefix) and unsynchronised (e.g., `max`, `find`) operations are supported, to enable various semantics and optimisations. Interestingly, MacroLab also provides a *deployment-specific code decomposition* approach where macro-programs can be decomposed into different sets of micro-programs supporting different deployment scenarios. The MacroLab decomposer works by choosing a macrovector representation and then using rules to map vector operations into micro-level network operations. Three main representations include: a *decentralised* representation where vector values for a node are stored in that node; a *centralised* representation where vectors are centrally stored in a single node (e.g., a base station); or a *replicated* representation where vectors are replicated in every node.

Flask (Mainland *et al.*, 2008) Flask is a functional macroprogramming DSL, implemented in Haskell, that supports a dataflow-oriented design of the behaviour of sensor networks. It provides a *macroprogramming combinator*, called `nfold`, that combines local with other nodes' signals together; this is implemented by the whole network by aggregating values on a spanning tree. Flask has been used to program an implementation of TinyDB, called FlaskDB.

Sense2P (Choochaisri *et al.*, 2012) It is a *logic macroprogramming system* for WSNs, based on *LogicQ* (Choochaisri and Intanagonwiwat, 2008), a system that abstracts sensor networks as relational databases and supports collecting data and spreading logic queries.

In Sense2P, programs are expressed in a Prolog-like language: *facts* represent sensor data; *rules* enable generation of new facts; and *queries* enable checking and retrieving for (derived) facts. The macroprogrammers think like the facts were in a centralised database: the actual process of data retrieval is abstracted away. An example from the paper follows: it gets a set of all “hot objects” in a spatial area denoted by atom `area70`.

```

1 hotObject(Obj, AreaID):- detect(Obj, AreaID), temperature(Obj,T), T > 50.
2 ?- hotObject(X, area70).

```

Operationally, the subqueries (`detect`, `temperature`) are propagated in the network and evaluated only in the nodes that support them. So, only sensors detecting any object in `area70` are considered. Missing facts/rules or false conditions cause the evaluation on the node to be suppressed. The system architecture of Sense2P has two main components: (i) a query processing engine, with a compiler that translates Sense2P macro-programs into compiled code, and a run-time processing unit which executes the compiled program and submits queries to be disseminated across the network; and (ii) a data-gathering engine which is responsible of providing results to queries by exploiting a routing tree connectign sensors to the WSN base station.

PICO-MP (Dulay *et al.*, 2018) It is a publish/subscribe system for WSNs where subscriptions are expressed through *global FOL formulae*. Subscriptions are checked in a decentralised way against the published events to produce notifications bubbling up in a tree overlay network of brokers. This is done by having brokers perform local checks as described by *projections* of the global formulae.

D’Artagnan (Mizzi *et al.*, 2018) D’Artagnan is a stream-based, functional, macro-programming DSL embedded in Haskell for IoT systems. Its core idea is to specify stream processing functions that periodically execute on sensor data. For instance,

```

1 average :: [Stream Float] -> Stream Float
2 average ss = sum ss ./ consStream (length ss)

```

is a generic function that computes a stream of averages from a list of streams of values from sensors:

```

1 let input1 = input (device 1) (sensor 1)
2     input2 = input (device 2) (sensor 1)
3     input3 = input (device 2) (sensor 2)
4 in average [input1, input2, input3]

```

The language also provides two communication operators: `pull` to perform a request-response interaction, and `push` for a fire-and-forget action. For instance, in expression

```

1 input1 .+. (push (device 2) (input2 .*. input3))

```

the multiplication is performed on `device 2` before sending the partial result in `device 1` (cf. the definition of `input1`), hence avoiding transmission of both `input2` and `input3` with separate messages.

Nano-CF (Gupta *et al.*, 2011) Nano-CF is a macroprogramming framework for WSNs. Architecturally, a Nano-CF system consists of three layers: (i) the *runtime environment* provides support for executing local actions above the sensor node OS; (ii) the *integration layer* deals with packet delivery, data aggregation, scheduling, and batching tasks; (iii) the *coordinated programming environment (CPE)* allows users to compile and send programs to the sensor nodes as well as to receive data from the WSN. A Nano-CF macro-program consists of a number of *service* definitions (expressing the local behaviour of a sensor node) and a set of *job descriptors* each describing in which nodes a service must be executed, at which frequency (and tolerable deviation), and how output data must be gathered (through aggregation functions such as `min`, `max`, `sum`, `count`, and `noaggr` for keeping all data instances). For instance, consider the following program for counting the number of rooms occupied in a building and getting the temperatures of all the rooms (adapted and simplified from (Gupta *et al.*, 2011)).


```

1 JOB:
2   occupancy_monitor <L1,L2,...> <20s,5s> SUM
3   temperature_collection_service <L1,L2,...> <50s,0s> NOAGG
4 END
5
6 SERVICE: occupancy_monitor uint8
7   if(/* determine if occupied e.g. using local sensors */) return 1; else return 0; endif
8 END
9
10 SERVICE: temperature_collection_service uint16
11   return gets(TEMP);
12 END

```

Notice the macro-level viewpoint in the `JOB` block, where service are mapped to multiple nodes and overall service data is aggregated.

DDFlow (Noor *et al.*, 2019) DDFlow is a graphical language for programming IoT systems through specification of declarative dataflow graphs. A *dataflow graph* describes an application as a set of interrelated action *nodes*. Nodes represent stateful macro-actions. The actual deployment of tasks onto the devices of the system can be configured by specifying a (possibly dynamic) spatial region or a set of target devices through corresponding attributes in the dataflow node itself. Nodes are connected through *wires*, which can be of three main types: one-to-one (stream), one-to-many (broadcast), or many-to-one (unite). The following is an example of object tracking (adapted from the paper).



Clearly, the graph provides a macro-view of the system that abstracts from the underlying IoT nodes.

5.3 Space-time oriented approaches

Space-time-oriented macroprogramming approaches are those that leverage spatial and temporal abstractions to organise the behaviour of a system.

Pieces (Programming and Interaction Environment for Collaborative Embedded Systems) (Liu *et al.*, 2003) Pieces is a *state-centric* programming model for WSA_Ns where

programmers think in terms of dividing the global state of physical phenomena into a hierarchical set of independently updatable pieces with one computational entity (called a *principal*) maintaining each piece. (Liu *et al.*, 2003)

That is, a principal is an agent that interacts with other principals to update its piece of state, and that may move across WSA_N nodes. Pieces leverages the notion of *collaboration group*, i.e., a scoped set of principals playing different roles that collaborate to a state update, to abstract communication and resource allocation patterns. Examples of groups include *geographically constrained* groups (a set of nodes located in some geographical region), *n-hop neighbourhood* groups (a set of nodes within *n* hops from a given anchor node), and *publish/subscribe* groups (a set of consumer and producer nodes on certain topics).

```

1 public class SomePrincipal extends MobilePrincipal {
2   private InputPortAgent someAgent;
3   private BeliefState someBelief;
4   private UtilityFunction someUtility = new InformationUtility();
5   private GeoConstrainedLeaderGroup someGroup;
6
7   public void initialize() {
8     someAgent = new SomeAgent(this);
9     someGroup = new GeoConstrainedLeaderGroup(geometricExtent, someAgent, ...);
10  }
11
12  // The principal is awakened every 1 second by a time trigger.
13  public void react(WakeupEvent event) {
  
```

```

14     updateState(); // Compute a new target belief state
15     moveTo(someGroup, someUtility); // Choose next host for this principal
16 }
17
18 // Function to update the state of the principal.
19 public synchronized void updateState() {
20     if(someAgent.isInputReady())
21         someBelief = someStateUpdateFunction(someBelief, someAgent.getInputData());
22 }
23 }

```

The above code shows that principals are defined individually, but these somewhat abstract from the underlying WSN nodes. In other words, principals are executors different than the micro-level entities of the system (sensors): they orchestrate the activity of global state management.

Abstract Regions (Welsh and Mainland, 2004) It provides a “*region-based collective communication interface [...] to hide the details of data dissemination and aggregation within regions*” (Welsh and Mainland, 2004). Supported classes of operators include those for neighbour discovery, enumeration of nodes in a region, data sharing, and data aggregation (or reduction).

Regiment (Newton and Welsh, 2004; Newton *et al.*, 2007) Regiment is a functional reactive spatiotemporal macroprogramming language. It is based on the abstractions of *time-varying signals* (to model, e.g., the values produced by a temperature sensor) and *regions*, modelling dynamic collections of spatially distributed signals (i.e., regions are essentially the same concept as computational fields). Signals and regions can be manipulated through typical functional operations such as map, filter, and fold. These global operations abstract data acquisition, storage, and communication: it is the job of the compiler to map these to local operations on the network nodes (through a process called *deglobalisation*). New regions can be constructed based on spatial and topological relationships between nodes through *region formation primitives*, which are grouped into two categories: (i) functions for *growing regions* from “source” nodes called *anchors* (implemented using *spanning trees*) and (ii) *gossip-based functions* (based on one-hop broadcasts). A sample Regiment program computing the average temperature across an entire sensor network (denoted via region *world*) is as follows (adapted from (Newton *et al.*, 2007)).

```

1 doSum :: float (float, int) -> (float, int);
2 doSum(temperature, (sum, count)) { (sum+temperature, count+1) }
3
4 temperatureRegion = rmap(fun(node){ sense("temperature", node) }, world);
5 sumSignal = rfold(doSum, (0.0, 0), temperatureRegion)
6 avgSignal = smap(fun((sum,count)){ sum / count }, sumSignal)
7
8 BASE <- avgSignal % move such information to the base station

```

As in functional reactive programming, change in signals is propagated to dependent signals. So, as temperature sensors yield new values, as sensors fail, disconnect, or enter the

network, the signals and regions depending on them are updated, ultimately adjusting the average temperature value, which is finally transmitted to the base station. Notice how this macro-program abstracts low-level details such as network communications.

SpatialViews (Ni *et al.*, 2005) This approach works by abstracting a MANET into *spatial views* (i.e., collections of *virtual nodes*) of a configurable space-time granularity, that can be iterated on to visit nodes and request services. In detail, the model is as follows. A physical network consists of physical nodes. A physical node has a spatio-temporal location and a set of provided services. A virtual node is the digital twin of a physical node: its programming abstraction. A spatial view defines a virtual network over the physical network which is discovered and instantiated when iterated. Operationally, the system works by migratory execution of the program during iteration. The SpatialViews language is implemented as an extension to Java.

```
1 // Spatial views are collections of virtual nodes
2 spatialview sv1 = Camera @ BuildingC.Floor3;
3 spatialview sv2 = TemperatureSensor @ CampusB % 50; // 50 meters space granularity
4
5 // Discover virtual nodes in a spatial view
6 visiteach x : sv1 every 5 forever { x.getPicture().upload(); }
7
8 // Take average of temperatures
9 sumreduction float s = 0;
10 sumreduction int n = 0;
11 visiteach y : sv2 { s += y.read(); n++; }
12 float avg = s/n;
```

Space-time granularities are used to distinguish virtual nodes, which are visited once per iteration; instead, the underlying physical nodes might be visited more than once (e.g., because of mobility or after a quantum of time granularity). We remark that this work did not use any “macroprogramming”-like term to label SpatialViews, though clearly embracing the paradigm.

SpaceTime Oriented Programming (STOP) (Wada *et al.*, 2007), a.k.a. Chronus (Wada *et al.*, 2010) This WSN macroprogramming system exposes a space-time abstraction to support collection and processing of past or future data in arbitrary spatio-temporal resolutions. Architecturally, it consists of a network of battery-powered sensors (where data is gathered) and base stations (where data is processed) linked to a gateway connected to the STOP server, which holds network data in the so-called *spatiotemporal database*. Operationally, the system is implemented through mobile agents carrying data to the STOP server, which in turn updates the database: *event agents* detect events and replicate themselves to move hop-by-hop towards a base station, where they finally *push* data; by contrast, *query agents* move across a spatial region in order to *pull* relevant data. The STOP/Chronus language is an object-oriented, Ruby DSL enabling on-command

and on-demand (event-driven) data collection and processing. An example, selected and adapted from (Wada *et al.*, 2007), is the following.

```

1 sp = Spacetime.new(Polygon.new(points), RelativePeriod.new(NOW, Hr-1))
2
3 spaces = sp.get_spaces_every(Min 5, Sec 10, 80)
4
5 values = spaces.collect { |space|
6   space.get_data('f-spectrum', MAX, Min 2){
7     |event_type, value, space, time |
8     # ...
9   }
10 }

```

This program queries data in space-time “slices” that abstract the data generation activity of the underlying collection of sensor nodes. Indeed, it focusses on a macroscopic perspective.

SOSNA (Karpinski and Cahill, 2008) SOSNA is a stream-based, macroprogramming language for WSAWs where programs operate on streams of spatial values. Spatial values are essentially like the regions in Regiment and are called *field streams*. The other kind of spatial value is given by *cluster streams*, which are spatially-limited fields with a singleton node (*cluster head*) holding cluster field data. A cluster stream is built via cluster operators from a field stream which internally drive a *leader election* (according to the used operator and local data) and a *clustering* process of nodes through spanning trees of bounded height (based on a compilation parameter and possibly resulting in multi-hops paths). Other operators allow for moving data from cluster members to cluster heads (`fold`) and vice versa (`unfold`) as well as for evolving state (through `pre x`, which refers to the stream `x` at the previous round) and aggregating data from neighbour nodes (`foldnbrs`). Execution of SOSNA programs is round-wise and synchronous: a *round* consists of an application-specific number of *steps*; in each step, neighbours exchange a *protocol packet*. Any network operator requires a fixed number of execution steps, and the compiler can statically infer the maximum number of steps of each round. Consider this example from the paper:

```

1 object = where (sensor > THRESH) c1max sensor
2 totalMass = fold (+) sensor object
3 objX = (fold (+) (posX*sensor) object) / totalMass
4 objY = (fold (+) (posY*sensor) object) / totalMass

```

It is a simple object tracking program. The cluster stream `object` is defined by the `c1max` (cluster-max) operator on the field stream `sensor` filtered for values greater than `THRESH`. Then, the local values `sensor` of all the cluster members are accumulated into `totalMass`, and then the coordinates of the object are computed by applying the formula of centre-of-mass. In summary, SOSNA is similar to Proto (Beal and Bachrach, 2006), but requires synchronisation and is tailored to WSAWs.

Karma (Dantu *et al.*, 2011) Karma is a framework for programming swarms of micro-aerial vehicles. It proposes a *hive-drone* model where the user submits tasks to the hive which

is responsible for orchestrating the drones based on a central data store. The programmer writes a set of process definitions that include an *activation predicate* (used by the hive to determine how to allocate tasks to the drones) and a *progress function* (used to determine progress towards the goal). During a mission or sortie, a drone writes data to a *scratchpad*, which is ultimately flushed to the data store at the hive.

Pleiades (Bouget *et al.*, 2018) It is a topology programming framework leveraging self-organising overlays and assembly-based modularity (Bruneton *et al.*, 2006) to construct and enforce self-stabilising structural invariants in large-scale distributed systems. Shapes are described through templates specifying positions and neighbours for nodes; configurations of shapes are disseminated in the system and used by nodes for joining shapes; shape formation is regulated through protocols. However, these features are not captured linguistically. A simple example from the paper is a naive self-stabilising ring.

$$\begin{array}{ll}
 E_{ring} = [0, 1[; & \text{position space} \\
 f_{ring}(n) = rand([0, 1]); & \text{projection function (assigns nodes to positions)} \\
 d_{ring}(x, y) = min(|x - y|, 1 - |x - y|); & \text{ranking function} \\
 k_{ring} = 2 & \text{number of neighbours per node}
 \end{array}$$

5.4 Collective adaptive systems and ensemble-based approaches

Macroprogramming is also popular in the field of multi-agent (MAS) (Wooldridge, 2009) and collective adaptive systems (CAS) (Ferscha, 2015) engineering. CASs approaches are quite related to spatiotemporal approaches since CASs are often situated and space represents a foundational structure for coordination. In these approaches, it is common to consider large, dynamic groups of devices as first-class abstractions, which are commonly referred to as *ensembles*, *collectives*, or *aggregates*. The general idea is to support interaction between (sub-)groups of devices by abstracting certain details away (e.g., membership, connections, concurrency, failure). With respect to the network abstraction and other macroprogramming approaches, the works focus more on addressing the specification of dynamic ensembles, do not take an explicit, spatial space or are not limited to data gathering and processing.

Aggregate programming (Viroli *et al.*, 2019) Aggregate programming is a macro-programming paradigm, founded on field calculi (Viroli *et al.*, 2019), for expressing the decentralised, self-organising behaviour of a (spatiotemporally situated) distributed system. It builds on the *computational field* abstraction, a conceptually distributed data structure that maps any device of a system to a value, over time. Then, macroscopic behaviour can be expressed in terms of a single program which manipulates fields through constructs for state management, neighbourhood-based interaction, and domain partitioning (i.e., the

ability to run a computation on a subset of the system nodes). Aggregate programming is supported by languages such as the Scala-internal DSL ScaFi (Casadei *et al.*, 2020b) and the standalone DSL Protelis (Pianini *et al.*, 2015). For instance, the problem of counting, in any device, the number of neighbour devices experiencing a high temperature can be expressed in ScaFi as follows:

```
1 foldhood(0)(_+_(if(nbr(sense("temperature")) 1 else 0)
```

where `foldhood(init)(acc)(f)` folds over the neighbourhood of each device by aggregating the neighbours’ evaluation of `f` through accumulation function `acc`, starting with `init`. The interesting aspect about aggregate programming is that it is possible to capture collective behaviour into reusable *functions* (from which libraries of domain-specific features can be defined) and *compose* functions “from fields to fields” to define increasingly complex behaviour. For instance, the following `channel` functionality reuses functions provided by the ScaFi library to build a minimum-width path field from a source to a destination device, which is – crucially – able to self-adapt to input changes (i.e., different source or destination) and topology changes (e.g., as devices move or leave the system).

```
1 // source: input Boolean field (true only in the source device)
2 // target: input Boolean field (true only in the target device)
3 // width: input floating-point field for enlarging the channel
4 def channel(source: Boolean, target: Boolean, width: Double): Boolean = {
5   distanceTo(source)+distanceTo(target) <= distanceBetween(source,target)+width
6 } // output: true if the device belongs to the channel, false otherwise
```

Notice how this program abstracts from the individual devices at the micro-level: such a `channel` function denotes a macro-level structure that is sustained by repeated computation and interaction from the underlying network of devices. In virtue of this flexibility, aggregate programming can be deemed a *scalable* macroprogramming approach as it retains the ability to address individual devices but provides tools for raising the abstraction level.

Distributed Emergent Ensembles of Components (DEECo) (Bures *et al.*, 2013)

DEECo is a CAS development model where components can only communicate by dynamically binding together through ensembles. A DEECo component is an autonomous entity made of *knowledge* (i.e., state), exposed to external world through *interfaces* (providing a partial view of the state), and *processes* (i.e., behaviour) which manipulate local knowledge, possibly perform side-effects, and are scheduled periodically or on-demand. A DEECo ensemble dynamically binds components according to a *membership condition* and consists of one *coordinator* component and multiple *member* components interacting by implicit *knowledge exchange*. A DEECo application has the following structure:

```
1 interface I1: field1, field2
2 interface I2: field3
3
4 component C1 features I1:
5   knowledge:
6     field1 = 77
```



```

7   field2 = [ "a", "b" ]
8   process P:
9     in knowledge_field2, out knowledge_field1 function: // ...
10    scheduling: triggered(changed(knowledge_field2))
11
12  component C2 features I2: // ...
13
14  ensemble E:
15    coordinator: I1
16    member: I2
17    membership: f(coordinator.field1) && g(member.field3)
18    knowledge-exchange: coordinator.field2 <- // ...
19    scheduling: periodic (5000ms)

```

DEECo has also a Java implementation called jDEECo⁴ which enables the definition of components and ensembles through Java annotations.

Meld (Ashley-Rollman *et al.*, 2007) Meld is a logic macroprogramming language for modular robotics, inspired by P2 (Loo *et al.*, 2006) (a declarative language for overlay networks). It abstracts low-level coordination in robot ensembles by taking a global perspective to programming: macroprograms are compiled to microprograms distributed to the individual robots. It assumes robot interaction is only possible between immediate, in-contact neighbours. In Meld, production rules are used to generate new facts from existing ones to possibly enable other rules (forward chaining); facts that are invalidated will be *eventually* deleted; and, interestingly, *aggregate rules* can be used to collapse multiple facts into one (e.g., by maximising/minimising or folding). The runtime system at the robots must deal with the sharing of facts via communication as well as the consistent deletion of facts. An example, adapted from the paper, shows how to use Meld to reach a destination using three robots where each robot is able to move only by rolling against other robots.

```

1  Nbr(a,b). Nbr(a,c). Nbr(b,c).
2  At(a, (0,1)). At(b, (0,2)). At(c,(1,1.73)).
3  RobotRadius(<size>).
4
5  Nbr(A,B) :- Nbr(B,C), A=C, !. % reflexivity rule for Nbr
6
7  Dist(A, min<n>).
8  Dist(A,0) :- At(A,P), P = destination().
9  Dist(A,n+1) :- Neighbor(A,B), Dist(B,n). % NB: gets Dist for each neighbour!
10
11 Farther(S,T):- Neighbor(S,T), Dist(S,DS), Dist(T,DT), DS >= DT.
12
13 MoveAround(S,T,U):- Farther(S,T), Farther(S,U), U /= T.

```

Comingle (Lam *et al.*, 2015) Inspired by Meld, Comingle is a distributed, logic programming framework for systems of mobile devices. In this model, devices are identified through a location and contribute to the system through *located facts*; the set of all located facts is called a *rewriting state*; rules operate on rewriting states. The rewriting semantics

⁴<https://github.com/d3scomp/JDEECo>

is global: it operates on a distributed data structure of located facts (contributed by the locations participating in the ensemble).

Scopes (Jacobi *et al.*, 2008) Scopes is a macroprogramming language for specifying the logical structure of WSNs. It leverages the main abstraction of a *scope*, to represent a dynamic group of nodes (i.e., an ensemble). Scopes can be created and deleted through declarative, logical expressions. The middleware, then, is responsible for maintaining *scope membership*. The node that initiates the creation of a scope is called a *root node*. The scope supports bidirectional communication (according various routing algorithms supported by the framework) between the root node and the member nodes. For instance, expression

```
1 CREATE SCOPE temperatureNeighborhood AS
2 ((EXISTS SENSOR TEMPERATURE AND TEMPERATURE > 20)
3  AND (IN SPHERE ( SPHERE (ROOT_NODE_POS, 30), NODE_POS)))
```

would create a scope selecting as members the nodes which have a temperature sensor providing a temperature of more than 20 degrees and are situated within a radius of 30 metres from the root node.

Attribute-based interaction in component ensembles A collection of formalisms have been proposed to address distributed adaptive systems through ensembles and attribute-based communication, i.e., a style of interaction where recipient groups are dynamically determined via attributes. Service Component Ensemble Language (SCEL) (Nicola *et al.*, 2014) is a kernel language to specify the behaviour of autonomic components, the logic of ensemble formation, as well interaction through attribute-based communication (which enables implicit selection of a group of recipients). A simpler process calculus inspired by SCEL is *AbC (Attribute-based Communication)* (Alrahman *et al.*, 2015), capturing the essence of this interaction style. AbC has been implemented for the Erlang programming language through the AErlang library (Nicola *et al.*, 2018). CARMA (Collective Adaptive Resource-sharing Markovian Agents) (Loreti and Hillston, 2016) is a related stochastic process algebra and language that models collective of components that may dynamically aggregate into ensembles, also using attribute-based communication (uni- or multi-cast) to implement broadcasts for coordinating large ensembles of devices.

TeCoLa (Koutsoubelias and Lalis, 2016) TeCoLa is described as a “*programming framework for high-level coordination of robotic teams [...] with novel and unified abstractions for controlling individual robots as well as teams of robots [...] and with the bulk of team management work being performed behind the scenes*”. TeCoLa has the following concepts: a *node* has *resources* and exposes *services*, consisting of *methods* and *properties* and remotely invocable via *proxies*. A *mission group* is a dynamic set of nodes participating in a mission,

which is monitored and controlled by a *coordinator* entity (e.g., a leader node or a command-control centre), and can be further split into *teams* whose actual shape is automatically managed according to a *membership rule* (e.g., on the set of services to be supported by team members). When all the members of a team provide a certain service, that service is said to be *promoted* at the team-level, meaning that it can be requested on the team itself, causing a corresponding service request on all the team members and yielding a vector of results. TeCoLa has been implemented in Python, enabling macro-programs such as the following.

```

1 class TemperatureSvc(object):                # define a service
2     __metaclass__ = Service
3     def readTemperature(): # ...             # define a service operation
4     def __activate(): # ...                 # hook method for service activation
5     def __passivate(): # ...               # hook method for service deactivation
6
7     co = Coordinator(...)                  # create coordinator
8
9     n1 = Node("TemperatureSensor")         # create node
10    n1 += TemperatureSvc()                 # configure node
11    # ...
12
13    co.group += n1                          # add node to mission group
14    # ...
15
16    t = co.defTeam(node=(any),              # define a team based on membership conditions
17                  service="TemperatureSvc", property=(any))
18    ts = t.TemperatureSvc.readTemperature() # invoke a team-promoted service (bulk operation)
19    for node, temp in temperatures.iteritems(): # do something

```

In this example, the set of collected temperatures depends on what nodes currently belong to team `t`: these include nodes currently supporting the `TemperatureSvc` service (which can in principle be dynamically de/activated according to conditions such as, e.g., the battery-level of the node).

Voltron (Mottola *et al.*, 2014) Voltron is defined as a *team-level* programming model for drone systems. It abstracts a set of individual drones through an abstraction of a *team* of drones, which is tasked as a whole. The specifics regarding what and when actions are performed by the individual drones is delegated to the platform system at runtime. The programmer issues action commands to the drone team together with spatiotemporal constraints. Indeed, tasks are actually associated to spatial locations, and the team self-organises to populate multisets of future values representing the eventual result of the task on a given location (i.e., it is similar to a computational field). The paper provides an example of adaptive sampling of pictures in an archeological site, here reported with comments and minor adjustments.

```

1 // definition of a spatial geometry as a filter of platform-generated Locations
2 boolean grid(Location loc) {
3     if (loc.x % Drones.get("gridStep")==0 && loc.y % Drones.get("gridStep")==0) return true;
4     else return false;
5 }
6

```

```

7 // spatial variable declarations
8 spatial Image tiles; // 1 or more Images, each associated to a different location
9
10 // loop program
11 do {
12     tilesOK = true; // loop flag
13     tiles@grid = Drones.do("pic", Drones.cam, handleCam); // assign 'tiles' according to grid
14         locations
15     foreachlocation (Location loc in tiles){
16         float aberr = aberrationEstimate(tiles@loc);
17         if (aberr > MAX_ABR && !sceneChanged) {
18             Drones.stop(handleCam);
19             int newStep = tune(Drones.get("gridStep"),aberr);
20             Drones.set("gridStep",newStep);
21             tilesOK = false;
22             break;
23         }
24     } while (!tilesOK);

```

PaROS (PROgramming Swarm) (Dedousis and Kalogeraki, 2018) PaROS is a framework for programming swarms of robots. It proposes an *abstract swarm* abstraction, implemented through a Java API, to promote swarm orchestration and spatial organisation. The API consists of functions for: path planning, declaration of points of interest or spatial areas to be inspected, enumeration of the robots in the swarm, task partitioning, setting handlers for detection events or robot failure. A program in PaROS looks like the following.

```

1 // Build a swarm from a set of drones
2 Swarm swarm = new Swarm(setOfDrones);
3 // Create flight plans by splitting an area and assigning sub-areas
4 swarm.areaDeclaration(targetArea);
5 // Define a collective task
6 swarm.setTask(Task.COVERAGE);
7 // Adds a handler for event detection
8 swarm.eventHandler((drone) -> { System.out.print("Event detected by " + drone); });
9 // Starts the mission: will run pathPlanning() and droneManipulation()
10 swarm.startMission();
11 // While the mission is running...
12 while(swarm.isMissionRunning()){
13     for(Drone drone : swarm.getListOfDrones()){
14         if(drone.isTaskComplete()){
15             doSomethingWith(drone.getCameraImage(camera));
16         }
17     }
18 }

```

Many details regarding the coordination of the swarm are abstracted away. Therefore, PaROS promotes a multi-paradigm approach comprising elements from imperative, declarative, and event-driven programming.

SmartSociety platform (Scekic *et al.*, 2020) This is a programming model of Smart-Society for hybrid collaborative adaptive systems is proposed in which the designer specifies an environment where collectives—i.e., persistent or transient teams of peers (humans and machines)—are involved in collective tasks. The approach can be used for applications involving crowdsourcing, human orchestration, and collective activities.

```

1 TaskRequest r = new RideRequest(...);
2 CollectiveBasedTask cbt = CBTBuilder.from(
3     TaskFlowDefinition.usingContinuousOrchestration(...)
4     ).withTaskRequest(r).build();
5 cbt.start();

```

The macro-abstraction of the `CollectiveBasedTask` encapsulates team formation, plan execution and composition, as well as other collective activities like negotiation and incentivisation.

It is common for IoT programming frameworks and middlewares provide a *centralised view* of the entire IoT system and hence support a form of macroprogramming.

EcoCast (Tu et al., 2011) EcoCast is an interactive, object-oriented/functional macro-programming framework for Python. Its basic idea is to “*extend the concept of functional programming on lists of data to macroprogramming on groups of nodes*” (Tu et al., 2011). It uses a particular kind of object, called a *group handle*, as a proxy for a group of nodes. This group is static, i.e., it does not automatically deal with group membership like in ensemble-based approaches. An example of EcoCast code follows.

```

1 single_node = ecNode(77) # instantiates a node handle with ID=123
2 group = ecGroup([1,2,3,single_node]) # creates a group handle with nodes of IDs=1,2,3,77
3
4 dangerous_nodes = ecFilter(lambda x: x > TEMP_THRESHOLD, group, read_temperature)
5 ecMap(issue_warning_action, dangerous_nodes)
6 max_temperature = ecReduce(max, group, read_temperature)

```

From these lines, it is visible a “node-” and “group-to-object mapping” approach. So, it follows a modern approach where object- and functional-orientation coexist to provide convenient APIs. Operationally, EcoCast attempts to parallelise execution of actions and communications.

Organisation-oriented programming, MOISE (Hübner et al., 2007) Organisation-oriented programming is a macroprogramming approach where an *organisation* of agents is considered as a first-class entity. In MOISE, a multi-agent system (MAS) is described through multiple specifications. A structural specification defines the structure of a MAS at the individual level (with *roles*), at the social level (with *links*, namely relationships between roles), and at the collective level (with *groups*, defined in terms of roles, links, and constraints). Similarly, a MAS is functionally specified at the individual level (with *missions*, namely goals assigned to roles) and at the collective level (with *schemes*, namely trees of goals assigned to groups). Such specifications are expressed through modelling languages. During execution, mediated by the “organisational platform”, agents join or leave groups, commit to missions in their groups’ schemes, can reason about organisation entities, and are enforced to follow the specifications.

5.5 Ad-hoc approaches

Market-Based Macroprogramming (MBM) (Mainland *et al.*, 2004) In MBM, a sensor network is programmed as a *virtual market*. The nodes of the network follow a fixed behaviour protocol where they “sell” *actions* to get a *profit*. They choose actions according to a local *utility function* that expresses a trade-off between the profit and the *cost* of performing the action. For instance, the value of reading a sensor value or communicating with another agent could be in contrast with time, energy or bandwidth expenses. The macro-program defines the logic of updating the globally-advertised *price* of the actions to foster the desired global behaviour by driving the choice of the actions useful for the current situation.

NetKAT (Anderson *et al.*, 2014), **SNAP** (Stateful Network Abstractions for Packet processing) (Arashloo *et al.*, 2016) etc. NetKAT and SNAP (which derives from NetKAT) are languages for software-defined networking (SDN) that are stateful and consider the network as “*one big switch*” (Kang *et al.*, 2013). The NetKAT language is based on KAT (Kleene Algebra with Tests) plus constructs for networking. Conceptually, a macro-program in these languages is a function of a packet and network state (represented through global variables) that produces a set of packets and a new network state as output. In practice, a program consists of the classical imperative constructs (assignment, conditionals, loops) which are however interpreted in the SDN domain. The compiler translates the macro-program into micro-programs for the network devices dealing with *traffic routing* and *placement of state variables*.

Wave-Oriented Swarm Programming (WOSP) (Varughese *et al.*, 2020) WOSP is an approach for swarm-level programming that requires minimalistic communication, inspired by two biological mechanisms: (i) scroll waves in slime mould and (ii) periodic light emission in fireflies. Each robot of the swarm follows a protocol where it is initially *inactive*, listening for incoming pings; upon reception of a ping, it runs a “relay code block” and goes into an *active* state where it emits a ping; after the emission of a ping, it goes in the *refractory state*, where it does nothing, being insensible to pings, and finally turns back to the inactive state after a refractory period. On each state transition, the robot decrements an internal timer (randomly initialised) and performs the corresponding logic for the current state; after that, it checks if the timer has hit zero, and in case it runs an “initialisation code block” for resetting the robot (state). As an example, consider a simple “leader election” behaviour, whose pseudocode from the paper has been slightly adjusted.

```
1 function Initiate_Codeblock {  
2   candidate <- true;  
3   timer <- random(TIMER_MAX);  
4 }  
5
```


```

6 function Relay_Codeblock {
7   timer <- null; // deactivate the timer
8   candidate <- false;
9 }

```

In this program, the idea is that any time a robot receives a ping before its internal timer has elapsed, it runs `Relay_Codeblock` to withdraw from the election process. In case no ping has been received, it can safely assume it has no rivals. However, proper parameterisation is needed to ensure a single leader remains after multiple election rounds. To wrap up, though no evident macroprogramming abstraction is used at the code-level, the approach manages to steer collective behaviour by exploiting randomness, parameterisation, and simple local behaviours.

Bayesian Network-based Macroprogramming (BNM) (Mamei, 2011) In this work, Bayesian networks are used as macroprogramming language for spatially distributed systems. The idea is to design Bayesian sub-networks to capture functional requirements of the application and to deploy multiple copies of these Bayesian sub-networks to corresponding portions of the underlying network of devices. Such a replication results in the full Bayesian network being deployed in the distributed systems, hence supporting Bayesian inference in a distributed fashion (in turn enabling prediction, diagnosis, and anomaly detection). The deployment is based on the connection of input and output *ports* of the functional Bayesian subnetworks and of devices together. Crucially, the details of distributed execution of Bayesian inference are abstracted by the macroprogram, which focusses only on the Bayesian subnetwork definitions (i.e., random variables and corresponding relationships) and logical connectivity (through ports). As an example, took from the paper (Mamei, 2011), consider the following functional Bayesian subnetwork for inferring the luminosity of an environment.



In a concrete system, the above Bayesian sub-network will be deployed on each light sensor device: the sensor will provide the light measurement as input to `Measure`, and the `Light` node will provide its output to the input of a neighbour’s `Neighbour Light` node.

Graph-centric programming (Tian *et al.*, 2013) Giraph++ is a framework for distributed graph processing that embodies a “think like a graph” programming model. This is in contrast with traditional graph-processing approaches following a “think like a

vertex” paradigm. Indeed, Giraph++ exposes the first-class concept of a *graph partition* that allows to (i) obtain the vertices included in that partition, (ii) send data to or act over all the included vertices, and (iii) implement a user-defined function `compute()` operating on the whole graph partition. According to the authors, this abstraction would enable various sorts of optimisations which were prevented by the vertex-centric approaches.

6 Analysis and Outlook

In this section, we analyse some data from the survey (Section 6.1), the surveyed approaches by a technical point of view (Section 6.2), and then review significant opportunities (Section 6.3) and challenges (Section 6.4) related to macroprogramming.

6.1 Data and Trends

In this survey, we have considered a total of 66 *works*, and have *included* (i.e., considered as a macroprogramming approach, after manual analysis) 49 *works*, of which 39 *core* works have been identified (i.e., some approaches have been implemented through multiple published languages or DSLs) corresponding to the number of rows of Table 2.


The distribution of the included works by (publication) year is reported in Figure 3a. From this histogram, we observe the rise of macroprogramming from WSN research in early 2000s, a loss of hype in early 2010s, and a new wave from 2014 as a result of recent trends and developments in fields like the IoT, CPSs, and CASs (cf. Section 3). The distribution of works across domains is shown in Figure 3b, where we observe a predominance of the WSN domain; the domain fragmentation seems to be a characteristic of the second wave of macroprogramming. Another interesting datum is how many of the surveyed works explicitly advertise themselves as macroprogramming: according to Figure 3c, this is only the case for 18 out of 39 core works.

Another significant aspect concerns the availability of accessible software for a macroprogramming language. According to Figure 3d, the number of works for which a repository or website exists that provides access to software is 18 out of 49 works. Arguably, this low score is partially due to the limited practice of providing artifacts in early 2000s, as well as to the obsolescence of some of the proposed languages from those years.


6.2 Analysis of Macroprogramming Approaches

Paradigms


The distribution of macroprogramming languages across the approach clusters and the basic paradigms (cf. Section 4.4) is shown in Figure 4a and Figure 4b, respectively. Apparently, the majority of works follow a data-oriented approach; arguably, this reflects the fact that




(a) Number of works per two-year periods.



(b) Number of core works per domain.



(c) Number of core works that explicitly advertise themselves as macroprogramming.



(d) Number of works with publicly accessible software (e.g., through a website or repository).

Figure 3: Collected data about non-technical aspects, from the survey.

most of the works target the WSN domain, where the main goal is to extract data from the sensor network. This is also coherent with the fact that most of the macroprogramming languages take a declarative, specification stance. Beside that, all the main paradigms (logic, functional, imperative, object-oriented) have a discrete number of representatives—showing the orthogonality of the macro viewpoint to programming, as well as the consequence of embedding . On the other hand, only a handful of works take an ad-hoc approach that could not be framed as either control-, data-, space-time-, or ensemble-oriented.

Underlying platforms and languages

In Figure 4c, there is a hint about the underlying platforms or languages in which a given macroprogramming is supported or implemented. We denote with “*” that an approach supports multiple target platforms; with “None” that no implementation is provided or described; and we use a label “Other” to collect platforms for which only a single occurrence exists (this is the case, e.g., of embedded platforms, simulators, or individual languages such as Embedded Matlab, PeerSim, or Groovy, respectively). Several approaches found on the Java language and platform; various approaches target TinyOS, an operating system for WSN motes; however, it is most frequent to address specific platforms (as a reflection of a rather wide coverage of target domains and paradigms).

Micro-level dependency

In Figure 4d, we observe that the majority of works do depend on micro-level entities (e.g., because they need to be addressed individually); however, there are also many works that abstract completely from the underlying set of components. Not surprisingly, only a few approaches are “scalable”, allowing both to address individual nodes as well as to abstract from them entirely: these include Regiment (Newton *et al.*, 2007) and aggregate programming (Viroli *et al.*, 2019). Indeed, the main goal of the surveyed macroprogramming approaches is to provide zero-cost abstractions to simplify the programming activity without renouncing to performance. Moreover, in several cases, the programming models aim to provide specific benefits: communication or execution efficiency (cf. WSN programming models), dynamic binding and architectures (cf. Scopes, DEECo, Warble, TECOLA), and self-organisation (cf. aggregate programming, Pleiades).

Macro-to-micro mapping

As it can be observed from Figure 4e, The implementation of macro-to-micro mapping is generally based on either *compilation* of the macro-program into the programs for the individual nodes (also known as *deglobalisation* or *global-to-local compilation*) or *interpretation* of the macroprogram according to some *execution protocol* (e.g., involving migratory execution

of agents or orchestration of individuals). Quite frequent is also the approach based on *orchestration*, such as in Dolphin (Lima *et al.*, 2018) or SmartSociety (Scekic *et al.*, 2020), or the definition of additional entities like *mobile agents* which interact with micro-level entities to promote desired emergents, as in PIECES (Liu *et al.*, 2003) or STOP/Chronus (Wada *et al.*, 2010). The less frequent mechanism is “context change”, e.g., parameter setting as found in WOSP (Varughese *et al.*, 2020) or market-based macroprogramming (Mainland *et al.*, 2004), though these may not even be considered a “programming approach”, strictly speaking.

Unfortunately, the macro-to-micro mapping is often not described formally (or even explicitly), which exceptions like SCEL (Nicola *et al.*, 2014), and aggregate programming (Beal *et al.*, 2015). For instance, in the latter approach, the core language – namely the field calculus – has a macro-level denotational semantics linked to the local operational semantics (Viroli *et al.*, 2019), using computational fields (global data structures) as bridging abstraction.

Macroprogramming abstractions

Finally, we can observe that a number of abstractions or features recur in macroprogramming approaches. These include:

- *first-class groups*—the ability to directly express and manipulate groups of individuals (cf. group handles in EcoCast, swarms in Buzz or PaROS);
- *group lifecycle management*—the ability to evolve groups dynamically (cf. dynamic binding in Warble);
- *group addressing*—the ability to address a group, e.g., in terms of the individuals found in a certain spatial region or that share certain capabilities (cf. Regiment, SpatialViews, STOP/Chronus);
- *distributed state*—the ability to address the state of a group of stateful entities (cf. fields in aggregate programming, state rewriting in Comingle);
- *group inspection*—the ability to inspect or iterate over the individuals of a group (cf. node iteration in Kairos, resources in PyoT);
- *group goal decomposition*—the ability to consider a global goal and ways to split it across multiple individuals (cf. task partitioning in PaROS, spatial decomposition in Karma);
- *group communication*—the ability to get data from or push data to a group (cf. report/tell/collective actions in makeSense, or neighbourhood-based communication in COSMOS, and aggregate programming);

- *information flow patterns*—the ability to specify how information should flow independently of structure or concrete communication mechanisms (cf. ATaG);
- *group-level actions*—the ability to express *what* a group should do (cf. functions in aggregate programming, activity nodes in DDFlow).

Sometimes, some of these aspects are abstracted away and implemented at the middleware layer: for instance, approaches that consider a WSN “like a database” let the programmer express a query (global goal) and then handle its partitioning into micro-actions through underlying mechanisms and execution protocols.

On implementation and abstracted concerns

A major goal of macroprogramming is abstracting from a series of low-level concerns. This is also strikingly evident from the quotes reported in Table 1, which suggest that the programmer can be relieved from “explicitly managing control, coordination, and state maintenance at the individual node level” (Bakshi and Prasanna, 2005) in order to retrieve “simplicity and productivity” (Wada *et al.*, 2008) through “focus on application specification rather than low-level details or inter-node messaging” (Awan *et al.*, 2007). Besides productivity, there is also the idea that low-level details can be addressed efficiently or opportunistically at the middleware level—see Section 6.3 for further considerations on this point.

The concerns that are abstracted may be classified according to the fundamental dimensions of structure, behaviour, and interaction. *Structural concerns* include connections between components and membership relationships. As these elements tend to change dynamically, expressing them in a declarative fashion enables the underlying platform to adopt flexible strategies for their reification. For instance, in Buzz (Pinciroli and Beltrame, 2016), each robot follows a protocol to keep track of its membership in swarms, which further affects the set of its neighbours. In ScaFi (Casadei *et al.*, 2021), groups self-organise by playing the logic expressed by the macroprogram in repeated sense-compute-interact rounds to continuously evaluate the “spatiotemporal boundary” of the process/ensemble. Therefore, we may conclude that often the macro-program is a piece of behaviour that is used to parameterize a larger behaviour, supported by a proper runtime system or middleware, which provides the “basic principle” for the collection of micro-level entities to act as a system.

Behavioural concerns that can be abstracted include specific decisions (e.g., what data must be stored or propagated), processing operations, and time aspects (e.g., when a certain behaviour is to be executed). For instance, in SNAP (Arashloo *et al.*, 2016), the individual switches must determine how to route traffic and where the place state variables. As another example, macro-programs in aggregate computing (Beal *et al.*, 2015), abstract

from scheduling aspects, which enables dynamic tuning of the frequency at which devices operate, making time a “fluid” notion in such systems (Pianini *et al.*, 2020).

Interactional concerns are also often abstracted. In many cases, indeed, the details of communication, such as the specific format of the messages, the specific set of recipients, can be determine at runtime. Macroprogramming approaches for WSN, for instance, generally provide abstractions over routing and hop-by-hop information flows.

Among implementation strategies, a number of patterns recur. The macroprogram can, as in PIECES (Liu *et al.*, 2003) or STOP/Chronus (Wada *et al.*, 2010), instruct mobile agents to move across the nodes of the network to access and process local state to infer global information. Orchestration – cf. Dolphin (Lima *et al.*, 2018) and SmartSociety (Scekic *et al.*, 2020) – is similar but does not involve moving agents. Related is also the approach, used for instance in Pyot (Azzara *et al.*, 2014), based on inferring tasks from the macroprogram and distributing them over the set of micro-level entities. Round-based execution of macroprograms or projected micro-programs is also frequent and can be found both in asynchronous variants, as in aggregate computing (Beal *et al.*, 2015), and in synchronous variants as in Giraph++ (Tian *et al.*, 2013), SOSNA (Karpinski and Cahill, 2008), and WOSP (Varughese *et al.*, 2020). Such implementation strategies, beside “filling the abstraction gap”, are also aimed at optimising application-specific concerns, which may include saving resources (e.g., energy or bandwidth) or promoting Quality of Service metrics like latency or reliability.


6.3 Opportunities

Research on macroprogramming provides opportunities (with corresponding challenges, covered in Section 6.4) in terms of synergies with related research fields and application domains.


Model- and Language-based Software Engineering

Models, as abstract representations of some aspect of a real or imagined object, play a key role in software engineering (Ludewig, 2004). Systems are generally described through multiple models covering different perspectives or viewpoints (Finkelstein *et al.*, 1992). As covered in Sections 3 to 5, *macroscopic perspectives* can be instrumental for directly addressing global properties, collective tasks, or system-level aspects. Indeed, we can observe that prominent perspectives in software modelling (e.g., structure, behaviour, and interaction) can be considered at a microscopic or a macroscopic level. For the latter:


- The *macro-structural view* considers the structural arrangement of multiple components of a system. The creation of macro-structures is sometimes a goal of macroprogramming (cf. topology programming in Pleiades (Bouget *et al.*, 2018)).




(a) Number of core works per approach category.




(b) Number of core works per paradigm.



(c) Number of works per host platform/language. The (*) means that multiple languages are supported.



(d) Number of core works per micro-level dependency level.



(e) Number of core works per macro-to-micro mapping approach.

Figure 4: Collected data about technical aspects of the surveyed macroprogramming approaches.

- The *macro-behavioural view* considers behaviours emerging from multiple components of a system. This is generally the goal of macroprogramming: expressing the behaviour of a system as a whole (cf. swarm macroprogramming in Buzz (Pinciroli and Beltrame, 2016)).
- The *macro-interactive view* considers interaction and communication at increasingly non-local levels. This is often instrumental to drive macro-behaviour by expressing how information flows among several components or across large structures (cf. collective communication interfaces in Abstract Regions (Welsh and Mainland, 2004)).

Models have to be expressed in some language (also called a meta-model). Languages exist for specification, design, implementation, and verification of software, and contribute to a vision of *language-based software engineering* (Gupta, 2015), which promotes the use of high-level DSLs for building software. Related notions such as *goal-oriented* (Renesse, 1998) or *declarative* programming (Lloyd, 1994a; Baldoni *et al.*, 2010) are used to denote a similar idea: the use of languages to express an abstract model of a system emphasising *what* has to be achieved rather than *how*. The benefit is that the complexity for efficiently mapping the *what* to the *how* can be encapsulated in a middleware layer, while application developers can focus on domain abstractions and the business logic. In this sense, macroprogramming can be considered as a particular domain of declarative programming; however, we think that research in this field can potentially provide insights on the general principles and foundations of declarative programming.

Intelligent middlewares

Beside expressiveness, the abstraction provided by macroprogramming can foster the implementation of smart solutions at the middleware level. In early macroprogramming approaches on WSNs, the goal was often simplifying the programming activity (i.e., productivity) while keeping performance overhead at acceptable levels. In time, the idea of actually *improving* performance started to be considered as a research goal. Indeed, overfitting solutions may not be able to adequately generalise their performance to the various situations a system may experience in practice. On the other hand, more abstract architectures could adapt to diverse situations and do that *opportunistically*—by *proactively* looking for opportunities of optimisation. Of course, there is a trade-off between overfitting and underfitting models, and this revolves around a careful design of macroprogramming solutions in terms of (domain-specific) assumptions.

The middleware could be the part of the software system that implements the global-to-local mapping logic, possibly in a smart way. Such a smartness could serve to avoid unnecessary computations or communications, change structure to promote functionality, or re-configure the application to improve performance or resiliency. For instance, in aggregate

computing (Casadei *et al.*, 2020a) and MacroLab (Hnat *et al.*, 2008), the logical macro-programmed system can be deployed variously on available infrastructure, where different deployments may result in different non-functional trade-offs; moreover, their middleware can in principle adapt the deployment opportunistically as infrastructure, user preferences, or environmental conditions change. Indeed, a key opportunity would be to leverage recent advances in self-adaptive software and autonomic computing as well as artificial intelligence and machine learning.

Additionally, it is interesting to note, in certain macroprogramming approaches, the particular interplay between the language (and hence the programs) and the middleware. For instance, in aggregate computing (Viroli *et al.*, 2019), the programs do not express control flow and the programmer rather assumes the program to be collectively played by the system of devices through a “self-organisation-like execution protocol”. As mentioned earlier, this provides opportunities in terms of flexibility in the implementation and deployment of the actual execution protocol (Casadei *et al.*, 2020a). The point is how much these results can be generalised into design principles and patterns: this is a research opportunity (with corresponding challenges—see Section 6.4) related to the (relationship between the) design of declarative programming languages and the design of intelligent middlewares for corresponding applications.

Collective Intelligence, Soft Computing, Social Computing

The recent techno-scientific trends and visions (cf. pervasive and ubiquitous computing, the IoT etc.) let us foresee an ever-increasing, world-wide deployment of devices capable of computation and communication. Reasoning just in terms of individual devices would hardly allow us to fully harness “the power of the collective”. On the other hand, adopting a vision of “cyber-physical collectives and ecosystems” could provide a further perspective for better addressing socio-technical services and applications. There are several systems that are amenable to be studied and engineered by a collective perspective, as well as several research fields that address aspects of such collective systems (Tumer and Wolpert, 2004). Works on macroprogramming are often found in such research areas (see Section 3 and Section 5.4), and might contribute (from its construction-oriented perspective) to the overall research endeavour about collective systems.

Computational collective intelligence (CCI) is a sub-field of AI that focusses on “the form of intelligence that emerges from the collaboration and competition of many individuals (artificial and/or natural)” (Szuba, 2001). The affinity with macroprogramming is evident, as the latter generally provides a means for expressing *what* collective intelligent behaviour should be like or work at, encapsulating the logic for building it in terms of rules of individual behaviour and interaction. However, the abstraction provided by strong macroprogramming languages tends to favour implementations achieving approximated solutions in complex

situations. This is especially evident in macroprogramming languages for collective adaptive systems (Section 5.4), such as aggregate computing (Viroli *et al.*, 2019), where macroprograms express global outcomes that are to be sought progressively in a self-organising fashion. In this sense, macroprogramming promotes a language-based approach to *soft computing* (Liang and He, 2020), namely the use of computing to approximately solve very complex problems despite uncertainty, perturbations, and partial knowledge.

A recent systematic literature review on “collective intelligence” (Suran *et al.*, 2020), covers conceptual frameworks and models for “collaborative problem solving and decision making”, in the broad sense of *social computing* (Wang *et al.*, 2007)—namely the paradigm where humans, society, and computing technology integrate to promote information representation, processing, communication, and use. The survey focusses on a high-level view and purposefully abstracts from specific domains—not even mentioned, the programming viewpoint is completely neglected. However, macroprogramming DSLs could work as inter-disciplinary artifacts capturing relationship and behaviour of groups and ecosystems. Benefits could be obtained by addressing issues at the right perspective.

6.4 Challenges

There are a number of challenges related to the engineering of macroprogramming systems. These include, e.g., designing macro-level abstractions, bridging macro-level abstractions with micro-level activity, formalising the macro-to-micro mapping logic, providing formal guarantees about the correctness of such a mapping, and integrating macroprogramming systems with more traditional programming environments.

Abstraction and global-to-local mapping

A key challenge in macroprogramming is defining a good, coherent set of macro-level abstractions and identifying a proper way to map those to micro-level activity while promoting both functional and non-functional requirements. This also includes finding a balance between over-fitting and under-fitting solutions: the former may hinder reusability and extensibility, while the latter, as an attempt to achieve a one-size-fits-all support, may complicate implementations. As discussed previously, effective, highly-productive programming and smartness in implementations is where the most opportunities arise and arguably the major concerns for any macroprogramming language. The challenge revolves around ensuring that global-to-locally mapped behaviour results, when actually carried out, in local-to-global effects in a consistent (and possibly efficient) way.

Implementing proper global-to-local mapping logic is a key challenge in any macroprogramming system. This is related to what Tumer and Wolpert call the *inverse problem* in *COIN (Collective Intelligence)* (Tumer and Wolpert, 2004), i.e., configuring the laws

of a system such that the desired collective behaviour is generated⁵. The difficulty of this problem is one of the reasons that make it hard to find specific designs or solutions for macroprogramming in general: domain goals set peculiar global requirements, and domain assumptions are often instrumental for effective mapping of abstractions down to the underlying “platform”. Still, the observation of regularities, namely “patterns”, can provide for useful hints to both the theory and practice of macroprogramming.

Moreover, some macroprogramming approaches such as, e.g., DEECo (Bures *et al.*, 2013), SCEL (Nicola *et al.*, 2014), and aggregate programming (Beal *et al.*, 2015), target *complex/collective adaptive systems* (Ferscha, 2015)—see Section 5.4. Such systems feature complex networks of interactions that typically result in *emergent properties* (*emergents*) (Wolf and Holvoet, 2004), namely macro-level properties that cannot be easily traced back to micro-level activity, because they are not – by definition – the result of mere summation of individual contributions (i.e., they are based on non-linear dynamics) (Holland, 1998). Due to its very nature, promoting desired emergents is a challenge. However, in some cases, emergence can be “steered”. Existing research (Casadei *et al.*, 2021) seems to suggest that macroprogramming may provide a privileged perspective and approach for steering emergent behaviour towards the desired emergents. In a sense, the development of a macroprogramming system might force its designers to approach the problem by a mixed top-down/bottom-up strategy.

Formal approaches to macroprogramming

In software engineering, the use of formal methods enables specification of non-ambiguous models of systems and promote their analysis and verification, possibly automated. In macroprogramming, languages backed by formal theories and calculi may be analysed to verify qualitative or quantitative properties. For instance, in aggregate programming it has been possible, by considering its core language (the field calculus), to prove Turing-like universality for space-time computations, identify language fragments supporting self-stabilising and density-independent computations, prove optimality theorems for specific algorithms or encodings, and promote deployment-independence at the middleware level (Viroli *et al.*, 2019). In SCEL (Nicola *et al.*, 2014), statistical model checking tools can be used to verify reachability properties, i.e., to compute the probability that a certain system configuration (e.g., expressed as a predicate on collected information) is reached within a certain deadline. Vice versa, several other macroprogramming languages focus mainly on providing a high-level API, simplifying the programming activity but providing little support for analysis

⁵However, the COIN approach aims to steer macro-behaviour by merely setting the local utility functions of reinforcement learning agents: this can hardly be seen as strong macroprogramming since no macro-level abstraction is used. According to the proposed terminology (Section 4.3), this can instead be seen as a weak form of macroprogramming, or meso-programming.

and verification. In some cases, the semantics of the DSL is not even specified formally. Other approaches, such as WOSP (Varughese *et al.*, 2020), provide certain properties (e.g., low communication overhead) by construction and use empirical methods (e.g., simulation) for verification. Therefore, a challenge related to the identification of good abstractions and global-to-local mapping strategies is the definition of formal frameworks supporting both correct and efficient implementations as well as discovery of properties and results (both at the application and middleware level). We note that this challenge (and opportunity) is also recognised by other fields of research including self-adaptive software and robotics threads (Weyns *et al.*, 2012; Farrell *et al.*, 2018).

Besides applying formal methods for verification and analysis within specific macroprogramming systems, another challenge lies in devising a *general, formal theory of macroprogramming* that abstracts from specific languages and possibly even from concrete paradigms. One possibility would be to rigorously identify a minimal but complete set of concepts or predicates applicable to programming systems to classify them as (a form of) macroprogramming. The basic principles provided in Section 4.2 could make for a starting point in this research. The use of such a formal framework could then be used to provide alternative, possibly more precise, classifications of macroprogramming approaches with respect to the one provided in Section 4.4.

Heterogeneity

A system is *heterogeneous* if it comprises different kinds of components. Macroprogramming a system of multiple heterogeneous components or individuals is challenging because making use of the different capabilities of these requires an individual-level viewpoint. Vice versa, macroprogramming homogeneous collectives (such as swarms of homogeneous robots) tends to be simpler as any robot is assimilable to another. In principle, heterogeneity may be abstracted at the programming level and encapsulated at the middleware level, or code may be organised such that specific behaviour is modularised. We also remark that homogeneity and heterogeneity are not sharp characteristics but form a continuum, and that abstraction makes things more homogeneous, by removing unnecessary details (possibly including differences and peculiarities).

Moreover, heterogeneity is not only in shape or capabilities but also in aspects like autonomy and programmability. For instance, consider a heterogeneous cyber-physical collective made of smart city components (e.g., smart traffic lights, cloudlets, autonomous vehicles) and augmented human operators (e.g., through smartphones, smart watches or glasses), which may be programmed to support decentralised crowdsensing applications; the digital devices worn by those humans will move according to those humans' deliberation, and hence their mobility could not be programmed (but only "requested", at best). Among the surveyed approaches, only the SmartSociety platform (Scekic *et al.*, 2020) provides

some support for human orchestration, where humans and machines are considered *peers*.

While collectives tend to be homogeneous, heterogeneity is typically more present in *composites*, namely collections of entities related by a notion of *componenthood* (Brodaric and Neuhaus, 2020). An example is a car, which builds on components such as engine, wheels, etc. However, it would be very hard to imagine the possibility of *programming* a car as a whole.

To conclude this reflection, macroprogramming does not need to assume homogeneity, but it does need to take heterogeneity into account at some level of its engineering stack (middleware, application, model). Moreover, we also observe that macroprogramming is not to be thought as a comprehensive approach meant to define all aspects of a system behaviour, which also leads to the following challenge.

Integration with other programming paradigms and toolchains

As discussed in previous sections, macroprogramming embodies a particular viewpoint of system development, which may not capture all the relevant functional and non-functional requirements. Indeed, a complex system may involve the solution of multiple different problems, each one best addressed by a specific paradigm. This is the idea of *multi-paradigm programming* (Spinellis *et al.*, 1994; Albert *et al.*, 2005). On a more pragmatic side, supporting macroprogramming on top of existing development platforms (such as the JVM or .NET) may enable quick prototyping as well as reuse of features and tools from the host platform. This has fostered the emergence of *internal DSLs* (Voelter *et al.*, 2013) for macroprogramming, which are embedded as expressive APIs on top of existing general-purpose languages: this is the case of PyoT (Python) (Azzara *et al.*, 2014), Chronus (Ruby) (Wada *et al.*, 2010), jDEECo (Java) (Bures *et al.*, 2013), ScaFi for aggregate programming (Scala) (Casadei *et al.*, 2020b), Dolphin (Groovy) (Lima *et al.*, 2018), D’Artagnan (Haskell) (Mizzi *et al.*, 2018), and AErlang (Erlang) (Nicola *et al.*, 2018). However, this aspect of integration of paradigms poses *architectural* challenges, especially considering that macroprogramming tends to permeate various dimensions of the system—including structure, behaviour, and interaction. In summary, multi-paradigm programming is appealing but must be carefully analysed at the level of models, architecture, and development practice.

7 Related Work

This work integrates, extends upon, and differentiates with respect to other survey papers. The main difference is that the secondary studies presented in the following, while similarly rich and detailed, adopt a narrower perspective (spatial computing, WSN, microelectromechanical systems, and swarm robotics, respectively). By contrast, this survey aims to relate various macroprogramming approaches across disparate domains, and adopts a general

software engineering viewpoint. Moreover, due to their publication time, other surveys only cover works published before 2012. Indeed, by analysing the twenty-year time-frame from early 2000s to 2020, we can also make considerations about trends (see Section 3).

The most related survey is (Beal *et al.*, 2012), which however focusses on *spatial computing* languages. It proposes a conceptual framework where spatial computation can be described in terms of constructs for (i) *measuring space-time* (sensors); (ii) *manipulating space-time* (actuators); (iii) *computation*; and (iv) *physical evolution* (inherent spatiotemporal dynamics). The device model accounts for the way devices are *discretised* in space-time (distinguishing between discrete, cellular, and continuous models), the way they are programmed (e.g., by giving them a uniform programs, heterogeneous programs, or leveraging mobile code), their communication scope (e.g., through local, neighbourhood, global regions), and their communication granularity (e.g., unicast, multicast, or broadcast). The survey classifies languages in the following groups: (i) amorphous computing (including pattern languages and manifold programming languages); (ii) biological modelling; (iii) agent-based modelling (including multi-agent and distributed systems modelling); (iv) wireless sensor networks (distinguishing between region-based, dataflow-based, database abstraction-based, centralised-view, and agent-based languages); (v) pervasive computing; (vi) swarm and modular robotics; (vii) parallel and reconfigurable computing (including dataflow, topological, and field languages); (viii) formal calculi for concurrency and distribution (i.e., process algebras/calculi). Languages are further analysed based on: characteristics of the language (type, DSL implementation pattern, platform, layers), supported spatial computing operators, and abstract device characteristics. Language type ranges over functional, imperative, declarative, graphical, process calculus, and any.

Very related is also (Mottola and Picco, 2011), a 2011 survey that covers programming approaches for wireless sensor networks. In their taxonomy, the *interaction pattern* is classified into (i) *one-to-many*, (ii) *many-to-one*, and (iii) *many-to-many*. Moreover, the extent of distributed processing in space can be (i) *global*, e.g., in environment monitoring applications; or (i) *regional*, e.g., in intrusion detection or HVAC systems in buildings. Other dimensions include *goal* (sense-only or sense-and-react), *mobility* (static, mobile), *time* (periodic or event-driven). Regarding WSN programming abstractions, they define a taxonomy as follows. *Communication* aspects cover: *scope* (system-wide, physical neighbourhood-based, or multi-hop group); *addressing* (physical or logical); and *awareness* (implicit or explicit). *Computation* aspects include *scope* of computation (local, group, or global). The *model of data access* could be database, data sharing, mobile code, or message passing. Finally, the *paradigm* could be: *imperative* (sequential or event-driven); *declarative* (functional, rule-based, SQL-like, special-purpose); or *hybrid*.

The survey (Liang *et al.*, 2016) on distributed intelligent microelectromechanical systems (MEMS) programming also provides a classification based on the distinction between *device-level* and *system-level* programming models. The surveyed programming models are then

analysed w.r.t. the characteristics of real-time support, application range (general-purpose vs. domain-specific), syntax complexity, scalability, mobility support, and uncertainty tolerance.

The review (Brambilla *et al.*, 2013) of swarm robotics from an engineering perspective neglects the programming viewpoint. However, they provide a taxonomy where collective behaviour is classified into behavior for (i) *spatial organisation* (e.g., pattern formation, morphogenesis), (ii) *navigation and mobility* (e.g., coordinated motion and transport), (iii) *collective decision making* (e.g., consensus achievement and task allocation), and (iv) *other*. *Design methods* are categorised into *behaviour-based* (e.g., finite state machines, virtual physics-based) and *automatic* (e.g., evolutionary robotics and reinforcement learning-based methods). *Analysis methods* are categorised into *microscopic models*, *macroscopic models* (e.g., via rate/differential equations or control/stability theory), and *real-robot analysis*.

Finally, certain works proposed concepts useful for classifying and understanding macro-programming approaches. These elements have been considered and integrated into the taxonomy provided in Section 4.4. A possible classification of macroprogramming approaches (Choochaisri *et al.*, 2012) distinguishes between

1. *node-dependent* macroprogramming—where the nodes (or, more generally, the components of the micro-level) and their states are referred to explicitly by the macroprogram; and
2. *node-independent* macroprogramming—where the underlying nodes are not visible at all to the programmer.

As per the discussion of Section 4.3, node-dependent approaches tend to enact a weak form of macroprogramming. Examples of node-independent approaches include, e.g., those that abstract a WSN as a database. Another distinction can be made between:

1. *data-driven* macroprogramming (Pathak and Prasanna, 2010)—where macro-programs define tasks consuming and producing data; and
2. *control-driven* macroprogramming (Bakshi and Prasanna, 2005)—where macro-programs specify control flow and instructions operating on distributed memory.

The classification in data-driven and control-driven approaches has been applied in other fields such as coordination (Papadopoulos and Arbab, 1998), where the latter are also known as *task-* or *process-oriented* coordination models.

8 Conclusion

This paper provides, for the first time, an explicit, integrated view of research on macroprogramming languages. It discusses what macroprogramming is, its core application domains,

its main concepts, and analyses and classifies a wide range of works addressing system development by a more-or-less macroscopic perspective. We argue that such a high-level stance could be beneficial for software engineering in forthcoming distributed computing scenarios (cf. IoT, CPS, smart ecosystems) and for promoting language-based solutions to collective adaptive behaviour and intelligence. In particular, the macro-level perspective could represent a complementary viewpoint for addressing structure, behaviour, and interaction in complex systems. Macroprogramming approaches tend to be domain-specific, because domain assumptions are generally instrumental to properly and efficiently map high-level abstractions to activity on the low-level platform. However, there is arguably margin for recovering general principles through inter-domain discussion and sharing of ideas, but this requires a more integrated and structured view of macroprogramming as a field, which this article aims to cultivate.

References

- Adams, J. A. (2001). “Multiagent Systems: A Modern Approach to Distributed Artificial Intelligence”. *AI Mag.* 22(2): 105–108. DOI: [10.1609/aimag.v22i2.1567](https://doi.org/10.1609/aimag.v22i2.1567). URL: <https://doi.org/10.1609/aimag.v22i2.1567>.
- Albert, E., M. Hanus, F. Huch, J. Oliver, and G. Vidal. (2005). “Operational semantics for declarative multi-paradigm languages”. *J. Symb. Comput.* 40(1): 795–829. DOI: [10.1016/j.jsc.2004.01.001](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsc.2004.01.001). URL: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsc.2004.01.001>.
- Alexander, J. (1987). *The Micro-macro Link. Sociology (University of California)*. University of California Press. ISBN: 9780520060685. URL: <https://books.google.it/books?id=CIWF4cw5qc4C>.
- Alrahman, Y. A., R. D. Nicola, M. Loreti, F. Tiezzi, and R. Vigo. (2015). “A calculus for attribute-based communication”. In: *Proceedings of the 30th ACM Symposium on Applied Computing*. Ed. by R. L. Wainwright, J. M. Corchado, A. Bechini, and J. Hong. ACM. 1840–1845. DOI: [10.1145/2695664.2695668](https://doi.org/10.1145/2695664.2695668). URL: <https://doi.org/10.1145/2695664.2695668>.
- Anderson, C. J., N. Foster, A. Guha, J.-B. Jeannin, D. Kozen, C. Schlesinger, and D. Walker. (2014). “NetKAT: semantic foundations for networks”. In: *POPL*. ACM. 113–126.
- Appelbe, W. F. and K. Hansen. (1985). “A Survey of Systems Programming Languages: Concepts and Facilities”. *Softw. Pract. Exp.* 15(2): 169–190. DOI: [10.1002/spe.4380150205](https://doi.org/10.1002/spe.4380150205). URL: <https://doi.org/10.1002/spe.4380150205>.
- Arashloo, M. T., Y. Koral, M. Greenberg, J. Rexford, and D. Walker. (2016). “SNAP: Stateful Network-Wide Abstractions for Packet Processing”. In: *SIGCOMM*. ACM. 29–43.
- Ashley-Rollman, M. P., S. C. Goldstein, P. Lee, T. C. Mowry, and P. Pillai. (2007). “Meld: A declarative approach to programming ensembles”. In: *2007 IEEE/RSJ International Conference on Intelligent Robots and Systems, October 29 - November 2, 2007, Sheraton Hotel and Marina, San Diego, California, USA*. IEEE. 2794–2800. DOI: [10.1109/IROS.2007.4399480](https://doi.org/10.1109/IROS.2007.4399480). URL: <https://doi.org/10.1109/IROS.2007.4399480>.
- Atzori, L., A. Iera, and G. Morabito. (2010). “The Internet of Things: A survey”. *Comput. Networks.* 54(15): 2787–2805. DOI: [10.1016/j.comnet.2010.05.010](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.comnet.2010.05.010). URL: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.comnet.2010.05.010>.
- Audrito, G., R. Casadei, F. Damiani, and M. Viroli. (2017). “Compositional Blocks for Optimal Self-Healing Gradients”. In: *11th IEEE International Conference on Self-Adaptive and Self-Organizing Systems, SASO 2017, Tucson, AZ, USA, September 18-22, 2017*. IEEE Computer Society. 91–100. DOI: [10.1109/SASO.2017.18](https://doi.org/10.1109/SASO.2017.18). URL: <http://doi.ieeecomputersociety.org/10.1109/SASO.2017.18>.

- Awan, A., S. Jagannathan, and A. Grama. (2007). “Macroprogramming heterogeneous sensor networks using COSMOS”. In: *Proceedings of the 2007 EuroSys Conference, Lisbon, Portugal, March 21-23, 2007*. ACM. 159–172. DOI: [10.1145/1272996.1273014](https://doi.org/10.1145/1272996.1273014). URL: <https://doi.org/10.1145/1272996.1273014>.
- Azzara, A., D. Alessandrelli, S. Bocchino, M. Petracca, and P. Pagano. (2014). “PyoT, a macroprogramming framework for the Internet of Things”. In: *Proceedings of the 9th IEEE International Symposium on Industrial Embedded Systems, SIES 2014, Pisa, Italy, June 18-20, 2014*. IEEE. 96–103. DOI: [10.1109/SIES.2014.6871193](https://doi.org/10.1109/SIES.2014.6871193). URL: <https://doi.org/10.1109/SIES.2014.6871193>.
- Bachrach, J., J. Beal, and J. McLurkin. (2010). “Composable continuous-space programs for robotic swarms”. *Neural Comput. Appl.* 19(6): 825–847. DOI: [10.1007/s00521-010-0382-8](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00521-010-0382-8). URL: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00521-010-0382-8>.
- Baeten, J. C. M. (2005). “A brief history of process algebra”. *Theor. Comput. Sci.* 335(2-3): 131–146. DOI: [10.1016/j.tcs.2004.07.036](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tcs.2004.07.036). URL: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tcs.2004.07.036>.
- Bai, L. S., R. P. Dick, and P. A. Dinda. (2009). “Archetype-based design: Sensor network programming for application experts, not just programming experts”. In: *IPSN*. IEEE Computer Society. 85–96.
- Bakshi, A., V. K. Prasanna, J. Reich, and D. Larner. (2005). “The abstract task graph: a methodology for architecture-independent programming of networked sensor systems”. In: *Proceedings of the 2005 workshop on End-to-end, sense-and-respond systems, applications and services*. 19–24.
- Bakshi, A. and V. K. Prasanna. (2005). “Programming Paradigms for Networked Sensing: A Distributed Systems’ Perspective”. In: *IWDC*. Vol. 3741. *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*. Springer. 451–462.
- Baldoni, M., C. Baroglio, V. Mascardi, A. Omicini, and P. Torroni. (2010). “Agents, Multi-Agent Systems and Declarative Programming: What, When, Where, Why, Who, How?” In: *A 25-Year Perspective on Logic Programming: Achievements of the Italian Association for Logic Programming, GULP*. Vol. 6125. *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*. Springer. 204–230. DOI: [10.1007/978-3-642-14309-0_10](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-14309-0_10). URL: https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-14309-0_10.
- Beal, J. and J. Bachrach. (2006). “Infrastructure for Engineered Emergence in Sensor/Actuator Networks”. *IEEE Intelligent Systems*. 21(2): 10–19. DOI: [10.1109/MIS.2006.29](https://doi.org/10.1109/MIS.2006.29).
- Beal, J., S. Dulman, K. Usbeck, M. Viroli, and N. Correll. (2012). “Organizing the Aggregate: Languages for Spatial Computing”. *CoRR*. abs/1202.5509. arXiv: [1202.5509](https://arxiv.org/abs/1202.5509). URL: <http://arxiv.org/abs/1202.5509>.
- Beal, J., D. Pianini, and M. Viroli. (2015). “Aggregate Programming for the Internet of Things”. *Computer*. 48(9): 22–30. DOI: [10.1109/MC.2015.261](https://doi.org/10.1109/MC.2015.261). URL: <https://doi.org/10.1109/MC.2015.261>.

- Beckett, R., R. Mahajan, T. D. Millstein, J. Padhye, and D. Walker. (2019). “Don’t mind the gap: Bridging network-wide objectives and device-level configurations: brief reflections on abstractions for network programming”. *Comput. Commun. Rev.* 49(5): 104–106.
- Boissier, O., R. H. Bordini, J. F. Hübner, A. Ricci, and A. Santi. (2013). “Multi-agent oriented programming with JaCaMo”. *Sci. Comput. Program.* 78(6): 747–761. DOI: [10.1016/j.scico.2011.10.004](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scico.2011.10.004). URL: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scico.2011.10.004>.
- Bouget, S., Y.-D. Bromberg, A. Luxey, and F. Taiani. (2018). “Pleiades: Distributed Structural Invariants at Scale”. In: *48th Annual IEEE/IFIP International Conference on Dependable Systems and Networks, DSN 2018, Luxembourg City, Luxembourg, June 25-28, 2018*. IEEE Computer Society. 542–553. DOI: [10.1109/DSN.2018.00062](https://doi.org/10.1109/DSN.2018.00062). URL: <https://doi.org/10.1109/DSN.2018.00062>.
- Brambilla, M., E. Ferrante, M. Birattari, and M. Dorigo. (2013). “Swarm robotics: a review from the swarm engineering perspective”. *Swarm Intell.* 7(1): 1–41. DOI: [10.1007/s11721-012-0075-2](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11721-012-0075-2). URL: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11721-012-0075-2>.
- Brodaric, B. and F. Neuhaus. (2020). “Pluralities, collectives, and composites”. In: *Formal Ontology in Information Systems: Proceedings of the 11th International Conference (FOIS 2020)*. Vol. 330. IOS Press. 186.
- Bruneton, E., T. Coupaye, M. Leclercq, V. Quéma, and J.-B. Stefani. (2006). “The fractal component model and its support in java”. *Software: Practice and Experience.* 36(11-12): 1257–1284.
- Bures, T., I. Gerostathopoulos, P. Hnetyinka, J. Keznikl, M. Kit, and F. Plasil. (2013). “DEECO: an ensemble-based component system”. In: *CBSE’13, Proceedings of the 16th ACM SIGSOFT Symposium on Component Based Software Engineering, part of CompArch ’13, Vancouver, BC, Canada, June 17-21, 2013*. Ed. by P. Kruchten, D. Giannakopoulou, and M. Tivoli. ACM. 81–90. DOI: [10.1145/2465449.2465462](https://doi.org/10.1145/2465449.2465462). URL: <https://doi.org/10.1145/2465449.2465462>.
- Carbone, M., K. Honda, and N. Yoshida. (2007). “Structured global programming for communication behaviour”. In: *Proceedings of the 16th European Symposium on Programming Languages and Systems (ESOP)*. Vol. 4421. 2–17.
- Cardelli, L. (1997). “Global Computation”. *ACM SIGPLAN Notices.* 32(1): 66–68.
- Casadei, R., D. Pianini, A. Placuzzi, M. Viroli, and D. Weyns. (2020a). “Pulverization in Cyber-Physical Systems: Engineering the Self-Organizing Logic Separated from Deployment”. *Future Internet.* 12(11): 203. DOI: [10.3390/fi12110203](https://doi.org/10.3390/fi12110203). URL: <https://doi.org/10.3390/fi12110203>.

- Casadei, R., M. Viroli, G. Audrito, and F. Damiani. (2020b). “FScaFi : A Core Calculus for Collective Adaptive Systems Programming”. In: *Leveraging Applications of Formal Methods, Verification and Validation: Engineering Principles - 9th International Symposium on Leveraging Applications of Formal Methods, ISoLA 2020, Proceedings, Part II*. Ed. by T. Margaria and B. Steffen. Vol. 12477. *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*. Springer. 344–360. DOI: [10.1007/978-3-030-61470-6__21](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-61470-6__21). URL: https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-61470-6%5C_21.
- Casadei, R., M. Viroli, G. Audrito, D. Pianini, and F. Damiani. (2021). “Engineering collective intelligence at the edge with aggregate processes”. *Eng. Appl. Artif. Intell.* 97: 104081. DOI: [10.1016/j.engappai.2020.104081](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.engappai.2020.104081). URL: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.engappai.2020.104081>.
- Choochaisri, S. and C. Intanagonwiwat. (2008). “A System for Using Wireless Sensor Networks as Globally Deductive Databases”. In: *IEEE International Conference on Wireless and Mobile Computing, Networking and Communications, WiMob 2008, Avignon, France, 12-14 October 2008, Proceedings*. IEEE Computer Society. 649–654. DOI: [10.1109/WiMob.2008.22](https://doi.org/10.1109/WiMob.2008.22). URL: <https://doi.org/10.1109/WiMob.2008.22>.
- Choochaisri, S., N. Pornprasitsakul, and C. Intanagonwiwat. (2012). “Logic Macroprogramming for Wireless Sensor Networks”. *Int. J. Distributed Sens. Networks.* 8. DOI: [10.1155/2012/171738](https://doi.org/10.1155/2012/171738). URL: <https://doi.org/10.1155/2012/171738>.
- Computing Media and Languages for Space-Oriented Computation, 03.09. - 08.09.2006.* (2007). Vol. 06361. *Dagstuhl Seminar Proceedings*. URL: <http://drops.dagstuhl.de/portals/06361/>.
- Cruz-Filipe, L. and F. Montesi. (2020). “A core model for choreographic programming”. *Theor. Comput. Sci.* 802: 38–66. DOI: [10.1016/j.tcs.2019.07.005](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tcs.2019.07.005). URL: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tcs.2019.07.005>.
- Dantu, K., B. Kate, J. Waterman, P. Bailis, and M. Welsh. (2011). “Programming micro-aerial vehicle swarms with karma”. In: *Proceedings of the 9th International Conference on Embedded Networked Sensor Systems, SenSys 2011, Seattle, WA, USA, November 1-4, 2011*. Ed. by J. Liu, P. Levis, and K. Römer. ACM. 121–134. DOI: [10.1145/2070942.2070956](https://doi.org/10.1145/2070942.2070956). URL: <https://doi.org/10.1145/2070942.2070956>.
- De Nicola, R., S. Jähnichen, and M. Wirsing. (2020). “Rigorous engineering of collective adaptive systems: special section”. *Int. J. Softw. Tools Technol. Transf.* 22(4): 389–397. DOI: [10.1007/s10009-020-00565-0](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10009-020-00565-0). URL: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10009-020-00565-0>.
- Dedousis, D. and V. Kalogeraki. (2018). “A Framework for Programming a Swarm of UAVs”. In: *Proceedings of the 11th PErvasive Technologies Related to Assistive Environments Conference, PETRA 2018, Corfu, Greece, June 26-29, 2018*. ACM. 5–12. DOI: [10.1145/3197768.3197772](https://doi.org/10.1145/3197768.3197772). URL: <https://doi.org/10.1145/3197768.3197772>.

- Dulay, N., M. Micheletti, L. Mostarda, and A. Piermarteri. (2018). “PICO-MP: Decentralised Macro-Programming for Wireless Sensor and Actuator Networks”. In: *32nd IEEE International Conference on Advanced Information Networking and Applications, AINA 2018, Krakow, Poland, May 16-18, 2018*. IEEE Computer Society. 289–296. DOI: [10.1109/AINA.2018.00052](https://doi.org/10.1109/AINA.2018.00052). URL: <https://doi.org/10.1109/AINA.2018.00052>.
- Dunkels, A., B. Grönvall, and T. Voigt. (2004). “Contiki - A Lightweight and Flexible Operating System for Tiny Networked Sensors”. In: *29th Annual IEEE Conference on Local Computer Networks (LCN 2004), 16-18 November 2004, Tampa, FL, USA, Proceedings*. IEEE Computer Society. 455–462. DOI: [10.1109/LCN.2004.38](https://doi.org/10.1109/LCN.2004.38). URL: <https://doi.org/10.1109/LCN.2004.38>.
- Farrell, M., M. Luckcuck, and M. Fisher. (2018). “Robotics and Integrated Formal Methods: Necessity Meets Opportunity”. In: *Integrated Formal Methods - 14th International Conference, IFM 2018, Proceedings*. Vol. 11023. *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*. Springer. 161–171. DOI: [10.1007/978-3-319-98938-9_10](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-98938-9_10). URL: https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-98938-9_10.
- Ferscha, A. (2015). “Collective Adaptive Systems”. In: *Adjunct Proceedings of the 2015 ACM International Joint Conference on Pervasive and Ubiquitous Computing and Proceedings of the 2015 ACM International Symposium on Wearable Computers. UbiComp/ISWC’15 Adjunct*. Osaka, Japan: ACM. 893–895. ISBN: 978-1-4503-3575-1. DOI: [10.1145/2800835.2809508](https://doi.org/10.1145/2800835.2809508).
- Fincher, S., J. Jeuring, C. S. Miller, P. Donaldson, B. du Boulay, M. Hauswirth, A. Hellas, F. Hermans, C. M. Lewis, A. Mühling, J. L. Pearce, and A. Petersen. (2020). “Capturing and Characterising Notional Machines”. In: *Proceedings of the 2020 ACM Conference on Innovation and Technology in Computer Science Education, ITiCSE 2020*. ACM. 502–503. DOI: [10.1145/3341525.3394988](https://doi.org/10.1145/3341525.3394988). URL: <https://doi.org/10.1145/3341525.3394988>.
- Finkelstein, A., J. Kramer, B. Nuseibeh, L. Finkelstein, and M. Goedicke. (1992). “Viewpoints: A Framework for Integrating Multiple Perspectives in System Development”. *Int. J. Softw. Eng. Knowl. Eng.* 2(1): 31–57. DOI: [10.1142/S0218194092000038](https://doi.org/10.1142/S0218194092000038). URL: <https://doi.org/10.1142/S0218194092000038>.
- Finkelstein, S. E., P. J. Freyd, and J. Lipton. (2003). “A new framework for declarative programming”. *Theor. Comput. Sci.* 300(1-3): 91–160. DOI: [10.1016/S0304-3975\(01\)00308-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0304-3975(01)00308-5). URL: [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0304-3975\(01\)00308-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0304-3975(01)00308-5).
- Flood, R. L. (1994). “I keep six honest serving men: they taught me all I knew”. *System Dynamics Review*. 10(2-3): 231–243.
- Gignoux, J., G. Chérel, I. D. Davies, S. R. Flint, and E. Lateltin. (2017). “Emergence and complex systems: The contribution of dynamic graph theory”. *Ecological Complexity*. 31: 34–49. DOI: [10.1016/j.ecocom.2017.02.006](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecocom.2017.02.006).

- Gude, N., T. Koponen, J. Pettit, B. Pfaff, M. Casado, N. McKeown, and S. Shenker. (2008). “NOX: towards an operating system for networks”. *Comput. Commun. Rev.* 38(3): 105–110. DOI: [10.1145/1384609.1384625](https://doi.org/10.1145/1384609.1384625). URL: <https://doi.org/10.1145/1384609.1384625>.
- Gummadi, R., O. Gnawali, and R. Govindan. (2005). “Macro-programming Wireless Sensor Networks Using *Kairos*”. In: *Distributed Computing in Sensor Systems, First IEEE International Conference, DCOSS 2005, Marina del Rey, CA, USA, June 30 - July 1, 2005, Proceedings*. Vol. 3560. *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*. Springer. 126–140. DOI: [10.1007/11502593_12](https://doi.org/10.1007/11502593_12). URL: https://doi.org/10.1007/11502593_12.
- Gupta, G. (2015). “Language-based software engineering”. *Sci. Comput. Program.* 97: 37–40.
- Gupta, V., J. Kim, A. Pandya, K. Lakshmanan, R. Rajkumar, and E. Tovar. (2011). “Nano-CF: A coordination framework for macro-programming in Wireless Sensor Networks”. In: *SECON*. IEEE. 467–475.
- Hamann, H. (2010). *Space-Time Continuous Models of Swarm Robotic Systems - Supporting Global-to-Local Programming*. Vol. 9. *Cognitive Systems Monographs*. Springer. ISBN: 978-3-642-13376-3. DOI: [10.1007/978-3-642-13377-0](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-13377-0). URL: <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-13377-0>.
- Hnat, T. W., T. I. Sookoor, P. Hooimeijer, W. Weimer, and K. Whitehouse. (2008). “Macro-Lab: A Vector-Based Macroprogramming Framework for Cyber-Physical Systems”. In: *Proceedings of the 6th ACM Conference on Embedded Network Sensor Systems. SenSys '08*. Raleigh, NC, USA: Association for Computing Machinery. 225–238. ISBN: 9781595939906. DOI: [10.1145/1460412.1460435](https://doi.org/10.1145/1460412.1460435). URL: <https://doi-org.ezproxy.unibo.it/10.1145/1460412.1460435>.
- Hnat, T. W. and K. Whitehouse. (2010). “A relaxed synchronization primitive for macro-programming systems”. In: *INSS*. IEEE. 219–226.
- Holland, J. (1998). *Emergence: From Chaos to Order*. *Emergence: From Chaos to Order*. Oxford University Press. ISBN: 9780198504092. URL: <https://books.google.it/books?id=JINIW1XziBUC>.
- Horsman, C., S. Stepney, R. C. Wagner, and V. Kendon. (2013). “When does a physical system compute?” *CoRR*. abs/1309.7979. arXiv: [1309.7979](https://arxiv.org/abs/1309.7979). URL: <http://arxiv.org/abs/1309.7979>.
- Hübner, J. F., J. S. Sichman, and O. Boissier. (2007). “Developing organised multiagent systems using the MOISE⁺ model: programming issues at the system and agent levels”. *Int. J. Agent Oriented Softw. Eng.* 1(3/4): 370–395. DOI: [10.1504/IJAOSE.2007.016266](https://doi.org/10.1504/IJAOSE.2007.016266). URL: <https://doi.org/10.1504/IJAOSE.2007.016266>.
- Jacobi, D., P. E. Guerrero, I. Petrov, and A. Buchmann. (2008). “Structuring sensor networks with scopes”. In: *3rd IEEE European Conference on Smart Sensing and Context (EuroSSC), IEEE Communications Society, Zurich*.

- Jin, Y. and Y. Meng. (2011). “Morphogenetic Robotics: An Emerging New Field in Developmental Robotics”. *IEEE Trans. Syst. Man Cybern. Part C*. 41(2): 145–160. DOI: [10.1109/TSMCC.2010.2057424](https://doi.org/10.1109/TSMCC.2010.2057424). URL: <https://doi.org/10.1109/TSMCC.2010.2057424>.
- Kalantari, S., E. Nazemi, and B. Masoumi. (2020). “Emergence phenomena in self-organizing systems: a systematic literature review of concepts, researches, and future prospects”. *J. Organ. Comput. Electron. Commer.* 30(3): 224–265. DOI: [10.1080/10919392.2020.1748977](https://doi.org/10.1080/10919392.2020.1748977). URL: <https://doi.org/10.1080/10919392.2020.1748977>.
- Kang, N., Z. Liu, J. Rexford, and D. Walker. (2013). “Optimizing the "one big switch" abstraction in software-defined networks”. In: *CoNEXT*. ACM. 13–24.
- Karpinski, M. and V. Cahill. (2008). “Stream-based macro-programming of wireless sensor, actuator network applications with SOSNA”. In: *Proceedings of the 5th Workshop on Data Management for Sensor Networks, in conjunction with VLDB, DMSN 2008, Auckland, New Zealand, August 24, 2008*. Ed. by Y. Diao and C. S. Jensen. *ACM International Conference Proceeding Series*. ACM. 49–55. DOI: [10.1145/1402050.1402061](https://doi.org/10.1145/1402050.1402061). URL: <https://doi.org/10.1145/1402050.1402061>.
- Kennedy, J. (2006). “Swarm Intelligence”. In: *Handbook of Nature-Inspired and Innovative Computing - Integrating Classical Models with Emerging Technologies*. Springer. 187–219. DOI: [10.1007/0-387-27705-6_6](https://doi.org/10.1007/0-387-27705-6_6). URL: https://doi.org/10.1007/0-387-27705-6_6.
- Kephart, J. O. and D. M. Chess. (2003). “The Vision of Autonomic Computing”. *Computer*. 36(1): 41–50. DOI: [10.1109/MC.2003.1160055](https://doi.org/10.1109/MC.2003.1160055). URL: <https://doi.org/10.1109/MC.2003.1160055>.
- Kiczales, G. (1992). “Towards a new model of abstraction in the engineering of software”. In: *International Workshop on Reflection and Meta-Level Architecture*. Citeseer. 67–76.
- Kipling, R. (1902). “I keep six honest serving men”. *Just so stories*.
- Kitchenham, B. A. and S. Charters. (2007). “Guidelines for performing Systematic Literature Reviews in Software Engineering”. English. *Tech. rep.* No. EBSE 2007-001. Keele University and Durham University Joint Report. URL: https://www.elsevier.com/___data/promis_misc/525444systematicreviewsguide.pdf.
- Koutsoubelias, M. and S. Lalis. (2016). “TeCoLa: A Programming Framework for Dynamic and Heterogeneous Robotic Teams”. In: *MobiQuitous*. ACM. 115–124.
- Kreutz, D., F. M. V. Ramos, P. J. E. Verissimo, C. E. Rothenberg, S. Azodolmolky, and S. Uhlig. (2015). “Software-Defined Networking: A Comprehensive Survey”. *Proc. IEEE*. 103(1): 14–76.
- Krishnamurthi, S. and K. Fisler. (2019). “Programming paradigms and beyond”. *The Cambridge Handbook of Computing Education Research*. 37.

- Lam, E. S. L., I. Cervesato, and N. Fatima. (2015). “Comingle: Distributed Logic Programming for Decentralized Mobile Ensembles”. In: *Coordination Models and Languages - 17th IFIP WG 6.1 International Conference, COORDINATION 2015, Held as Part of the 10th International Federated Conference on Distributed Computing Techniques, DisCoTec 2015, Grenoble, France, June 2-4, 2015, Proceedings*. Ed. by T. Holvoet and M. Viroli. Vol. 9037. *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*. Springer. 51–66. DOI: [10.1007/978-3-319-19282-6_4](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-19282-6_4). URL: https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-19282-6_4.
- Lemos, R. de, H. Giese, H. A. Müller, M. Shaw, J. Andersson, M. Litoiu, B. R. Schmerl, G. Tamura, N. M. Villegas, T. Vogel, D. Weyns, L. Baresi, B. Becker, N. Bencomo, Y. Brun, B. Cukic, R. J. Desmarais, S. Dustdar, G. Engels, K. Geihs, K. M. Göschka, A. Gorla, V. Grassi, P. Inverardi, G. Karsai, J. Kramer, A. Lopes, J. Magee, S. Malek, S. Mankovski, R. Mirandola, J. Mylopoulos, O. Nierstrasz, M. Pezzè, C. Prehofer, W. Schäfer, R. D. Schlichting, D. B. Smith, J. P. Sousa, L. Tahvildari, K. Wong, and J. Wuttke. (2010). “Software Engineering for Self-Adaptive Systems: A Second Research Roadmap”. In: *Software Engineering for Self-Adaptive Systems II - International Seminar, Dagstuhl, Revised Selected and Invited Papers*. Vol. 7475. *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*. Springer. 1–32. DOI: [10.1007/978-3-642-35813-5_1](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-35813-5_1). URL: https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-35813-5_1.
- Levis, P., S. Madden, J. Polastre, R. Szewczyk, K. Whitehouse, A. Woo, D. Gay, J. L. Hill, M. Welsh, E. A. Brewer, and D. E. Culler. (2005). “TinyOS: An Operating System for Sensor Networks”. In: *Ambient Intelligence*. Ed. by W. Weber, J. M. Rabaey, and E. H. L. Aarts. Springer. 115–148. DOI: [10.1007/3-540-27139-2_7](https://doi.org/10.1007/3-540-27139-2_7). URL: https://doi.org/10.1007/3-540-27139-2_7.
- Liang, J., J. Cao, R. Liu, and T. Li. (2016). “Distributed Intelligent MEMS: A Survey and a Real-Time Programming Framework”. *ACM Comput. Surv.* 49(1): 20:1–20:29. DOI: [10.1145/2926964](https://doi.org/10.1145/2926964). URL: <https://doi.org/10.1145/2926964>.
- Liang, Y. and T.-p. He. (2020). “Survey on soft computing”. *Soft Comput.* 24(2): 761–770. DOI: [10.1007/s00500-019-04508-z](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00500-019-04508-z). URL: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00500-019-04508-z>.
- Lilis, Y. and A. Savidis. (2020). “A Survey of Metaprogramming Languages”. *ACM Comput. Surv.* 52(6): 113:1–113:39. DOI: [10.1145/3354584](https://doi.org/10.1145/3354584). URL: <https://doi.org/10.1145/3354584>.
- Lima, A., W. Cirne, F. V. Brasileiro, and D. Fireman. (2006). “A Case for Event-Driven Distributed Objects”. In: *On the Move to Meaningful Internet Systems 2006: CoopIS, DOA, GADA, and ODBASE 2006. Proceedings, Part II*. Vol. 4276. *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*. Springer. 1705–1721. DOI: [10.1007/11914952_46](https://doi.org/10.1007/11914952_46). URL: https://doi.org/10.1007/11914952_46.
- Lima, K., E. R. B. Marques, J. Pinto, and J. B. Sousa. (2018). “Dolphin: A Task Orchestration Language for Autonomous Vehicle Networks”. In: *IROS*. IEEE. 603–610.

- Lindblom, J. and T. Ziemke. (2003). “Social Situatedness of Natural and Artificial Intelligence: Vygotsky and Beyond”. *Adapt. Behav.* 11(2): 79–96. DOI: [10.1177/10597123030112002](https://doi.org/10.1177/10597123030112002). URL: <https://doi.org/10.1177/10597123030112002>.
- Liu, J., M. Chu, J. Liu, J. Reich, and F. Zhao. (2003). “State-Centric Programming for Sensor-Actuator Network Systems”. *IEEE Pervasive Comput.* 2(4): 50–62. DOI: [10.1109/MPRV.2003.1251169](https://doi.org/10.1109/MPRV.2003.1251169). URL: <https://doi.org/10.1109/MPRV.2003.1251169>.
- Lloyd, J. W. (1994a). “Practical Advantages of Declarative Programming”. In: *1994 Joint Conference on Declarative Programming, GULP-PRODE 1994, Volume 1*. 18–30.
- Lloyd, J. (1994b). “Practical advantages of declarative programming”. English. In: *Unknown*. 3–17.
- Loo, B. T., T. Condie, M. N. Garofalakis, D. E. Gay, J. M. Hellerstein, P. Maniatis, R. Ramakrishnan, T. Roscoe, and I. Stoica. (2006). “Declarative networking: language, execution and optimization”. In: *Proceedings of the ACM SIGMOD International Conference on Management of Data, Chicago, Illinois, USA, June 27-29, 2006*. Ed. by S. Chaudhuri, V. Hristidis, and N. Polyzotis. ACM. 97–108. DOI: [10.1145/1142473.1142485](https://doi.org/10.1145/1142473.1142485). URL: <https://doi.org/10.1145/1142473.1142485>.
- Loreti, M. and J. Hillston. (2016). “Modelling and Analysis of Collective Adaptive Systems with CARMA and its Tools”. In: *Formal Methods for the Quantitative Evaluation of Collective Adaptive Systems - 16th International School on Formal Methods for the Design of Computer, Communication, and Software Systems, SFM 2016, Bertinoro, Italy, June 20-24, 2016, Advanced Lectures*. Ed. by M. Bernardo, R. De Nicola, and J. Hillston. Vol. 9700. *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*. Springer. 83–119. ISBN: 978-3-319-34095-1. DOI: [10.1007/978-3-319-34096-8_4](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-34096-8_4). URL: https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-34096-8_4.
- Ludewig, J. (2004). “Models in software engineering - an introduction”. *Inform. Forsch. Entwickl.* 18(3-4): 105–112. DOI: [10.1007/s00450-004-0155-7](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00450-004-0155-7). URL: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00450-004-0155-7>.
- Madden, S. R., R. Szewczyk, M. J. Franklin, and D. Culler. (2002). “Supporting Aggregate Queries Over Ad-Hoc Wireless Sensor Networks”. In: *Workshop on Mobile Computing and Systems Applications*.
- Mainland, G., L. Kang, S. Lahaie, D. C. Parkes, and M. Welsh. (2004). “Using virtual markets to program global behavior in sensor networks”. In: *ACM SIGOPS European Workshop*. ACM. 1.
- Mainland, G., G. Morrisett, and M. Welsh. (2008). “Flask: staged functional programming for sensor networks”. In: *Proceeding of the 13th ACM SIGPLAN international conference on Functional programming, ICFP 2008, Victoria, BC, Canada, September 20-28, 2008*. Ed. by J. Hook and P. Thiemann. ACM. 335–346. DOI: [10.1145/1411204.1411251](https://doi.org/10.1145/1411204.1411251). URL: <https://doi.org/10.1145/1411204.1411251>.

- Mamei, M. (2011). “Macro Programming a Spatial Computer with Bayesian Networks”. *ACM Trans. Auton. Adapt. Syst.* 6(2): 16:1–16:25.
- Mamei, M., F. Zambonelli, and L. Leonardi. (2004). “Co-Fields: A Physically Inspired Approach to Motion Coordination”. *IEEE Pervasive Comput.* 3(2): 52–61. DOI: [10.1109/MPRV.2004.1316820](https://doi.org/10.1109/MPRV.2004.1316820). URL: <https://doi.org/10.1109/MPRV.2004.1316820>.
- Martins, P. M. and J. A. McCann. (2017). “Network-wide programming challenges in cyber-physical systems”. In: *Cyber-physical systems*. Elsevier. 103–113.
- Mizzi, A., J. Ellul, and G. Pace. (2018). “D’Artagnan: An embedded DSL framework for distributed embedded systems”. In: *Proceedings of the Real World Domain Specific Languages Workshop 2018*. 1–9.
- Mizzi, A., J. Ellul, and G. J. Pace. (2019). “Porthos: Macroprogramming Blockchain Systems”. In: *NTMS*. IEEE. 1–5.
- Mobus, G. E. and M. C. Kalton. (2014). *Principles of Systems Science*. Springer Publishing Company, Incorporated. ISBN: 1493919199.
- Morris, K. (2016). *Infrastructure as Code: Managing Servers in the Cloud*. 1st. O’Reilly Media, Inc. ISBN: 1491924357.
- Mottola, L., M. Moretta, K. Whitehouse, and C. Ghezzi. (2014). “Team-level programming of drone sensor networks”. In: *SenSys*. ACM. 177–190.
- Mottola, L. and G. P. Picco. (2011). “Programming wireless sensor networks: Fundamental concepts and state of the art”. *ACM Comput. Surv.* 43(3): 19:1–19:51. DOI: [10.1145/1922649.1922656](https://doi.org/10.1145/1922649.1922656). URL: <https://doi.org/10.1145/1922649.1922656>.
- Mottola, L., G. P. Picco, F. J. Oppermann, J. Eriksson, N. Finne, H. Fuchs, A. Gaglione, S. Karnouskos, P. M. Montero, N. Oertel, K. Römer, P. Spieß, S. Tranquillini, and T. Voigt. (2019). “makeSense: Simplifying the Integration of Wireless Sensor Networks into Business Processes”. *IEEE Trans. Software Eng.* 45(6): 576–596. DOI: [10.1109/TSE.2017.2787585](https://doi.org/10.1109/TSE.2017.2787585). URL: <https://doi.org/10.1109/TSE.2017.2787585>.
- Newton, R., G. Morrisett, and M. Welsh. (2007). “The regiment macroprogramming system”. In: *Proceedings of the 6th International Conference on Information Processing in Sensor Networks, IPSN 2007, Cambridge, Massachusetts, USA, April 25-27, 2007*. Ed. by T. F. Abdelzaher, L. J. Guibas, and M. Welsh. ACM. 489–498. DOI: [10.1145/1236360.1236422](https://doi.org/10.1145/1236360.1236422). URL: <https://doi.org/10.1145/1236360.1236422>.
- Newton, R. and M. Welsh. (2004). “Region streams: functional macroprogramming for sensor networks”. In: *DMSN*. Vol. 72. *ACM International Conference Proceeding Series*. ACM. 78–87.
- Ni, Y., U. Kremer, A. Stere, and L. Iftode. (2005). “Programming ad-hoc networks of mobile and resource-constrained devices”. *ACM SIGPLAN Notices*. 40(6): 249–260.
- Nicola, R. D., T. Duong, O. Inverso, and C. Trubiani. (2018). “AErlang: Empowering Erlang with attribute-based communication”. *Sci. Comput. Program.* 168: 71–93. DOI: [10.1016/j.scico.2018.08.006](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scico.2018.08.006). URL: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scico.2018.08.006>.

- Nicola, R. D., M. Loreti, R. Pugliese, and F. Tiezzi. (2014). “A Formal Approach to Autonomic Systems Programming: The SCEL Language”. *ACM Trans. Auton. Adapt. Syst.* 9(2): 7:1–7:29. DOI: [10.1145/2619998](https://doi.org/10.1145/2619998). URL: <https://doi.org/10.1145/2619998>.
- Noor, J., H.-Y. Tseng, L. Garcia, and M. B. Srivastava. (2019). “DDFlow: visualized declarative programming for heterogeneous IoT networks”. In: *Proceedings of the International Conference on Internet of Things Design and Implementation, IoTDI 2019, Montreal, QC, Canada, April 15-18, 2019*. Ed. by O. Landsiedel and K. Nahrstedt. ACM. 172–177. DOI: [10.1145/3302505.3310079](https://doi.org/10.1145/3302505.3310079). URL: <https://doi.org/10.1145/3302505.3310079>.
- Nygaard, K. (1997). “GOODS to Appear on the Stage”. In: *ECOOP’97 - Object-Oriented Programming, 11th European Conference, Jyväskylä, Finland, June 9-13, 1997, Proceedings*. Ed. by M. Aksit and S. Matsuoka. Vol. 1241. *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*. Springer. 1–31. DOI: [10.1007/BFb0053372](https://doi.org/10.1007/BFb0053372). URL: <https://doi.org/10.1007/BFb0053372>.
- Papadopoulos, G. A. and F. Arbab. (1998). “Coordination Models and Languages”. *Adv. Comput.* 46: 329–400. DOI: [10.1016/S0065-2458\(08\)60208-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0065-2458(08)60208-9). URL: [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0065-2458\(08\)60208-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0065-2458(08)60208-9).
- Pathak, A. and V. K. Prasanna. (2010). “Energy-Efficient Task Mapping for Data-Driven Sensor Network Macroprogramming”. *IEEE Trans. Computers.* 59(7): 955–968.
- Pathak, A. and V. K. Prasanna. (2011). “High-Level Application Development for Sensor Networks: Data-Driven Approach”. In: *Theoretical Aspects of Distributed Computing in Sensor Networks. Monographs in Theoretical Computer Science. An EATCS Series*. Springer. 865–891.
- Pianini, D., R. Casadei, M. Viroli, S. Mariani, and F. Zambonelli. (2020). “Time-Fluid Field-Based Coordination through Programmable Distributed Schedulers”. *CoRR*. abs/2012.13806. arXiv: [2012.13806](https://arxiv.org/abs/2012.13806). URL: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2012.13806>.
- Pianini, D., R. Casadei, M. Viroli, and A. Natali. (2021). “Partitioned integration and coordination via the self-organising coordination regions pattern”. *Future Gener. Comput. Syst.* 114: 44–68. DOI: [10.1016/j.future.2020.07.032](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.future.2020.07.032). URL: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.future.2020.07.032>.
- Pianini, D., M. Viroli, and J. Beal. (2015). “Protelis: practical aggregate programming”. In: *Proceedings of the 30th Annual ACM Symposium on Applied Computing, Salamanca, Spain, April 13-17, 2015*. Ed. by R. L. Wainwright, J. M. Corchado, A. Bechini, and J. Hong. ACM. 1846–1853. DOI: [10.1145/2695664.2695913](https://doi.org/10.1145/2695664.2695913). URL: <https://doi.org/10.1145/2695664.2695913>.
- Pincioli, C. and G. Beltrame. (2016). “Buzz: A Programming Language for Robot Swarms”. In: vol. 33. No. 4. 97–100. DOI: [10.1109/MS.2016.95](https://doi.org/10.1109/MS.2016.95). URL: <https://doi.org/10.1109/MS.2016.95>.
- Pincioli, C., A. Lee-Brown, and G. Beltrame. (2016). “A tuple space for data sharing in robot swarms”. In: *Proceedings of the 9th EAI International Conference on Bio-inspired Information and Communications Technologies (formerly BIONETICS)*. 287–294.

- Pinto, J., P. S. Dias, R. Martins, J. Fortuna, E. Marques, and J. Sousa. (2013). “The LSTS toolchain for networked vehicle systems”. In: *2013 MTS/IEEE OCEANS-Bergen*. IEEE. 1–9.
- Qiao, Y., R. Nolani, S. Gill, G. Fang, and B. A. Lee. (2018). “ThingNet: A micro-service based IoT macro-programming platform over edges and cloud”. In: *ICIN*. IEEE. 1–4.
- Rasheed, A., O. San, and T. Kvamsdal. (2020). “Digital Twin: Values, Challenges and Enablers From a Modeling Perspective”. *IEEE Access*. 8: 21980–22012. DOI: [10.1109/ACCESS.2020.2970143](https://doi.org/10.1109/ACCESS.2020.2970143). URL: <https://doi.org/10.1109/ACCESS.2020.2970143>.
- Renesse, R. van. (1998). “Goal-oriented programming, or composition using events, or threads considered harmful”. In: *Proceedings of the 8th ACM SIGOPS European Workshop: Support for Composing Distributed Applications 1998*. ACM. 82–87. DOI: [10.1145/319195.319208](https://doi.org/10.1145/319195.319208). URL: <https://doi.org/10.1145/319195.319208>.
- Saputra, Y., J. Hua, N. Wendt, C. Julien, and G.-C. Roman. (2019). “Warble: programming abstractions for personalizing interactions in the internet of things”. In: *Proceedings of the 6th International Conference on Mobile Software Engineering and Systems, MOBILESoft@ICSE 2019, Montreal, QC, Canada, May 25, 2019*. Ed. by E. Tilevich. IEEE. 128–139. DOI: [10.1109/MOBILESoft.2019.00026](https://doi.org/10.1109/MOBILESoft.2019.00026). URL: <https://doi.org/10.1109/MOBILESoft.2019.00026>.
- Scekic, O., T. Schiavinotto, S. Videnov, M. Rovatsos, H. L. Truong, D. Miorandi, and S. Dustdar. (2020). “A Programming Model for Hybrid Collaborative Adaptive Systems”. *IEEE Trans. Emerg. Top. Comput.* 8(1): 6–19. DOI: [10.1109/TETC.2017.2702578](https://doi.org/10.1109/TETC.2017.2702578). URL: <https://doi.org/10.1109/TETC.2017.2702578>.
- Schillo, M., K. Fischer, and C. T. Klein. (2000). “The Micro-Macro Link in DAI and Sociology”. In: *Multi-Agent-Based Simulation, Second International Workshop, MABS 2000, Revised and Additional Papers*. Vol. 1979. *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*. Springer. 133–148. DOI: [10.1007/3-540-44561-7_10](https://doi.org/10.1007/3-540-44561-7_10). URL: https://doi.org/10.1007/3-540-44561-7_10.
- Serpanos, D. (2018). “The Cyber-Physical Systems Revolution”. *Computer*. 51(3): 70–73. DOI: [10.1109/MC.2018.1731058](https://doi.org/10.1109/MC.2018.1731058). URL: <https://doi.org/10.1109/MC.2018.1731058>.
- Sookoor, T. I. (2009). “The Design of MDB: a Macrodebugger for Wireless Embedded Networks”. *PhD thesis*. University of Virginia.
- Spinellis, D., S. Drossopoulou, and S. Eisenbach. (1994). “Language and Architecture Paradigms as Object Classes”. In: *Programming Languages and System Architectures, International Conference, Proceedings*. Vol. 782. *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*. Springer. 191–207. DOI: [10.1007/3-540-57840-4_32](https://doi.org/10.1007/3-540-57840-4_32). URL: https://doi.org/10.1007/3-540-57840-4_32.
- Spolsky, J. (2004). “The law of leaky abstractions”. In: *Joel on Software*. Springer. 197–202.
- Sugihara, R. and R. K. Gupta. (2008). “Programming models for sensor networks: A survey”. *ACM Trans. Sens. Networks*. 4(2): 8:1–8:29.

- Suran, S., V. Pattanaik, and D. Draheim. (2020). “Frameworks for Collective Intelligence: A Systematic Literature Review”. *ACM Comput. Surv.* 53(1): 14:1–14:36. DOI: [10.1145/3368986](https://doi.org/10.1145/3368986). URL: <https://doi.org/10.1145/3368986>.
- Szuba, T. (2001). *Computational Collective Intelligence. Wiley Series on Parallel and Distributed Computing*. Wiley. ISBN: 9780471349662. URL: <https://books.google.it/books?id=YINQAAAAMAAJ>.
- Thomsen, B. and L. L. Thomsen. (2001). “Towards Global Computations Guided by Concurrency Theory”. In: *Current Trends in Theoretical Computer Science: Entering the 21st Century*. USA: World Scientific Publishing Co., Inc. 460–468. ISBN: 9810244738.
- Tian, Y., A. Balmin, S. A. Corsten, S. Tatikonda, and J. McPherson. (2013). “From "Think Like a Vertex" to "Think Like a Graph"”. *Proc. VLDB Endow.* 7(3): 193–204. DOI: [10.14778/2732232.2732238](https://doi.org/10.14778/2732232.2732238). URL: <http://www.vldb.org/pvldb/vol7/p193-tian.pdf>.
- Tu, Y.-H., Y.-C. Lee, Y.-W. Tsai, P. H. Chou, and T.-C. Chien. (2011). “EcoCast: Interactive, object-oriented macroprogramming for networks of ultra-compact wireless sensor nodes”. In: *IPSN*. IEEE. 113–114.
- Tumer, K. and D. Wolpert. (2004). *Collectives and the Design of Complex Systems*. Springer. ISBN: 9780387401652. URL: <https://books.google.it/books?id=O-Xw23-eOWAC>.
- Valiant, L. G. (1990). “A Bridging Model for Parallel Computation”. *Commun. ACM.* 33(8): 103–111. DOI: [10.1145/79173.79181](https://doi.org/10.1145/79173.79181). URL: <https://doi.org/10.1145/79173.79181>.
- Van Roy, P. (2009). “Programming paradigms for dummies: What every programmer should know”. *New computational paradigms for computer music*. 104: 616–621.
- Varughese, J. C., H. Hornischer, P. Zahadat, R. Thenius, F. Wotawa, and T. Schmickl. (2020). “A swarm design paradigm unifying swarm behaviors using minimalistic communication”. *Bioinspiration & Biomimetics*. 15(3): 036005.
- Viroli, M., J. Beal, F. Damiani, G. Audrito, R. Casadei, and D. Pianini. (2019). “From distributed coordination to field calculus and aggregate computing”. *J. Log. Algebraic Methods Program.* 109. DOI: [10.1016/j.jlamp.2019.100486](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jlamp.2019.100486). URL: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jlamp.2019.100486>.
- Voelter, M., S. Benz, C. Dietrich, B. Engelmann, M. Helander, L. C. L. Kats, E. Visser, and G. Wachsmuth. (2013). *DSL Engineering - Designing, Implementing and Using Domain-Specific Languages*. dslbook.org. ISBN: 978-1-4812-1858-0. URL: <http://www.dslbook.org>.
- Wada, H., P. Boonma, and J. Suzuki. (2007). “A SpaceTime Oriented Macroprogramming Paradigm for Push-Pull Hybrid Sensor Networking”. In: *Proceedings of the 16th International Conference on Computer Communications and Networks, IEEE ICCCN 2007, Turtle Bay Resort, Honolulu, Hawaii, USA, August 13-16, 2007*. IEEE. 868–875. DOI: [10.1109/ICCCN.2007.4317927](https://doi.org/10.1109/ICCCN.2007.4317927). URL: <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICCCN.2007.4317927>.
- Wada, H., P. Boonma, and J. Suzuki. (2008). “Macroprogramming Spatio-temporal Event Detection and Data Collection in Wireless Sensor Networks: An Implementation and Evaluation Study”. In: *HICSS*. IEEE Computer Society. 498.

- Wada, H., P. Boonmab, and J. Suzukic. (2010). “Chronus: A spatiotemporal macroprogramming language for autonomic wireless sensor networks”. *Autonomic Network Management Principles: From Concepts to Applications*: 167.
- Wael, M. D., S. Marr, B. D. Fraine, T. V. Cutsem, and W. D. Meuter. (2015). “Partitioned Global Address Space Languages”. *ACM Comput. Surv.* 47(4): 62:1–62:27. DOI: [10.1145/2716320](https://doi.org/10.1145/2716320). URL: <https://doi.org/10.1145/2716320>.
- Waldo, J., G. Wyant, A. Wollrath, and S. Kendall. (1996). “A note on distributed computing”. In: *International Workshop on Mobile Object Systems*. Springer. 49–64.
- Wang, F.-Y., K. M. Carley, D. Zeng, and W. Mao. (2007). “Social Computing: From Social Informatics to Social Intelligence”. *IEEE Intell. Syst.* 22(2): 79–83. DOI: [10.1109/MIS.2007.41](https://doi.org/10.1109/MIS.2007.41). URL: <https://doi.org/10.1109/MIS.2007.41>.
- Weisenburger, P., J. Wirth, and G. Salvaneschi. (2020). “A Survey of Multitier Programming”. *ACM Comput. Surv.* 53(4): 81:1–81:35. DOI: [10.1145/3397495](https://doi.org/10.1145/3397495). URL: <https://doi.org/10.1145/3397495>.
- Welsh, M. and G. Mainland. (2004). “Programming Sensor Networks Using Abstract Regions”. In: *1st Symposium on Networked Systems Design and Implementation (NSDI 2004), Proceedings*. USENIX. 29–42. URL: <http://www.usenix.org/events/nsdi04/tech/welsh.html>.
- Weyns, D., M. U. Iftikhar, D. G. de la Iglesia, and T. Ahmad. (2012). “A survey of formal methods in self-adaptive systems”. In: *5th International C* Conference on Computer Science & Software Engineering, C3S2E 2012*. ACM. 67–79. DOI: [10.1145/2347583.2347592](https://doi.org/10.1145/2347583.2347592). URL: <https://doi.org/10.1145/2347583.2347592>.
- Whitehouse, K., C. Sharp, E. Brewer, and D. Culler. (2004). “Hood: a neighborhood abstraction for sensor networks”. In: *2nd International Conference on Mobile systems, applications, and services*. Boston, MA, USA: ACM. DOI: [10.1145/990064.990079](https://doi.org/10.1145/990064.990079).
- Whitehouse, K., F. Zhao, and J. Liu. (2006). “Semantic Streams: A Framework for Composable Semantic Interpretation of Sensor Data”. In: *EWSN*. Vol. 3868. *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*. Springer. 5–20.
- Wolf, T. D. and T. Holvoet. (2004). “Emergence Versus Self-Organisation: Different Concepts but Promising When Combined”. In: *Engineering Self-Organising Systems, Methodologies and Applications [revised versions of papers presented at the Engineering Selforganising Applications (ESOA 2004) workshop, held during the Autonomous Agents and Multi-agent Systems conference (AAMAS 2004) in New York in July 2004, and selected invited papers]*. Ed. by S. Brueckner, G. D. M. Serugendo, A. Karageorgos, and R. Nagpal. Vol. 3464. *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*. Springer. 1–15. DOI: [10.1007/11494676_1](https://doi.org/10.1007/11494676_1). URL: https://doi.org/10.1007/11494676_1.
- Wooldridge, M. J. (2009). *An Introduction to MultiAgent Systems, Second Edition*. Wiley. ISBN: 978-0-470-51946-2.

- Yousefpour, A., C. Fung, T. Nguyen, K. Kadiyala, F. Jalali, A. Niakanlahiji, J. Kong, and J. P. Jue. (2019). “All one needs to know about fog computing and related edge computing paradigms: A complete survey”. *J. Syst. Archit.* 98: 289–330. DOI: [10.1016/j.sysarc.2019.02.009](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sysarc.2019.02.009). URL: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sysarc.2019.02.009>.
- Zarour, K., D. Benmerzoug, N. Guermouche, and K. Drira. (2020). “A systematic literature review on BPMN extensions”. *Bus. Process. Manag. J.* 26(6): 1473–1503. DOI: [10.1108/BPMJ-01-2019-0040](https://doi.org/10.1108/BPMJ-01-2019-0040). URL: <https://doi.org/10.1108/BPMJ-01-2019-0040>.
- Zykov, V., E. Mytilinaios, M. Desnoyer, and H. Lipson. (2007). “Evolved and Designed Self-Reproducing Modular Robotics”. *IEEE Trans. Robotics.* 23(2): 308–319. DOI: [10.1109/TRO.2007.894685](https://doi.org/10.1109/TRO.2007.894685). URL: <https://doi.org/10.1109/TRO.2007.894685>.