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Abstract

A major challenge in modelling and simulation is the need to combine expertise in both software technologies and a given scientific domain. When High-Performance Computing (HPC) is required to solve a scientific problem, software development becomes a problematic issue. Considering the complexity of the software for HPC, it is useful to identify programming languages that can be used to alleviate this issue.

Because the existing literature on the topic of HPC is very dispersed, we performed a Systematic Mapping Study (SMS) in the context of the European COST Action CHiPSet. This literature study maps characteristics of various programming languages for data-intensive HPC applications, including category, typical user profiles, effectiveness, and type of articles.

We organised the SMS in two phases. In the first phase, relevant articles are identified employing an automated keyword-based search in eight digital libraries. This lead to an initial sample of 420 papers, which was then narrowed down in a second phase by human inspection of article abstracts, titles and keywords to 152 relevant articles published in the period 2006–2018. The analysis of these articles enabled us to identify 26 programming languages referred to in 33 of relevant articles. We compared the outcome of the mapping study with results of our questionnaire-based survey that involved 57 HPC experts.

The mapping study and the survey revealed that the desired features of programming languages for data-intensive HPC applications are portability, performance and usability. Furthermore, we observed that the majority of the programming languages used in the context of data-intensive HPC applications are text-based general-purpose programming languages. Typically these have a steep learning curve, which makes them difficult to adopt. We believe that the outcome of this study will inspire future research and development in programming languages for data-intensive HPC applications.
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1. Introduction

Although being sometimes controversial to some practitioners because of not having a clear definition, Big Data is a term with increasing interest and widely used by both the industry and academia. Beyers and Laney [9] describe the Big Data using properties Volume, Velocity, and Variety (also known as the "3Vs") as follows:

"Big data is high-Volume, high-Velocity and/or high-Variety information assets that demand cost-effective, innovative forms of information processing that enable enhanced insight, decision making, and process automation."

The "3Vs" description of Big Data has been further extended to "5Vs" [30], by adding a further "V" for Veracity that indicates that the quality and accuracy of the data may vary, and a "V" for data Value.

One of the major challenges of scientific computing in the context of Big Data is the need to combine software development technology for High Performance Computing (HPC) with the management and analysis of Big Data [11, 59, 50]. For instance, the Square Kilometre Array (SKA) [63] project is building a radio telescope with one square kilometre of collecting surface. SKA computing requirements are more than 100 petaflops, and the data traffic of SKA will exceed the data traffic of the whole Internet. Efficient processing of large amounts of data demands computational, communication and memory resources of large-scale HPC systems [1]. Modern HPC systems comprise a large amount of interconnected computing nodes, each having one or more multi-core or many-core processors. For instance, the Summit [64] supercomputer (Ranked 1st in the current TOP500 list [65]) has 4608 nodes, and each node comprises two IBM Power9 22-core processors and six Nvidia Volta GPUs.

While large-scale heterogeneous HPC systems provide high performance, there is a consensus that programming heterogeneous systems is not straightforward [32, 60]. Parallelization of sequential legacy code as well as writing parallel programs from scratch is not easy and the difficulty of programming multi-core systems is also known as "programmability wall" [57]. The multi-core shift in computer architecture has accelerated the research efforts in developing new programming frameworks for parallel computing, which should assist domain scientists, for instance, by generating and optimising low-level parallel code for coordination of computations across multiple cores and multiple computers [8, 58].

This study presents the results of a systematic mapping study carried out as part of the European COST Action cHiPSet [16] that addresses High-Performance Modelling and Simulation for Big Data Applications. The mapping study focuses on the main paradigms and properties of programming languages used in High Performance Computing for Big Data processing. Our initial literature search resulted in 420 articles, of which 152 articles were retained for final review after the evaluation of initial search results by domain experts. Results of our mapping study indicate, for instance, that the majority of the used HPC languages in the context of Big Data are text-based general-purpose programming languages and target the end-user community. To evaluate the outcome of the mapping study, we developed a questionnaire and collected the opinions of 57 HPC experts. A comparison of the mapping study outcome with opinions of HPC experts reveals that the key features of HPC programming languages for Big Data are portability, performance and usability. As key issues that need more attention in future research we identified the language learning curve and interoperability (for instance, interoperability of parallel runtime libraries). We consider that the outcome of this study may help in understanding the current limitations in HPC programming languages for Big Data, and it may also help the reader in the identification of issues that need to be addressed in future research.

The rest of the paper is organised as follows. We introduce the concepts of Systematic Mapping Studies and Systematic Literature Reviews and briefly discuss the related work, in Section 2. Section 3 describes the methodology of the Systematic Mapping Study (SMS). We present the obtained results in Section 4. Section 5 evaluates the SMS results via a survey involving HPC experts. Section 6 highlights our major observations and lists challenges and future research directions. The paper is concluded in Section 7 with a summary of the work.

2. Background and Related Work

In this section we describe the concepts of Systematic Mapping Studies and Systematic Literature Reviews and briefly discuss the related work with respect to parallel programming models and languages for data-intensive HPC applications.

Systematic Mapping Studies (SMS) [35, 55] take a broad and shallow approach to literature review and are typically used for structuring a research area. They are built on general questions to discover research trends. In this context, the quality assessment of primary studies is optional; for instance, primary studies without empirical evidence can be included.

On the contrary, Systematic Literature Reviews (SLR) take a narrow and deep approach to literature review. They are used for gathering and synthesising evidence on a well-defined area. They are built on focused questions to aggregate evidence on a very specific goal. Here, the quality assessment of primary studies is crucial; for instance, primary studies without empirical evidence should not be included.

Related work was so far mainly focused on comparisons of few parallel programming languages [49], but there is a lack of comprehensive literature studies that address HPC programming languages in the context of Big Data. There are also some primary studies regarding tools, such as libraries [2, 24, 27, 29, 40, 62, 69], integrated in known languages used in this type of computation, or APIs and programming models [7, 20, 61, 68, 70, 72]. For instance, there are several well known mainstream libraries, such as the widespread and durable MPI. We discard those from our study as they mostly offer APIs for Programming at the transport layer embedded in General Purpose Languages (like C, C++, Python or others). The main reason is that, to program in those terms, it is an awkward way of thinking for numerical application developers or expert domain users. Thus, if the point is to make HPC more accessible and widely
adopted, we can consider those libraries to be at a wrong level of abstraction, as to increase productivity, it should be hidden the complexity of the communication from the domain scientist.

Diaz et al. [22] give a survey of parallel and distributed programming models for multi- and many-core computing, including PGAS, heterogeneous and hybrid programming models, though not covering the Big Data aspect yet. Dobre and Xhafa [23] review programming models for Big Data processing. Aldinucci et al. [3, 52] compared Big Data frameworks mapping their functional and parallelism aspects on a common lower-level programming model, i.e. the data-flow model. Different general-purpose parallel programming models for single-node multi-/many-core computing were compared quantitatively in terms of programmability and performance in a number of studies, such as, by Ali et al. [4] and by Memeti et al. [49].

3. The Review Process

The methodology used in this Systematic Mapping Study (SMS) follows the methodology proposed by Kitchenham and Charters [34, 35]. The review process has three main phases: planning, conducting and reporting. In the next subsections we outline how the first two phases are carried out for this SMS, followed by an explanation of procedure for data extraction and synthesis of information (input to the current publication, part of the reporting). Finally, we explain general quality concerns that had to take into account during the whole process.

3.1. Planning the SMS

Kitchenham and Charters propose 5 stages within planning: (i) identification of the need for a review, (ii) commissioning, (iii) specifying the research questions, (iv) developing a review protocol and (v) evaluating it.

3.1.1. Identification of the need for a review

The need for this study was identified within the scope of the CHiPSet COST Action [16]. There is a body of knowledge scattered in many publications, which makes it difficult for newcomers to HPC to have an entry point to this domain.

3.1.2. Commissioning the review

A working group focused on parallel programming models was assigned with the mission to conduct this systematic mapping study.

3.1.3. The Research Questions

We followed a systematic approach for the definition of our research questions, by adopting a subset of the PICOC criteria [56]: Population, Intervention, Comparison, Outcomes, Context. In particular, the Comparison criterion is not applicable to our study, as this criterion refers to the software engineering methodology, tool, technology, or procedure to which a given intervention is being compared [35]:

- Population is composed of the primary studies on Languages for High-Performance Computing (HPC);
- Intervention is the specification or adoption of languages for HPC;
- Comparison is not applicable in this framework;
- Outcomes is the overview of the language landscape for HPC;
- Context is a set of research papers produced by leading experts in HPC, as well as other stakeholders, such as domain scientists, who use HPC in their domains.

The goal of this SMS is to answer five research questions, further articulated in 22 sub-questions, which are presented in Table 1. The research questions have been discussed for over one year within the parallel programming models Working Group and in the plenary meetings of the CHiPSet COST Action.

3.1.4. Definition of the review protocol

A small task force within the working group developed an initial proposal for the review protocol. The protocol included the selection of information sources, the creation of a search string, the definition of explicit inclusion and exclusion criteria for the primary papers, and the development of a template to support data collection. All these articles were made available to the remaining members of the working group.

3.1.5. Evaluation of the review protocol

The members of the CHiPSet working group in charge of this mapping study reviewed and proposed improvements to the initial proposal, leading to the protocol followed in this review, as described in the next section.

3.2. Conducting the SMS

The conduction of an SMS involves the following steps: (i) identification of research, (ii) selection of primary studies, (iii) data extraction and monitoring, and (iv) data synthesis. This process is outlined in Figure 1. Also, the process should also include quality assessment.

3.2.1. Identification of research

The main goal of an SMS is to identify a large number of primary studies related to the proposed research questions.

Figure 1: Primary studies selection and filtering
Table 1: Research Questions that were formulated

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Research Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RQ1</td>
<td>What are the categories of languages in use?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RQ1.1</td>
<td>What are the current research trends in languages for HPC?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RQ2</td>
<td>What is the nature of the languages for HPC?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RQ2.1</td>
<td>What kind of language is it?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RQ2.2</td>
<td>What is the execution model that is being used?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RQ2.3</td>
<td>What are the key advantages of the language?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RQ2.4</td>
<td>What are the application domains of the language?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RQ2.5</td>
<td>What are the paradigms underlying the languages?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RQ2.6</td>
<td>Which are the execution stack requirements (TaaS) to support the artifacts created with those languages?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RQ2.7</td>
<td>What is the existing tool support for the language?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RQ2.8</td>
<td>What are the technologies used to create the language tool suite?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RQ2.9</td>
<td>Does the language target specific hardware?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RQ2.10</td>
<td>What is the purpose of the language?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RQ2.11</td>
<td>What is the preferred language representation type?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RQ3</td>
<td>What are the typical user profiles for the languages?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RQ3.1</td>
<td>What are the roles of the users of this language?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RQ3.2</td>
<td>What kind of technical knowledge is required?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3.2.2. Selection of primary studies

#### Search for candidate primary studies

We used the keywords in our research questions as a basis for designing our search query. We connected those terms with the AND operator:

- `"Big data" AND "Programming Model" AND "High performance computing"`

In order to increase the coverage of our study, we included closely related terms, selected by cHiPSet experts (hereafter referred to as experts), for our index terms. These synonyms are included in our search string with the OR operator, leading to the final search query:

- `("Big Data" OR "Data Intensive" OR "Stream Data") AND ("Programming Model" OR "Language Model" OR "Modelling Language") AND ("Domain Specific Language" OR "General Purpose Language" OR "Programming Language") AND ("Programming Framework") AND ("HPC" OR "High Performance Computing" OR "Grid Computing" OR "Supercomputing" OR "Parallel" OR "Concurrency")

We selected 8 digital libraries for performing this SMS. These libraries were chosen to ensure coverage of the main venues where we expected to find candidate primary studies. We asked experts to identify those venues (Table 2). This shortlist of venues was used as a “gold standard” for our automated search.

All searches were based on the title, abstract and keywords of publications from January 2006 to March 2018, a period of time that was considered by the experts as adequate for this SMS. After removing duplicates, we obtained a total of 420 candidate primary studies (Table 3).

First selection of primary studies. We defined a set of inclusion and exclusion criteria (Table 4) to filter out candidate primary studies that would not contribute to answering our research questions. These criteria were set before the conduction of the automated search, while planning this SMS. They were applied by analysing the title, abstract and keywords of each of the 420 candidate primary studies. We took a conservative approach at this stage: when in doubt, we kept the candidate primary studies. It is worth mentioning that all language application publications were excluded, as the focus of our study is on the design and development of languages and not about examples of their use. At the end of this step, we excluded 268 candidate studies, according to those criteria. This resulted in 152 candidate studies selected for the next steps.

Final selection of primary studies. We refined the selection from the previous step by reading the full papers, rather than just the title, abstract, and keywords in order to reapply the inclusion and exclusion criteria, now to the full contents of the candidate primary studies. The goal was to filter out papers that, in practice, were beyond the scope of our research questions, even if their title and abstract suggested otherwise. Specifically, studies reporting libraries (rather than languages) were sieved out. In addition, in line with the guidelines [35] and common practice in performing the selection of primary studies [34], we also included a set of relevant papers that were jointly identified by experts. These were primary studies directly known by those experts that fell within the scope of this SMS. In this step 9 papers were added to the batch. These additions were mainly due to the usage of slightly different terminology, not captured by our automatic search query. The selection of the key terms in the automated search query has to balance coverage with the minimisation of false positives, to ensure the feasibility of the study in terms of scale (e.g. adding an extra key term can easily lead to hundreds of extra papers to analyse). Manually adding...
Table 2: Conferences and journals considered in the study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conferences (11)</th>
<th>Journals (8)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GTC / GPGPU conference</td>
<td>ACM Transactions on Parallel Computing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IEEE Intl. Conference on Parallel Processing</td>
<td>Concurrency and Computation Practice and Experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intl. Conference on Supercomputing</td>
<td>Future Generation Computer Systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intl. European Conference on Parallel and Distributed Computing</td>
<td>IEEE Computing in Science and Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intl. Supercomputing Conference</td>
<td>Journal of Parallel and Distributed Computing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parallel Computing Conference</td>
<td>Journal of Supercomputing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principles and Practice of Parallel Programming</td>
<td>Parallel Computing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIAM Conference on Parallel Processing for Scientific Computing</td>
<td>Scientific Programming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supercomputing Conference</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Candidate primary studies per digital library

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source Name</th>
<th>Number of Studies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>academia.edu</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACM Digital Library</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compendex</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elsevier Science Direct</td>
<td>289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Google Scholar</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IEEE Xplore</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ResearchGate</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Springer Link</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total of articles found: 420

known papers to the batch is a pragmatic way of mitigating the risk of missing important references, while keeping the sample size manageable. Overall, 33 primary studies were selected for data extraction (please consult the companion site [5] for the complete list of resulting selected papers).

3.3. Data extraction and Synthesis

Data Extraction Process. To enhance data consistency, the data extraction process was guided by a template implemented as a shared spreadsheet. A team of 19 experts (the authors of this paper) participated in data extraction directly reading the primary studies selected during the previous stage and answering to the research questions listed in Table 1. Each study has been randomly assigned to one expert. We identified a total of 26 languages, including 14 Domain-Specific Languages, 14 general purpose languages, and 4 domain-specific languages embedded in general purpose languages.

Synthesis of the Information. During this stage, the previously extracted information was cross-reviewed by all experts with the aim of identifying possible clerical errors during previous steps and taking into account the research questions formulated (the studies that referred to the languages used for HPC). After this task, a shared document was created for entering answers to the research questions and referring to the found languages.

3.4. SMS Quality concerns

When conducting an SMS we need to address the following quality concerns:

- Are the inclusion and exclusion criteria described and appropriate? This aspect has been directly addressed during the Selection of the Primary Study stage (Sec. 3.2.2): all the criteria were explicitly defined (see Table 4) and the set of 152 studies at this step was filtered against inclusion and exclusion criteria.

- Does the literature search cover all relevant studies? We addressed this during the Search of Primary Study stage (Sec. 3.2.2) by selecting appropriate keywords with the help of the cHiPSet experts and then complementing the set of papers resulting from our automatic search and subsequent expert opinion-based filtering with a set of papers known by experts, to capture papers that were missed by the automatic search.

- Was the information from the primary studies correctly extracted? Each primary study was inspected by at least one of the authors of this SMS. Although there is no absolute guarantee that important information was not lost, as a safeguard mechanism, a sample of papers were inspected by a second expert. No information loss was detected.

4. Discussion of the Results

4.1. Programming languages for HPC

Throughout this section, the programming languages for data-intensive HPC applications are firstly categorised by Research Question 1 (RQ1), then analysed through their main features with respect to Research Questions 2 – 5 (RQ2 – RQ5).

In addition to the information gathered on the existing languages, several studies have been found regarding libraries and Application Programming Interfaces (API), which were not considered because they are integrated in the languages mentioned throughout this section. Respecting these conditions, at the end of this process, we identified 33 articles, to which corresponded 26 languages.

In [5] (data set companion) it is presented a list of the identified languages and their characteristics. Due to the similarity of the answers given to the research questions, some languages were grouped, for instance, C and C++, or Python and R.
Table 4: Inclusion and Exclusion criteria of the articles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inclusion Criteria</th>
<th>Exclusion Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Study must have addressed HPC research</td>
<td>Irrelevant study that lay outside the core HPC research field</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer reviewed study that had been published in journal, conference and workshop</td>
<td>– Non-peer reviewed study (abstract, tutorial, editorial, slides, talk, tool demonstration, poster, keynote, technical report)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study must be written in English</td>
<td>Study not in English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study must be accessible electronically</td>
<td>Electronically non-accessible study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study is related with Computer science literature &amp; Systems area Article published before 2006</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**RQ1: Which are the categories of languages in use?**

We have categorised the encountered programming languages in four classes:

1. **Domain Specific Language (DSL)**, which is a language adapted to a specific application domain that offers appropriate annotations and abstractions [37, 38, 67];
2. **General Purpose Language (GPL)**, which is a programming language designed to be used in writing software in a wide variety of application domains [38];
3. DSL embedded in another DSL;
4. DSL embedded in a GPL.

As shown in Figure 2, 54% of the languages have been classified as being GPL (14 languages). Please note that 31% of these languages (8 languages) are DSL. The remaining 4 languages were considered DSL embedded in an GPL. Though the study considered that a DSL embedded in another DSL could be found, our analysis did not find any in the domain of data-intensive HPC applications.

**Figure 2: RQ1 – Which are the categories of languages in use?**

**RQ2: What is the nature of the languages for HPC?**

The objective of this research question was to characterise the nature of the encountered languages for HPC. To accomplish this objective several sub research questions were identified and their results are here discussed.

The encountered languages use Virtual Execution Environments such as Java Virtual Machine (JVM) and Distributed Middleware like Hadoop Distributed File System (HDFS) and IBM InfoSphere (RQ 2.2).

The key advantage of the encountered languages is the usability of the language. The ease of configuration, portability, orchestration and performance of the language are the other advantages that are perceived as important. Other advantages referred to were visualisation of user-initiated query results, ease to express constraint problems and enabling high-level parallel programming using skeletons, see Figure 3.

The application domain of the encountered languages is the parallel analysis of Big Data (RQ 2.4).

The main paradigm underlying the encountered languages is Object-Oriented, followed by Functional (see Figure 4).

The encountered languages generally support multiple OS. Some of them require Message Passing Middleware such as Message Passing Interface (MPI) and I/O architectures such as HDFS. Some languages require libraries like Apache Hadoop to support the artifacts created (RQ 2.6).

Concerning tools supporting the languages, compilers are the most well represented support tool, followed by tool suite and interpreters (see Figure 5). IDE’s, simulation and validation tools are comparatively more scarce.

There are some technologies used to create the languages tool suite. These are compiler generators such as IBM InfoSphere Streams, some XML based technologies (e.g. in Java, they used a syntax to describe classes and methods), and some frameworks such as Knowledge Discovery Toolbox (KDT) (RQ 2.8).

Most of the surveyed languages do not target specific hardware (85%). About 40% of the encountered languages target general-purpose multi-core architectures or GPUs (RQ 2.9).

The main purpose of the encountered languages is to implement the solution, followed by the Formalisation of the solution, Formalisation of the requirements of the problem and Data Interpretation (see Figure 6).

Results for the language representation type revealed that there is a concrete syntax for all the encountered languages and the preferred representation type of 76% of them is Textual (see Figure 7).

**RQ3: What are the typical user profiles for the languages?**

Figure 8 displays the distribution of the typical user profiles for the languages. Most of the identified languages are used by end-users, who utilise the language to solve problems. About 16.7% of the languages are used by developers, who utilise the language to create tools/setups/solutions for other users.
The technical knowledge required to use these languages is mainly based on the languages themselves or those where they are embedded, some hardware knowledge, clusters and theoretical background related to the application domains of the language in question. As an example, to use FastFlow we should be accustomed to C++ language, have some knowledge about CPU and theoretical background about Streaming Applications (RQ 3.2).

**RQ4: How effective are the languages?** Effectiveness is articulated in three aspects, addressed by RQ4.1 (success), RQ4.2 (productivity gain), and RQ4.3 (advantage against competitive approaches). Around 88% of the articles reviewed in this study evaluated the corresponding languages for success.

Figure 9 depicts productivity gains brought by the languages studied in this paper based on qualitative and quantitative analysis. Based on quantitative analysis, the most referred productivity gain brought by the reported languages was the easiness to use the language, followed by the learnability. With respect to qualitative analysis, the most referred productivity gain brought by the reported languages was the easiness to use, followed by the lower cognitive overload and the learnability. We may observe that productivity gains brought by the reported languages are mainly estimated using qualitative methods.

The chart in Figure 10 depicts the products’ performance gains brought by the studied languages in this paper. Based on qualitative analysis, the most referred products’ performance gains brought by the reported languages were the computation efficiency and the scalability. With respect to qualitative analysis, the most referred products’ performance gain brought by the reported languages was evolvability/maintainability, followed by scalability. Unlike the productivity gains, the products performance gains brought by the reported languages are mainly estimated using quantitative methods.

According to the statistics, 64% of the articles included an explicit comparison between the reported language and other
competing approaches. About half of the articles included an explicit comparison of the proposed language with respect to distinct settings/ context/ configurations (RQ 4.3).

All metrics were obtained using quantitative methods. The most frequently used metric was the computational time, followed by the lines of code and the satisfaction (see Figure 11).

RQ5: What types of articles are published in the area of programming models for HPC? The scientific journals that published most of articles included in this study are “Future Generation Computer Systems”, “Parallel Computing”, and “Journal of Parallel and Distributed Computing”, as depicted in Figure 12 (RQ 5.1).

Most of these articles were sponsored by public or both public and private funds (RQ 5.2). Each of these articles can be classified as a case study, as an experiment report, or a comparative assessment; we observed that there was a greater occurrence of experience reports; case studies and comparative assessments were found in a similar number, as shown in Figure 13.

5. SMS Validation by HPC Experts

To validate the SMS results that are presented in Section 4, we conducted a survey (in November 2018) with 28 HPC experts involved in the chHiPSet COST action using a questionnaire (see [5]) to which we added, in October 2019, 29 HPC experts which were not involved in that COST action. Participants were recruited through convenience sampling, and contacted directly by the authors of this paper. In total, we received

Table 5: List of the encountered languages in the Systematic Mapping Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain Specific Languages (DSL)</th>
<th>General Purpose Languages (GPL)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Crucible [18]</td>
<td>C/C++ [6, 10, 24, 38, 48, 54, 61]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e-Science Central WFMS [14]</td>
<td>Erlang [66]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liszt [21]</td>
<td>Goal Language supported by RugPlanner [31]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mendeeleeve [17]</td>
<td>Java [6, 15, 45, 46, 48]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PythonR [6, 28, 42]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scout [47]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Selective Embedded Just-In-Time Specialization [43]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SkME-GL [19]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Swift [44, 71]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DSL embedded in GPL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pipeline Composition (PiCo) [53]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spark Streaming and Spark SQL [41]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weaver [12]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
57 filled survey forms.

The majority of respondents have more than 10 years experience in HPC (see Figure 14), and rate their own technical knowledge in HPC languages and tools as good or excellent (Figure 15). We have a fairly balanced sample of HPC framework and tool developers and primary HPC users (see Figure 16). Although most of the respondents work in computer science (including AI), several of them also work in particular application domains, such as Bioinformatics, albeit with a larger dispersion among those domains (see Fig. 17). 11 of the survey answers came from coauthors of this systematic mapping study, 17 from other chipSet members not involved in the SMS, and the remaining 29 from other respondents recruited through convenience sampling by this paper’s co-authors. Hence, the expert sample may be somewhat biased towards computer science professors developing HPC programming frameworks.

Figure 12: Which conferences and journals publish articles about languages for HPC? - RQ5.1

Figure 13: Number of articles reporting each type of research - RQ5.3

Figure 14: Expert sample: Level of experience of working in HPC

Figure 15: Expert sample: Self-estimation of technical knowledge in HPC programming languages/frameworks

Figure 16: Expert sample: HPC Tool Developers vs. Users

Figure 18 shows the list of HPC programming languages, frameworks and tools that the respondents (a) use and (b) know. In the survey the questions had explicitly distinguished between “true” programming languages discussed in Section 4 and non-language programming frameworks (such as, libraries) and other programming tools. From the answers filled in on the survey form, it also became clear that a significant number of respondents do not see any particular difference between language and non-language programming frameworks or at least do not consider that as important in practice. For that reason, we show the answers for both (a) and (b) in the same diagram, using different colours. The three main blocks in Figure 18 coarsely structure more than 100 mentioned programming frameworks and
tools into general-purpose frameworks, domain-specific (esp.,
machine learning) frameworks and tools.

Figure 18 shows high numbers of answers for a few (se-
quential) base-level programming languages of central impor-
tance in data-intensive HPC, including both the traditional HPC
base languages C/C++ (highest score of all) and Fortran (less
frequent) as well as the base languages Python, Java, Scala
and (less frequently) R, which are the most common ones for
use with current Big Data and machine learning programming
frameworks. Among the truly parallel HPC programming frame-
works, MPI dominates as expected together with OpenMP and
(somewhat less frequent) pthreads, but also the GPU program-
ning models CUDA, OpenCL and OpenACC score quite high
numbers of answers. PGAS languages such as UPC, X10 and
Chapel are known to a number of experts in the sample, but
are hardly used by them. The most-used big data and machine
learning programming frameworks among the answering ex-
erts are Hadoop / MapReduce, Spark, TensorFlow and Keras,
though they receive less scores than the traditional parallel pro-
gramming models. A number of skeleton/pattern based parallel
programming frameworks also occur in the list, with FastFlow
and SkePU scoring the largest number of answers. Figure 18
also reveals a “long tail” of many programming frameworks
and tools that were only named by one two persons.

Figure 19 charts the answers by the expert sample on the
question about perceived advantages of the programming frame-
works used. Most answers focused on performance/efficiency,
followed by programmability (easy coding), portability and avail-
ability of features. We also asked for honest answers about
other factors that led to adoption of a certain programming frame-
work. Although only few answered this question, it revealed
factors such as popularity, mandatory use in a project or the use
in teaching parallel programming, see Figure 20.

Comparing Figure 18 with the list of programming frame-
works resulting from the systematic literature study in Table 5,
we can see a number of similarities; for example, the expert
sample confirms the high significance of C++ for the HPC do-
main. In contrast, apart from machine learning frameworks,
other domain-specific languages tend to be more used in spe-
cific niches, as suggested by the lower frequency with which
those languages are referred by our survey respondents. A pos-
sible explanation is that the expert sample answers focus on
tools being used, i.e., mature technology that has been devel-
oped years (sometimes decades) ago, while the literature sam-
ple feeding the SMS results contained quite a number of papers
about more exotic domain-specific programming frameworks
that represent the current front of research in the design and
development of programming frameworks rather than their use
for solving actual HPC and big data application problems.

6. Observations, research challenges and future directions

In this section we summarise our major observations, re-
search challenges and future directions in the domain of HPC
programming languages for Big Data processing.

Major observations based on the reviewed literature:

- General-purpose programming languages are used most frequently (54% of observed cases);
- Majority (that is 76%) of the languages were text-based;
- Usability (Effectiveness, Efficiency, Satisfaction) is con-
sidered the key feature of the used language;
- Simulators, validators or IDEs are not often available;
- About 67% of the language users are end-users;
- 87% of the reviewed literature has provided a kind of lan-
guage evaluation, with majority of the cases using com-
putational time as metric;
- Majority of the reviewed literature reports experiments.

Major observations based on the opinions of HPC experts
that responded to our questionnaire:

- Key features of a HPC programming language for data-
tensive applications are performance / efficiency, pro-
grammability, and availability of tools / libraries;
- C/C++ and Python general-purpose programming lan-
guages are frequently used by HPC experts;
- Most frequently used parallel programming frameworks
by HPC experts are MPI and OpenMP;
- While significant research effort has been invested in PGAS
languages (such as, UPC, X10 and Chapel), they are not
often used in practice;
- Programming models / languages for heterogeneous com-
puting – CUDA, OpenCL and OpenACC – are popular
among HPC experts;
- Apart from machine learning frameworks, other domain-
specific languages tend to be more used in specific niches,
as suggested by the lower frequency with which those
languages are referred by our survey respondents;
Figure 18: Expert sample: HPC programming languages, frameworks and tools used and known
Majority of the HPC experts that responded to our questionnaire develop support tools.

Major challenges and future research directions include:

- Learning curve of the HPC programming languages is a major challenge that needs to be addressed in future;
- Development of IDEs and supporting tools, e.g., simulators and validators, to fill in the current gap in HPC languages.

7. Summary

We performed a systematic mapping study to examine the main paradigms and properties of programming languages used in High-Performance Computing for data-intensive applications. We performed an automated search for articles in eight different digital databases, to select papers published from January 2006 to March 2018. We used a two-step filtering process to select the relevant primary studies. In addition, we also included 9 extra papers that were known among the experts to be relevant for our study. In the end, we conducted data extraction on 33 papers. We identified 26 languages for HPC for data-intensive applications. We provided a comprehensive classification of the languages encountered and their usage and evaluation by different criteria. The majority of the used HPC languages in the context of data-intensive applications are text-based general-purpose programming languages and target the end-user community. Those users, from different application domains, may lack a strong background in computing and HPC technologies. This creates several challenges: the expressiveness of the most commonly used languages, in terms of domain rules, is closer to the solution domain (programming technologies) than to the problem domain (the domain of application) - this mismatch introduces added accidental complexity; usability aspects such as learnability, or programmability, may benefit from the adoption of DSLs. As a complementary form of evaluation, we also performed a survey for collecting opinions from HPC experts on the languages they commonly use for HPC for data-intensive applications. Based on the mapping study outcomes and HPC experts opinions, we found that the key features of HPC programming languages for data-intensive applications are performance/efficiency, programmability, and availability of tools/libraries. This suggests that there is an opportunity for bridging the gap between HPC and its target application domains. One possible way of bridging this gap is to support a wider DSL adoption. DSLs can be as efficient as GPLs, and more accessible to domain experts (increased programmability), as long as robust tool/libraries support is made available to domain experts. However, this requires a stronger investment in developing languages that capture the target domain knowledge and established practices, while leveraging the HPC approaches.

As highlighted by the HPC expert survey (in line with common sense), the durable Message Passing Interface (MPI) standard, with send/receive, broadcast, reduction operators and global synchronisations (barriers), has remained the programming paradigm of choice for over twenty years to construct parallel applications composed of tens to hundreds of thousands of communicating processes. The reason d’être of HPC is, by definition, high performance and a highly optimised MPI code exhibit unparalleled performances because each MPI application, despite its complexity, is conceived as a single program designed on developer-based precise knowledge of the whole code, the partitioning of data and the communication overheads. In the hierarchy of abstractions, this is only slightly above toggling absolute binary in the front panel of the machine. We believe that this approach is unable to effectively scale to support the main-
stream of software development where human productivity, total cost and time to a solution are equally, if not more, important aspects. However, to date, attempts to develop high-level programming abstractions, DSL and environments for HPC have mostly remained in the research labs, and they failed to scale to large scale scientific and industrial applications.
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