

# GOOL: A Generic Object-Oriented Language

(Short Paper)

Brooks MacLachlan  
Department of Computing and  
Software  
McMaster University  
Hamilton, Ontario, Canada  
maclachb@mcmaster.ca

Jacques Carette  
Department of Computing and  
Software  
McMaster University  
Hamilton, Ontario, Canada  
curette@mcmaster.ca

Spencer Smith  
Department of Computing and  
Software  
McMaster University  
Hamilton, Ontario, Canada  
smiths@mcmaster.ca

## Abstract

We present GOOL, a Generic Object-Oriented Language. GOOL shows that with the right abstractions, a language can capture the essence of object-oriented programs. GOOL generates human-readable, documented and idiomatic code in Python, Java, C#, and C++. In it, we can express common programming idioms and patterns.

**CCS Concepts** • **Software and its engineering** → **Source code generation**; *Abstraction, modeling and modularity*; *Object oriented languages*.

**Keywords** Code Generation, Domain Specific Language, Haskell, Documentation

## ACM Reference Format:

Brooks MacLachlan, Jacques Carette, and Spencer Smith. 2020. GOOL: A Generic Object-Oriented Language: (Short Paper). In *Proceedings of ACM SIGPLAN Conference on Programming Languages (PL’20)*. ACM, New York, NY, USA, 7 pages.

## 1 Introduction

Java or C#? As languages, this is close to a non-question: the two are so similar that only ecosystem issues would be the deciding factor. Unlike the question “C or Prolog?”, which is almost non-sensical, as the kinds of applications where each is well-suited are vastly different. But, given a single paradigm, such as Object-Oriented (OO), would it be possible to write a meta-language that captures the essence of writing OO programs? They generally all contain (mutable) variables, statements, conditionals, loops, methods, classes, etc.

OO programs written in different languages appear, superficially, quite dissimilar. But this is mostly due to syntactic differences. Are they so different in the utterances that one can make? Are OO programs akin to sentences in Romance languages (French, Spanish, Portuguese, etc.) which, although syntactically different, are structurally very similar?

This is what we set out to explore. One non-solution is to pick a language and implement a translator to the others. It is feasible — say by engineering a multi-language compiler (such as gcc) to de-compile its Intermediate Representation (IR) into most of its input languages. The end-results would

be wildly unidiomatic; roughly the equivalent of a novice in a (spoken) language “translating” word-by-word.

So we set out to design a meta-language that embodies the common semantic concepts of OO languages, encoded so that the necessary information for translation is present. This language is agnostic of the eventual target language — and free of the idiosyncratic details of any given language. In fact, with proper care, one can go even further and teach the translator about idiomatic patterns of each target language.

Trying to capture all the subtleties of each language is hopeless — akin to capturing the rhythm, puns, metaphors, similes, and cultural allusions of a sublime poem in translation. But programming languages are most often used for much more prosaic tasks: writing programs for getting things done. This is closer to translating technical textbooks, making sure that all of the meaningful material is preserved.

We want to capture the conceptual meaning of OO programs, so as to fully automate the translation from the “conceptual” to human-readable, idiomatic code, in mainstream languages. At some level, this is not new. Domain-Specific Languages (DSLs) are high-level languages with syntax and semantics tailored to a specific domain [17]. A DSL abstracts over the details of “code”, providing notation to specify domain-specific knowledge in a natural manner. DSL implementations often work via translation to a General Purpose programming Language (GPL) for execution. Some generate human-readable code [5, 12, 18, 24]. This is what we do, for the domain of OO programs.

While designing a generic OO language is a worthwhile endeavour, we had a second motive: we needed a means to do exactly that as part of our Drasil project [22, 23]. The idea of Drasil is to generate all the requirements documentation and code from expert-provided domain knowledge. The generated code needs to be human readable so that experts can certify that it matches their requirements. We largely rewrote SAGA [5] to create GOOL<sup>1</sup>. It is implemented as a Haskell embedded DSL (EDSL) that can currently generate code in Python, Java, C#, and C++. Others can be added, with the implementation effort being commensurate to the (semantic) distance to the languages already supported.

<sup>1</sup>Available at <https://github.com/JacquesCarette/Drasil> as a sub-package.

In Section 2, we outline the high-level requirements for GOOL, followed by an outline of the syntax in Section 3, to enable concrete examples. The interesting design details are given in Section 4. How we capture idioms and patterns is in Section 5. We close with a discussion of related work, plans for future improvements and conclusions.

## 2 Requirements

Our requirements are as follows:

- mainstream** Generate code in mainstream OO languages.
- readable** The generated code should be human-readable.
- idiomatic** The generated code should be idiomatic.
- documented** The generated code should be documented.
- patterns** Common OO patterns should be expressible.
- expressivity** The language should be rich enough to express a set of existing OO programs, which act as test cases for the language.
- common** Language commonalities should be abstracted.

Targeting OO languages (**mainstream**) reflects their popularity, thus the most potential users — one reason that the makers of Scala and Kotlin chose to target the JVM to leverage the Java ecosystem, and Typescript for Javascript.

The **readable** requirement is not as obvious. We aim to write high-level OO code once and have it be available in many GPLs. One use case is to generate libraries of functions for a narrow domain. As needs evolve and language popularity changes, it is useful to have it immediately available in a number of languages. We use it to get *extremely well documented* code that would be unrealistic to do by hand, as part of Drasil [22, 23]. **readable** is also a proxy for *understandable*, which is helpful for debugging.

The same underlying reasons for **readable** also drive **idiomatic** and **documented**, as they contribute to the human-understandability of the generated code. **idiomatic** is important as readers would otherwise find the code “foreign”. Documentation spans informal one-liners meant for humans to formal, structured comments for generating API documentation with tools like Doxygen, or static analysis. Readability (and thus understandability) are improved when code is pretty-printed [7]. Thus layout, redundant parentheses, well-chosen variable names, and using a common style with lines that are not too long, are just as useful for generated code as for human-written code. GOOL does not prevent bad code, it just simplifies creating **readable**, **idiomatic** and **documented** code in multiple languages.

The **patterns** requirement is typical of DSLs: common idioms can be reified into a linguistic form instead of being informal. Even some of the *design patterns* of [10] can become part of the language. This makes writing some OO code even easier in GOOL than in GPLs, but it also helps keep GOOL language-agnostic and facilitates generating idiomatic code.

**expressivity** is about GOOL capturing the ideas contained in OO programs. We test GOOL against real-world

examples from the Drasil project, such as software for determining whether glass withstands a nearby explosion and software for simulating projectile motion.

The last requirement (**common**) that language commonalities be abstracted, is internal: we noticed too much code duplication in our initial backends.

## 3 Creating GOOL

To create a “generic” OO language, we chose an incremental abstraction approach: start from programs written in two different languages, and unify them *conceptually*. We abstract from concrete programs, not just for **expressivity**, but also because that is our “domain”. Although what can be said in any given OO language is quite broad, what we *actually want to say* is often much more restricted. And what we *need to say* is often even more concise. For example, Java offers introspection features, but C++ doesn’t, so abstracting from portable OO will not feature introspection (although generating idiomatic Java may do so). C++ templates are different: while other languages do not necessarily have comparable meta-programming features, it is not only feasible but easy to provide template-like features in GOOL, as well as some partial evaluation. Thus we do not need to generate templates. We are trying to abstract over the fundamental ideas expressed via OO programs, rather than abstracting over the languages. We believe the end result captures the essence of OO programs. Some features, such as static types, which is not a feature of Python but required in Java, will be present as doing full type inference is unrealistic.

Some features of OO programs are not operational: comments and formatting decisions amongst them. To us, programs are a bidirectional means of communication; they must be valid and executable, but also readable and understandable by humans. Generating code for interpretation by machines is well understood, but generating code for human consumption has been given less attention. We paid close attention to readability features — such as when programmers write long methods, they write them as blocks separated by blank lines, often with comments. Thus in GOOL, bodies are not just a sequence of statements, but a list of blocks, to represent the actual structure of OO programs.

The GOOL language is shown in Table 1. We distinguish a variable from its value<sup>2</sup>, motivated by semantic considerations; it is beneficial for stricter typing and enables convenient syntax for **patterns** for more idiomatic code.

We might eventually give GOOL its own external syntax, but for now it works well as a Haskell EDSL, especially as part of Drasil. We can, with judicious use of smart constructors, somewhat mimic the syntax of OO languages. We also use smart constructors for common idioms, like `privMVar` to denote a private dynamic state variable, and `pubClass` for a public class. Note that many of the constructs (see Table 1)

<sup>2</sup>as befits the use-mention distinction from analytic philosophy

**Table 1.** The GOOL Language - brackets indicate shortcuts for common cases

Types	bool, int, float, char, string, infile (read mode), outfile (write mode), listType, obj
Variables	var, extVar, classVar, objVar, \$-> (infix operator for objVar), self, [listVar]
Values	valueOf (value from variable), litTrue, litFalse, litInt, litFloat, litChar, litString, ?!, ?&&, ?<, ?<=, ?>, ?>=, ?==, ?!=, #~, #/^, # , #+, #-, #*, #/, #^, inlineIf, funcApp, extFuncApp, newObj, objMethodCall, [selfFuncApp, objMethodCallNoParams]
Statements	varDec, varDecDef, assign, &=, &+=, &-=, &++, &~, break, continue, returnState, throw, free, comment, ifCond, ifNoElse, switch, for, forRange, forEach, while, tryCatch, block, body [bodyStatements (single-block body), oneLiner (single-statement body)]
List API	listAccess, at (same as listAccess), listSet, listAppend, listIndexExists, indexOf, listSlice
Scope	public, private
Binding	static_, dynamic_
Functions	function, method, param, pointerParam, mainFunction, docFunc, [pubMethod, privMethod]
State Variables	stateVar, constVar, [privMVar, pubMVar (dynamic), pubGVar (static)]
Classes	buildClass, docClass, [pubClass, privClass]
Packages	buildModule, fileDoc, docMod, prog, package, doxConfig, makefile

have doc versions. We can also generate Makefiles and Doxygen config files.

## 4 GOOL Implementation

There are three standard methods of encoding EDSLs in Haskell: deep (a set of GADTs), shallow (a set of functions), or “finally tagless” (a set of methods in classes). GOOL uses a “sophisticated” version of tagless [8] involving *type families*.

Tagless encodes a language as a generalized *fold* over any *representation* of the language. Thus what look like GOOL “keywords” are actually methods, typically instantiated to language renderers, but also to static analysis passes. By using *type families*, each instance can choose different underlying data structures for GOOL’s types. For example the C++ instance stores destructor statements with state variables, which is not needed by the other languages. GOOL is defined by 328 methods across a hierarchy of 43 classes (see Figure 2), grouped by functionality — it is not a small language!


For example, here is part of the class for variables:

```
class (TypeSym repr) => VariableSym repr where
  type Variable repr
  var :: Label -> repr (Type repr)
      -> repr (Variable repr)
```

As variables are typed, their representation must be too and thus that capability (the TypeSym class) is a constraint. The *associated type* type Variable repr is a representation-dependent type-level function. Each instance can define its own representation of what a Variable is.

We have defined 300 functions that abstract over **commonalities** between target languages, making writing new renderers fairly straightforward. GOOL’s Java and C# renderers show this: out of the 328 total methods, 229 are shared. That is 40% more common instances than between Python

and Java, for example. A further 37 are partially shared — they call the same common function but with different parameters. The numbers of common methods between each pair of renderers are shown in Figure 1. Python is the least similar to the other languages, whereas C# has the most in common. 143 methods are the same between all 4 target languages (which possibly means they should be generic functions rather than methods).

**Figure 1.** Number of common methods between renderers

## 5 Idioms and Patterns

### 5.1 Idioms

**Command line arguments** Accessing these differs significantly across languages. Thus we abstract over the details through an `argList` that represents the list of arguments, with a dedicated API.

**Lists** As with command line arguments, list APIs vary considerably. We thus reverse engineer the “useful” API for lists




Figure 2. Dependency graph of all of GOOL's type classes

from actual use cases. Lists in OO languages are rarely *linked lists* (unlike Haskell), but more like dynamically sized vectors. In particular, indexing a list by position, which is a horrifying idea for linked lists, is extremely common. The result is a small set of functions and statements, shown in Table 1 on the line labelled *List API*.

List slicing (the `listSlice` statement) is interesting as the code it generates varies a lot by language. For example

```
listSlice someAges (valueOf ages) (Just $ litInt 1)
      (Just $ litInt 3) Nothing
```

in Python is rendered as:

```
someAges = ages [1:3]
```

while in Java it is

```
ArrayList<Double> temp = new ArrayList<Double>(0);
for (int i_temp = 1; i_temp < 3; i_temp++) {
    temp.add(ages.get(i_temp));
}
someAges = temp;
```

Idiomatic code generation is enabled by having appropriate high-level information driving the generation.

**Printing** is also target dependent. Again Python is more “expressive” so that printing a list (via `println ages`) generates `print(ages)`, but in other languages we must generate a loop. There is also similar functionality for reading input.

**Procedures with I/O/B parameters** Our hand-written target codes had methods that used their parameters differently: as inputs, outputs, or both. This is a *semantic* pattern that is not necessarily obvious in any of the implementations. Once noticed, we created an encoding of that information to generate better, more idiomatic code. Concretely, the following Python code

```
def applyDiscount(price, discount):
    price = price - discount
    isAffordable = price < 20
```

```
    return price, isAffordable
```

can be captured in GOOL with the `inOutFunc` idiom:

```
inOutFunc "applyDiscount" public static_
  [discount] [isAffordable] [price]
  (bodyStatements [
    price &-= valueOf discount,
    isAffordable &= valueOf price ?< litFloat 20.0])
```

We can produce the following C#

```
public static void applyDiscount(ref int price, \
  int discount, out Boolean isAffordable) {
    price = price - discount;
    isAffordable = price < 20;
```



```

}
and C++
void applyDiscount(int &price, \
    int discount, bool &isAffordable) {
    price = price - discount;
    isAffordable = price < 20;
}

```

to capture the same idea. The Java version (not shown) is more awkward. A natural task-level “feature” — different kinds of parameters — ends up being rendered differently, but hopefully idiomatically, in each target language. GOOL manages the tedious aspects of generating any needed variable declarations and return statements. To call an `inOutFunc` function, one must use `inOutCall` so that GOOL can “line up” all the pieces properly.

**Getters and setters** are common in OO programs (regardless of whether these actually achieve encapsulation), and mechanical to write. In GOOL, `getMethod "FooClass" foo` and `setMethod "FooClass" foo` are sufficient to generate that code, which can be called with `get` and `set`, and yet abstracts over the idiosyncracies of each target language.

**Design Patterns** GOOL currently handles three design patterns: Observer, State, and Strategy [10].

For Strategy, we ensure that the set of strategies that will be used are statically known at generation time, and then generate code only for those that will be used. `runStrategy` is the user-facing function.

For Observer, `initObserverList` generates an observer, given a list of initial values; it generates a declaration of an observer list variable, initially containing the given values. `addObserver` can be used to add a value to the observer list, and `notifyObservers` will call a method on each of the observers. Currently, the name of the observer list variable is fixed, so there can only be one observer list in a given scope.

The State pattern is specialized to *Finite State Machines* with fairly general transition functions. Transitions happen on checking, not on changing the state. `initState` takes a name and a state label and generates a declaration of a variable. `changeState` changes the state of the variable. `checkState` is more complex: it takes the name of the state variable, a list of value-body pairs, and a fallback body; it generates a conditional (usually a switch statement) that checks the state and runs the corresponding body, or the fallback body, if none of the states match.

The design patterns could have been coded in GOOL, but having these as language features is useful for two reasons: 1) the GOOL-level code is clearer in its intent (and more concise), and 2) the resulting code can be more idiomatic.

Figure 3 shows a larger example. The recommended style is to name all strings (to avoid hard-to-debug typos) and variables, then write the code proper.

```

patternTest :: (MethodSym repr) => repr (Method repr)
patternTest = let      fsmName = "myFSM"
    offState = "Off"    onState = "On"
    noState = "Neither" obsName = "Observer"
    obs1Name = "obs1"   obs2Name = "obs2"
    printNum = "printNum" nName = "n"
    obsType = obj obsName
    n = var n int
    obs1 = var obs1Name obsType
    obs2 = var obs2Name obsType
    newObs = extNewObj obsName obsType [] in

mainFunction (body [block [
    varDec n,

    initState fsmName offState,
    changeState fsmName onState,
    checkState fsmName
    [( litString offState , oneLiner $ printStrLn offState ),
      ( litString onState, oneLiner $ printStrLn onState)]
    (oneLiner $ printStrLn noState)],

    block [
        varDecDef obs1 newObs,
        varDecDef obs2 newObs],

    block [
        initObserverList obsType [valueOf obs1],
        addObserver $ valueOf obs2,
        notifyObservers (func printNum void []) obsType]])

```

Figure 3. GOOL sample code

## 6 Related Work

### 6.1 General-purpose Code Generation

**Haxe** [3] is a general-purpose multi-paradigm language and cross-platform compiler. It compiles to all of the languages GOOL does, and many others. However, it is designed as a more traditional programming language, and does not offer the high-level abstractions that GOOL provides. Furthermore Haxe strips comments and generates source code around a custom framework; the effort of learning this framework and the lack of comments makes the generated code not particularly readable. The internal organization of Haxe does not seem to be well documented.

**Protokit** [14] is a DSL and code generator for Java and C++, where the generator is designed to produce general-purpose imperative or object-oriented code. The Protokit generator is model-driven and uses a final “output model”

from which actual code can be generated. Since the “output model” is quite similar to the generated code, it presented challenges with regards to semantic, conventional, and library-related differences between the target languages [14]. GOOL’s design helps overcome differences between target languages.

**ThingML** [11] is a DSL for model-driven engineering targeting C, C++, Java, and JavaScript. It is specialized to deal with distributed reactive systems (a nevertheless broad range of application domains). This means that it is not quite a general-purpose DSL, unlike GOOL. ThingML’s modelling-related syntax and abstractions stand in contrast to GOOL’s object-oriented syntax and abstractions. The generated code lacks some of the pretty-printing provided by GOOL, specifically indentation, which detracts from readability.

## 6.2 Object-oriented generators

There are code generators which multiple target OO languages, but all are domain-specific.

**Google protocol buffers** [2] is a DSL for serializing structured data, which can be compiled into Java, Python, Objective C, and C++. **Thrift** [20] is a Facebook-developed tool for generating code in multiple languages and even multiple paradigms based on language-neutral descriptions of data types and interfaces. **Clearwater** [21] is an approach for implementing DSLs with multiple target languages for components of distributed systems. The **Time Weaver** tool [9] uses a multi-language code generator to generate “glue” code for real-time embedded systems. The domain of mobile applications is host to a bevy of DSLs with multiple target languages, of which **MobDSL** [15] and **XIS-Mobile** [19] are two examples. **Conjure** [1] is a DSL for generating APIs. It reads YML descriptions of APIs and can generate code in Java, TypeScript, Python, and Rust.

## 6.3 Design Patterns

A number of languages for modeling design patterns have been developed. The **Design Pattern Modeling Language** (DPML) [16] is similar to the Unified Modeling Language (UML) but designed specifically to overcome UML’s shortcomings. DPML consists of both specification diagrams and instance diagrams for instantiations of design patterns, but does not attempt to generate actual source code. The **Role-Based Metamodeling Language** [13] is also based on UML but with changes to allow for better models of design patterns, with specifications for the structure, interactions, and state-based behaviour in patterns. Again, source code generation is not attempted. Another metamodel for design patterns includes generation of Java code [4]. IBM developed a DSL in the form of a visual user interface for generation of OO code based on design patterns [6]. The languages that generate code do so only for design patterns, not for any general-purpose code, as GOOL does.

## 7 Future Work

Currently GOOL code is typed based on what it represents: variable, value, type, or method, for example. The type system does not go “deeper”, so that values (such as booleans and strings) are simply “values”. This is sufficient to allow us to generate well-formed code, but not to ensure that it is well-typed. We have started to statically type GOOL.

We also want to improve the generated import statements, via tracking actual dependencies on features used. In general, we can do various kinds of static analyses to enhance the code generation quality, such as being more precise about throws `Exception` in Java.

We also want to interface with external libraries, such as a variety of ODE solvers, since Drasil currently focuses on scientific applications. The API for available solvers varies considerably, so we will need to change the “shape” of generated code depending on the user’s choice.

Some implementation decisions, such as representing lists in Java as `ArrayList`, are hard-coded. But we could have used `Vector` instead. We would like such a choice to be user-controlled. Another such decision point is to allow users to choose which specific external library to use.

## 8 Conclusion

We currently successfully use GOOL to simultaneously generate code in all of our target languages for the glass and projectile programs described in Section 2.

Conceptually, mainstream object-oriented languages are similar enough that it is indeed feasible to create a single “generic” object-oriented language that can be “compiled” to them. Of course, these languages are syntactically quite different in places, and each contains some unique ideas as well. In other words, there exists a “conceptual” object-oriented language that is more than just “pseudocode”: it is a full-fledged executable language that captures the common essence of mainstream OO languages.

GOOL is an unusual DSL, as its “domain” is actually that of object-oriented programs. More precisely, of conceptual programs that can be easily written in languages containing a procedural core with an object-oriented layer on top — which is what Java, Python, C++, and C# are.

Since we are capturing *conceptual programs*, we can achieve several things that we believe are *together* new:

- generation of idiomatic code for each target language,
- turning coding patterns into language idioms,
- generation of human-readable, well-documented code.

We must also re-emphasize this last point: that for GOOL, the generated code is meant for human consumption as well as for computer consumption. This is why semantically meaningless concepts such as “blocks” exist: to be able to chunk code into pieces meaningful for the human reader, and provide documentation at that level as well.

## References

- [1] [n. d.]. Conjure: a code-generator for multi-language HTTP/JSON clients and servers. <https://palantir.github.io/conjure/#/> Accessed 2019-09-16.
- [2] [n. d.]. Google Protocol Buffers. <https://developers.google.com/protocol-buffers/> Accessed 2019-09-16.
- [3] [n. d.]. Haxe - The cross-platform toolkit. <https://haxe.org> Accessed 2019-09-13.
- [4] Hervé Albin-Amiot and Yann-Gaël Guéhéneuc. 2001. Meta-modeling design patterns: Application to pattern detection and code synthesis. In *Proceedings of ECOOP Workshop on Automating Object-Oriented Software Development Methods*.
- [5] Lucas Beyak and Jacques Carette. 2011. SAGA: A DSL for story management. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1109.0776* (2011).
- [6] Frank J. Budinsky, Marilyn A. Finnie, John M. Vlissides, and Patsy S. Yu. 1996. Automatic code generation from design patterns. *IBM systems Journal* 35, 2 (1996), 151–171.
- [7] Raymond PL Buse and Westley R Weimer. 2009. Learning a metric for code readability. *IEEE Transactions on Software Engineering* 36, 4 (2009), 546–558.
- [8] Jacques Carette, Oleg Kiselyov, and Chung-chieh Shan. 2009. Finally tagless, partially evaluated: Tagless staged interpreters for simpler typed languages. *Journal of Functional Programming* 19, 5 (2009), 509–543.
- [9] Dionisio de Niz and Raj Rajkumar. 2004. Glue code generation: Closing the loophole in model-based development. In *10th IEEE Real-Time and Embedded Technology and Applications Symposium (RTAS 2004). Workshop on Model-Driven Embedded Systems*. Citeseer.
- [10] Erich Gamma. 1995. *Design patterns: elements of reusable object-oriented software*. Pearson Education India.
- [11] Nicolas Harrand, Franck Fleurey, Brice Morin, and Knut Eilif Husa. 2016. Thingml: a language and code generation framework for heterogeneous targets. In *Proceedings of the ACM/IEEE 19th International Conference on Model Driven Engineering Languages and Systems*. ACM, 125–135.
- [12] Sungpack Hong, Hassan Chafi, Edic Sedlar, and Kunle Olukotun. 2012. Green-Marl: a DSL for easy and efficient graph analysis. *ACM SIGARCH Computer Architecture News* 40, 1 (2012), 349–362.
- [13] Dae-Kyoo Kim, Robert France, Sudipto Ghosh, and Eunjee Song. 2003. A uml-based metamodeling language to specify design patterns. In *Proceedings of Workshop on Software Model Engineering (WiSME)*, at UML 2003. Citeseer.
- [14] Gábor Kövesdán and László Lengyel. 2017. Multi-Platform Code Generation Supported by Domain-Specific Modeling. *International Journal of Information Technology and Computer Science* 9, 12 (2017), 11–18.
- [15] Dean Kramer, Tony Clark, and Samia Oussena. 2010. MobDSL: A Domain Specific Language for multiple mobile platform deployment. In *2010 IEEE International Conference on Networked Embedded Systems for Enterprise Applications*. IEEE, 1–7.
- [16] David Mapelsden, John Hosking, and John Grundy. 2002. Design pattern modelling and instantiation using DPML. In *Proceedings of the Fortieth International Conference on Tools Pacific: Objects for internet, mobile and embedded applications*. Australian Computer Society, Inc., 3–11.
- [17] Marjan Mernik, Jan Heering, and Anthony M Sloane. 2005. When and how to develop domain-specific languages. *ACM computing surveys (CSUR)* 37, 4 (2005), 316–344.
- [18] Arjan J Mooij, Jozef Hooman, and Rob Albers. 2013. Gaining industrial confidence for the introduction of domain-specific languages. In *2013 IEEE 37th Annual Computer Software and Applications Conference Workshops*. IEEE, 662–667.
- [19] André Ribeiro and Alberto Rodrigues da Silva. 2014. Xis-mobile: A dsl for mobile applications. In *Proceedings of the 29th Annual ACM Symposium on Applied Computing*. ACM, 1316–1323.
- [20] Mark Slee, Aditya Agarwal, and Marc Kwiatkowski. 2007. Thrift: Scalable cross-language services implementation. *Facebook White Paper* 5, 8 (2007).
- [21] Galen S Swint, Calton Pu, Gueyoung Jung, Wenchang Yan, Younggyun Koh, Qinyi Wu, Charles Consel, Akhil Sahai, and Koichi Moriyama. 2005. Clearwater: extensible, flexible, modular code generation. In *Proceedings of the 20th IEEE/ACM international Conference on Automated software engineering*. ACM, 144–153.
- [22] Daniel Szymczak, W. Spencer Smith, and Jacques Carette. 2016. Position Paper: A Knowledge-Based Approach to Scientific Software Development. In *Proceedings of SE4Science'16 in conjunction with the International Conference on Software Engineering (ICSE)*. In conjunction with ICSE 2016, Austin, Texas, United States. 4 pp.
- [23] Drasil Team. 2019. Drasil Software: Generate All The Things (Focusing on Scientific Software). <https://github.com/JacquesCarette/Drasil>.
- [24] Daniel C Wang, Andrew W Appel, Jeffrey L Korn, and Christopher S Serra. 1997. The Zephyr Abstract Syntax Description Language.. In *DSL*, Vol. 97. 17–17.