

# Transforming Javascript event-loop into a scalable pipeline

Etienne Brodu  
etienne.brodu@insa-lyon.fr  
Université de Lyon, INRIA,  
INSA-Lyon, CITI-INRIA, F-69621,  
Villeurbanne, France

Stéphane Frénot  
stephane.frenot@insa-lyon.fr  
Université de Lyon, INRIA,  
INSA-Lyon, CITI-INRIA, F-69621,  
Villeurbanne, France

Frédéric Oblé  
frederic.oble@worldline.com  
Worldline  
Bât. Le Mirage, 53 avenue Paul  
Krüger  
69624 Villeurbanne Cedex

## ABSTRACT

The development of a web application often starts with a feature-oriented approach allowing to quickly react to users feedbacks. However, this approach poorly scales in performance. Yet, the audience of a web application can increase by an order of magnitude in a matter of hours. This first approach is unable to deal with the higher connections spikes. It leads the development team to adopt a scalable approach often linked to new development paradigm such as dataflow programming. This represents a disruptive and continuity-threatening shift of technology. To avoid this shift, we propose to abstract the feature-oriented development into a more scalable high-level language. Indeed, reasoning on this high-level language allows to dynamically cope with audience growth and decrease.

We propose a compilation approach that transforms a Javascript, single-threaded web application into a network of small independent parts communicating by message streams. We named these parts *fluxions*, by contraction between a flow<sup>1</sup> and a function. The dynamic reorganization of these parts in a cluster of machine can help an application to deal with its load in a similar way network routers do with IP traffic. We evaluate this approach by applying the compiler to real web applications. We successfully transform a web application to parallelize the execution of an independent part and present the results.

## Categories and Subject Descriptors

Software and its engineering [Software notations and tools]: Compilers—*Runtime environments*

## General Terms

Compilation, dataflow, code transformation

## Keywords

Flow programming, Web, Javascript

1. flux in french

## 1. INTRODUCTION

The growth of web platforms is partially due to Internet's capacity to allow very quick releases of a minimal viable product (MVP). In a matter of hours, it is possible to release a prototype and start gathering a user community. “*Release early, release often*”, and “*Fail fast*” are the punchlines of the web entrepreneurial community. It is crucial for the prosperity of such project to quickly validate that the proposed solution meets the needs of its users. Indeed, the lack of market need is the number one reason for startup failure<sup>2</sup>. That is why the development team quickly concretises an MVP using a feature-driven approach and iterates on it.

If the service successfully complies with users requirements, its community might grow with its popularity. The service needs to be scalable to be able to respond to this growth. However, feature-based development best practices are hardly compatible with the requirement of scalability. The features are bundled in modules which spread through the code base. This organization in modules overlaps and disturbs the organization of a scalable execution. Eventually this growth requires to discard the initial approach to adopt a more efficient processing model. Many of the most efficient models decompose applications into execution units, disregarding the initial feature oriented approach. This decomposition may be spread over a cluster of commodity machines [8]. MapReduce [6] and the Staged Event-driven Architecture (SEDA) [18] are famous examples of that trend. Once split, the service parts are connected by an asynchronous messaging system. Many tools have been developed to express and manage these service parts and their communications. We can cite Spark [20], MillWheel [2], Timestream [15], Naiad [12] and Storm [16], and many others. However, these tools are in disruption from the initial approach. It requires the development team either to be trained or to hire experts, and more importantly, to start over the initial code base. This shift causes the development team to spend development resources in background without adding visible value for the users. It is a risk for the evolution of the project as the number two and three reasons for startup failures are running out of cash, and missing the right competences<sup>2</sup>.

The risks described above come from a disruption between the two levels of application expression, the feature level and the execution level. To lift these risks, we propose a tool to identify the alignment between the two levels, so as to allow a continuous transition from one to the other and back. We focus on web applications driven by users requests, develop-

2. <https://www.cbinsights.com/blog/startup-failure-post-mortem/>

ped in Javascript using the *Node.js* execution environment.

Javascript is increasingly used to develop web applications. It is the most used language on Github<sup>3</sup> and StackOverflow<sup>4</sup>. We think that it is possible to analyze this type of application as a stream of requests, passing through a pipeline of stages. Indeed, the event-loop used in *Node.js* is very similar to a pipeline architecture. We propose a compiler to transform a Javascript application into a network of autonomous parts communicating by message streams. We named these parts *fluxions*, by contraction between a flux and a function. We are interested in the problems arising from the isolation of the global memory into these fluxions. We present an early version of this tool as a proof of concept for this compilation approach. We start by describing in section 2 the execution environment targeted by this compiler. Then, we present the compiler in section 3, and its evaluation in section 4. We compare our work with related works in section 5. And finally, we conclude this paper.

## 2. FLUXIONAL EXECUTION MODEL

In this section, we present an execution model to provide scalability to web applications. To achieve this, the execution model provides a granularity of parallelism at the function level. Functions are encapsulated in autonomous execution containers with their state, so as to be reallocated and executed in parallel. This execution model is close to the actors model, as the execution containers are independent and communicate by messages. The communications are assimilated to stream of messages, similarly to the dataflow programming model. It allows to reason on the throughput of these streams, and to react to load increases.

The fluxional execution model executes programs written in our high-level fluxionnal language, whose grammar is presented in figure 1. An application  $\langle \text{program} \rangle$  is partitioned into parts encapsulated in autonomous execution containers named *fluxions*  $\langle \text{flx} \rangle$ . In the following paragraphs, we present the *fluxions*. Then we present the messaging system to carry the communications between *fluxions*. Finally, we present an example application using this execution model.

### 2.1 Fluxions

A *fluxion*  $\langle \text{flx} \rangle$  is named by a unique identifier  $\langle \text{id} \rangle$  to receive messages, and might be part of one or more groups indicated by tags  $\langle \text{tags} \rangle$ . A *fluxion* is composed of a processing function  $\langle \text{fn} \rangle$ , and a local memory called a *context*  $\langle \text{ctx} \rangle$ . At a message reception, the *fluxion* modifies its *context*, and sends messages on its output streams  $\langle \text{streams} \rangle$  to downstream *fluxions*. The *context* handles the state on which a *fluxion* relies between two message receptions. In addition to message passing, the execution model allows *fluxions* to communicate by sharing state between their *contexts*. The fluxions that needs to synchronize together are grouped with the same tag, and loose their independence.

There is two types of streams, *start* and *post*, which corresponds to the nature of the rupture point yielding the stream. We differentiates the two types with two different arrows, double arrow ( $\Rightarrow$  or  $\gg$ ) for *start* rupture points and simple arrow ( $\rightarrow$  or  $\rightarrow$ ) for *post* rupture points. The two different type of rupture points are further detailed in section 3.1.1.

3. <http://github.info/>

4. <http://stackoverflow.com/tags>

$\langle \text{program} \rangle$	$\models$	$\langle \text{flx} \rangle \mid \langle \text{flx} \rangle \text{ eol } \langle \text{program} \rangle$
$\langle \text{flx} \rangle$	$\models$	$\text{flx } \langle \text{id} \rangle \langle \text{tags} \rangle \langle \text{ctx} \rangle \text{ eol } \langle \text{streams} \rangle \text{ eol } \langle \text{fn} \rangle$
$\langle \text{tags} \rangle$	$\models$	$\& \langle \text{list} \rangle \mid \text{empty string}$
$\langle \text{streams} \rangle$	$\models$	$\text{null} \mid \langle \text{stream} \rangle \mid \langle \text{stream} \rangle \text{ eol } \langle \text{streams} \rangle$
$\langle \text{stream} \rangle$	$\models$	$\langle \text{type} \rangle \langle \text{dest} \rangle [\langle \text{msg} \rangle]$
$\langle \text{dest} \rangle$	$\models$	$\langle \text{list} \rangle$
$\langle \text{ctx} \rangle$	$\models$	$\{ \langle \text{list} \rangle \}$
$\langle \text{msg} \rangle$	$\models$	$[ \langle \text{list} \rangle ]$
$\langle \text{list} \rangle$	$\models$	$\langle \text{id} \rangle \mid \langle \text{id} \rangle, \langle \text{list} \rangle$
$\langle \text{type} \rangle$	$\models$	$\gg \mid \rightarrow$
$\langle \text{id} \rangle$	$\models$	<i>Identifier</i>
$\langle \text{fn} \rangle$	$\models$	<i>imperative language and stream syntax</i>

Figure 1: Syntax of a high-level language to represent a program in the fluxionnal form

### 2.2 Messaging system

The messaging system assures the stream communications between fluxions. It carries messages based on the names of the recipient fluxions. After the execution of a fluxion, it queues the resulting messages for the event loop to process.

The execution cycle of an example fluxional application is illustrated in figure 2. The source code for this application is in listing 1 and the fluxional code for this application is in listing 2. In figure 2, circles represent registered fluxions. The fluxion *reply* has a context containing the variable count. The plain arrows represent the actual message paths in the messaging system, while the dashed arrows between fluxions represent the message streams as seen in the fluxionnal application.

The *main* fluxion is the first fluxion in the flow. It never receives any message, but when the application receives a request, the *main* fluxion triggers the flow with a *start* message, ②. This first message is to be received by the next fluxion *handler*, ③ and ④. The fluxion *handler* sends back a message, ⑤, to be enqueued, ⑥. The system loops through steps ③ through ⑥ until the queue is empty. This cycle starts again for each new incoming request causing another *start* message.

### 2.3 Service example

To illustrate the fluxional execution model, and the compiler, we present an example of a simple web application. This application reads a file, and sends it back along with a request counter.

The original source code of this application is available in listing 1<sup>5</sup>. In this source code, some points are worth noticing. The handler function, line 5 to 11, receives the input stream of request. The count variable at line 3 increments the request counter. This object needs to be persisted in the fluxion *context*. The *template* function simply formats the output stream to send back to the client. The *app.get* and *res.send* functions, respectively line 5 and 8, interface the application with the clients. And between these two interface functions is a chain of three functions to process the client requests : *app.get*  $\Rightarrow$  *handler*  $\rightarrow$  *reply*.

1 `var app = require('express')(),`

5. The listings are also available on github[5].




Figure 2: The fluxionnal execution model in details

```

2   fs = require('fs'),
3   count = 0;
4
5   app.get('/', function handler(req, res){
6     fs.readFile(__filename, function reply(err, data) {
7       count += 1;
8       res.send(err || template(count, data));
9     });
10  });
11
12  app.listen(8080);

```

Listing 1: Example web application

This application is transformed into the high-level fluxional language in listing 2 which is illustrated in Figure 2.

The application is organized as follow. The flow of requests is received from the clients by the fluxion `main`, it continues in the fluxion `handler`, and finally go through the fluxion `reply` to be send back to the clients. The fluxions `main` and `reply` have the tag `network`. This tag indicates their dependency over the network interface, because they received the response from and send it back to the clients. The fluxion `handler` has the tag `isolated`, it doesn't have any dependencies, hence it can be distributed on an isolated event-loop.

The last fluxion, `reply`, depends on its context to holds the variable `count` and the function `template`. It also depends on the variable `res` created by the first fluxion, `main`. This variable is carried by the stream through the chain of fluxion until the fluxion `reply` that depends on it. This variable holds the references to the network sockets. It is the variable the `group network` depends on.

Moreover, if the last fluxion, `reply`, did not had a context, the `group network` would be stateless. The whole group could be replicated as many time as needed.

This execution model allows to parallelize the execution of

an application. Some parts are arranged in pipeline, like the fluxion `handler`, some other parts are replicated, like could be the `group network`. This parallelization improves the scalability of the application. Indeed, as a fluxion contains its state and expresses its dependencies, it can be migrated. It allows to adapt the number of fluxions per core to adjust the resource usage in function of the desired throughput.

Our goal, as described in the introduction, is not to propose a new programming paradigm with this high-level language but to automate the architecture shift. We present the compiler to automate this architecture shift in the next section.

```

1  flx main & network
2  >> handler [res]
3  var app = require('express')(),
4  fs = require('fs'),
5  count = 0;
6
7  app.get('/', >> handler);
8  app.listen(8080);
9
10 flx handler & isolated
11 -> reply [res]
12 function handler(req, res) {
13   fs.readFile(__filename, -> reply);
14 }
15
16 flx reply & network {count, template}
17 -> null
18 function reply(error, data) {
19   count += 1;
20   res.send(err || template(count, data));
21 }

```

Listing 2: Example application expressed in the high-level fluxional language

### 3. FLUXIONNAL COMPILER

The source languages we focus on should present higher-order functions and be implemented as an event-loop with a global memory. Javascript is such a language : it doesn't require an event-loop implementation, but it is often implemented that way. *Node.js* is an example of such an implementation. We developed a compiler that transforms a *Node.js* application into a fluxional application compliant with the execution model described in section 2.




Figure 3: Compilation chain

The chain of compilation is described in figure 3. From the source of a *Node.js* application, the compiler extracts an Abstract Syntax Tree (AST). From this AST, the analyzer step identifies the limits of the different application parts and how they relate to form a pipeline. This first step outputs a pipeline representation of the application. Section 3.1 explains this first compilation step. In the pipeline representation, the stages are not yet independent and encapsulated into fluxions. From the AST, `escope` produces a representation of the memory scopes. The `pipeliner` step analyzes the pipeline representation and the scopes representation to

distribute the shared memory into independent groups of fluxions. Section 3.2 explains this second compilation step.

### 3.1 Analyzer step

The limit between two application parts is defined by a rupture point. The analyzer identifies these rupture points, and outputs a representation of the application in a pipeline form, with application parts as the stages, and rupture points as the message streams of this pipeline.

#### 3.1.1 Rupture points

A rupture point is a call of a loosely coupled function. It is an asynchronous call without subsequent synchronization with the caller. In *Node.js*, I/O operations are asynchronous functions and indicates such rupture point between two application parts. Figure 4 shows an example of a rupture point with the execution of the two application parts isolated into fluxions. The two application parts are the caller of the asynchronous function call on one hand, and the callback provided to the asynchronous function call on the other hand.

A callback is a function passed as a parameter to a function call. It is invoked by the callee to continue the execution with data not available in the caller context. We distinguish three kinds of callbacks, but only two are asynchronous : listeners and continuations. Similarly, there is two types of rupture points, respectively *start* and *post*.

**Start rupture points** are indicated by listeners. They are on the border between the application and the outside, continuously receiving incoming user requests. An example of a start rupture point is in listing 1, between the call to `app.get()`, and its listener handler. These rupture points indicate the input of a data stream in the program, and the beginning of a chain of fluxions to process this stream.

**Post rupture points** are indicated by continuations. They represent a continuity in the execution flow after an asynchronous operation yielding a unique result, such as reading a file, or querying a database. An example of a post rupture point is in listing 1, between the call to `fs.readFile()`, and its continuation reply.

#### 3.1.2 Detection

The compiler uses a list of common asynchronous callee, like the `express` and file system methods. This list can be augmented to match asynchronous callee individually for any application. To identify the callee, the analyzer walks the AST to find a call expression matching this list.

After the identification of the callee, the callback needs to be identified as well to be encapsulated in the downstream fluxion. For each asynchronous call detected, the compiler test if one of the arguments is of type function. Some callback functions are declared *in situ*, and are trivially detected. For variable identifier, and other expressions, the analyzer tries to detect their type. To do so, the analyzer walks back the AST to track their assignations and modifications, and determine their last value.

### 3.2 Pipeliner step

A rupture point eventually breaks the chain of scopes, hence the closures between the upstream fluxion and the downstream fluxion. The pipeliner step replaces the need for these closures by message passing, allowing application parts to be encapsulated in independent fluxions. It uses the




Figure 4: Rupture point interface

scope representation, containing the variable usages through the pipeline. Depending on this representation, there is three different ways the compiler can replace the broken closures. We present these three alternative with the example figure 5.




Figure 5: Rupture point interface

#### Scope.

If a variable is modified inside only one application part in the current *post*, then it can be part of the context of its fluxion.

In figure 5, the variable `a` is updated in the function `add`. The pipeliner steps store this variable in the context of the fluxion `add`.

#### Stream.

If a variable is modified inside an application part, and read inside downstream application parts, then it can be part of the message stream to be sent to the downstream fluxions.

It is impossible to send variables to upstream fluxions, without race conditions. If the fluxion retro propagates the variable for an upstream fluxion to read, the upstream fluxion might use the old version while the new version is on its way.

In figure 5, the variable `b` is set in the function `onReq`, and read in the function `add`. The pipeliner makes the fluxion `onReq` send the updated variable `b`, in addition to the

variable `v`, in the message sent to the fluxion `add`.

### Share.

If a variable is needed for modification by several application parts, or is read by an upstream application part, then it needs to be synchronized between the fluxions. The synchronization of a distributed memory is a well-known subject starting with the BASE semantics[8]. To respect the semantics of the source application, we cannot tolerate inconsistencies. Therefore, all the fluxions sharing a variable are grouped with the same tag.

In figure 5, the variable `c` is set in the function `end`, and read in the function `add`. As the fluxion `add` is upstream of `end`, the pipeliner steps groups the fluxion `add` and `end` with the tag `c` to allow the two fluxions to share this variable.

## 4. EVALUATION

The goal of this evaluation is to prove the possibility for an application to be compiled in order to defer parts of its execution on a remote worker. We want to show the limitations of this isolation for future works, and the modifications needed to circumvent these limitations.

For brevity, we present in this paper only one test on a real application, `gifsockets-server`<sup>6</sup>. This application is part of the selection from our previous paper [4]. We chose it because it is a complete, working, application, not a library, and it is simple enough to illustrate this evaluation.

This application is an example of a chat using gif-based communication channels. The client, a page containing a never-ending gif, sends a request containing a text typed by the user. The server transforms this text into a gif frame, and pushes this frame back to the never-ending gif to be displayed. Listing 3 is a simplified version of this application, containing only critical sections.

The web application framework used in this application, `express`, allows to register chains of functions to process user requests. On line 25, the call to `app.post` register two functions to process the requests on the url `/image/text`. The closure `saveBody`, line 7, returned by `bodyParser`, line 6, and the method `routes.writeTextToImages` from the external module `gifsockets-middleware`, line 3. The closure `saveBody` gather the whole request, and let `express` call the next function in the chain, `routes.writeTextToImages`, by calling `next`, line 20.

```
1 var express = require('express'),
2   app = express(),
3   routes = require('gifsockets-middleware');
4   getRawBody = require('raw-body');
5
6 function bodyParser(limit) {
7   return function saveBody(req, res, next) {
8     getRawBody(req, {
9       expected: req.headers['content-length'],
10      limit: limit
11    }, function (err, buffer) {
12      // If there was an error (e.g. bad length, over
13        length), respond poorly
14      if (err) {
15        res.writeHead(500, {
16          'content-type': 'text/plain'
17        });
18        return res.end('Content was too long');
19      }
20      req.body = buffer;
21      next();
22    });
23  };
24 }
```

6. <https://github.com/twolfson/gifsockets-server>

```
22   };
23 }
24
25 app.post('/image/text', bodyParser(1 * 1024 * 1024),
26   routes.writeTextToImages);
27 app.listen(8000);
```

Listing 3: Simplified version of `gifsockets-server`

### 4.1 Compilation

We compile this application with the compiler detailed in section 3. The function call `app.post`, line 25, is asynchronous, but the compiler is currently unable to detect the function `saveBody` returned by `bodyParser` as a callback. The compiler detects only one rupture point, between `getRawBody` and its anonymous callback, line 11. It encapsulates this callback in a fluxion named `anonymous_1000`. The original callback is replaced with a placeholder function to send a message to this fluxion now containing the callback.

The compiler identifies that this callback uses the variables `req`, `res`, and `next`. It puts these variables in the stream of the message to send to the downstream fluxion `anonymous_1000`.

The compilation doesn't seem to introduce bugs, as the result of compilation executes without errors, and works as expected. However, it is important to note that the fluxion `anonymous_1000` is not yet isolated on a remote worker. Therefore, the variables used in the fluxion, `req`, `res` and `next`, are still shared with the rest of the application. Our goal is to isolate this fluxion in a different memory heap, to be able to safely parallelize its execution.

```
1 flx app_js
2 >> anonymous_1000 [req, res, next]
3   var express = require('express'),
4     app = express(),
5     routes = require('gifsockets-middleware');
6     getRawBody = require('raw-body');
7
8   function bodyParser(limit) {
9     return function saveBody(req, res, next) {
10       getRawBody(req, {
11         expected: req.headers['content-length'],
12         limit: limit
13       }, >> anonymous_1000);
14     };
15   }
16
17   app.post('/image/text', bodyParser(1 * 1024 * 1024),
18     routes.writeTextToImages);
19   app.listen(8000);
20
21 flx anonymous_1000
22 -> null
23   function (err, buffer) {
24     // If there was an error (e.g. bad length, over
25       length), respond poorly
26     if (err) {
27       res.writeHead(500, {
28         'content-type': 'text/plain'
29       });
30       return res.end('Content was too long');
31     }
32     req.body = buffer;
33     next();
34   }
```

Listing 4: Compilation result of the simplified version of `gifsockets-server`

### 4.2 Isolation

The variables `req` and `res` points to objects containing closures, and the variable `next` points to a closure. The fluxion `anonymous_1000` require access over these closures. Indeed, in listing 4, it modifies the attribute `body` of the object `req`, line 30, to store the text of the received request. It calls `next` to continue the execution, line 31. And in case of error, it uses the function `res.writeHead`, line 25, and `res.end`, line 28. It is impossible to serialize closures from within Javascript. Isolating the fluxion `anonymous_1000` produces runtime exceptions because it lacks access to these closures. We detail in the next paragraph, how the compiler handles this situation. In this evaluation, we ignore the case of error, and focus on the closure `next`.

#### 4.2.1 Closure next

The function `next` is a closure over the *express* Router. This function is provided by the Router itself to allow one function in the chain to call the next. It is impossible to send this closure to the isolated fluxion. Instead, we modify *express*, so as to be compatible with the fluxionnal execution model.

The `req`, `res` and `next` objects needs to stay on the master worker to preserve their closures. The *express* Router registers a local fluxion named `express_dispatcher` to holds these objects on the master worker, and receives the result of the isolated fluxion `anonymous_1000`. The application sends the original object to the fluxion `express_dispatcher` and serialized copies to the isolated fluxion `anonymous_1000`. In this latter fluxion, the anonymous callback do its computation; it assigns the received body as an attribute of `req`.

In the original application, the anonymous callback finishes by calling the function `next` to let the Router call the next function to process the request. In the compiled application, this function `next` is not available on the isolated worker. Instead, the anonymous callback inside `anonymous_1000` calls a function `next` specially provided by the fluxionnal execution model to send a message to the fluxion `express_dispatcher` with the modified copies of `req` and `res`.

In the original application, *express* relies on side-effects on the objects `req` and `res` to get their modifications. The call to `next` doesn't need them as argument. In the isolated fluxion, as the serialized object and their originals are isolated from each other, side-effects don't propagate. The special `next` function needs explicit references to the modified objects to send them back to `express_dispatcher`. The fluxion `express_dispatcher` then merges back the modified copies and their originals, before calling the original function `next`.

After the modifications detailed above, the server works as expected for the subset of functionalities we modified. The isolated fluxion correctly receives, and returns its serialized messages. The client successfully receives a gif frame containing the text. However, in this evaluation, we ignored the case of error.

#### 4.2.2 Fluxionnal web framework

In case of error, the anonymous callback calls `res.writeHead` and `res.end`. These two closures are similar to the closure `next`. It is possible to extend the modifications presented above to build a complete web application framework, with some limitations detailed below. Indeed, the evaluation proves that it is possible to modify the *express* framework to be compatible with the fluxionnal execution model.

The closure `next` is assured to be called only once at the end of the callback. It can be called asynchronously, and can be assimilated to a rupture point. Therefore, it is safe to replace it by a communication between the two workers. On the other hand, the functions `res.writeHead` and `res.end` are synchronous. It is unsafe to replace every call by a communication between the two workers. It would lead to race conditions. These calls needs to modify the serialized, local copies of `req` and `res`, and sends the result to the master only once.

## 5. RELATED WORKS

Most of the code transformation intended for parallelization require annotations, or transform loops inside of a sequential program. Our approach is different in that we aim at avoiding completely annotations. Indeed, the knowledge of asynchronism from the developer is enough so that we don't need more annotations. Furthermore, the transformation of the loops in sequential program is inherently limited by the sequential surrounding. Amdahl's law state that such program cannot expect high speedup due to parallelization. On the otherhand, the event-loop our approach is based on doesn't have any sequential surrounding. It is the most outer loops, because it is not part of the language, but of the runtime. Therefore, our approach is not limited by this sequential surrounding.

The idea to split a task into independent parts goes back to the Actor's model [9] in 1973, and to Functional programming, like Lucid [3] in 1977 and all the following works on DataFlow leading up to Flow-Based programming (FBP) and Functional Reactive Programming (FRP). Both FBP and FRP, recently got some attention in the Javascript community with the projects *NoFlo*<sup>7</sup>, *Bacon.js*<sup>8</sup> and *react*<sup>9</sup>.

The execution model we presented in section 2, is inspired by some works on scalability for very large system, like the Staged Event-Driven Architecture (SEDA) by Matt Welsh [18], System S developed in the IBM T. J. Watson research center [10, 19], and later the MapReduce architecture [6]. It also drew its inspiration from more recent work following SEDA. Among the best-known following works, we cited in the introduction Spark [20, 21], MillWheel [2], Timestream [15] and Storm [16]. The first part of our work stands upon these thorough studies. However, we believe that it is too difficult for common developers to express their algorithm into a network of independent parts communicating through messages. This belief motivated us to propose a compiler from an imperative programming model to these more scalable, distributed execution engines.

The transformation of an imperative programming model to be executed onto a parallel execution engine was recently addressed by Fernandez *et. al.* [7]. However, like in similar works [13, 14], the developer needs to manually specify the distribution of state. We believe the difficulties encountered by developers in concurrent programming models lies more in the distribution of states, than on the structuration of the algorithm. Indeed, developers seems to have little difficulties programming in an asynchronous concurrent programming model, like the Javascript event-loop. In such programming model, the memory is global but the algorithm is ripped into multiple, asynchronous steps. While the synchronous

7. <http://noflojs.org/>

8. <https://baconjs.github.io/>

9. <https://facebook.github.io/react/>



concurrent programming model, based on multi-threading and locks to assure the consistency of shared states, is known to be more difficult to apprehend by novice developers [1].

Our compiler uses the *estools* suite to parse, manipulate and generate source code from Abstract Syntax Tree (AST)<sup>10</sup>. It modifies AST, as described in [11]. The implementation of the analyzer might be inspired from the points-to analysis in future works [17]. Our implementation is based on the work by Ryan Dahl : *Node.js*<sup>11</sup>, as well as on one of the best-known *Node.js* web framework : *Express*<sup>12</sup>.

## 6. CONCLUSION

In this paper, we presented our work on a high-level language allowing to represent a web application as a network of independent parts communicating by message streams. We presented a compiler to transform a *Node.js* web application into this high-level representation. To identify two independent parts, the compiler spots rupture points in the application, possibly leading to memory isolation and thus, parallelism. The compiler is still in early development, and is unable to soundly distribute memory. However, we proved it is possible to compile an application so that parts of its execution are parallelized, with minimum helps from the developer - only to identify the asynchronous calls. We also presented the execution model to operate an application expressed in our high-level language. This distributed approach allows code-mobility which may lead to a better scalability. We believe this high-level approach can enable the scalability required by highly concurrent web applications without discarding the familiar monolithic and asynchronous programming model used in *Node.js*.

## Références

- [1] A ADYA, J HOWELL et M THEIMER. “Cooperative Task Management Without Manual Stack Management.” In : *USENIX Annual Technical Conference* (2002).
- [2] T AKIDAU et A BALIKOV. “MillWheel : Fault-Tolerant Stream Processing at Internet Scale”. In : *Proceedings of the VLDB Endowment* 6.11 (2013).
- [3] Edward A ASHCROFT et William W WADGE. “Lucid, a nonprocedural language with iteration”. In : *Communications of the ACM* 20.7 (1977), p. 519–526.
- [4] E BRODU, S FRÉNOT et F OBLÉ. “Toward automatic update from callbacks to Promises”. In : *AWeS* (2015).
- [5] Etienne BRODU. *flex-example*. DOI : 10.5281/zenodo.11945.
- [6] J DEAN et S GHEMAWAT. “MapReduce : simplified data processing on large clusters”. In : *Communications of the ACM* (2008).
- [7] Raul Castro FERNANDEZ, Matteo MIGLIAVACCA, Evangelia KALYVIANAKI et Peter PIETZUCH. “Making state explicit for imperative big data processing”. In : *USENIX ATC* (2014).
- [8] A FOX, SD GRIBBLE, Y CHAWATHE, EA BREWER et P GAUTHIER. *Cluster-based scalable network services*. 1997.
- [9] C HEWITT, P BISHOP, I GREIF et B SMITH. “Actor induction and meta-evaluation”. In : *Proceedings of the 1st annual ACM SIGACT-SIGPLAN symposium on Principles of programming languages* (1973).
- [10] N JAIN, L AMINI, H ANDRADE et R KING. “Design, implementation, and evaluation of the linear road benchmark on the stream processing core”. In : *Proceedings of the ...* (2006).
- [11] J JONES. “Abstract syntax tree implementation idioms”. In : *Proceedings of the 10th Conference on Pattern Languages of Programs (PLoP2003)* (2003).
- [12] F MCSHERRY, R ISAACS, M ISARD et DG MURRAY. “Composable Incremental and Iterative Data-Parallel Computation with Naiad”. In : *Microsoft Research* (2012).
- [13] C MITCHELL, R POWER et J LI. “Oolong : asynchronous distributed applications made easy”. In : *Proceedings of the Asia-Pacific Workshop on ...* (2012).
- [14] R POWER et J LI. “Piccolo : Building Fast, Distributed Programs with Partitioned Tables.” In : *OSDI* (2010).
- [15] Z QIAN, Y HE, C SU, Z WU et H ZHU. “Timestream : Reliable stream computation in the cloud”. In : *Proceedings of the 8th ACM European Conference on Computer Systems (EuroSys '13)* (2013).
- [16] A TOSHNIWAL et S TANEJA. “Storm@ twitter”. In : *Proceedings of the 2014 ACM SIGMOD international conference on Management of data - SIGMOD '14* (2014).
- [17] S WEI et BG RYDER. “State-sensitive points-to analysis for the dynamic behavior of JavaScript objects”. In : *ECOOP 2014-Object-Oriented Programming* (2014).
- [18] M WELSH, SD GRIBBLE, EA BREWER et D CULLER. *A design framework for highly concurrent systems*. 2000.
- [19] KL WU, KW HILDRUM et W FAN. “Challenges and experience in prototyping a multi-modal stream analytic and monitoring application on System S”. In : *Proceedings of the 33rd ...* (2007).
- [20] M ZAHARIA et M CHOWDHURY. “Spark : cluster computing with working sets”. In : *HotCloud'10 Proceedings of the 2nd USENIX conference on Hot topics in cloud computing* (2010).
- [21] M ZAHARIA, T DAS, H LI, S SHENKER et I STOICA. “Discretized streams : an efficient and fault-tolerant model for stream processing on large clusters”. In : *Proceedings of the 4th ...* (2012).

10. <https://github.com/estools>

11. <https://nodejs.org/>

12. <http://expressjs.com/>