



## **Master thesis**

**How can sensing techniques redefine our interaction with plants ?**

**Matthieu SEGUI**

**October 5, 2024**

### **Supervisor**

**Clément Duhart and Marc Teyssier**

# Contents

<b>Contents</b>	<b>ii</b>	
1	Introduction . . . . .	1
1.1	Background motivation . . . . .	1
1.2	Context and overview . . . . .	1
1.3	Problematic . . . . .	1
1.4	Research domain . . . . .	1
1.5	Contributions . . . . .	2
2	State of the art . . . . .	3
2.1	Plant as sensor . . . . .	3
2.1.1	Human-Plant cohabitation . . . . .	3
2.1.2	Human-Plant interaction . . . . .	3
2.1.3	Plant as sensors Plant transformed into sensors . . . . .	5
2.1.4	Touch sensors . . . . .	5
2.1.5	Humidity sensors . . . . .	5
2.1.6	Sonification . . . . .	6
2.1.7	Sonification on microcontrollers . . . . .	7
2.1.8	Commercial products . . . . .	7
2.2	Internet of Plants . . . . .	7
2.2.1	Distributed system . . . . .	8
2.2.2	Distributed instruments . . . . .	9
2.2.3	Sonification using software . . . . .	9
3	Plant as sensor . . . . .	11
3.1	Technical choices . . . . .	11
3.2	The electronic interface . . . . .	11
3.3	Human interaction . . . . .	14
3.3.1	Use of the sensor/filter . . . . .	14
3.3.2	Sonification on the device . . . . .	15
3.3.3	User study . . . . .	16
3.4	Evaluation ? . . . . .	21
3.5	Discussion . . . . .	21
3.6	Conclusion . . . . .	22
4	Internet of Plants . . . . .	23
4.1	Overview . . . . .	23
4.2	Communication . . . . .	23
4.3	Server . . . . .	24
4.4	Deployment . . . . .	24
4.4.1	Distributed instruments . . . . .	25

4.5	output . . . . .	26
4.5.1	Art exhibition . . . . .	26
4.5.2	Final product, limitations and future work . . . . .	26
4.6	Conclusion . . . . .	27
5	Conclusion . . . . .	29
	<b>References</b>	<b>30</b>



# 1 Introduction

## 1.1 Background motivation

I am a creative technology engineer that is passionate about embedded systems and their hardware/software architecture. Pushed by my principal investigator and motivated by challenges, I wanted to explore the intersection of biology and electronics. I aim to transform plants into bio-sensors, using their natural sensing capabilities to capture the human-plant interaction. Extending the capacities of a single plant, I want to create a network of plant-based sensors.

I am also interested in the use of sensor data. With no particular appetite for musical creation, my principal investigator challenged me onto create a device that can use the data from the plant and generate sound based on interaction. The musical generation allows the plant to be listened to and to care about it.

## 1.2 Context and overview

This research is in line with the new means of interaction and new sensors that surround us every day. This master's thesis seeks to use the natural capacities of plants, which are made up of thousands of sensors, and to understand them. This could make it possible to create plant networks and monitor the state of our green partners. At the same time, it could reduce the amount of silicon needed to deploy a sensor field. It could also open up new possibilities in the field of Human Computer Interface research by adding a new interface.

## 1.3 Problematic

The main problematic that this master thesis will focus on is :

**How can sensing technologies redefine our interactions with plants ?**

## 1.4 Research domain

Research domains on the human-plant interaction are wide. The HCI\* field is focused during this master thesis. The Human Computer Interaction field focuses on the interfaces between people and computers. This field is at the intersection "between psychology and social sciences, on the one hand, and computer science and technology, on the other" [1]. This master thesis aims to work onto the interaction we have with plants and nature and to enhance plant capabilities.

The plant is transformed used as a living sensor and thus the project is reaching the instrumentation engineering and electronic field. This field aims to think and create new way of capturing data to make sensors. A bio-living sensor such as the plant needs to be understood using sensing techniques.

The sensor making and creation field is also focused. In this master thesis plants are transformed into sensor. This transformation...

---

\* Human Computer Interaction

## 1.5 Contributions

## 2 State of the art

### 2.1 Plant as sensor

#### 2.1.1 Human-Plant cohabitation

Plants have a lot of benefic effects on human. The study from Charles Hall and Melinda Knuth [2] explain all the benefits of plants on our human system. Watts and al. shows that urban "greening" (add green spaces in urban city) increase tranquility, relieve stress and anxiety [3]. An experience has been conducted in offices by Ikei and al [4] to expose roses to employees. The experience showed that the "parasympathetic nervous activity was significantly higher while viewing the rose". The subjects were more comfortable being exposed to roses than people that were not.

On top of that, we, as human, are spending 85% of our live indoor [5]. We are subject to the *technostress*. *Technostress* is a term introduced by Brod and Craig [6] in 1984. Brod and Craig describe it as a modern disease caused by the inability of a person to interact and use information and communication technologies in a healthy way [7]. Lee and al [5] compared the stress caused by the doing a task on a computer to interacting with a plant (specifically transplanting it). The computer task was increasing the level of stress (increased diastolic blood pressure and sympathetic nervous system activity for example). The plant interaction on the other side was found to create positive feeling to the subjects. The plant is a good way of reducing the *technostress*.


Another study comes to the same conclusions. Hassan and al. [8] studied the effect of plant interaction on young adults subjects to stress induced by electronic devices (similar to *technostress*). They concluded that significant differences in blood pressure occurred between the subjects interacting with a plant (transplanting) and the one that add to do the task on the electronic device (phone).

It's understandable that people see plants as un-stressful and not harmful. This makes them a perfect human-machine interface.


#### 2.1.2 Human-Plant interaction

The human plant interaction has been studied. Seow and al. [9] created a framework that is able to detect when something (and someone) interact with a plant. However, this is not any plant, the plant used is the *Mimosa Pudica*. This plant is special, when something touches its leaves, the plant closes its leaves to protect them from the danger [10]. An electrical impulse is released and is caught by the device Seow and al. developed. The electrical signal is easy to catch and thus can be used as actuator. However, the plant needs time and energy to re-open the leaves. This framework also can't be generalized to other species of plants.

Sato and al. used the process of capacitive sensing to detect interaction with objects of our daily lives [11]. In this paper, they proposed a device called *Touché* that uses swept frequency capacitive sensing to detect touch interaction (ref figure 2) but also more complex interactions (such as interacting with a finger, the whole hand...). More complex interactions are captured using machine learning algorithm.



**Figure 1:** *Pudica* framework made by Seow and al. The *Mimosa Pudica* is a special plant that react to the interaction by closing its leaves. The framework captures the electrical impulse and then interprets that an interaction happened.



**Figure 2:** *Touché* made by Sato and al. The *Touché* architecture that is based swept frequency capacitive sensing. The user is closing the circuit by representing the ground level.

This paper doesn't apply the device to plants. Poupyrev and al. [12] used the device on plant to demonstrate the usage. This swept frequency technique is usable and better than the previous single frequency technique as it captures more data. In their article, Honigman and al. [13] adapted the *Touché* device to be use with an Arduino<sup>†</sup> microcontroller. This allowing people to reproduce the set-up easily.

<sup>†</sup> Open source compute unit

### 2.1.3 Plant as sensors Plant transformed into sensors

#### 2.1.4 Touch sensors

Usual sensors uses physical properties to capture the data. For instance, in 1999, Hinckley and al. [14] were building a touch sensor made of conductive paint. The conductive paint is used as an electrode. In the circuit, a component is generating a 30 Hertz square signal. When the user interact with the conductive surface, it shifts and induce delay in the square wave. The delay induce by the user hands is caused by its natural capacitance. This circuit, however, gives a boolean output based on a threshold. The answer is *touched* or *untouched*.

When thinking of touch sensors, we think about the trackpad/touchpad that we daily use in our personal computer. Those sensors use resistive or capacitive sensing. Both of these techniques are based on electrical properties. Resistive sensing is based on the perturbation of the resistance in a circuit. Whereas capacitive is based on the capacitance. Capturing those specific properties are usually the basic of touch sensors.

For instance, Olberding and al. created a cuttable multitouch sensor based on capacitive sensor [15]. This specific sensor allows to create something similar to a trackpad but with different shapes.

Reading the capacitance at a fixed frequency is working and is already used in our daily lives. However, to capture more complex interaction and to rely on the data, adding another dimension of data is useful. Swept Frequency Capacitive sensing consists on emitting a electrical signal and then read the capacitive values similar to what a classic sensor would do. However, the electrical signal is not generated at a fix frequency but is generated following a changing frequency. Sato and al. introduced first this technique in the *Touché* device [11]. This allows to get richer information on the output of the device. *Touché* allows then to capture the information on a variety and a multitude of daily objects. Indeed, searching through many frequencies make it simpler to find small changes and though different kind and type of interactions.

#### 2.1.5 Humidity sensors

In order to capture more data than only the touch interaction, we are interested into moisture sensors.

Lee and Lee [16] wrote a review on the different kind of humidity sensors. It exists many kind of humidity sensors. They expose many kinds of moisture sensors: resistive, capacitive, gravimetric, optical, piezoresistive and magnetoelastic sensors.

Resistive and capacitive moisture sensors differ mainly in their operating principles and durability. Resistive sensors measure soil moisture by detecting changes in electrical resistance between two probes inserted into the soil, with lower resistance indicating higher moisture levels. While these sensors are cost-effective and simple, they tend to degrade over time due to electrolysis, especially in saline conditions, reducing their reliability. Additionally, resistive sensors are sensitive to temperature changes, which can lead to signal drift, although they offer good sensitivity and typically exhibit a linear response to changes in moisture.

In contrast, capacitive sensors work by measuring changes in the dielectric constant of the soil, without direct contact between the electrodes and the soil. This design makes capacitive sensors more durable and resistant to corrosion, offering greater long-term stability and accuracy. They are also less affected by temperature variations. However, capacitive sensors require careful design, with the ratio between the thickness of the sensitive material and the sensor geometry being crucial, as the electrodes' periodicity and the thickness of the sensitive coating layer significantly impact the sensor's response [17]. Despite these complexities, capacitive sensors tend to provide more reliable and stable readings over time, though at a higher cost.

### 2.1.6 Sonification

Sonification is “the use of non-speech audio to convey information or perceptualize data” [18].

The sonification has been used for a long time using the human ear sensor to interpret data. For instance, the Geiger counter is using the sonification to measure the ionizing radiation. This sensor is "beeping" and "crackling" depending of the level of radiation.

Herman and al [18] created two sonification models to represent particles moving. They are saying that the sonification is allowing a multidimensional representation of the data captured. Humans are sensible to sounds. The sound allows a "rapid screening" because it is easier to listen to a sound than read a graph or a text. The sound when combined with visualization is bringing more granularity and understanding. They are also adding that we are using sound to diagnosis issues on a daily basis ; giving the example of a car mechanic that is having a failure and that we can predict.

The sonification has been used in many projects. Ballora and al. [19] designed a project that mix the fluctuation of the stock market with the apparition of keyword on Twitter social network. They were mapping specific and defined keyword with specific sounds. The designed an app to be able to tweak and change the volume of the different sounds. The same procedure is applied to the variation of the stock price. They conducted this experiment in order to add another possible channel of information in the market place. The traders and people working there are already flooded with visual information. This new channel could allow to process more data. The result were encouraging. However, this experiment rose issues. People were annoyed and disturbed by the sound. They were lowering the volume and thus not hearing it. Some other people were just too much concentrated on their task that they did not hear the variations. More experiment should be conducted to refine the sound created and the level needed.

In the same direction, Ballora and al. [19] also developed a device to monitor the heart rate of people using sonification. It takes the output of an electrocardiogram and transform it into a sound. Each of the ECG's frequencies were pass into a filter and then given a specific sound. The output of the sound creation is then listened to and interpreted. This application with a trained ear can help diagnosis the sleep apnea through heart variability.

### 2.1.7 Sonification on microcontrollers

MCUs<sup>†</sup> [20] is a kind of small computer. Those devices can be used to generate sound. The most common way of doing electronical music is to use MIDI<sup>§</sup> [21]. MIDI has been created in order to create music with digital computer. MIDI do not describe directly the audio signal but the human actions to create the signal (such as turn the knob left, push the slider...). MCU are able to produce those kind of directives [22][23]. However, the MCU can produce MIDI but MIDI does not directly generate sounds. A synthetizer is needed to create the sound described.

For our use case of embedding the device, we look at MCU that were able to directly generate the signal from a DAC<sup>¶</sup>. Projects had been conducted with many microcontrollers such as a small 8 bits AVR microcontrollers (ATmega32) [24]. This paper does not include limitation of such a product but we can guess that the 8 bits microcontroller is limiting the sound quality. A larger project from Shaer and al. [25] is including an Arduino Mega controlling the visual effect of the project, but also the interaction sensors. The Arduino Mega is then sending MIDI information to Teensy 3.2. The Teensy is then generating the sound. The project is still too large to be fully embedded but the Teensy 3.2 is a promising compute unit. The Teensy 3.2 is running at 72 MHz, way faster than the ATmega32 that is operating at 16MHz. The frequency is essential when trying to produce sound signals.

### 2.1.8 Commercial products

Generating music from plants is not a new concept. Several commercial products are available on the market. Looking at *PlantWave* device from the eponym company, the device is able to generate sound from the plant. The device is built using a small box with two electrodes. The electrodes are then connected to the plant. The device generates sound. The process of sonification is not described and thus is blurry as it is a patent technology. The device is also not open-source

Another commercial product is the *Music of the Plants* product. How the product works is even more opaque and the company building the product is sometimes associated with cult and esotericism. The product is also not open-source.

## 2.2 Internet of Plants

The Internet of Plants is not a new word. Nevertheless, the term is not that spread around. Aliev and al. [26] evoked the word. The paper explain that the word is based on the IoT. The paper is using this word to describe a system of sensors to monitor plants and crops. This is really close to the IoT as it is using silicon made sensor to retrieve the data from the plants.

Internet of Plants is especially used for agriculture. In the paper of Steeneken and al. [27], they are explaining that the use of specific sensors

---

<sup>†</sup> microcontrollers

<sup>§</sup> Musical Instrument Digital Interface

<sup>¶</sup> Digital to Analog Converter

Internet of Things



**Figure 3:** The PlantWave product on a demonstration picture (source from their website)

could and should be very efficient to boost the productivity of the crops. The paper is also using talking about classic connected sensors but applied to plants.

Like the previous authors, Kitano and al. [28] also used this specific word for sensor connected agriculture. I think that the IoP of plants in that use is more a specific application of the IoT instead of a specific field of research.

### 2.2.1 Distributed system

The Internet of Plants relies on the paradigm of *distributed systems*. Van and al. define distributed systems as " collection of autonomous computing elements that appears to its users as a single coherent system." [29]. Distributed systems scaled up with the improvement of computation power and networking link speed. It is now possible using networking to spread calculation power around a room or even the world and to rely on this computation power as a part of a working system.

Even if distributed systems spread up thanks to the increasing networking speed, they are far from being new. In 1985 Kleinrock and Leonard [30] already explained the principle of distributed systems. They get inspired by nature looking at bees that are communicating to fetch food, ants are also communicating but adding also their strength to get back the food. At this time, adding computation power was a really interesting way of expanding the power on a local network.

Distributed system complicates the monitoring of the system and add complexities and faulty points in the system. There have been a lot of research about the best way of linking pieces of a distributed system. Distributed system are usually based on a communication protocol such as the internet protocol (IP), bluetooth mesh or even Lora. Relying on those already existing communication protocol ease the deployment of the application. However, congested communication protocol or distance can introduce latencies and thus data failure and inconsistency. It is important in a final product that the data is checked and verified. We

are them introducing the CAP (consistency, availability and partition tolerance) theorem also called Brewer theorem. It has been introduced by Brewer in 2000 [31]. This theorem explains that it is impossible to have full data consistency, complete availability and partition tolerance in a distributed system. Only two of the three capabilities can be achieved. You always have to think about the balance and what is the most important in your system. It was mainly thought especially for the distributed databases but can also be used for all the distributed systems that are including a network communication.

On the monitoring side, Joyce and al. [32] explained how to build a monitoring on a distributed system. Monitoring in the case of a full solution is mandatory to be able to capture and react to eventual failure on the system.

### 2.2.2 Distributed instruments

Now that we looked at what is a distributed system, we can go further in what is interesting to us and talk about distributed instrument. Tanaka wrote a chapter in the Oxford Handbook of Computer Music [33] describing the arrival of new instruments based on sensors. The author, in the chapter, first describe the evolution of the definition of an instrument [34]. Then the author is reviewing the new possibilities on the new instruments going through bio-signal instruments, tabletop and surface instruments. The chapter is ending by talking about ensembles in music and then to network music. Network music is exposed as a new generation of ensembles where you can spread the ensemble in space, playing instruments in remote. Pushing even further, this chapter describes network instruments to not only being a replacement of on-site music ensembles but also a new distinct mode of play. The chapter is citing the *Public Sound Objects* project from Barbosa and al. [35]. Barbosa and al. created a space that allows people to create music collaboratively on a wider area: The Internet.

Distributed instruments are then a new way of thinking musical exhibitions and experiments. It brings a new level of possibilities.

### 2.2.3 Sonification using software


Sonification, the process of converting data into sound for interpretation, has seen significant advancements through the use of software frameworks. On this specific part of the state of the art we will focus only on softwares and applications used for sonification. Modern tools enable real-time, interactive sound generation, which is particularly useful in analyzing complex datasets across disciplines such as neuroscience, environmental monitoring, and human-computer interaction. Kramer and al. [36] explored and wrote a study on the status of the sonification field.

It exists three main sonification platforms : Max/MSP, Pure Data, and SuperCollider. They all offer flexible environments for designing custom sound mappings, supporting a wide range of applications [37][38].


These tools often integrate algorithmic processes, sensor data, and even machine learning, producing sophisticated auditory representations

that are increasingly immersive. Both SuperCollider and Pure Data are open source projects. Also Max/MSP is only available on Windows and MacOS based machines which can be a limitation when working with sonification Linux server.

Max/MSP and Pure Data work similarly (ref figure 4 and figure 5)



**Figure 4:** An example of a patch generating a sine wave on Max/MSP



**Figure 5:** An example of a patch generating a sine wave on Pure Data

SuperCollider is algorithmic based and less graphical (ref figure 6).

```
{
    // Open the Function
    SinOsc.ar( // Make an audio rate SinOsc
        440, // frequency of 440 Hz, or the tuning A
        0, // initial phase of 0, or the beginning of the cycle
        0.2 // mul of 0.2
    ).play; // close the Function and call 'play' on it
}
```

**Figure 6:** An example of a patch generating a sine wave on SuperCollider

Web-based technologies, such as the Web Audio API [39], have further expanded accessibility, making interactive sonification more widespread. Peng and al. created a workstation called *SIREN* based on this Web Audio API [40]. The development of the Web Audio API really eases the development of new sonification frameworks but also the collaboration between artists. It reduces the investment necessary to use sonification software as all the people already has a web browser.

Even if new tools are emerging or old tool getting upgraded, sonification struggle to be totally widespread [41]. Artistic design continues to push the boundaries of how we interpret data through sound but it stills confined in research or artistic fields.

### 3 Plant as sensor

#### 3.1 Technical choices

Before diving into the implementation, several technical choices were made to shape the overall design of the system. The first major decision was selecting the ESP32 microcontroller as the core processing unit due to its versatility, offering built-in WiFi, multiple GPIO pins, and analog-to-digital converters, which allow for handling sensor data and wireless communication efficiently.

Additionally, the system's audio capabilities were a critical consideration, leading to the inclusion of a basic amplification circuit to boost sound output, ensuring compatibility with external speakers. The design also included a micro-SD slot to allow for expandable storage, enabling future enhancements like storing pre-recorded sounds or more detailed data logs. These foundational decisions laid the groundwork for a scalable and reliable system, ensuring smooth integration of the components that follow in the implementation.

#### 3.2 The electronic interface

The electronic interface is the interface that allows a compute unit to capture and interpret the plant signal and communication. The interface is a device made by us for this use case. The printed circuit board (PCB) device is composed of 3 main parts:

- ▶ The core of the circuit, the microcontroller, an ESP32 Wroom 32
- ▶ An electronic filter connected using an electrode to the plant
- ▶ A sound part of the PCB that is including an audio amplifier, a volume knob and a terminal block to connect a speaker

The design of the PCB has been done using the open source software Kicad. As said previously, the circuit contains 3 parts.


The core of the circuit is the computation part, including the microcontroller, an ESP32. All the other devices of the circuit are connected to the ESP32. The choice to use a devkit has been done to ease the electronic conception and to avoid any communication and soldering issue with the MCU\*.

The PCB also includes a dedicated slot for a capacitive humidity sensor (ref figure 8). This humidity sensor is added to reinforced the data captured by the main sensor/filter. This sensor captures the moisture level in the plant's soil, providing valuable insight into the plant's overall health and hydration status.


By integrating this additional sensor, the system can monitor environmental factors alongside the main sensor's data, such as the plant's response to touch or other interactions. The humidity data complements the primary sensor readings which can be used to refine the interaction model or influence the sonification process. This added layer of data could permits more precision and complexity when doing the sonification process.

---

\* Microcontroller Unit




**Figure 7:** The main schematic of the device. This main schematic regroups components and sub-sheets (including the audio circuit and the filter circuit). The main component is an ESP32 Wroom DevKit. All other components are linked to this microcontroller



**Figure 8:** The sensor chosen is the capacitive moisture sensor from Seeed Studio: The Grove. This sensor is able to capture the moisture level in the plant's soil, providing valuable insight into the plant's overall health and hydration status. However, the connector on the PCB allows to connect any other sensor that has 3 pins (VCC, GND, DATA) connection.


The circuit component that allows us to read data from the plant is the electronic filter. This filter has been designed by Jakub Nikonorowicz and Łukasz Matuszewski from Politechnika Poznańska. Thanks to them, I adapted it for my application on my embedded device.



**Figure 9:** The electronic circuit designed to capture the interaction by analyzing the electronic frequency response. The circuit includes 3 resistors, 3 inductors and 3 capacitors as main components

This filter is ending by a crocodile clamp that is directly connected to the plant.

The last part of the circuit is the sound output/rendering. This circuit includes a small amplifier, the LM386 from Texas Instruments. The rest of the circuit are components needed in order to induce amplification on the signal without creating too many noise and saturation.




**Figure 10:** The sound output part of the circuit that is used to render the sound. This part includes a small amplifier, the LM386. The circuit also includes the components necessary to control and handle the amplification (reduce noise and saturation)

The PCB is built to be able to add a micro-SD slot (ref to 7). This micro-SD slot allows to increase the storage of the embedded ROM. This can be used to store pre-built sounds and music to avoid generating a sound on-board.

Once the schematic was completed, the next step was routing the tracks. There are several methods for PCB routing, including single-sided, double-sided, and multiple-layer designs. We opted for a double-sided PCB on each side because this configuration simplifies component placement, making the layout more efficient and organized. Additionally, it


is significantly more cost-effective compared to multi-layer PCBs, striking a good balance between performance and budget. Indeed, in terms of routing, PCBs can be single-sided, double-sided, or multi-layered. Single-sided boards are simple and low-cost but limited in complexity. Double-sided PCBs, with copper on both sides, allow for more efficient routing and are commonly used for moderate complexity. Multi-layered PCBs offer even greater routing density, suitable for advanced electronics such as computer motherboards or phone components.

In terms of track width, we used 0.2mm wide tracks for data signals to maintain signal integrity, while the power tracks were designed with a width of 0.8mm. This wider width ensures that the power tracks can safely handle up to 800 mA, providing sufficient current capacity without overheating or voltage drops.



**Figure 11:** Double sided PCB routed. This view allows to see the track used for components inter-connection. The tracks width is 0.2mm for data tracks and 0.8mm for power tracks.

Kicad also allows us to generate a 3D view of the future PCB. This allows us to imagine what the PCB will look like when it will be manufactured.



**Figure 12:** Front 3D rendering of the built PCB. The rendering is done using open source software: Kicad

### 3.3 Human interaction

#### 3.3.1 Use of the sensor/filter

The device is able to capture the human interaction with the plant. The touch interaction is inducing changes in the impedance, capacitance and

inductance of the plant. Values are captured using the GPIO (General Port Input/Output) 14 of the ESP32 DevKit. This GPIO is able to read analog data and convert them to digital values using analog to digital converter (ADC). The values are a floating point number between Values are fluctuating depending on the interaction.

The possibilities of

### 3.3.2 Sonification on the device

The human interaction goes through the sonification on the device. ESP32 embeds a 8-bit digital to analog converter (DAC). The embed DAC is enough to play low quality sounds. Combined with the micro-SD card including in it, it is a media player. Using the *Arduino Audio Tools* library it is possible to read MP3, Wav and other audio format. Taking the sensor value as an input, you can then apply a pitch shift on the data that will be rendered on the DAC. The pitch shift is a value included between 0 and 100. We are mapping the max value of the sensor and the min value to this range using the *map()* Arduino function.

The data is sent to the DAC and rendered. *Arduino Audio Tools* also includes a way to communicate data to the DAC.

There are two DAC available on the ESP32. DAC 1 and DAC 2 respectively on GPIO25 and GPIO26. The IoP device allows to choose between the one you want by using a removable jumper.

The output of the DAC is too low to be able to render it on a speaker. The amplification circuit allows a small amplification of the output. The amplifier is a basic and simple one. I added a 10k Ohms potentiometer to be able to tweak the volume. The sound quickly reach amplifier limitations and is becoming saturated.

The amplified output is sent to a terminal block that acts as the connection interface to the audio speaker. The audio speaker chosen in our specific example is a 8 Ohms 3 Watts speaker.



**Figure 13:** 8 ohms 3 Watts basic speaker used in our example.

### 3.3.3 User study

**Abstract of user study** This study explores human-plant interaction. This study has been conducted in order to understand what kind of interaction we have to detect in order to have the best and more natural kind of interaction with plants. The results will be applied in the Internet of Plants (IoP) project which intends to create a fully connected bio-organ system. The IoP is looking to reduce the gap between humans and plants by creating a symbiotic relationship between nature and technology. We envision a world where our daily objects are responsive.

**Introduction** Plants represent a full ecosystem of evolution, adaptation and communication.

In the context of the Internet of Plant (IoP) project, this study aims to extract the natural interaction between people and plants. This experiment explores the interactions the IoP device will have to detect to create a symbiotic relation between human and plants. The physical touch is the starting point of a sonification process. Sonification is "the use of non-speech audio to convey information or perceptualize data" [kramerSonificationReportStatusa]. Three distinct plant species—*Dypsis lutescens*, *Pachira glabra*, and *Dracaena*—are employed as subjects to extract user perceptions and interactions within this framework.

The methodology engages students from the engineering school and two researchers. The participants are asked to interact with the plants and imagine the sounds that could be generated by the plants.

The correlation between plant height and trunk interactions reveals environmental factors impacting human-plant dynamics. Additionally, interactions are categorized based on intensity, spatial displacement, and duration.

### Methodology

**Participants** The study is conducted on 22 participants. Participants are mainly composed of engineering students. The participant set includes 15 males and 7 females. The age of participants is between 19 and 22 years old. Exception for three participants that are older than 22 years old.

**The Procedure** We introduced the subject telling participants : "We're in the very near future. You are looking at plants that make music when you physically interact with them (it is not actually the case, but imagine it). Explore their capabilities." Using this prompt, we tried not to bridle them to much but approach them to the physical interaction component. Subsequently, participants were given time to explore the potential musical capacities of the plants at their own pace. We conducted the study without providing any guidance during the exploration phase. In instances where participants encountered difficulty initiating exploration, the prompt was reiterated to encourage the participants to explore. This methodological approach was designed to capture the intuitive

and natural human-plant interaction. Also, we avoided any kind of communication or talking between 2 participants to reduce the potential bias.

**Materials/Tools** To proceed and conduct this user study, we chose 3 different plants from 3 different species.

*Dracaena*: It has long leaves and fragile perceived trunk but also flexible. The plant is 95 cm tall.



Figure 14: The N°1 plant is a *Dracaena*.

*Pachira glabra*: We chose to use this plant for its large leaves and its wide trunk. The plant is 110 cm tall.




Figure 15: The N°2 plant is a *Pachira glabra*.

*Dypsis lutescens*: The *Dypsis lutescens* is composed of many trunks and stems. On top of that, the leaves are numerous and tight. The plant is ... tall.



**Figure 16:** The N°3 plant is a *Dypsis lutescens*.

**The experimental space** The experimental space featured three distinct levels of height, each corresponding to one of the three plants introduced to participants.



**Figure 17:** User study space setup. The setup is built from our lab space.

**Data collection** To capture the participant's interactions with the plants, a collaborative approach was adopted, involving two researchers to provide dual perspectives. Throughout the exploration phase, both researchers took notes, documenting the diverse ways in which participants engaged with the three distinct plants. The researchers explicitly specified the plant involved in the interaction in order to extract special features related to a specific plant.

The written notes retrieved descriptions of participants' actions, movements and interactions. The dual-observer strategy tends to reduce the potential biased.

At the beginning of the experiment, the *Dypsis lutescens* was on the floor, the *Dracaena* was on a chair and the *Pachira Glabra* was on a table. At the middle of the experiment, we switched the *Dypsis lutescens* and the *Pachira Glabra* to see if the participants would interact differently with the plants. The set-up of the experiment is shown in Figure 17.


**Results** The data given by the user study allowed us to define 5 main types of interaction. Those interactions are defined by the way the user interacts with the plant. The 5 main types of interaction are :

- ▶ Grasp : user uses the whole hand to grab trunk or leaves.
- ▶ Pinch : user uses 2 to 3 digits to grab trunk or leaves.
- ▶ Slide : user uses his/her hand or finger to slide on the plant whether is on a leave or on the trunk. The action is continuous.
- ▶ Pet : user uses his/her hand to cuddle the plant or to pass through the leaves. The user is moving his/her hand in space. She/he is not staying still or staying on a particular object.
- ▶ Tam Tam : user taps on the plant mainly using the whole hand.

Looking at the results, we extracted the table 1.

Plant/Interaction	Group 1		Group 2		Group 3	
	Grasp	Pinch	Slide	Pet	Tam Tam	
Plant N°1	4	8	4	4	2	
Plant N°2	9	3	3	3	10	
Plant N°3	10	1	5	7	3	
Total	23	12	12	14	15	

With the extraction of the result we were able to design a bar chart. The graph is grouping the interactions by plant. The height of the bar is the number of participants that performed the interaction. The graph is shown in figure 17.




In the end, of the 22 participants, 15 were already familiar with the project and 7 were not.

**Discussion** Looking at the results, the interaction were various depending on the plant. Thus, we can extract main interactions that are linked to the plant type. Looking at table 1, people are more inclined to use their hands as tam tam or grasp the *Pachira glabra*. However, for the *Dracaena* users prefer to pinch the trunk or leave. Participants decided to grasp whether a pack of trunk or leaves when it came to *Dypsis lutescens*. This is induced by many factors including the leaves shape, the width of the trunk.

It was observed that when the plants were positioned at higher elevations on the table, individuals tended to engage more with the trunk of the plants.

**Table 1:** Raw results extracted from the user study

**Figure 18:** Bar chart that is extracting the main types of interaction regarding each plants.



**Figure 19:** Figure showing graphically the intensity of the 3 types of factors we defined. (a) Group 1 : pinch and grasp. (b) Group 2 : slide. (c) Group 3 : pet and tam tam.

Looking at table 1, we decided to group interaction. This was done by grouping type of interaction depending on 3 main factors :

- The intensity factor : what is the intensity of the interaction (ex : pinch is lighter than grasp)
- The spatial factor : what is the interaction displacement.
- The duration factor : what is the interaction duration (ex : tam tam is instantaneous).

The "Group 1" includes the pinch and grasp interaction. Indeed, looking at the 3 factors we defined, the pinch and grasp are high in intensity and long in duration but people stay still in space. This group of interaction can be defined as **binary interaction**. The user is either grasping or not.

The "Group 2" includes the slide. The slide interaction is long in time, it moves in space but low in intensity. This group of interaction can be defined as **continuous interaction**.

Whereas, the "Group 3" includes the pet and Tam Tam. These 2 interactions are really high in intensity, people usually tam tam and pet in different places but those interactions are short in time. This group is defined as **repetitive interaction**. The user is repeating the same action over and over again.

The participants we interviewed introduced a bias in the results. They were all students from the engineering school and thus, they all had a similar background. Some of them were already familiar with the project.

**Conclusion** During our study on the Internet of Plant project, we've captured insights into how people might interact with plants in a future where they make music through touch.

Our three chosen plants influenced how participants engaged with them. We observed everything from gentle petting to energetic drumming on the plants. Interestingly, we found that when the plants were higher up, participants tended to focus more on the trunk.

By grouping interactions based on factors like intensity and duration, we gained a clearer picture of how people approached these musical plants. It turns out that certain interactions, like grasping and pinching, were more common, while others, like sliding, had their own distinct appeal.

Regarding to the results we thought about what could be done with the defined interactions. For instance, the sound generated from the interaction could be linked to the kind of interaction. People doing Tam Tam on the plant will expect a drum sound. Whereas, people performing a slide will expect a sound closer to a continuous organ sound. The possibilities are endless and the only restrictions are the capabilities of the device capturing the interaction.

### 3.4 Evaluation ?



**Figure 20:** Signals coming from the system. The yellow signal is the signal generated by the ESP32 (PWM). The purple one is the signal that we capture at the output of the filter. This signal is the one that goes in the Plant.

### 3.5 Discussion

The final product is an embedded device that include signal filtering, wireless communication and embedded sonification.

A better audio amplifier could be explored in order to reduce the distortion of the sound. Adding an external digital to analog converter is also a possibility in order to upgrade the output. However, this possibility adds new components that will increase the size. Exploring the I2S protocol opens better output. The I2S protocol is a protocol

### 3.6 Conclusion

In conclusion, the standalone electronic system demonstrates significant potential in transforming natural plants into interactive bio-sensors, using the capabilities of a powerful microcontroller like the ESP32. The system's ability to capture plant responses to human touch and translate them into digital data is made possible by its efficient electronic interface. This architecture enables real-time interaction and offers new approach to human-plant interaction. This is also driving research into the use of plants' natural capacities as sensors. However, despite the microcontroller's strengths, the system still has notable limitations.

One major challenge lies in the sonification process, where the system struggles with producing high-quality, nuanced sound outputs due to the basic 8-bit DAC and limited audio amplification. Additionally, the data processing capabilities of the standalone device are limited, restricting the complexity of interactions it can detect and interpret. The sensor accuracy also has room for improvement, particularly in capturing fine-grained variations in plant interaction, which could taint the overall user experience and reduce the immersion.

To overcome these standalone limitations, a more sophisticated architecture is required. By connecting multiple devices in a distributed system, the Internet of Plants approach can enhance the processing power, improve sonification through external software, and allow for more complex data analysis. It could unlock the full potential of plant-based sensors. The next section will explore how this expanded network can significantly enhance both the system's capabilities and user experience.

## 4 Internet of Plants

### 4.1 Overview

The Internet of Plants, also called IoP, is a concept that aims to interconnect the plant device previously built. This in order to empower the device capabilities and to provide a better user experience. This project includes:

- ▶ A better sound quality by using professional sonification software
- ▶ The ability to create a full artistic experience by creating a distributed instrument
- ▶ Refining the interaction with the plant by using more complex data analyses

### 4.2 Communication

On the communication side, we benchmarked several communication protocol including internet protocol, Bluetooth, Bluetooth Low Energy and Zigbee (ref to table 2).

The IP protocol (whether it is on WiFi or Ethernet) has been chosen for this application for several reasons:

- ▶ High bandwidth: It supports the transmission of large amounts of data quickly and efficiently, which is essential for real-time interactions in the system.
- ▶ Widespread availability: WiFi and Ethernet are commonly available in most exhibition spaces, ensuring easy deployment in a variety of environments.
- ▶ Multi-device connectivity: The protocol allows the connection of multiple devices simultaneously, which is crucial for building a distributed system where many plants can interact with the server.
- ▶ Compatibility: Ethernet is already available on the server, and WiFi is built into the ESP32, eliminating the need for additional hardware.

The communication system is based on WiFi technology, leveraging the ESP32's built-in wireless capabilities. Both the server and the ESP32 devices are connected to the same local network. Data is transmitted from the ESP32 to the server using the IP protocol via a TCP (Transmission Control Protocol) socket. Each ESP32 opens a dedicated TCP socket to the server, and the server is capable of handling multiple sockets simultaneously—one for each connected device.

However, a potential drawback of using IP networks is that they can become overcrowded, especially in environments with high network traffic, which may lead to packet loss or truncated data frames. To mitigate these issues, a start ("") and stop ("; n") character is embedded in the data transmission protocol. This structure

Protocol	IP	Bluetooth	BLE	Zigbee
Handle multiple connections	Yes	No	No	Yes
Requires additional hardware	No	No	No	Yes
Subject to interference	Yes	Few	Few	Yes
Energy efficiency (using a battery)	Days	Months	Years	Years

**Table 2:** Comparison between different communication protocol to find the one that will suits our needs.

helps the server recognize the beginning and end of each message, allowing it to discard incomplete or corrupted frames and process only complete, intact data. This approach minimizes the impact of network congestion by ensuring that even if a frame is truncated or lost, the server can still recover and process the next full message without error.

Additionally, this strategy helps maintain a balance within the CAP theorem (Consistency, Availability, and Partition tolerance). While it is impossible to achieve all three properties perfectly in a distributed system, the chosen protocol structure ensures data consistency by filtering out incomplete messages, availability by maintaining active connections across multiple devices, and some degree of partition tolerance in the event of temporary network failures. This balance is critical for ensuring reliable data transmission and processing in the Internet of Plants system.

### 4.3 Server

The server is a small fanless computer running Lubuntu. Lubuntu is a lighter version of Ubuntu that includes LXQt as desktop environment. The choice of a distribution with graphical interface is induced by the use of *Pure Data* as sonification software.


Pure Data (PD) is an open-source visual programming language designed primarily for creating interactive multimedia applications, particularly in the fields of audio, video, and graphical processing. Pure Data is part of a family of patcher programming languages, which also includes Max/MSP. Unlike traditional text-based programming, PD uses a graphical interface where users connect "objects" with virtual patch cables to create complex data flows and signal processing chains. Its modular design allows for real-time manipulation of sound and graphics, making it a powerful tool for artists, musicians, and researchers interested in exploring experimental media.

Pure Data requires, in a development environment, a graphical interface to test and debug. The Pure Data patch receives the data through a TCP socket. The data is processed through several operations. Then, if a threshold is passed, an interaction happened and the music is triggered. The music is outputted through the item *DAC* which means Digital to Analog Converter. The digital input from pure data is converted to a sound that speakers can output.

Pure Data is a sonification software that requires data as input. In order to get and process the data, we designed a Python based software. The software is object oriented. The standalone IoT modules connect using WiFi to the receiver module of the software. The connection is made using TCP socket from the ESP32 to the server. The main module of the software then creates software abstraction of the standalone module. The abstraction module is processing and storing all the processed data. The main module then sends the processed data to Pure Data patch using also local TCP socket.

### 4.4 Deployment

The server software is easily deployable. The software includes a shell script to deploy the server service. Indeed, the server relies on a *systemd*



**Figure 21:** Basic *Pure Data* patch that is used for sonification of the data of the plant. In case of an art exhibition, the *Pure Data* patch can be upgraded to meet the artist needs


linux service. *Systemd* [42] is a Linux software that manage application that runs *daemons* or services. *Daemons* are pieces of software that run in background of the operating system. They are mainly started at the during the boot of the operating system.

The server is deployed that way so the software starts with the operating system. It waits for the network interfaces to be up and running and opens the socket. The installation tool install Python dependencies, fill in the templated service file, install the service and enable it. The server is able to receive data from IoP standalone modules and use Pure Data software for sonification. The last step is to connect a jack speaker to the jack builtin output.

On the IoP standalone module side, it requires a software that is able to upload firmware to an ESP32 MCU. I recommend using PlatformIO which is an open source embedded software development platform. The firmware is developed using this platform. The source code is written in C++ using the Arduino framework. You flash the firmware to the chip after setting up the WiFi credentials. The module sends all the retrieved data to the server.

#### 4.4.1 Distributed instruments

The Internet of Plants (IoP) architecture enables the creation of a distributed instrument, where multiple IoP standalone modules can be deployed across different plants to form an interconnected musical system. Each module, linked to the server via WiFi, sends data collected from plant interactions, which the server then processes. By assigning



**Figure 22:** Architecture diagram of Internet of Plants project centered on server-side.

unique IDs to each module, the server can differentiate between the various plants, allowing for distinct musical outputs based on the origin of the data.

The system sends this data to Pure Data (PD), an open-source visual programming language for multimedia applications, where sound parameters such as pitch, tone, and rhythm can be finely controlled. This setup allows for highly customizable soundscapes, where each plant generates unique sounds based on user interaction, creating a rich, immersive musical experience. The distributed instrument thus transforms the interaction with plants into a collaborative musical performance, opening up new possibilities for art installations and interactive environments.

## 4.5 output

### 4.5.1 Art exhibition


To push further the distributed instrument, it is possible to build an entire musical experience for an art exhibition. The immersive experience can take place as a fully connected forest. The music would vary depending on the touch interaction that people have with the plants.

This exhibition could allow people to rethink the way they see and interact with plants. Plants are not seen anymore as decoration object but as a living being. The living being is here highlighted by the fact that plants can now express their state. The humidity level, the light intensity and other state signs are modifying the plant reaction.

Musicians can also work in pair with plants to create songs using music from the plants. The music coming from the plant is fully configurable with the sonification software.

### 4.5.2 Final product, limitations and future work

Final product is a software that allows the connection between multiple standalone IoP modules and a sonification software, Pure Data. The soft-



**Figure 23:** Schematic of the IoP art exhibition. The music varies depending on the interaction that people have with the installation. People are immersed into the full musical and sonification experience.

ware handle multiple connection and apply a filtering and cleaning on the data retrieved. The data is then sent to Pure Data for sonification.

On the limitation side, the use of WiFi ease a lot the deployment of the system, however

#### 4.6 Conclusion



**Figure 24:** Server-module demo. In this specific use case, the module is connected by wire to a computer. Otherwise, the module is usable wirelessly. The computer is acting as a server. On this version of the demo, the screen is displaying a figure that is evolving depending on the touch interaction. The computer, acting as the server, is producing the sound using Pure Data software.

## 5 Conclusion

# References

Here are the references in citation order.

- [1] John M Carroll. 'HUMAN-COMPUTER INTERACTION: Psychology as a Science of Design'. In: () (cited on page 1).
- [2] Charles Hall and Melinda Knuth. 'An Update of the Literature Supporting the Well-Being Benefits of Plants: A Review of the Emotional and Mental Health Benefits of Plants'. In: (2019) (cited on page 3).
- [3] Greg Watts. 'The Effects of "Greening" Urban Areas on the Perceptions of Tranquillity'. In: *Urban Forestry & Urban Greening* 26 (Aug. 2017), pp. 11–17. doi: [10.1016/j.ufug.2017.05.010](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ufug.2017.05.010). (Visited on 06/26/2024) (cited on page 3).
- [4] Harumi Ikei et al. 'The Physiological and Psychological Relaxing Effects of Viewing Rose Flowers in Office Workers'. In: *Journal of Physiological Anthropology* 33.1 (Dec. 2014), p. 6. doi: [10.1186/1880-6805-33-6](https://doi.org/10.1186/1880-6805-33-6). (Visited on 06/26/2024) (cited on page 3).
- [5] Min-sun Lee et al. 'Interaction with Indoor Plants May Reduce Psychological and Physiological Stress by Suppressing Autonomic Nervous System Activity in Young Adults: A Randomized Crossover Study'. In: *Journal of Physiological Anthropology* 34.1 (Dec. 2015), p. 21. doi: [10.1186/s40101-015-0060-8](https://doi.org/10.1186/s40101-015-0060-8). (Visited on 10/02/2024) (cited on page 3).
- [6] Craig Brod. 'Technostress: The human cost of the computer revolution'. In: (*No Title*) (1984) (cited on page 3).
- [7] Ayyagari, Grover, and Purvis. 'Technostress: Technological Antecedents and Implications'. In: *MIS Quarterly* 35.4 (2011), p. 831. doi: [10.2307/41409963](https://doi.org/10.2307/41409963). (Visited on 10/02/2024) (cited on page 3).
- [8] Ahmad Hassan et al. 'Effects of Plant Activity on Mental Stress in Young Adults'. In: *HortScience* 53.1 (Jan. 2018), pp. 104–109. doi: [10.21273/HORTSCI12447-17](https://doi.org/10.21273/HORTSCI12447-17). (Visited on 10/02/2024) (cited on page 3).
- [9] Olivia Seow et al. 'Pudica: A Framework For Designing Augmented Human-Flora Interaction'. In: *Augmented Humans* 2022. Kashiwa, Chiba Japan: ACM, Mar. 2022, pp. 40–45. doi: [10.1145/3519391.3519394](https://doi.org/10.1145/3519391.3519394). (Visited on 10/24/2022) (cited on page 3).
- [10] Alexander G. Volkov et al. 'Mimosa Pudica : Electrical and Mechanical Stimulation of Plant Movements'. In: *Plant, Cell & Environment* 33.2 (Feb. 2010), pp. 163–173. doi: [10.1111/j.1365-3040.2009.02066.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-3040.2009.02066.x). (Visited on 05/26/2024) (cited on page 3).
- [11] Munehiko Sato, Ivan Poupyrev, and Chris Harrison. 'Touché: Enhancing Touch Interaction on Humans, Screens, Liquids, and Everyday Objects'. In: *Proceedings of the SIGCHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*. Austin Texas USA: ACM, May 2012, pp. 483–492. doi: [10.1145/2207676.2207743](https://doi.org/10.1145/2207676.2207743). (Visited on 05/26/2024) (cited on pages 3, 5).
- [12] Ivan Poupyrev et al. 'Botanicus Interacticus: Interactive Plants Technology'. In: *ACM SIGGRAPH 2012 Emerging Technologies*. Los Angeles California: ACM, Aug. 2012, pp. 1–1. doi: [10.1145/2343456.2343460](https://doi.org/10.1145/2343456.2343460). (Visited on 05/26/2024) (cited on page 4).
- [13] Colin Honigman, Jordan Hochenbaum, and Ajay Kapur. 'Techniques in Swept Frequency Capacitive Sensing: An Open Source Approach'. In: () (cited on page 4).
- [14] Ken Hinckley and Mike Sinclair. 'Touch-Sensing Input Devices'. In: *Proceedings of the SIGCHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems the CHI Is the Limit - CHI '99*. Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, United States: ACM Press, 1999, pp. 223–230. doi: [10.1145/302979.303045](https://doi.org/10.1145/302979.303045). (Visited on 08/18/2024) (cited on page 5).
- [15] Simon Olberding et al. 'A Cuttable Multi-Touch Sensor'. In: *Proceedings of the 26th Annual ACM Symposium on User Interface Software and Technology*. St. Andrews Scotland, United Kingdom: ACM, Oct. 2013, pp. 245–254. doi: [10.1145/2501988.2502048](https://doi.org/10.1145/2501988.2502048). (Visited on 08/18/2024) (cited on page 5).
- [16] Chia-Yen Lee and Gwo-Bin Lee. 'Humidity Sensors: A Review'. In: *Sensor Letters* 3.1 (Jan. 2005), pp. 1–15. doi: [10.1166/sl.2005.001](https://doi.org/10.1166/sl.2005.001). (Visited on 10/05/2024) (cited on page 5).
- [17] Burcu Arman Kuzubasoglu. 'Recent Studies on the Humidity Sensor: A Mini Review'. In: *ACS Applied Electronic Materials* 4.10 (Oct. 2022), pp. 4797–4807. doi: [10.1021/acsaem.2c00721](https://doi.org/10.1021/acsaem.2c00721). (Visited on 10/05/2024) (cited on page 6).

- [18] T Hermann and H Ritter. 'Listen to Your Data: Model-Based Sonification for Data Analysis'. In: () (cited on page 6).
- [19] Mark Ballora et al. 'Use of sonification in the detection of anomalous events'. In: *Multisensor, Multisource Information Fusion: Architectures, Algorithms, and Applications* 2012. Vol. 8407. SPIE. 2012, pp. 213–219 (cited on page 6).
- [20] Adian F Rochim, Mukhlis A Aziz, and Adnan Fauzi. 'Design Log Management System of Computer Network Devices Infrastructures Based on ELK Stack'. In: *2019 International Conference on Electrical Engineering and Computer Science (ICECOS)*. IEEE. 2019, pp. 338–342 (cited on page 7).
- [21] Gareth Loy. 'Musicians Make a Standard: The MIDI Phenomenon'. In: *Computer Music Journal* 9.4 (1985), p. 8. doi: [10.2307/3679619](https://doi.org/10.2307/3679619) (cited on page 7).
- [22] I Fazenda, Sao Paulo, and I S Junior. 'Proceedings of the International Conference on New Interfaces for Musical Expression'. In: () (cited on page 7).
- [23] I Fazenda, Sao Paulo, and I S Junior. 'Proceedings of the International Conference on New Interfaces for Musical Expression'. In: () (cited on page 7).
- [24] Tanvir Hussain and Md Mejbaul Haque. 'AVR Microcontroller Implementation for Customized Sound Generation'. In: *International Journal of Electrical and Computer Engineering (IJECE)* 2.1 (Nov. 2011), pp. 112–119. doi: [10.11591/ijece.v2i1.139](https://doi.org/10.11591/ijece.v2i1.139) (cited on page 7).
- [25] Bassam Shaer et al. 'Interactive Capacitive Touch Music Table with Embedded Microcontrollers'. In: *The Journal of Supercomputing* 76.11 (Nov. 2020), pp. 8845–8865. doi: [10.1007/s11227-020-03167-4](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11227-020-03167-4) (cited on page 7).
- [26] Khurshid Aliev et al. 'Internet of Plants Application for Smart Agriculture'. In: *International Journal of Advanced Computer Science and Applications* 9.4 (2018). doi: [10.14569/IJACSA.2018.090458](https://doi.org/10.14569/IJACSA.2018.090458). (Visited on 08/24/2024) (cited on page 7).
- [27] Peter G. Steeneken et al. 'Sensors in Agriculture: Towards an Internet of Plants'. In: *Nature Reviews Methods Primers* 3.1 (Aug. 2023), p. 60. doi: [10.1038/s43586-023-00250-x](https://doi.org/10.1038/s43586-023-00250-x). (Visited on 08/24/2024) (cited on page 7).
- [28] Masaharu Kitano et al. 'Internet of Plants (IoP) Empowers Bottom-up Innovations in Greenhouse Horticulture'. In: *Environment Control in Biology* 60.1 (Jan. 2022), pp. 3–12. doi: [10.2525/ecb.60.3](https://doi.org/10.2525/ecb.60.3). (Visited on 08/24/2024) (cited on page 8).
- [29] Maarten van Steen and Andrew S. Tanenbaum. *Distributed Systems*. Third edition, Version 3.01. Erscheinungsort nicht ermittelbar: Maarten van Steen, 2017 (cited on page 8).
- [30] Leonard Kleinrock. 'Distributed Systems'. In: () (cited on page 8).
- [31] Dr Eric A Brewer. 'Towards Robust Distributed Systems'. In: (2000) (cited on page 9).
- [32] Jeffrey Joyce, Greg Lomow, and Brian Unger. 'Monitoring Distributed Systems'. In: *ACM Transactions on Computer Systems* 5.2 () (cited on page 9).
- [33] Roger Thornton Dean. *The Oxford Handbook of Computer Music*. Oxford Handbooks. New York (N.Y.): Oxford University Press, 2009 (cited on page 9).
- [34] Atau Tanaka. *Sensor-based musical instruments and interactive music*. na, 2009 (cited on page 9).
- [35] A. Barbosa and M. Kaltenbrunner. 'Public Sound Objects: A Shared Musical Space on the Web'. In: *Second International Conference on Web Delivering of Music*, 2002. WEDELMUSIC 2002. Proceedings. Darmstadt, Germany: IEEE Comput. Soc, 2002, pp. 9–16. doi: [10.1109/WDM.2002.1176188](https://doi.org/10.1109/WDM.2002.1176188). (Visited on 10/03/2024) (cited on page 9).
- [36] Gregory Kramer et al. 'Sonification Report: Status of the Field and Research Agenda'. In: () (cited on page 9).
- [37] Miller S Puckette. 'Pure Data: Another Integrated Computer Music Environment'. In: () (cited on page 9).
- [38] James McCartney. 'Rethinking the Computer Music Language: Super Collider'. In: *Computer Music Journal* 26.4, (2002), pp. 61–68 (cited on page 9).
- [39] Boris Smus. *Web audio API: advanced sound for games and interactive apps.* " O'Reilly Media, Inc.", 2013 (cited on page 10).
- [40] Tristan Peng and Hongchan Choi. 'SIREN: A Case Study in Web Audio Based Sonification'. In: *Proceedings of the 26th International Conference on Auditory Display (ICAD 2021)*. Virtual Conference:

- International Community for Auditory Display, June 2021, pp. 126–130. doi: [10.21785/icad2021.042](https://doi.org/10.21785/icad2021.042). (Visited on 10/04/2024) (cited on page 10).
- [41] John G. Neuhoff. 'Is Sonification Doomed to Fail?' In: *Proceedings of the 25th International Conference on Auditory Display (ICAD 2019)*. Newcastle upon Tyne: Department of Computer and Information Sciences, Northumbria University, June 2019, pp. 327–330. doi: [10.21785/icad2019.069](https://doi.org/10.21785/icad2019.069). (Visited on 10/04/2024) (cited on page 10).
- [42] David Both. 'systemd'. In: *Using and Administering Linux: Volume 2: Zero to SysAdmin: Advanced Topics*. Berkeley, CA: Apress, 2020, pp. 379–410. doi: [10.1007/978-1-4842-5455-4\\_13](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4842-5455-4_13) (cited on page 25).