

Real-world Machine Learning Systems: A Survey from a Data-Oriented Architecture Perspective

CHRISTIAN CABRERA, ANDREI PALEYES, PIERRE THODOROFF, and NEIL D. LAWRENCE,
Department of Computer Science and Technology, University of Cambridge, United Kingdom

Machine Learning models are being deployed as parts of real-world systems with the upsurge of interest in artificial intelligence. The design, implementation, and maintenance of such systems are challenged by real-world environments that produce larger amounts of heterogeneous data and users requiring increasingly faster responses with efficient resource consumption. These requirements push prevalent software architectures to the limit when deploying ML-based systems. Data-oriented Architecture (DOA) is an emerging concept that equips systems better for integrating ML models. DOA extends current architectures to create data-driven, loosely coupled, decentralised, open systems. Even though papers on deployed ML-based systems do not mention DOA, their authors made design decisions that implicitly follow DOA. The reasons why, how, and the extent to which DOA is adopted in these systems are unclear. Implicit design decisions limit the practitioners' knowledge of DOA to design ML-based systems in the real world. This paper answers these questions by surveying real-world deployments of ML-based systems. The survey shows the design decisions of the systems and the requirements these satisfy. Based on the survey findings, we also formulate practical advice to facilitate the deployment of ML-based systems. Finally, we outline open challenges to deploying DOA-based systems that integrate ML models.

CCS Concepts: • **Software and its engineering**; • **Computing methodologies** → **Artificial intelligence**; **Machine learning**;

Additional Key Words and Phrases: Artificial Intelligence, Machine Learning, Real World Deployment, Systems Architecture, Data-Oriented Architecture.

ACM Reference Format:

Christian Cabrera, Andrei Paleyes, Pierre Thodoroff, and Neil D. Lawrence. 2023. Real-world Machine Learning Systems: A Survey from a Data-Oriented Architecture Perspective. *ACM Comput. Surv.* 1, 1 (October 2023), 33 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/nnnnnnn.nnnnnnn>

1 INTRODUCTION

Artificial intelligence solutions based on machine learning have gained much attention recently. They have been used to solve challenging problems in domains as varied as healthcare, agriculture, natural language processing, physics, and transportation [70]. Their success has been driven by the growth of available data, increasingly powerful hardware, and the development of novel ML models [37]. Many of these models were developed in academic environments, but their demonstrated practical value has led to their rapid adoption in real-world software systems. The design, implementation, deployment, and maintenance of systems that integrate ML models (i.e., ML-based systems) are challenged by the contrast between real-world environments and the more controlled environments from which ML models originate. The nature of real-world environments challenges

Authors' address: Christian Cabrera; Andrei Paleyes; Pierre Thodoroff; Neil D. Lawrence, {chc79,ap2169,pt440,ndl21}@cam.ac.uk, Department of Computer Science and Technology, University of Cambridge, Cambridge, United Kingdom.

Permission to make digital or hard copies of all or part of this work for personal or classroom use is granted without fee provided that copies are not made or distributed for profit or commercial advantage and that copies bear this notice and the full citation on the first page. Copyrights for components of this work owned by others than ACM must be honored. Abstracting with credit is permitted. To copy otherwise, or republish, to post on servers or to redistribute to lists, requires prior specific permission and/or a fee. Request permissions from permissions@acm.org.

© 2023 Association for Computing Machinery.

0360-0300/2023/10-ART \$15.00

<https://doi.org/10.1145/nnnnnnn.nnnnnnn>

practitioners when they adopt and deploy ML models as parts of larger systems [97]. In particular, real-world environments produce large amounts of heterogeneous, dynamic, high-dimensional, and sometimes sensitive data, which need to be processed in real time and in an efficient fashion [23, 59]. ML-based systems deployed in the real world must be scalable, fast, adaptable, secure, resource-efficient, and autonomous while enabling data availability, reuse, monitoring, and trust [73, 97, 100]. Service-oriented architectures (SOAs) and microservices are the dominant software systems architectures nowadays [11, 87]. These paradigms are formulated around services that separate systems' functionalities, communicate through well-defined programming interfaces (i.e., APIs), and are usually deployed in the cloud [122]. Real-world requirements push these paradigms to their limits. SOAs and microservices are well-equipped to address some of them but not all. Separation of concerns facilitates systems maintenance by following the divide-and-conquer principle [64, 79]. However, monitoring and transparency requirements are hard to satisfy because services hide the systems' data behind their programming interfaces [30]. This situation is known as "The Data Dichotomy": while high-quality data management requires exposing systems' data, services are designed to hide it [119]. Services are deployed in flexible cloud platforms, which makes systems highly available and scalable [61]. However, cloud deployments can fail to meet low-latency requirements from critical applications. The physical distance between end users and cloud data centres impacts systems' end-to-end response time [25]. Data security, privacy, and trust requirements are also affected when systems are deployed in the cloud. The ownership of the data changes from end users to cloud providers, which generates availability, privacy and security concerns [4, 67]. Cloud resources are expensive and not accessible to everyone, which does not satisfy resource-constraint requirements from real-world organisations [68].

Data-Oriented Architecture (DOA) is an emerging concept that complements the current paradigms for building and deploying systems. DOA considers data as the common denominator between disparate system components [59]. Services in DOA are distributed, autonomous, and communicate with each other at the data level (i.e., data coupling) using asynchronous messages [110, 126]. DOA enables systems to achieve properties such as data availability, reusability, and monitoring, as well as systems adaptability, autonomy, and resource efficiency [59, 110, 126]. These properties equip systems better for adopting and integrating ML models in production environments. For example, a DOA-based system stores the states of the data that flows through it by design because of the data coupling between its components. An ML engineer or a meta-learning system can trace and analyse such records, identify when the system's data distribution changes, and update the system's learning models. Similarly, DOA enables the creation of open systems because of the autonomous communication between their components. New devices can automatically join and provide computing and storage power to DOA-based systems. Such flexibility facilitates the deployment of ML models in resource-constraint environments and can mitigate low-latency requirements as services are deployed closer to end users [121].

Even though most papers on deployed ML-based systems do not mention DOA explicitly, their authors faced the same challenges that DOA aims to address. They made design decisions that implicitly followed DOA principles in their projects to achieve successful delivery. The reasons why, how, and the extent to which DOA is adopted in these systems are unclear. Such implicit design decisions limit the knowledge of practitioners about DOA to design and deploy ML-based in the real world. This paper surveys ML-based systems deployed in the real world to identify the reasoning behind their design decisions and the requirements these satisfy. This analysis provides insights and future research directions for practitioners who want to deploy ML models as part of larger software systems. We start contextualising the DOA principles through the ML deployment challenges. Then, we present the survey of current deployed ML-based systems from a data-oriented architecture perspective. We analyse the commonalities between the reviewed systems and discuss why, how and to what extent DOA principles have been adopted in practice. Finally, we formulate practical advice, open challenges, and future research directions for designing DOA-based systems in the context of the ML-based systems deployed in the real world.

2 RELATED WORK

Although the principles behind DOA are not new, DOA as an architecture for ML applications is an emerging pattern. Many domains have discovered and are reaping the benefits of applying these principles. Data-oriented design (DOD) applies many DOA principles on a lower level of abstraction, with claims of significant improvements over analogous Object Oriented Programming (OOP) solutions. Video game development is one domain where DOD is widespread, as it is used to improve memory and cache utilisation [1]. For example, Coherent Labs utilised DOD while creating their game engine Hummingbird [83] to overcome the performance limitations of solutions based on Chromium and WebKit. DOD helped the developers eliminate cache misses and compiler branch mispredictions, leading to a 6.12x improvement in animation rendering speed. Outside of gaming, Mironov et al. [76] utilised DOD to improve the performance of a trading strategy backtesting utility. They improved the parallelisation opportunities and increased the performance speed to 66%. These examples illustrate that DOA-like principles, especially around data prioritisation, emerge at a different level of abstraction with different motivations and nevertheless bring significant benefits to diverse practitioners.

A wide range of papers have surveyed the application of AI in the last few years. They usually focus on the AI algorithms that solve problems in specific domains. They report the challenges these algorithms face and their open research gaps. For example, Cai et al. [26] survey multimodal ML techniques applied to the healthcare domain. They review systems for disease analysis, triage, diagnosis, and treatment. Bohg et al. [19] survey data-driven methodologies for robot grasping. They focus on techniques based on object recognition and pose estimation for known, familiar, and unknown objects. The review compares data-driven methodologies and analytics approaches. Qin et al. [101] analyse data-driven methods for industrial fault detection and diagnosis. This survey focuses on fault detectability and identifiability methods for industrial processes with different complexity and size. Wong et al. [130] present the challenges of applying deep learning (DL) techniques in radio frequency applications. This work reviews DL applications in the radio frequency domain from the perspective of data trust, security, and hardware/software issues for DL deployment in real-world wireless communication applications. Joshi et al. [58] surveys the deployment of deep learning approaches at the edge. Their review presents architectures of deep learning models, enabling technologies, and adaptation techniques. Their work also describes different metrics for designing and evaluating deep learning models at the edge.

Recent survey papers on the AutoML domain focus on the automatic selection, composition, and parametrisation of learning models [127]. Faes et al. [39] evaluated automated DL software and tools to develop medical image diagnostic classifiers by healthcare professionals. They found that these professionals can use AutoML software to develop DL algorithms whose performance is comparable to the ones in the existing literature. Waring et al. [127] review the state-of-the-art of automatic ML from a computer science and biomedical perspective. This paper shows that automated techniques can support experts in different ML tasks by reducing processing times. Escalante [38] describes the main paradigms of AutoML in the supervised learning context. This paper surveys research works in this area and outlines future research opportunities. Similarly, Zheng et al. [135] review the application of AutoML techniques to the domain of recommender systems. They propose a reference architecture for a recommender system and analyse the state of the art according to the architecture's components.

Previous surveys study the application and automation of ML models in specific domains. They consider ML models as isolated components to be optimised under different settings. However, they do not focus on the systems architectures where such models are integrated and how these architectures are deployed in real-world environments. This paper surveys ML-based systems deployed in the real world from a data-oriented perspective. We consider ML models as components of larger systems that face challenging requirements from the real world. This survey analyses why, how, and quantifies the extent to which current systems adopt the DOA principles to address such challenges. It identifies the systems' shared requirements, design decisions, and

enabling technologies. These findings are then used to formulate practical advice and open research challenges for practitioners to build DOA-based systems in the context of real-world ML deployments.

3 DATA-ORIENTED ARCHITECTURES PARADIGM AND ML CHALLENGES

Service-oriented architecture (SOA) is the prevalent systems design paradigm. It defines services as individual components that expose their functionalities through interfaces (APIs) and interact via calls to these interfaces [119]. Modularity enables the assignation of systems components to different teams. Such separation of concerns facilitates the maintainability of systems in large organisations. Independent departments in the organisation focus on specific services instead of the whole system because of the well-defined interfaces between the parts of the system [64, 79]. Services and microservices are usually deployed in cloud platforms for high availability and robustness. Flexible and automatic management of resources (e.g., replicas, load-balancers, etc.) enables systems to be fault-tolerant and guarantee the quality of service despite the amount of data to be processed [61]. Maintainability, high availability, and scalability are essential requirements that ML-based systems must satisfy when deployed in the real world. Services abstractions and cloud deployments enable current systems architectures to meet these requirements. However, real-world environments pose additional requirements to ML-based systems, which are difficult to satisfy within the SOA paradigm. Data monitoring and transparency are challenging because services hide data behind their interfaces (“The Data Dichotomy”, [119]). Service interactions based on interfaces prioritise control flow and make data exchanged during the communication ephemeral [91]. Cloud platforms are expensive and take ownership of end users’ data. The physical distance between end users and cloud servers impacts the end-to-end latency of critical applications supported by AI (e.g., real-time health diagnosis) [25]. Cloud resources are usually expensive failing to satisfy resource constraint requirements when there are budget constraints in the real-world systems [68]. Cloud deployments imply the change of data ownership from end users to service providers. End users are unaware of where and how providers process their sensible data. Data ownership, security, accountability, and trust requirements are hard to satisfy in such deployments [4, 30, 67].

Data-Oriented Architecture (DOA) is an emerging concept that can improve our ability to overcome these challenges when deploying ML-based systems in the real world. DOA proposes a set of principles for building data-oriented software: considering data as a first-class citizen, decentralisation as a priority, and openness [59, 67, 110, 126]. Figure 1 maps ML deployment challenges and DOA principles addressing them. The left side of the figure shows the challenges of the ML workflow at deployment discussed by Paleyes et al. [97], while the right side shows the DOA principles we have extracted from the literature [59, 67, 110, 126]. This section introduces each DOA principle and discusses how they support the deployment of ML-based systems in the real world.

3.1 Data as a First Class Citizen

Data collection, augmentation, preprocessing, analysis, and monitoring tasks are challenging for systems deployed in the real world. Such environments usually generate high volumes of variable data, which needs to be processed in real-time to create value for organisations and individuals. These requirements mainly come from the properties of the data real-world systems must handle, which are also known as “the five Vs” of big data: volume, variability, velocity, veracity, and value [81]. Such data properties and requirements become more critical for ML-based systems because they are data-driven. The outputs and overall performance of ML-based systems depend on the quality of the data that flows through their components [42]. Practitioners must design data-driven systems according to the data systems handle and process. These systems must monitor their data to evaluate their performance at run time, identify or predict failures, and trigger maintenance or adaptation operations. The nature of the systems’ data and its quality determines the systems’ components’ definition, interactions, and evolution. Current software design paradigms build systems based on individual services that encapsulate atomic capabilities and interact through their interfaces. These paradigms usually fall into “The Data Dichotomy” as they hide their




Fig. 1. Map between ML Workflow Challenges at Deployment [97] and DOA's principles. The left side shows the ML challenges at deployment, and the right side shows the DOA's principles. The links between them represent which principles support addressing the respective challenges.

data behind service interfaces, while data management requires exposing data [119]. The dichotomy does not suit data management tasks as additional efforts are needed to access the data that flows through the system. Such data unavailability complicates systems' monitoring and transparency and the tasks that depend on it [30].

In the ML context, it means that systems' data unavailability challenges the selection, parametrisation, training, testing, verification, integration, monitoring, composition, and updating of the learning model components as well as systems' data privacy, transparency, and security requirements [97].

DOA proposes to treat the **data as a first-class citizen** of a software system, understanding data as the common denominator between disparate components [59]. It means that the data in a DOA-based system is primary and the operations on data are secondary. This principle makes systems *data-driven* by design, which matches the nature of ML-based components. DOA-based systems rely on a *shared data model* which is processed and nourished by multiple system components [110]. The shared data model is a single data structure equivalent to the one that data engineers build into the data management stage of ML workflows. The key difference is that this data model is automatically built from the system components' interactions. Systems components do not expose any APIs, and instead interact via data mediums, where input is listened to and output is offloaded [110]. Such interactions enable DOA-based systems to achieve *data coupling*, considered as the loosest form of coupling [85]. The shared data model stores the history of the system's state during its whole life cycle. Systems' data is fully available, describing the systems' current and past states. Data availability facilitates data management, learning model management, systems monitoring, failure detection, and adaptation tasks. Components' behaviour is programmatically observable, traceable, and auditable. Such transparency helps the responsible design of ML-based systems to resolve questions regarding accountability, trust, and security.

3.2 Prioritise Decentralisation

Big tech companies drove recent ML breakthroughs thanks to the increasingly powerful hardware and the efforts in building massive data sets [37, 70]. These enablers are not always present in systems deployed in the real world. Smaller organisations are using ML to solve challenging problems around the world (e.g. sustainable farming, epidemics, climate change, etc.) with limited budgets and resources¹. Most organisations worldwide cannot afford expensive cloud computing resources or the effort of building and maintaining massive learning models. Such a reality threatens the practical and democratic adoption of ML models as different stages of their workflow are computationally expensive. For example, the training stage is an iterative process that solves an optimisation problem to find learning model parameters. This process is expensive in complex models (e.g., large language models) that learn from non-quadratic, non-convex, and high dimensional data sets [49, 60, 88]. Hyperparameters improve the efficiency of the training process as well as the accuracy of the learning models [50]. However, the selection of these hyperparameters is also a resource-demanding optimisation problem [17, 90]. In addition, expensive and physically centralised deployments can fail to meet low-latency requirements from critical applications. The physical distance between end users and data centres impacts systems' end-to-end response time [25]. Data ownership, security, and trust requirements are also affected when systems are centralised. The ownership of the data changes from end users to cloud providers, which can entail privacy and security issues as end users are unaware of where and how their data is stored, processed, and used [4].

The simplest way to deliver a shared data model (Principle 3.1) would seem to be to centralise it, but in practice scalability, resource constraints, low latency, and security requirements mean that in DOA we **prioritise decentralisation** [67, 126]. Such decentralisation should be logical and physical. Logical decentralisation enables organisations to scale when developing ML-based systems as different development teams focus on smaller systems' components. Logical decentralisation is a way to achieve a clear separation of concerns, avoid central bottlenecks in the computational process, and increase flexibility in system development. Physical decentralisation enables the deployment of ML models in constrained environments where there is no access to expensive computational resources and improves privacy and ownership of data [67]. Components of ML-based systems should be deployed as decentralised *entities that store data chunks* of the shared information model described in

¹An example of such organisation is Data Science Africa (DSA): <http://www.datascienceafrica.org/aboutus/>

the previous principle. These entities first perform their operations with their local resources (i.e. *local first*, [67]). If local resources (i.e., data, computing time, or storage) are not enough, entities can connect temporally with other participants to share resources. Entities first scan their local environment for potential resources they need. They prioritise interactions with nodes in the close vicinity to share or ask for data and computing resources (i.e., *peer-to-peer first*). Centralised servers are used as fallback mechanisms [126]. This principle facilitates data management enabling the system's data replication by design as different entities can store the same data chunk. Such replication provides data availability because if one entity fails, its information is not lost. Similarly, replication provides scalability as different entities can respond to concurrent data requests [126]. Prioritising decentralisation also alleviates the high demand for resources of ML-based systems and reduces the inference latency of deployed ML models. ML-based systems can perform their data-related tasks (e.g., ML model training) in smaller data sets that are partitioned by design and trained models are deployed closer to end users providing faster responses [25]. In addition, decentralisation creates a flexible ecosystem where resources from different devices can be used on demand. This DOA principle advocates for a more sustainable and democratic approach that prioritises the computational power available in everyday devices over the expensive cloud resources. It is important to note that full decentralisation, logical or physical, is not always necessary, for example, there is no need to perform local first computations when large centralised computational resources are available. However, data replication, partitioned data sets, and flexible resource management are DOA-enabled properties that can still benefit even partial decentralisation of ML-based systems.

3.3 Openness

The development of ML components often involves the automation of various stages of data processing, both at the training and inference stages. Such automation is mainly required because of the amounts of data ML-based systems manage, the complex processes they perform, and the fact that their users are usually experts in domains different from ML (e.g. healthcare, physics, etc.) [127]. AutoML is a recent research area that aims to automate the ML training life cycle. AutoML approaches include processes such as data augmentation, model selection, and hyperparameter optimisation [38, 125]. Nevertheless, the deployment of ML-based systems in real-world environments sets automation requirements for adopting ML models that are not covered by AutoML. Real-world environments are dynamic and deployed systems must respond autonomously to changing goals, variable data, unexpected failures, security threats, complex uncertainties, etc. Autonomous responses are required because practitioners do not have complete control over such deployments [89], their complexity usually exceeds the limit of human comprehension [92], and human intervention is not feasible [23]. Current ML-based systems rely on the interaction of a significant number of heterogeneous components. Static systems architectures usually pre-define the components and devices that compose a system and third-party entities (e.g., central controllers) usually integrate, orchestrate, and maintain these components to satisfy end-to-end system quality requirements [24]. These static and centralised architectures are also challenged by the scale and dynamic nature of real-world deployments that demand autonomous solutions.

Autonomous and independent software components are the building blocks of systems that can adapt and respond to uncertain environments without human intervention [129]. DOA proposes **openness** as a principle that enables the design and implementation of such autonomous systems' components in open environments where they interact autonomously [59]. DOA represents components as *autonomous* and *asynchronous* entities that communicate with each other using a common *message exchange protocol*. Systems can take advantage of such environments when adopting ML models as their components could perform the integration, composition, monitoring, and adaptation tasks in an autonomous and decentralised manner. Asynchronous entities produce their outputs and can subscribe to inputs at any time [110]. These steps are public and explicit in favour of data trust, traceability, and transparency. Similarly, the system's components are autonomous in deciding which




Fig. 2. Survey process that depicts the steps from the review need identification to the full-text reading of the selected papers. This process is based on the methodology proposed by Kitchenham et al. [65, 66]

Table 1. Search query format used to retrieve papers. The query is composed by three search terms in conjunction. Each of them are replaced by the the values in the second column.

Search Query	<search_term_1>AND <search_term_2>AND <search_term_3>
<search_term_1>	"autonomous vehicle" OR "health" OR "industry" OR "smart cities" OR "multimedia" OR "science" OR "robotics" OR "oceanology" OR "finance" OR "space" OR "e-commerce"
<search_term_2>	"machine learning"
<search_term_3>	"real world" AND "deploy"

data to store, which data to make public, and which data to hide for security and privacy [126]. The message exchange protocol between asynchronous components replaces interface dependencies in service-oriented or microservices architectures with asynchronous messages between data producers and consumers. Asynchronous communication protocols enable data coupling, considered to be the loosest form of coupling in favour of scalability and low latency requirements [85].

4 SURVEY METHODOLOGY

The goal of this paper is to assess to which extent DOA principles are already adopted in existing deployed ML systems. We therefore want to survey research works that have used ML to solve problems in different domains and have been actually deployed and tested in real-world settings. We are particularly interested in works that report the software architectures behind these systems and, if possible, the design decisions authors made toward such architectures. The selection of these works is not straightforward as a myriad of papers that apply ML in different domains have been published in recent years, making manual selection unfeasible. For this reason, we developed a semi-automatic framework based on a well-known methodology for systematic literature reviews (SLRs) in software engineering [65, 66]. The framework is available publicly on GitHub² to allow the reproducibility of this work, as well as the reusability of this framework in other surveys. The framework queries the search APIs from different digital libraries to retrieve papers' metadata (e.g., title, abstract, and citations) in an automatic fashion. It then applies syntactic and semantic filters over the retrieved papers to reduce the search space. The filtered list of papers is manually examined to select the papers to be surveyed. Figure 2 depicts the stages of the survey process. It has two principal stages described in the next section.

4.1 Planning Stage

The first stage consists of the review plan definition as follows:

- a. *Need identification*: Section 3 introduced the DOA principles and how these can support software developers when addressing challenges of ML deployment in the real world. Despite these potential benefits, and

²Semi-automatic Literature Survey: <https://github.com/cabreric/semi-automatic-literature-survey>

Table 2. Synonyms to extend queries. Search terms in the Word column are expanded using their respective synonyms.

Word	Synonyms
"health"	"healthcare", "health care", "health-care", "medicine", "medical", "diagnosis".
"industry"	"industry 4", "manufacture", "manufacturing", "factory", "manufactory", "industrial".
"smart cities"	"sustainable city", "smart city", "digital city", "urban", "city", "cities", "mobility", "transport", "transportation system".
"multimedia"	"virtual reality", "augmented reality", "3D", "digital twin", "video games", "video", "image recognition", "audio", "speech recognition", "speech".
"science"	"pyshics", "psychology", "chemistry", "biology", "geology", "social", "maths", "materials", "astronomy", "climatology", "oceanology", "space".
"autonomous vehicle"	"self-driving vehicle", "self-driving car", "autonomous car", "driverless car", "driverless vehicle", "unmanned car", "unmanned vehicle", "unmanned aerial vehicle".
"networking"	"computer network", "intranet", "internet", "world wide web".
"e-commerce"	"marketplace", "electronic commerce", "shopping", "buying".
"robotics"	"robot".
"finance"	"banking".
"machine learning"	"ML", "deep learning", "neural network", "reinforcement learning", "supervised learning", "unsupervised learning", "artificial intelligence", "AI".
"deploy"	"deployment", "deployed", "implemented", "implementation", "software".
"real world"	"reality", "real", "physical world".

several surveys in ML and its applications (see Section 2), it is not clear yet to what extent current ML-based systems have adopted these principles. We want to conduct a survey of deployed ML-based systems from a DOA perspective to fill this gap and to identify best practices, and open research directions toward the development of the next generation of DOAs for ML systems in the real world.

- b. *Research questions:* The main research question we want to answer with this survey is *to what extent current ML-based systems have adopted the DOA principles?* The answer to this question will allow us to identify the research gaps and directions to develop the next generations of DOAs. The long-term goal of our work is to establish DOA as a mature and competitive paradigm for designing, developing, implementing, deploying, monitoring, and adapting ML-based systems.
- c. *Search terms:* We want to search for papers that present ML-based systems deployed in real-world environments in different domains. Table 1 shows the query format and the search terms we use to retrieve such papers. The query is composed of three search terms in conjunction (i.e., AND operator). The first term refers to popular domains where ML has been applied. The second term filters papers that apply machine learning in these domains, and the third term filters the papers that actually deploy their solution in the real world. Search engines in scientific databases use different matching algorithms. Some of them search for exact words in the papers' attributes (e.g., title or abstract), which can be too restrictive. We expand these queries by including synonyms for the different words in the search terms (Table 2). Synonyms extend queries using inclusive disjunction (i.e. OR operator) with their respective words.

Table 3. Categories and keywords for Lbl2Vec algorithm [108]

Category	Keywords
"system"	"architecture", "framework", "platform", "tool", "prototype".
"software"	"develop", "engineering", "methodology", "architecture", "design", "implementation", "open", "source", "application".
"deploy"	"production", "real", "world", "embedded", "physical", "cloud", "edge", "infrastructure".
"simulation"	"synthetic", "simulate".

- d. *Source selection*: We search in the most popular scientific repositories using the APIs they offer. They are IEEEExplore³, Springer Nature⁴, Scopus⁵, Semantic Scholar⁶, CORE⁷, and ArXiv⁸. Some repositories, such as the ACM digital library, could not be used as they do not provide an API to query. Nevertheless, because of the significant overlap with other sources (papers can be published in multiple libraries, or indexed by meta-repositories such as Semantic Scholar), we are confident in the sufficient coverage of our search.

4.2 Conducting Stage

The second stage consists of the review execution as follows:

- a. *Automatic search*: We implemented clients that consume the APIs exposed by the selected repositories as part of our semi-automatic framework. In this step, each client parses the query in the format the respective API understands, submits the request, and stores the search results in separate CSV files. The search results are the metadata of the retrieved papers (e.g., title, abstract, publication data).
- b. *Preprocessing of Retrieved Data*: Each API provides papers metadata in its own format, there are duplicated papers between repositories, and some records can be incomplete (e.g., a paper missing an abstract). The preprocessing step prepares the data for the following steps in our semi-automated framework. It joins the papers' metadata in a single file, cleaning the data, and removing repeated and incomplete papers. A total of 34,932 papers were selected after this step.
- c. *Syntactic and Semantic Filters*: All the data of the retrieved papers are stored in a single file after the preprocessing step. But the number of papers is still too large for manual processing. We reduce the search space by applying two filters. A syntactic filter selects the papers that talk in the abstract about real-world deployments. In particular, this filter searches for the "real world" and "deploy" words and their synonyms (Table 2) in the papers' abstracts. We found that the selected papers can be classified into four categories, after the syntactic filtering. The first category includes the papers that present architectures of deployed ML-based systems, the second category includes papers that present software engineering approaches to build ML-based systems in practice, the third category includes papers that present physical implementations (e.g., edge architectures) of ML-based systems with a special focus on the infrastructure, and the final category includes papers that experiment and evaluate ML algorithms and systems based on synthetic data and simulated environments. We used an unsupervised-learning algorithm Lbl2Vec to semantically classify the selected papers in these four groups following the work proposed by Schopf et

³IEEEExplore API: <https://developer.ieee.org/>

⁴Springer Nature API: <https://dev.springernature.com/>

⁵Scopus API: <https://www.elsevier.com/solutions/sciencedirect/librarian-resource-center/api>

⁶Semantic Scholar: <https://www.semanticscholar.org/product/api>

⁷CORE API: <https://core.ac.uk/services/api>

⁸ArXiv API: <https://arxiv.org/help/api/>

- al. [108]. Lbl2Vec requires as inputs a set of texts to classify (i.e., selected papers abstracts), and a set of predefined categories (Table 3). The algorithm assigns papers to the most relevant category. We use this semantic classification to select the papers that belong to the first three categories (i.e., system, software, and deploy). These filters produced a total of 5,559 papers.
- d. *Semi-automatic filtering*: The syntactic filters in the previous step reduce the set of papers to a number that is more feasible to be manually explored. Our framework in this step shows the paper information to the user in a centralised interface where papers are selected as included or excluded. Such manual selection has two stages following the methodology defined by Kitchenham et al. [65, 66]. We select the papers by reading their abstracts in the first stage. Then, we filter the selected papers by skimming the full text. The papers that pass these two filters are part of the final set of selected papers. Manual filters produced a total of 101 papers and were performed by one researcher in our team.
- e. *Snowballing*: We use the API from Semantic Scholar to retrieve metadata of the papers that cite the selected papers (i.e., 101 papers) from the previous stage. We apply the preprocessing stage as well as the syntactic, semantic, and manual filters to the resulting papers from this snowballing process. The papers that pass these filters are added to the final set of selected papers after removing repeated papers. This process resulted in 2 more papers added to the selection, resulting in a total of 103 papers for full-text reading.
- f. *Full-text reading*: Two researchers of our team read the 103 papers and selected 45 papers. We agreed on the selection criteria based on the DOA principles definition and made annotations in a centralised repository about to what extent these papers adopt the DOA principles (Section 3). Selection conflicts were solved by group discussions. Section 5 presents the survey of the 45 papers from a data-oriented perspective.
- g. *Exclusion criteria*: We exclude the following works during our semi-automatic process:
- Papers that report experiments on synthetic data or simulated environments.
 - Papers that propose systems architectures without a proper real-world deployment and evaluation.
 - Papers that present isolated ML algorithms which are not part of larger systems.
 - Papers with missing metadata that cannot be analysed by our framework (i.e., a paper without abstract).
 - Papers that are duplicates of already included papers.
 - Papers that are not written in English.
 - Survey and review papers.
 - Thesis and report documents.

5 ML APPLICATIONS SURVEY FROM DOA PRINCIPLES PERSPECTIVE

This section presents the survey of ML-based systems deployed in real-world environments. The main goal of this survey is to understand why, how, and to what extent the DOA principles (Section 3) have been applied in practice. The answer to these questions allows us to identify the systems’ requirements that DOA principles satisfy, and the practical approaches for implementing DOA, as well as to define the open challenges for building DOA-based systems (Section 6). Table 4 contrasts the DOA principles and sub-principles and the list of reviewed papers, which were selected according to the methodology described in Section 4. We found that the ML-based systems reported in these papers can adopt the principles fully, partially, or not at all. The level of adoption depends on the requirements these systems need to satisfy, the nature of the data they handle, and the environments where they are deployed. This section details the adoption of each principle and sub-principle.

5.1 Data as a First Class Citizen

Figure 3 shows the degree of adoption of the reviewed papers for the **data as a first-class citizen** principle. We found that all reviewed papers report *data-driven* systems. This result is expected as we are reviewing ML-based systems that are *data-driven* by nature. All the systems contain one or multiple learning models to accomplish

Table 4. All papers reviewed in our survey. We show whether each paper adopts (fully or partially) each of the DOA sub-principles discussed in Section 3.

Research work	Data as a First Class Citizen			Prioritise Decentralisation			Openness		
	Data driven	Shared data mode	Data coupling	Local data chunks	Local first	Peer-to-peer first	Autonomous entities	Asynchronous entities	Message exchange protocol
Lebofsky et al. [69]	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Herrero et al. [55]	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Zhang et al. [133]	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Dai et al. [33]	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Junchen et al. [56]	✓	✓	✓	-	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Karageorgou et al. [62]	✓	-	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Shan et al. [113]	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	-	-
Zhang et al. [134]	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	-	-	-
Sultana et al. [120]	✓	✓	✓	✓	-	✓	✓	✓	✓
Santana et al. [106]	✓	✓	✓	-	-	✓	-	-	-
Alonso et al. [8]	✓	-	✓	-	-	✓	-	-	-
Sarabia-Jácome et al. [107]	✓	-	✓	-	-	✓	-	-	-
Xu et al. [131]	✓	✓	✓	✓	-	✓	✓	✓	✓
Alves et al. [9]	✓	✓	✓	✓	-	✓	-	-	-
Conroy et al. [31]	✓	✓	✓	✓	-	✓	-	-	-
Bellocchio et al. [15]	✓	✓	✓	-	-	✓	-	-	-
Shih et al. [116]	✓	✓	-	-	-	✓	-	-	-
Gallagher et al. [45]	✓	✓	-	-	-	✓	-	-	-
Salhaoui et al. [104]	✓	✓	✓	-	-	✓	-	-	-
Shi et al. [115]	✓	✓	✓	-	-	✓	-	-	-
Nguyen et al. [82]	✓	✓	✓	✓	-	✓	-	✓	✓
Schumann et al. [111]	✓	✓	✓	✓	-	✓	-	✓	✓
Schubert et al. [109]	✓	✓	✓	✓	-	✓	-	✓	✓
Agarwal et al. [2]	✓	✓	✓	✓	-	✓	-	-	-
Habibi et al. [52]	✓	✓	-	✓	-	✓	-	-	-
Müller et al. [80]	✓	✓	-	✓	-	✓	-	-	-
Lu et al. [72]	✓	✓	✓	✓	-	✓	-	-	-
Calancea et al. [27]	✓	✓	✓	✓	-	✓	-	-	-
Quintero et al. [103]	✓	✓	✓	✓	-	✓	-	-	-
Franklin et al. [44]	✓	✓	✓	✓	-	✓	✓	✓	✓
Brumbaugh et al. [21]	✓	-	-	✓	-	✓	-	-	-
Hegemier et al. [54]	✓	✓	✓	-	-	✓	-	-	-
Gorkin et al. [51]	✓	✓	✓	✓	-	✓	-	-	-
Barachi et al. [13]	✓	✓	✓	✓	-	✓	-	-	-
Niu et al. [84]	✓	✓	✓	✓	-	✓	-	-	-
Qiu et al. [102]	✓	✓	✓	✓	-	✓	-	-	-
Cabanes et al. [22]	✓	✓	✓	✓	-	✓	-	-	-
Gao et al. [46]	✓	✓	-	✓	-	✓	-	-	-
Amrollahi et al. [10]	✓	-	-	✓	-	✓	-	-	-
Kemsaram et al. [63]	✓	✓	✓	✓	-	✓	-	-	-
Bayerl et al. [14]	✓	-	-	✓	-	✓	-	-	-
Johny et al. [57]	✓	✓	✓	✓	-	✓	-	-	-
Falcao et al. [40]	✓	✓	✓	✓	-	✓	-	-	-
Hawes et al. [53]	✓	✓	✓	✓	-	✓	-	-	-
Ali et al. [7]	✓	✓	✓	✓	-	✓	-	-	-

✓ = Adopted, - = Partially adopted, = Not adopted




Fig. 3. Adoption of data as a first-class citizen principle. All systems reviewed are data-driven, over 60% at least partially adopt shared data model, and just under half utilise data coupling.

the data tasks they are designed for. These systems' performance depends on the data that flow through them. For example, Schumann et al. [111] use a Bayesian network for health monitoring of space vehicles (e.g., rovers), Sarabia-Jacome et al. [107] build a DL model for fall detection in Ambient Assisted Living (AAL) environments, Junchen et al. [56] propose Pytheas as a data-driven approach that optimises the Quality of Experience (QoE) of applications based on network metrics, Agarwal et al. [2] present an RL-based decision-making system that Microsoft products use for different optimisation tasks, such as content recommendation system in MSN and virtual machine management in Azure Compute.

We found that 60% of the systems fully adopt the sub-principle of handling their information using *shared data models*, which are implemented either using data streams or databases. Our review shows that stream data structures fit better data produced from different sources in a continuous fashion. That is the case of environments that require systems to process multimedia streams (e.g., video) [33, 40, 46, 52, 56], sensors data [22, 31, 55, 63, 72, 82, 111, 116, 134], social media data [80, 113, 131, 133], and network metrics [106, 120]. We observed that streams are particularly common in systems that are built with dataflow architecture [32, 91], where data inputs are transformed by different components while they flow through the system. Herrero et al. [55] presents a good example of a system based on a dataflow architecture. They propose a platform for

Industry 4.0 based on the RAI4.0 reference architecture [74] that models software and hardware components as stream producers and consumers. This platform handles data-intensive, continuous, and dynamic data sources from a water pump and its environment. Streams enable the system to manage and respond to real-time changes while providing predictive maintenance. Similarly, Sultana et al. [120] present a software framework to detect Distributed Denial of Service (DDoS) attacks in real-time network traffic. This software is based on a Support Vector Machine (SVM) model deployed using the Acumos and ONAP platforms. The framework is separated into decoupled components that exchange data between them via Kafka streams. Databases are more appropriate as *shared data models* when the system's functionalities require making online decisions based on individual historical data records [2, 9, 15, 45, 53, 69, 109]. A shared data model in such cases facilitates the storage and management of historical records and provides an efficient communication medium between systems' components compared to synchronous API calls or Remote Procedure Calls (RPCs). For example, Alves et al. [9] propose a system for industrial predictive maintenance based on historical data collected from IoT devices. These devices produce and write monitoring data in a database. The system's components read such data for the respective maintenance decision-making. Schubert et al. [109] introduce a deep learning-based system used by the Texas Spacecraft Laboratory. The system's components store and retrieve data from AWS S3 buckets to generate large data sets of synthetic images that support on-orbit spacecraft operations. Hawes et al. [53] present a robotic platform that stores the Robotic Operative System (ROS) messages in a document-oriented database (i.e., MongoDB). These messages describe the status of the robot and its interactions with the environment. A monitoring component reads this history to predict future environment states.

Over thirteen per cent of the reviewed papers partially adopt a *shared data model* between their systems' components. That is the case for systems that combine different storage technologies in data models that are shared but not unique [10, 21, 62]. These systems must store, monitor, and trace the data status at different stages of its processing. Systems combine different storage technologies and models because the data structure and format change after each processing stage. For example, the AIDEx platform [10] queries an electronic medical records (EMR) database and passes such data to a set of microservices that predict the risk of patients' infection sepsis based on their own data models. AIDEx creates patients' health data streams based on the prediction results which are stored in a MongoDB instance that is then used for visualisation purposes. Karageorgou et al. [62] propose a system for multilingual sentiment analysis of Twitter streams. This platform uses RabbitMQ queues to collect tweets in different languages. The system then models such data as Kafka streams for sentiment analysis. Other systems that partially adopt a *shared data model* are the ones that must collect data from spatially distributed sources [8, 14, 107]. Systems distribute such data to satisfy low latency, resource constraints, and privacy requirements. Distributed nodes use common models to store local data, but this data is not shared between them. Subsection 5.2 reports more details on distributed and decentralised deployments.

Just over a quarter of the reviewed papers report systems whose components do not have shared data models. Some systems do not need shared data models because they are small and not data-intensive. These are either implemented as monoliths in the cloud [51, 84] or as edge architectures that use edge servers as gateways for data transmission and inference. Such edge solutions deploy trained learning models on embedded devices like in the monitoring and prediction systems proposed by Quintero et al. [103], Salhaoui et al. [104], Hegemier et al. [54], and Johnny et al. [57]. Monolithic deployments follow a client-server pattern to collect sensor data and respond to users' requests. For example, Niu et al. [84] deploy a recognition system of indoor daily activities for one-person household apartments. There are also systems that do not have shared data models but are complex, large and process big volumes of data. These rely on cloud data centres and follow well-known software architectures (e.g., microservices) to satisfy such requirements [7, 13, 27, 44, 102, 115]. Functionalities and data of systems' subcomponents are encapsulated and hidden behind interfaces (e.g., service APIs). Transparency and traceability requirements are not prioritised in these systems while monitoring tasks are performed by third-party cloud components (e.g., middleware solutions [24]).

Systems' components in 33% of the reviewed papers are designed following the *data coupling* sub-principle. It means that these systems' components interact with each other by reading from and writing to data mediums. Some of these systems adopt this principle to handle real-time data that needs to be processed and monitored in a continuous fashion. We found that components of real-time systems [21, 22, 31, 33, 55, 56, 62, 82, 111, 120] act as subscribers and publishers of data to streams that represent the state of the data at different stages in a workflow. Streams-based systems make use of different technologies such as Apache Kafka [55, 56, 120] or Spark Streaming [21, 56], sometimes adopting the underlying stream-based programming model for the entire system [33]. Message queues (e.g., RabbitMQ) are also used in systems to collect heterogeneous data from different sources or enable interaction between components that act in parallel [62, 82]. Systems also adopt the *data coupling* sub-principle to handle large amounts of data that cannot be sent through APIs or RPCs [69, 109] or when they analyse historical data [2, 9, 113, 133]. Components read and write data in shared databases that reflect the data states and enable batch processing. The system proposed by Zhang et al. [133] illustrates these types of *data coupling* by combining streams and databases. Social media data from Weibo and Chinese forums are stored in distributed Apache Kafka streams that are processed using Apache Storm to enable real-time sentiment analysis. The system also offers batch processing where social media is stored using the Hadoop Distributed File System (HDFS) and an HBase database. The Apache Spark machine learning library (MLlib) is used to analyse the data in a distributed fashion. Systems that partially adopt *data coupling* (i.e., 15.5%) [10, 21, 45, 46, 52, 80, 116] are the ones where some components communicate through data mediums and others using traditional process calls. APIs or RPCs are used to communicate with distributed components or external entities, while the centralised system's components interact through data mediums. For example, systems can use API calls to collect data from heterogeneous data sources [10, 80] or to interact with end users [45, 46]. More than half of the reviewed papers do not adopt *data coupling*. These systems mostly use REST [13, 51, 57, 63, 72, 84, 103, 106] or RPCs [8, 14, 15, 27, 40, 44, 53, 54, 102, 104, 107, 115, 131, 134] for communication. These systems' components hide the data behind their interfaces which causes the data dichotomy issue impacting data management tasks (e.g., monitoring) [119].

We found that not all the systems where components share a common data model necessarily follow the *data coupling* sub-principle. This is the case of distributed systems where components have common local data models, but there is no interaction between them. These systems are designed to address low latency and data privacy requirements but do not need to aggregate data from geographically distributed sources for training their models. Some of these distributed systems create independent deployments that are in charge of the functionality of the whole system in a given geographical region or coverage area [15, 53, 63, 72]. Other distributed systems are based on edge devices that play the role of intermediate nodes that collect, preprocess, and transmit data to centralised servers as well as perform inference tasks when designers deploy cloud-trained learning models on the edge [8, 14, 40, 106, 107, 113, 131, 134].

5.2 Prioritise Decentralisation

Figure 4 presents to what extent the papers **prioritise decentralisation** when deploying their ML-based systems. Almost eighteen per cent of the papers report systems where decentralised entities store and share *local data chunks* with minimal presence of centralised entities. Decentralised approaches [33, 55, 62, 69, 113, 131, 133, 134] rely on local data chunks, which provide partitioning and replication by design. Data partition and replication enable systems to efficiently manage computing resources and be fault tolerant. That is the case of the Breakthrough Listen program presented by Lebofsky [69]. This program collects data from radio and optical telescopes to search for extraterrestrial intelligence (SETI). The search is based on different strategies which include ML models for modulation scheme classification and outlier detection. The paper reports the software and hardware architecture behind the data collection, reduction, archival, and public dissemination pipeline. This architecture consists of




Fig. 4. Adoption of prioritising decentralisation principle. Most of the systems are based on centralised storage and processing to the detriment of the decentralisation sub-principles.

clusters of storage and compute nodes that handle raw data volumes averaging 1PB per day. Decentralised storage nodes use Hierarchical Data Format version 5 (HDF5) to organise the large data sets in groups that facilitate data management along the pipeline. Another example of decentralisation is Poligraph [113], a system that detects fake news by combining ML models and human knowledge. Users send fake news detection requests to decentralised servers that run different ML models and collect news reviews from experts. Users' requests and news are replicated using the Byzantine Fault Tolerant (BFT) protocol to mitigate experts' unavailability (i.e., fault tolerance). Systems designers also use decentralisation to process intensive and sparse data sources [55, 62, 131, 133]. For example, Zhang et al. [133] propose a system for sentiment analysis of tweets from three Chinese cities (i.e., Beijing, Shanghai, Guangzhou and Chengdu). The decentralised storage and management of data is based on HBase and Kafka. Decentralised approaches must rely on distributed computing protocols and technologies to mitigate the challenges that arise from the absence of a central control entity. Karageorgou et al. [62] use Spark for scalable sentiment analysis on multilingual data from social media, Xu et al. [131] use Distributed Hash Tables (DHTs) to facilitate the retrieval of social data stored by topic for spam detection, and Herrero et al. [55] integrate Zookeeper, Kafka, and Apache Cassandra in a decentralised platform for a predictive maintenance industrial service.

Some systems partially decentralise the storage of data (17.8% of the papers). These approaches exploit decentralisation properties (e.g., closeness to data owners) while having central control of the system [98, 121]. Partial decentralisation creates federated networks where collected data from sensor devices (e.g., IoT sensors, smartphones, wearables, etc.) is stored in local databases [8, 15, 54, 115] or encoded in local learning models trained in more powerful servers (e.g., the cloud) [54, 56, 104, 106, 107]. In both cases, edge servers preprocess and filter the collected data before transmitting it to back-end servers. Such central entities have a complete view of the system's state and perform more complex tasks (e.g., learning models training, job scheduling, resource allocation etc.). Partial distribution of data favours data ownership, privacy and security as devices and edge nodes can decide when and how to transmit the information to back-end servers. Santana et al. [106] propose a crowd management system based on Wi-Fi frames originating from people's smartphones in the context of the SmartSantander project [105]. The system collects WiFi frames as streams, which are preprocessed by edge nodes. This preprocessing includes data anonymisation to protect people's identity; and dimensionality reduction to extract the key features from the streams. A centralised processing tier stores and uses the preprocessed and anonymised data to train ML models (e.g., logistic regression classifier, naive Bayesian classifier, and random forest classifier) for crowdsensing estimation. Local data storage also facilitates ML-based solutions deployment in resource-constrained environments. Alonso et al. [8] implement a real-time monitoring edge system for smart farming, where farmers want to reduce storage and compute costs while monitoring the state of dairy cattle and feed grain. Edge servers in the system collect, buffer, and filter data from IoT devices to eliminate possible noise and discard duplicated frames. Such filtering also reduces transmission and storage costs.

The majority of reviewed papers report systems that rely on centralised storage (i.e., 64.4%). Some of these systems are deployed on single cloud servers [2, 7, 10, 13, 21, 27, 31, 44–46, 51, 52, 72, 80, 84, 102, 109, 116, 120], where all data is stored. Cloud servers are flexible and can handle Big Data requirements like the ones described by Conroy et al. [31]. This work presents a system that monitors and predicts COVID-19 infections to aid military workforce readiness. This system monitored personnel of the US Department of Defense during the pandemic. It had around 10,000 users in ten months, collected 201 million hours of data, and delivered 599,174 total user-days of predictive service. Similarly, Calancea et al. [27] use the Google Cloud Datastore service to store the data behind iAssistMe, a platform to assist people with eye disabilities. Both systems assure scalability by increasing or reducing the number of server instances based on the number of requests. Other systems are deployed on single resource-constrained devices like mobile phones [14, 103], robots [53, 63, 111], or small processing units (e.g., Raspberry Pi) [9, 22, 40, 57, 82]. This type of deployment fits data problems that require online and fast inference and actuation but where data storage is infeasible due to hardware or bandwidth constraints. For example, Nguyen et al. [82] present a neuroprosthetic hand with embedded deep learning-based control. The authors deploy a recurrent neural network (RNN) decoder on an NVIDIA Jetson Nano. This enables the implementation of the neuroprosthetic hand as a portable and self-contained unit with real-time control of individual finger movements. Data is not stored as it is processed online.

We found that 17.8% of the reviewed systems prioritise *local processing*. Learning models like other systems' components are deployed on distributed computing nodes that process users' requests, make decisions, and provide systems' functionalities. Decentralised processing helps to satisfy scalability and low latency requirements in data-intensive applications [33, 55, 56, 62, 69, 113, 133, 134]. Dai et al. [33] introduce BigDL, a distributed deep learning framework for big data platforms and workflows. Intel developed the BigDL framework to ease the application of deep learning in real-world data pipelines for its industrial users: Mastercard, World Bank, Cray, Talroo, UCSF, JD, UnionPay, Telefonica, GigaSpaces, and more. Data that these companies handle is dynamic, messy, and requires complex, iterative, and recurrent processing that is challenging to implement efficiently in centralised architectures. BigDL distributes both training and inference being built on top of the scalable architecture of the Spark compute model. The architecture of Spark partitions data across workers that form computing clusters. Workers apply map, filter, and reduce operations in a parallel fashion. The data partitioning

and parallel processing enable the design and implementation of fault-tolerant and efficient systems based on learning models built from large data sets. There are few cases where distributed nodes cooperate to offer systems' functionalities. These systems also follow the *peer-to-peer first* sub-principle and correspond to the 20% of the reviewed papers [33, 55, 56, 62, 69, 113, 131, 133, 134]. Peer-to-peer cooperation enables systems to satisfy scalability, latency, fault-tolerance, and resource management requirements of systems that handle data from intensive and distributed sources. That is the case with systems that analyse social media data, for example, sentiment analysis of tweets or spam detection [62, 131, 133], or the Breakthrough Listen program [69] in the search for extraterrestrial intelligence (SETI). The adoption of the *peer-to-peer* sub-principle requires the use of distributed computing technologies and protocols to handle the complexity of decentralised processing. Systems also use these technologies when they adopt the *local first* sub-principle. Examples of the use of these technologies are Zhang et al. [133], Dai et al. [33], and Karageorgou et al. [62] using Spark, Junchen et al. [56] based on Kafka, Xu et al. [131] using DHTs, Lebofsky et al. [69] storing data on Hierarchical Data Format (HDF5), Shan et al. [113] using the Byzantine Fault Tolerant (BFT) protocol, and Herrero et al. [55] based on Zookeeper.

Over thirty-one per cent of the reviewed systems partially adopt the *local first* sub-principle. Different nodes are in charge of different functionalities in these systems. Centralised servers are in charge of computationally expensive processing such as model training and updating [14, 54, 57, 63, 103, 104, 107, 115, 131], global decision making [8, 27, 106], and systems' orchestration [21, 120]. Centralised servers execute these tasks because they have enough computing power and a global view of the system. Central processing enables easier control of the components of the system, which can be challenging in fully decentralised systems as autonomous entities must self-govern. Such central control makes systems robust as they rely on the central servers to offer scalable and highly available solutions. The works of Sultana et al. [120] and Brumbaugh et al. [21] are good examples of central control. They encapsulate systems' functionalities in logically distributed containers, but their control is centralised. Kubernetes is used as a central platform to manage container instantiation, resource allocation, scheduling, and execution. Systems that partially adopt the *local first* sub-principle use edge nodes or mobile devices to offer data collection and preprocessing functionalities, as well as inferences when trained models are deployed on them. Edge architectures enable local inference to fit low latency and data ownership requirements as learning models are executed closer to end users [25, 121]. For example, Sarabia et al. [107] deploy an edge-based fall detection system for Ambient Assisted Living (AAL) environments. AAL systems process highly sensible patient data, and require very low processing time. The authors propose a 3-layer fog-cloud architecture composed of medical devices, fog nodes, and a cloud server. Deep learning models are deployed in fog nodes to detect patients' falls. The authors prove that the proposed platform provides better performance than a cloud baseline in terms of efficiency and response time. Each patient is attended by one or more fog nodes that create their own local area network and preprocess (e.g., filtering) the patient's data. Dedicated fog nodes enable data privacy and security by design. Kemsaram et al. [63] present the architecture design and development of an onboard stereo vision system for cooperative automated vehicles. The platform is based on a stereo camera that captures left and right images which are processed by pre-trained DNNs to perform object perception, lane perception, and free space perception. An object tracker then estimates different metrics over the classified images such as depth and radial distance, relative velocity, and azimuth and elevation angle. The system is based on a 4-layer architecture deployed in each vehicle where all its components interact to to guide autonomous navigation in real-time.

We found that over half of the papers report centralised systems in which all their components and functionalities are deployed in central nodes. Some of these systems work in extreme resource constraint scenarios that demand deployment in single and isolated devices [22, 40, 53, 82, 111]. Such deployments suit environments that require autonomous and self-contained systems because communication with back-end servers is limited or impossible. That is the case of the work proposed by Schumann et al. [111] that reports an ML-based system deployed in rovers to enable automatic vehicle monitoring in spatial missions. The Spirit and Opportunity Mars

Exploration Rovers (MER) were autonomously functional for 6 and 14 years respectively on the surface of Mars⁹. These rovers performed data collection and navigation tasks. The STRANDS Core System [53] is designed for long-term autonomy (LTA) robot applications in security and care environments. LTA refers to the capability of robots to be multiple weeks in continuous operation. STRANDS supported over 100 days of autonomous operations for robots performing navigation, human behaviour prediction, and activity recognition tasks. We also found that most of the centralised systems are deployed in cloud servers to exploit their flexibility and address scalability and availability requirements [2, 7, 9, 10, 13, 15, 31, 44–46, 51, 52, 72, 80, 84, 102, 109, 116]. That is the case of iTelescope [52], which is an ML-based platform for real-time video classification. This platform collects data streams from the network traffic and processes them with two learning models for video identification and resolution classification. iTeleScope was deployed in a campus network, served several hundreds of users, and demonstrated good performance with tens of thousands of concurrent streams. Centralised entities rely on third-party entities to satisfy additional requirements such as monitoring and security. For example, AIDEx [10] is a platform to predict patients' risk of developing sepsis in the next 4 to 6 hours. AIDEx fetches patients' records from a real-time EMR database and displays hourly sepsis risk scores for each patient. This platform is based on microservices for preprocessing data, executing the prediction learning model, and storing and visualising the prediction outcomes. The privacy and security of patients' data are key requirements of the system, which are delegated to configurable security mechanisms such as firewalls and virtual private clouds (VPCs).

Systems that follow the *peer-to-peer first* sub-principle correspond to the 20% of the reviewed papers as we mentioned above. The rest of the papers (i.e., 80%) report systems that do not follow this sub-principle. Some of these are implemented as centralised architectures in the cloud [2, 7, 10, 13, 21, 44, 46, 52, 80, 102, 109, 116, 120]. Central entities in these deployments orchestrate the interactions between systems' components. Such centralised control enables robust and flexible systems that are easy to scale and highly available as mentioned before. For example, Ali et al. [7] present the architecture of ID-Viewer, which is a surveillance system for identifying infectious diseases in Pakistan. Data collection, analysis, and visualisation components process data from different areas of the country. These components are deployed as microservices in a central server to enable spatio-temporal analysis of the causes and evolution of infectious diseases. Other systems are structured as federated architectures [8, 9, 15, 27, 31, 45, 51, 54, 72, 84, 103, 104, 106, 107, 115] without horizontal interactions between nodes at the same layer. Examples of these architectures are IoT deployments in different domains such as health care [31, 84, 103, 107], smart buildings [72, 106], and industry [8, 9]. The architectures of these platforms follow a layered pattern where there is a vertical interaction between IoT devices, edge servers, and cloud servers. Lower layers (i.e., IoT devices) are in charge of data collection, middle layers (i.e., edge servers) are in charge of data preprocessing, filtering, and transmission, and upper layers (i.e., cloud servers) are in charge of data aggregation, decision making, visualisation, and users' interaction. There are also self-contained systems deployed in single constraint devices [14, 22, 40, 53, 57, 63, 82, 111]. These are embedded systems that combine hardware and software components for specific functions in environments that require fast reactions (e.g., neuroprosthetic devices [82]), or have limited connectivity with back end servers (e.g., NASA's Mars rovers [111]).

5.3 Openness

Figure 5 shows to what extent the **openness** principle is adopted. We found that 22% of systems are based on flexible architectures where new components can join in an automatic fashion. These new components join and cooperate with the existing ones to achieve the systems' goals. It creates flexible, scalable, and highly available systems where storage and computing capabilities can be extended on demand to address dynamic requirements [33, 44, 55, 56, 62, 69, 113, 120, 131, 133]. For example, Shan et al. [113] propose a decentralised architecture for Poligraph based on Byzantine Fault Tolerant (BFT) protocol. Servers and reviewers can be added

⁹NASA's MER: <https://mars.nasa.gov/resources/spirit-and-opportunity-by-the-numbers/>

Adoption	Principle		
	Autonomous entities	Asynchronous entities	Message protocol
Full	22.222%	24.444%	24.444%
Partial	46.667%	48.889%	48.889%
No	31.111%	26.667%	26.667%

Fig. 5. Adoption of openness principles. Most reviewed systems use autonomous entities, but only a third use them asynchronously. More than 50% utilise message protocols.

to process requests for fake news detection in parallel. The number of servers changes to respond to the variability in the number of requests that Poligraph receives which enables scalability, while parallelism enables low latency. The Sifter platform [131] is an online spam detection system for social networks. It uses a recurrent neural network (RRN) for spam detection and Distributed Hash Tables (DHT) to address the fast-changing nature of topics and events. Social data is stored by decentralised servers and grouped by topics using the DHT structure to enable fast retrieval. Each server responds to spam detection requests using its local neural network. New servers can join by following the DHT protocol which extends the storage capability of Sifter. Local spam detection fits low latency requirements as requests are solved closer to end users. We observe that the technologies and protocols used to handle decentralised storage and peer-to-peer cooperation (Section 5.2) also support flexible architectures where entities can join autonomously. That is the case protocols such as DHT [131], HDF5 [69], Spark [33], or BFT [113], and architectural patterns such as dataflow [56, 120], the observer [44], or publish/subscribe [55, 56, 62, 120, 133].

There are systems based on federated [8, 15, 27, 54, 104, 106, 107, 115, 134] and centralised [7, 9, 13, 31, 45, 51, 57, 72, 84, 102, 103, 116] architectures that partially (i.e., 46% of the papers) adopt the *autonomous entities* sub-principle. These architectures have mechanisms to add new sensing devices or new users at any time. However, they are not flexible to include more storage or compute nodes at the edge or cloud layers. Systems

add new sensors and new users using interoperable technologies. New sensors expand systems' data collection capabilities and new users expand systems' service coverage. For example, Alonso et al. [8] use Fiware¹⁰ as a middleware to manage devices that transmit the collected data using the ZigBee wireless standard. The collected data is then used to make automated real-time decisions about the state of dairy cattle and the feed grain. Niu et al. [84] developed the SensorBox device that integrates different IoT sensors to measure environmental variables. Supervised learning models are trained with such data to classify daily activities. Barachi et al. [13] deploys a crowdsensing platform based on DL to generate accident reports. Users are data consumers and collectors that can be added to the network by installing a mobile application. Calancea et al. [27] also require users to install an Android application to use the NLP-based platform that supports visually challenged people.

A third of the papers report ML-based systems whose components are not autonomous. It is mainly because they are designed as self-contained embedded systems [14, 22, 40, 53, 63, 82, 111] or are based on cloud-based architectures [2, 10, 21, 46, 52, 80, 109]. Embedded systems are deployed to perform specific tasks with limited resources. A change in the tasks of these systems implies their redesign including their hardware components. That is the case of the robots of the STRANDS project [53] which are specifically designed for navigation, human behaviour prediction, and activity recognition tasks. Similarly, the embedded system proposed by Cabanes et al. [22] is particularly designed to detect parking events. It uses a single 3D sensor to collect the input data for an object recognition component. Cloud-based architectures rely on the cloud provider services to extend the storage or computing capabilities of the systems. This flexibility enables systems to satisfy availability and scalability requirements. For example, the Bighead framework [21] is based on Kubernetes to support the development of data-driven solutions across the whole AirBnB organisation. Such flexibility is usually achieved at the cost of the fees that cloud providers charge for the provided services.

Almost a quarter of papers report systems that are based on *asynchronous entities* [33, 44, 55, 56, 62, 69, 82, 109, 111, 120, 133]. Software components act as data producers and consumers when communicating between them. Components do not block each other and operate independently. They do not wait for responses from other components but subscribe to relevant data producers. Systems based on these loosely coupled interactions address low latency, resource constraint, and big data processing requirements because asynchronous entities enable parallelisation and decentralised computing. The papers that follow the *asynchronous entities* sub-principle also follow the *message exchange protocol* one. Autonomous entities in open environments need message exchange protocols to have a common understanding with other systems' components. These protocols describe when and how messages are produced and consumed. The sentiment analysis system proposed by Karageorgou et al. [62] is based on asynchronous components. Data from different intensive sources is collected using the publish/subscribe pattern, which also enables different workers to process different data streams in parallel. This communication is based on RabbitMQ and Apache Kafka standards, while Spark enables a configurable number of workers. Similarly, BigDL [33] support large-scale distributed training of deep learning models. A Spark cluster consists of different workers that compute local gradients for each model in parallel which are then aggregated. Spark provides a data-parallel functional computing model that rules how workers operate. Workers perform map, reduce, and filter operations to transform data represented as Resilient Distributed Datasets (RDD). Robotic systems are also based on asynchronous components as robots also perform tasks in parallel. For example, a rover must move while monitoring its sensors' status [111]. Similarly, the neuroprosthetic hand proposed by Nguyen et al. [82] consists of three separate threads that perform data acquisition, preprocessing, and motor decoding tasks in parallel. A queues-based protocol drives the communication between these systems' components. Data coupling (Section 5.1) enables asynchronous interactions by design as components write data to and read data from data mediums. We observe that most of the papers that follow the *asynchronous entities* sub-principle also follow the *data coupling* one.

¹⁰Fiware: <https://www.fiware.org/>

Half of the papers report systems that partially adopt the *asynchronous entities* and the *message exchange protocol* sub-principles. Some of these systems use asynchronous communication to interact with end users because they are required to listen to requests continuously or notify users at any time [13, 27, 51, 113, 116]. iAssistMe [27] is based on the publish/subscribe communication pattern to interact with visually challenged people and support their daily activities. The system uses RabbitMQ together with the Advanced Message Queuing Protocol (AMQP) to handle data producers and consumers. Sharkey [51] uses the AWS simple notification service (SNS) to send messages warning people about the presence of sharks via smartwatches. Users subscribe to the notification service following the publish/subscribe pattern too. Other systems use asynchronous entities to listen to data sources (e.g., sensor devices) that can produce data at any time [2, 8, 9, 15, 31, 45, 52, 72, 80, 84, 102–104, 106, 107, 115, 134]. Bellocchio et al. [15] present the SEAL project to provide home automation solutions based on ML for building energy management and safety. SmartSEAL is the platform that manages IoT devices deployed in the buildings. It offers both asynchronous and synchronous communication using pub/sub and client-server protocols. The pub/sub mechanism is supported by the Robot Operative System (ROS) where sensor nodes write and are subscribed to a topic. They extend ROS with a central entity (i.e., roscore) which provides naming and registration services to the devices. These services are consumed using synchronous API calls. Alves et al. [9] propose an industrial monitoring system based on IoT nodes capable of acquiring and transmitting machine status parameters using the publish/subscribe architectural pattern (i.e., the Message Queue Telemetry Transport (MQTT) protocol). IoT nodes post their readings in a shared database that is consumed by the system's components asynchronously. The interaction between the components that process the collected data follows traditional synchronous calls. Gallagher [45] uses both synchronous and asynchronous mechanisms in the IntelliMaV platform. IntelliMav is a cloud-based system that applies machine learning to verify the performance of energy conservation measures in near real-time. The system is deployed in the cloud and follows a 3-layer architecture. The user tier is the access point for users through a web browser that presents options for model training, deployment and visualisation. The cloud tier is a virtual private cloud and hosts the cloud computing infrastructure of the application. The application requests are processed by this tier by running R code that is accessed through APIs. The site tier represents the pipelines that collect data from the industrial site. These pipelines push the collected data to the cloud storage in an asynchronous fashion for further processing. The smart diary tracer platform [8] uses different protocols to collect data from different data sources. These protocols include Zigbee, LoRa, WiFi, Bluetooth, and 3G which support communication with IoT sensors deployed on the crops and the barns used to feed the livestock, the cattle to monitor their health, the factories for the traceability of packaged products and energy monitoring, and the trucks that transport the dairy products. Sarabia et al. [107] propose a 3-layer fog-cloud architecture where new healthcare devices join using low-power wireless technologies such as Bluetooth, Zigbee, 6LoWPAN, and Wi-Fi. The Bluetooth protocol is also used by Quintero et al. [103] to include new devices to collect photoplethysmography data and heart rate monitoring.

The rest of the reviewed papers (i.e., 26.7%) report systems whose components interact synchronously and do not need a particular protocol for such interaction. These are based on traditional communication patterns such as RPC or API calls. Some of these systems are small, self-contained, and attend synchronous requests [14, 22, 40, 53, 54, 57, 63]. Hegemier et al [54] propose a real-time danger avoidance systems for robots. They deploy a neural network in an edge server, which receives prediction requests from robots in HTTP format. Requests include an image of the robot environment and its status information (e.g., damages report). The edge server responds synchronously with a classification of the image. Similarly, the system proposed by Johnny et al [57] receives diagnosis requests from users that send histopathological images for metastasis detection. They deploy a deep learning model in a Raspberry Pi, which responds with the image classification. Users send their requests (i.e., images) to an embedded web server installed in the Pi. Components of larger systems also interact synchronously. These are usually deployed in the cloud and follow microservices architectures. They adopt layered and modular architectures that satisfy scalability and availability requirements [7, 10, 21, 46, 131]. For example, the AIDEX [10]

system adopts an architecture to predict patients' risk of developing sepsis. Each functionality of the system is encapsulated as a microservice. The system exposes microservices for preprocessing data, executing the prediction algorithm, storing the prediction outcomes, and visualising outcomes. These components are orchestrated using API calls to offer end-to-end capabilities such as sepsis prediction.

5.4 Summary

This section summarises the survey findings and provides practical advice for practitioners towards deploying Data-Oriented ML-based systems in the real world. We found that several ML-based systems follow all or most DOA principles [33, 55, 56, 62, 69, 113, 133, 134]. DOA principles (Section 3) support these systems to satisfy requirements that are becoming increasingly common for data-driven systems. These systems address users' data requirements that demand managing big data from distributed and intensive sources, low latency processing tasks, and efficient management of storage and computing resources. We observed that systems based on architectural patterns such as dataflow and publish/subscribe are more data-oriented and follow more of the DOA principles. These systems are designed in terms of data exchange between components (i.e., data first), which does not assume any coupling on the control flow level. **Practical advice:** Developers need to focus first on the data while creating data-intensive systems and operations are secondary. Dataflow and publish/subscribe patterns are well suited to for the design of DOA systems.

Engineers adopt the **data as a first-class citizen** principle because it enables efficient interactions between systems components. This design decision avoids data transmission between components as payloads of direct calls (e.g., API calls). Systems' components act as producers and consumers of data stored in *shared data models*. Such *data coupling* offers asynchronous interactions by design, which makes components autonomous and non-blocking for each other. *Data coupling* also addresses low latency requirements and resource constraints because autonomous components can process large data sets in parallel. The nature of the data systems handle influences the selection of the *shared data models* that systems components nurture. *Data coupling* based on databases is appropriate for systems that work with data that needs to be persisted in time, while streams fit better systems that handle continuous data from different and dynamic data sources. An engineer can design a system with one or more shared data models. This decision depends on how the data must be transformed from inputs to outputs along the system. **Practical advice:** *Data coupling* enables systems to address big data processing requirements in *data-driven* systems. Databases, streams, and message queues are examples of data mediums to consider when designing data-first systems. These data mediums play the role of *shared data models* and are based on technologies such as Apache Kafka, Spark Streaming, HDF5, RabbitMQ, or HBase.

Our results show that centralised architectures are the preferred design choice when deploying ML-based systems to the detriment of the **prioritise decentralisation** principle. It shows the current prevalence of cloud platforms that offer flexible services and facilitate the deployment of systems in production. Cloud platforms cope well with the most relevant requirements that ML-based systems have nowadays as they provide flexibility, high availability, and scalability, and most of the time satisfy current low latency requirements. However, it is natural to expect these requirements to be more critical and severe as data becomes more available, users require processing in shorter times, and applications become more complex (e.g., digital twins, augmented reality applications, etc.). Further research of decentralised architectures is necessary to enable the benefits of decentralisation while also making it a feasible option for deployment. Reviewed works that implement Edge computing already leverage federated architectures with increasingly powerful edge servers that offer *local data storage and processing*. However, the *peer-to-peer* interaction between nodes is missing in most of the cases according to our survey. Cloud servers as the backend still play the main storage and processing roles. A major collaboration between nodes at lower layers in edge architectures can enable more sustainable systems by exploiting the storage and computing power of everyday devices [67]. **Practical advice:** The absence of a central orchestrator in favour of

direct communication between any two nodes of the system is a straightforward way to move to decentralisation. Distributed storage technologies (e.g., Apache Kafka, HDFS, etc.) and distributed protocols (e.g., DHTs and BFT) were used by the reviewed papers to implement decentralised solutions.

Systems that collect data from distributed devices (e.g., sensors) are usually **open**. New sensors and data sources can be added to these systems based on the interoperability that current technologies offer (e.g., Wi-Fi, Bluetooth, Zigbee, etc.). Architectures are more closed and static at upper levels where software components are predefined in most cases. These components are designed as static entities which usually communicate in a synchronous fashion via RPC or API calls. Data coupling and open environments have a strong correlation according to our survey. Reading from and writing to data mediums is an *asynchronous communication* process where systems' components are modelled as data consumers and producers. This process requires components to utilise *message exchange protocols* that describe how and when to read and write data. Such protocols also enable seamless and flexible architectures where components can join or leave at any time. **Practical advice:** The use of message exchange protocols and data coupling results in systems that are open and flexible by design. It enables data availability and horizontal scalability as resources are added on demand. Communication protocols such as MQTT and RabbitMQ are well-known tools for building open systems.

5.5 Threats to validity

In this section, we discuss threats to validity and limitations of our work.

- a. *Research design validity.* A lot of ML deployments are not described in scientific literature. Sometimes they are presented as blog posts, but more often their details are not published anywhere. Besides, we dismissed some of the published reports because they omitted information about their software architecture from the paper. We addressed this threat by covering a wide range of fields and areas of ML applications.
- b. *Publication selection validity.* We used a multi-stage selection process to find papers for the survey. While we have followed an established methodology for such a process, this approach has its validity threats. First, we may have missed search terms while implementing lookups in digital libraries. We have iteratively improved our search procedure multiple times to mitigate that risk. Second, the search functionalities are different between databases in our automatic search. We tried to include as many databases as possible even if they overlap. Our tool is publicly available and easy to extend to include new sources in the future. Finally, the automatic filters applied to select papers could exclude relevant papers. The number of retrieved papers made it necessary to automate the filtering process. We used state-of-the-art algorithms for the automatic filters and tested them under different configurations to get the best possible result.
- c. *Survey validity.* We selected the surveyed papers based on a well-known methodology for literature reviews because of the large number of papers reporting ML applications. However, our work is a literature survey as we provide an in-depth analysis of the architectural design decisions of the reported systems.
- d. *Analysis validity.* The quality of analysis and conclusions of this paper hinges on the expertise of its authors and therefore can be prone to personal biases. To alleviate this risk we sought feedback on our work, presenting intermediate results internally to our research group and at external scientific events.

6 OPEN RESEARCH CHALLENGES

In the previous section, we observed that while the DOA principles offer the desired properties that enable ML-based systems to achieve demanding requirements at deployment, their adoption rates vary greatly. More research efforts are needed to advance the community's understanding of the DOA paradigm, its strengths and weaknesses, why and how to build DOA systems, and the advantages of the capabilities DOA offers. These research directions are discussed below.

6.1 Systems Monitoring and Shadow Systems

DOA proposes that systems' components interact through data mediums. Shared data models store systems' historic states that are fully available. This data availability should facilitate systems' monitoring tasks in contrast to software design paradigms where interfaces hide data (e.g., microservices). However, in practice, we found that only one of the forty-five reviewed papers uses the shared data model for monitoring purposes. Specifically, the robotic platform proposed by Hawes et al. [53] monitors the historical database records about the status of the robot and its interactions with the environment. New practices and frameworks for monitoring DOA systems are needed. These practices can leverage the systems' data availability offered by the DOA paradigm by design.

One possible approach that fits with the key features of DOA is a network of statistical emulators or "shadow system". A statistical emulator is a probabilistic surrogate model of a given process that can be trained in a data-efficient manner and allows quantifying uncertainty to inform decision-making [96]. By exposing all intermediary data interactions within the system, DOA can enable the creation and maintenance of a separate emulator for each component of the system. A network of such emulators acts as a shadow system, which is capable of measuring the gap in behaviour between the real-world deployment and the designed software system. Such measuring includes monitoring, identifying fluctuations in data streams, and estimating the effects of potential changes. Two main research efforts are required to move the idea of a shadow system beyond a mere concept. First, the DOA paradigm should be developed to identify the most efficient approaches and practices around the automatic fitting of surrogate models to software components. Existing work mostly focuses on auto-tuning of system parameters [6, 34] and has limited scalability. Thus, more case studies are needed to illustrate the use of shadow emulators as monitoring and explainability tools for software, as well as suggesting scalable ways of automatically building surrogate models of systems' components. Second, innovation in the mathematical composition of individual emulators is required to build networks that can efficiently propagate uncertainty between components [35]. While there is prior work on uncertainty propagation in software [77], it is still not common to see interfaces and APIs that provide access or otherwise handle input or output uncertainty.

6.2 Systems Security and Privacy

DOA advocates for open systems where entities are autonomous and can freely access shared data models [75, 99, 128]. These data models can contain sensitive data, which naturally raises questions regarding systems' security and privacy [124]. Malicious entities can access and modify systems' data and behaviour at any time in such environments. Depending on the application considered, data access and systems' components need to be restricted to a specific set of users or consider different security policies. The decentralisation principle can mitigate security and privacy threats by storing and processing data in devices closer to end users. For example, the crowd management system proposed by Santana et al. [106] anonymises Wi-Fi frames at the edge to protect people's identities. These frames are then used to train a learning model for crowdsensing estimation. Despite these efforts, managing authentication, permissions, and encryption in open environments is challenging.

Different research efforts from the security community can be applied to DOA open setups to address security and privacy challenges. Homomorphic encryption [43] is an interesting direction for performing decentralised computations directly on encrypted data, without needing to provide the decryption key to the participant nodes. For example, a payment system might inquire about the validity of a transaction without having access to the underlying data (e.g. bank account number). Early deployment of zero-knowledge proof [41] and homomorphic encryption are taking place in the industry [18]. This technology offers a solution to privacy issues in decentralized networks, but the field is still in its infancy. Algorithms developed are often computationally expensive, so further research is needed to make them more practical in resource-constrained devices. In addition to these technical advances, security and privacy issues also require authorities to develop novel initiatives and policy frameworks to keep up with advances in technology [78].

6.3 DOA Concept Maturity and Tooling

Previous sections show that practitioners utilise a great variety of tools, frameworks and services while building data-driven systems. Databases, streams, message queues and file systems were all used as data communication mediums. At the same time, there is no single reference which engineers could refer to while making decisions on which technology to use in their system. Other aspects of DOA, such as communication protocols, short and long-term storage solutions, and monitoring, are in a similar state. DOA can benefit from having a technical stack taxonomy so that developers can have a complete list of necessary abstractions in a DOA system, and a list of tools to choose for each abstraction (or their combination) together with the trade-offs involved with each tool. Such taxonomies already exist for other areas of engineering practice, such as MLOps¹¹ or microservices [47].

A question that is closely related to the choice of tools and frameworks is the operational maintenance of DOA systems. Over the years the software engineering community accumulated a vast amount of knowledge on how to run SOA systems in production: what metrics to monitor, how to scale horizontally and vertically, how to mitigate and troubleshoot performance issues [16, 36, 71, 118]. A similar knowledge base about DOA systems is necessary and can be developed with accumulated experience in running DOA software in production. Nevertheless, careful study of various configurations of DOA setups, their performance and critical metrics can be carried out in an academic environment.

6.4 Interplay with other areas

We believe that DOA offers a range of properties desirable for multiple types of software systems. In this section, we mention some of the research ideas that DOA can enable in the interplay with other fields of study. Shared data models offer opportunities for new practices around emulating individual systems' components as we noted before. Such emulation ability can lead to efficient systems' end-to-end optimisation [3, 132]. This is particularly pertinent in cases where the system has to satisfy multiple competing requirements [12], in which case multi-objective Bayesian optimisation techniques can be applicable [95]. DOA can also accelerate advances in the area of Edge Computing [25, 114, 121], Federated Learning [20] and self-adaptive systems [23, 48], all of which stand to benefit from distributed shared data model as well as autonomous open environments. The ability to discover and inspect explicit flows of data within DOA systems has been highlighted as a key feature required for data governance [5, 28, 112, 117], meaning DOA can play a role in developing AI systems that comply with existing and upcoming legislatures, such as GDPR, EU AI Act or Equal Credit Opportunity Act (ECOA). Similarly, access to a complete dataflow graph means engineers will be able to leverage causal inference techniques [93, 94].

The field of Natural Language Processing (NLP) has been experiencing rapid growth, with an increasing focus on Large Language Models (LLMs). Models such as GPT-4 [86], Llama [123] or Codex [29], have shown remarkable capabilities in understanding and generating human-like text or computer code. These massive models require significant computational and storage resources, making software infrastructure a key determinant of their success. Given LLMs' dependency on the quantity and quality of data, DOA bring benefits to building efficient and robust infrastructure for them. Understanding to which extent DOA principles are already used for building LLMs, as well as how current LLM infrastructure can be improved with DOA, is an exciting research direction.

7 CONCLUSIONS

This paper surveys ML-based systems deployed in the real world from a DOA perspective. We first discuss the DOA principles based on the existing literature and explain how these can support practitioners in addressing the challenges that emerge from deploying ML models as part of larger systems. We then survey why, how, and to what extent existing real-world ML-based systems have adopted the DOA principles. The works analysed in this survey were selected using a semi-automatic process to facilitate this study's reproducibility and evolution.

¹¹AI Infrastructure Alliance project: <https://ai-infrastructure.org/>

The tool we used was developed based on a well-known methodology for literature reviews in the software engineering domain and is available online.

Our survey shows that a few systems fully adopt the DOA principles, with the majority of reviewed works demonstrating partial adoption. We observed that systems that adopt the DOA principles are mostly data-intensive. They address requirements such as Big Data management, low latency real-time processing, efficient resource management, security and privacy. We also show the patterns and tools used for adopting the principles and distil recommendations for practitioners looking to build their data-intensive systems following DOA. We finish formulating open research challenges that can improve the community's understanding and application of DOA. We hope that our work will increase community awareness of DOA, and ignite interest in research, development, and adoption of this promising paradigm in the context of real-world ML-based systems.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This research was generously funded by the Engineering and Physical Sciences Research Council (EPSRC) and the Alan Turing Institute under grant EP/V030302/1. We thank Oluwatomisin Dada, Eric Meissner, Markus Kaiser, and Peter Ochieng for the helpful and insightful discussion on this paper.

REFERENCES

- [1] Mike Acton. 2014. Data-oriented design and C++. *CppCon* (2014).
- [2] Alekh Agarwal, Sarah Bird, Markus Cozowicz, Luong Hoang, John Langford, Stephen Lee, Jiaji Li, Dan Melamed, Gal Oshri, Oswaldo Ribas, Siddhartha Sen, and Alex Slivkins. 2016. Making Contextual Decisions with Low Technical Debt. (2016). <https://doi.org/10.48550/ARXIV.1606.03966>
- [3] Virginia Aglietti, Xiaoyu Lu, Andrei Paleyes, and Javier González. 2020. Causal Bayesian Optimization. In *Artificial intelligence and statistics*. PMLR.
- [4] Hussain Akbar, Muhammad Zubair, and Muhammad Shairoze Malik. 2023. The Security Issues and Challenges in Cloud Computing. *International Journal for Electronic Crime Investigation* 7, 1 (2023), 13–32.
- [5] Sherif Akoush, Andrei Paleyes, Arnaud Van Looveren, and Clive Cox. 2022. Desiderata for next generation of ML model serving. *Workshop on Challenges in Deploying and Monitoring Machine Learning Systems, NeurIPS* (2022).
- [6] Sami Alabed and Eiko Yoneki. 2022. BoGraph: structured bayesian optimization from logs for expensive systems with many parameters. *Proceedings of the 2nd European Workshop on Machine Learning and Systems* (2022).
- [7] M.A. Ali, Z. Ahsan, M. Amin, S. Latif, A. Ayyaz, and M.N. Ayyaz. 2016. ID-Viewer: a visual analytics architecture for infectious diseases surveillance and response management in Pakistan. *Public Health* 134 (2016), 72–85. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.puhe.2016.01.006>
- [8] Ricardo S. Alonso, Inés Sittón-Candanedo, Óscar García, Javier Prieto, and Sara Rodríguez-González. 2020. An intelligent Edge-IoT platform for monitoring livestock and crops in a dairy farming scenario. *Ad Hoc Networks* 98 (2020), 102047. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.adhoc.2019.102047>
- [9] Filipe Alves, Hasmik Badikyan, H.J. António Moreira, João Azevedo, Pedro Miguel Moreira, Luís Romero, and Paulo Leitão. 2020. Deployment of a Smart and Predictive Maintenance System in an Industrial Case Study. In *2020 IEEE 29th International Symposium on Industrial Electronics (ISIE)*. 493–498. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ISIE45063.2020.9152441>
- [10] Fatemeh Amrollahi, Supreeth Prajwal Shashikumar, Pradeeban Kathiravelu, Ashish Sharma, and Shamim Nemati. 2020. AIDEx - An Open-source Platform for Real-Time Forecasting Sepsis and A Case Study on Taking ML Algorithms to Production. In *2020 42nd Annual International Conference of the IEEE Engineering in Medicine & Biology Society (EMBC)*.
- [11] Mauricio Aniche, Joseph Yoder, and Fabio Kon. 2019. Current challenges in practical object-oriented software design. In *2019 IEEE/ACM 41st International Conference on Software Engineering: New Ideas and Emerging Results (ICSE-NIER)*. IEEE, 113–116.
- [12] Brendan Avent, Javier I. González, Tom Diethe, Andrei Paleyes, and Borja Balle. 2020. Automatic Discovery of Privacy–Utility Pareto Fronts. *Proceedings on Privacy Enhancing Technologies* 2020 (2020), 5 – 23.
- [13] May El Barachi, Faouzi Kamoun, Jannatul Ferdaos, Mouna Makni, and Imed Amri. 2020. An artificial intelligence based crowdsensing solution for on-demand accident scene monitoring. *Procedia Computer Science* 170 (2020), 303–310. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.procs.2020.03.044> The 11th International Conference on Ambient Systems, Networks and Technologies (ANT) / The 3rd International Conference on Emerging Data and Industry 4.0 (EDI40) / Affiliated Workshops.
- [14] Sebastian P. Bayerl, Tommaso Frassetto, Patrick Jauernig, Korbinian Riedhammer, Ahmad-Reza Sadeghi, Thomas Schneider, Emmanuel Stapf, and Christian Weinert. 2020. Offline Model Guard: Secure and Private ML on Mobile Devices. In *2020 Design, Automation & Test in Europe Conference & Exhibition (DATE)*. 460–465. <https://doi.org/10.23919/DATE48585.2020.9116560>

- [15] Enrico Bellocchio, Gabriele Costante, Silvia Cascianelli, Paolo Valigi, and Thomas A. Ciarfuglia. 2016. SmartSEAL: A ROS based home automation framework for heterogeneous devices interconnection in smart buildings. In *2016 IEEE International Smart Cities Conference (ISC2)*. 1–6. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ISC2.2016.7580798>
- [16] Betsy Beyer, Chris Jones, Jennifer Petoff, and Niall Richard Murphy. 2016. *Site reliability engineering: How Google runs production systems*. " O'Reilly Media, Inc."
- [17] Bernd Bischl, Martin Binder, Michel Lang, Tobias Pielok, Jakob Richter, Stefan Coors, Janek Thomas, Theresa Ullmann, Marc Becker, Anne-Laure Boulesteix, et al. 2021. Hyperparameter optimization: Foundations, algorithms, best practices and open challenges. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2107.05847* (2021).
- [18] Manuel Blum, Paul Feldman, and Silvio Micali. 2019. Non-interactive zero-knowledge and its applications. In *Providing Sound Foundations for Cryptography: On the Work of Shafi Goldwasser and Silvio Micali*. 329–349.
- [19] Jeannette Bohg, Antonio Morales, Tamim Asfour, and Danica Kragic. 2013. Data-driven grasp synthesis—a survey. *IEEE Transactions on Robotics* 30, 2 (2013), 289–309.
- [20] Keith Bonawitz, Hubert Eichner, Wolfgang Grieskamp, Dzmitry Huba, Alex Ingerman, Vladimir Ivanov, Chloé Kiddon, Jakub Konečný, Stefano Mazzocchi, Brendan McMahan, Timon Van Overveldt, David Petrou, Daniel Ramage, and Jason Roselander. 2019. Towards Federated Learning at Scale: System Design. In *Proceedings of Machine Learning and Systems*, A. Talwalkar, V. Smith, and M. Zaharia (Eds.), Vol. 1. 374–388. <https://proceedings.mlsys.org/paper/2019/file/bd686fd640be98efaae0091fa301e613-Paper.pdf>
- [21] Eli Brumbaugh, Mani Bhushan, Andrew Cheong, Michelle Gu-Qian Du, Jeff Feng, Nick Handel, Andrew Hoh, Jack Hone, Brad Hunter, Atul Kale, Alfredo Luque, Bahador Nooraei, John Park, Krishna Puttaswamy, Kyle Schiller, Evgeny Shapiro, Conglei Shi, Aaron Siegel, Nikhil Simha, Marie Sbrocca, Shi-Jing Yao, Patrick Yoon, Varant Zanooyan, Xiao-Han T. Zeng, and Qiang Zhu. 2019. Bighead: A Framework-Agnostic, End-to-End Machine Learning Platform. In *2019 IEEE International Conference on Data Science and Advanced Analytics (DSAA)*. 551–560. <https://doi.org/10.1109/DSAA.2019.00070>
- [22] Q. Cabanes, B. Senouci, and A. Ramdane-Cherif. 2019. A Complete Multi-CPU/FPGA-based Design and Prototyping Methodology for Autonomous Vehicles: Multiple Object Detection and Recognition Case Study. In *2019 International Conference on Artificial Intelligence in Information and Communication (ICAIIIC)*. 158–163. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICAIIIC.2019.8669047>
- [23] Christian Cabrera and Siobhán Clarke. 2019. A self-adaptive service discovery model for smart cities. *IEEE Transactions on Services Computing* (2019).
- [24] Christian Cabrera, Fan Li, Vivek Nallur, Andrei Palade, M. A. Razzaque, Gary White, and Siobhán Clarke. 2017. Implementing heterogeneous, autonomous, and resilient services in IoT: An experience report. In *2017 IEEE 18th International Symposium on A World of Wireless, Mobile and Multimedia Networks (WoWMoM)*. 1–6. <https://doi.org/10.1109/WoWMoM.2017.7974341>
- [25] Christian Cabrera, Sergej Svorobej, Andrei Palade, Aqeel Kazmi, and Siobhan Clarke. 2022. MAACO: A Dynamic Service Placement Model for Smart Cities. *IEEE Transactions on Services Computing* (2022), 1–1. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TSC.2022.3143029>
- [26] Qiong Cai, Hao Wang, Zhenmin Li, and Xiao Liu. 2019. A survey on multimodal data-driven smart healthcare systems: approaches and applications. *IEEE Access* 7 (2019), 133583–133599.
- [27] Cristina Georgiana Calancea, Camelia-Maria Miluț, Lenuța Alboaie, and Adrian Iftene. 2019. iAssistMe - Adaptable Assistant for Persons with Eye Disabilities. *Procedia Computer Science* 159 (2019), 145–154. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.procs.2019.09.169> Knowledge-Based and Intelligent Information & Engineering Systems: Proceedings of the 23rd International Conference KES2019.
- [28] Lucian Carata, Sherif Akoush, Nikilesh Balakrishnan, Thomas Bytheway, Ripduman Sohan, Margo Seltzer, and Andy Hopper. 2014. A primer on provenance. *Commun. ACM* 57, 5 (2014), 52–60.
- [29] Mark Chen, Jerry Tworek, Heewoo Jun, Qiming Yuan, Henrique Ponde, Jared Kaplan, Harrison Edwards, Yura Burda, Nicholas Joseph, Greg Brockman, Alex Ray, Raul Puri, Gretchen Krueger, Michael Petrov, Heidy Khlaaf, Girish Sastry, Pamela Mishkin, Brooke Chan, Scott Gray, Nick Ryder, Mikhail Pavlov, Alethea Power, Lukasz Kaiser, Mohammad Bavarian, Clemens Winter, Philippe Tillet, Felipe Petroski Such, David W. Cummings, Matthias Plappert, Fotios Chantzis, Elizabeth Barnes, Ariel Herbert-Voss, William H. Guss, Alex Nichol, Igor Babuschkin, S. Arun Balaji, Shantanu Jain, Andrew Carr, Jan Leike, Joshua Achiam, Vedant Misra, Evan Morikawa, Alec Radford, Matthew M. Knight, Miles Brundage, Mira Murati, Katie Mayer, Peter Welinder, Bob McGrew, Dario Amodei, Sam McCandlish, Ilya Sutskever, and Wojciech Zaremba. 2021. Evaluating Large Language Models Trained on Code. *ArXiv abs/2107.03374* (2021). <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:235755472>
- [30] Jennifer Cobbe, Michael Veale, and Jatinder Singh. 2023. Understanding Accountability in Algorithmic Supply Chains. In *Proceedings of the 2023 ACM Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency (Chicago, IL, USA) (FAccT '23)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 1186–1197. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3593013.3594073>
- [31] Bryan Conroy, Ikaro Silva, Golbarg Mehraei, Robert Damiano, Brian Gross, Emmanuele Salvati, Ting Feng, Jeffrey Schneider, Niels Olson, Anne G Rizzo, et al. 2022. Real-time infection prediction with wearable physiological monitoring and AI to aid military workforce readiness during COVID-19. *Scientific reports* 12, 1 (2022), 1–12.
- [32] David E Culler. 1986. Dataflow architectures. *Annual review of computer science* 1, 1 (1986), 225–253.
- [33] Jason Jinquan Dai, Yiheng Wang, Xin Qiu, Ding Ding, Yao Zhang, Yanzhang Wang, Xianyan Jia, Cherry Li Zhang, Yan Wan, Zhichao Li, Jiao Wang, Shengsheng Huang, Zhongyuan Wu, Yang Wang, Yuhao Yang, Bowen She, Dongjie Shi, Qi Lu, Kai Huang, and Guoqiong Song.

2019. BigDL: A Distributed Deep Learning Framework for Big Data. In *Proceedings of the ACM Symposium on Cloud Computing* (Santa Cruz, CA, USA) (SoCC '19). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 50–60. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3357223.3362707>
- [34] Valentin Dalibard, Michael Schaarschmidt, and Eiko Yoneki. 2017. BOAT: Building auto-tuners with structured Bayesian optimization. In *Proceedings of the 26th International Conference on World Wide Web*. 479–488.
- [35] Andreas Damianou and Neil D Lawrence. 2013. Deep gaussian processes. In *Artificial intelligence and statistics*. PMLR, 207–215.
- [36] Goran Delac, Marin Silic, and Sinisa Srblic. 2012. Reliability modeling for SOA systems. In *2012 Proceedings of the 35th International Convention MIPRO*. IEEE, 847–852.
- [37] Filip Karlo Došilović, Mario Brčić, and Nikica Hlupić. 2018. Explainable artificial intelligence: A survey. In *2018 41st International convention on information and communication technology, electronics and microelectronics (MIPRO)*. IEEE, 0210–0215.
- [38] Hugo Jair Escalante. 2020. Automated Machine Learning—a brief review at the end of the early years. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2008.08516* (2020).
- [39] Livia Faes, Siegfried K Wagner, Dun Jack Fu, Xiaoxuan Liu, Edward Korot, Joseph R Ledam, Trevor Back, Reena Chopra, Nikolas Pontikos, Christoph Kern, Gabriella Moraes, Martin K Schmid, Dawn Sim, Konstantinos Balaskas, Lucas M Bachmann, Alastair K Denniston, and Pearce A Keane. 2019. Automated deep learning design for medical image classification by health-care professionals with no coding experience: a feasibility study. *The Lancet Digital Health* 1, 5 (2019), e232–e242. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S2589-7500\(19\)30108-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S2589-7500(19)30108-6)
- [40] Joao Diogo Falcao, Prabh Simran S Baweja, Yi Wang, Akkarit Sangpetch, Hae Young Noh, Orathai Sangpetch, and Pei Zhang. 2021. PIWIMS: Physics Informed Warehouse Inventory Monitory via Synthetic Data Generation. In *Adjunct Proceedings of the 2021 ACM International Joint Conference on Pervasive and Ubiquitous Computing and Proceedings of the 2021 ACM International Symposium on Wearable Computers* (Virtual, USA) (UbiComp '21). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 613–618. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3460418.3480415>
- [41] Uriel Fiege, Amos Fiat, and Adi Shamir. 1987. Zero knowledge proofs of identity. In *Proceedings of the nineteenth annual ACM symposium on Theory of computing*. 210–217.
- [42] Kathi Fisler, Shriram Krishnamurthi, Benjamin S. Lerner, and Joe Gibbs Politz. 2021. *A Data-Centric Introduction to Computing*.
- [43] Caroline Fontaine and Fabien Galand. 2007. A survey of homomorphic encryption for nonspecialists. *EURASIP Journal on Information Security* 2007 (2007), 1–10.
- [44] Stan Franklin, Tamas Madl, Sidney D’Mello, and Javier Snaider. 2014. LIDA: A Systems-level Architecture for Cognition, Emotion, and Learning. *IEEE Transactions on Autonomous Mental Development* 6, 1 (2014), 19–41. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TAMD.2013.2277589>
- [45] Colm V. Gallagher, Kevin Leahy, Peter O’Donovan, Ken Bruton, and Dominic T.J. O’Sullivan. 2019. IntelliMaV: A cloud computing measurement and verification 2.0 application for automated, near real-time energy savings quantification and performance deviation detection. *Energy and Buildings* 185 (2019), 26–38. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enbuild.2018.12.034>
- [46] Guanyu Gao, Yonggang Wen, and Cedric Westphal. 2016. Resource provisioning and profit maximization for transcoding in Information Centric Networking. In *2016 IEEE Conference on Computer Communications Workshops (INFOCOM WKSHPS)*. 97–102. <https://doi.org/10.1109/INFCOMW.2016.7562053>
- [47] Martin Garriga. 2018. Towards a taxonomy of microservices architectures. In *Software Engineering and Formal Methods: SEFM 2017 Collocated Workshops: DataMod, FAACS, MSE, CoSim-CPS, and FOCLASA, Trento, Italy, September 4-5, 2017, Revised Selected Papers 15*. Springer, 203–218.
- [48] Simos Gerasimou, Thomas Vogel, and Ada Diaconescu. 2019. Software Engineering for Intelligent and Autonomous Systems: Report from the GI Dagstuhl Seminar 18343. <https://doi.org/10.48550/ARXIV.1904.01518>
- [49] Ian Goodfellow, Yoshua Bengio, and Aaron Courville. 2017. Deep learning (adaptive computation and machine learning series). *Cambridge Massachusetts* (2017), 321–359.
- [50] Ian Goodfellow, Oriol Vinyals, and Andrew Saxe. 2015. Qualitatively Characterizing Neural Network Optimization Problems. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*. <http://arxiv.org/abs/1412.6544>
- [51] Robert Gorkin, Kye R. Adams, Matthew J. Berryman, Sam Aubin, Wanqing Li, Andrew Davis, and Johan Barthélemy. 2020. Sharkeye: Real-Time Autonomous Personal Shark Alerting via Aerial Surveillance. *Drones* (2020).
- [52] Hassan Habibi Gharakheili, Minzhao Lyu, Yu Wang, Himal Kumar, and Vijay Sivaraman. 2019. iTeleScope: Softwarized Network Middle-Box for Real-Time Video Telemetry and Classification. *IEEE Transactions on Network and Service Management* 16, 3 (2019), 1071–1085. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TNSM.2019.2929511>
- [53] Nick Hawes, Christopher Burbridge, Ferdian Jovan, Lars Kunze, Bruno Lacerda, Lenka Mudrova, Jay Young, Jeremy Wyatt, Denise Hebesberger, Tobias Kortner, Rares Ambrus, Nils Bore, John Folkesson, Patric Jensfelt, Lucas Beyer, Alexander Hermans, Bastian Leibe, Aitor Aldoma, Thomas Faulhammer, Michael Zillich, Markus Vincze, Eris Chinellato, Muhannad Al-Omari, Paul Duckworth, Yiannis Gatsoulis, David C. Hogg, Anthony G. Cohn, Christian Dondrup, Jaime Pulido Fentanes, Tomas Krajník, Joao M. Santos, Tom Duckett, and Marc Hanheide. 2017. The STRANDS Project: Long-Term Autonomy in Everyday Environments. *IEEE Robotics & Automation Magazine* 24, 3 (2017), 146–156. <https://doi.org/10.1109/MRA.2016.2636359>
- [54] Henri Hegemier and Jaimie Kelley. 2021. Image Classification with Knowledge-Based Systems on the Edge for Real-Time Danger Avoidance in Robots. In *2021 IEEE World AI IoT Congress (AIoT)*. 0360–0365. <https://doi.org/10.1109/AIoT52608.2021.9454183>

- [55] Ricardo Dintén Herrero and Marta Zorrilla. 2022. An I4.0 data intensive platform suitable for the deployment of machine learning models: a predictive maintenance service case study. *Procedia Computer Science* 200 (2022), 1014–1023. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.procs.2022.01.300>
- [56] Junchen Jiang, Shijie Sun, Vyas Sekar, and Hui Zhang. 2017. Pytheas: Enabling Data-Driven Quality of Experience Optimization Using Group-Based Exploration-Exploitation. In *Proceedings of the 14th USENIX Conference on Networked Systems Design and Implementation* (Boston, MA, USA) (NSDI'17). USENIX Association, USA, 393–406.
- [57] Anil Johny and KN Madhusoodanan. 2021. Edge Computing Using Embedded Webserver with Mobile Device for Diagnosis and Prediction of Metastasis in Histopathological Images. *International Journal of Computational Intelligence Systems* 14, 1 (2021). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s44196-021-00040-x>
- [58] Praveen Joshi, Haithem Afli, Mohammed Hasanuzzaman, Chandra Thapa, and Ted Scully. 2022. Enabling Deep Learning for All-in EDGE paradigm. <https://doi.org/10.48550/ARXIV.2204.03326>
- [59] Rajive Joshi. 2007. Data-oriented architecture: A loosely-coupled real-time soa. *whitepaper, Aug* (2007).
- [60] J Stephen Judd. 1990. *Neural network design and the complexity of learning*. MIT press.
- [61] Işıl Karabey Aksakalli, Turgay Çelik, Ahmet Burak Can, and Bedir Tekinerdoğan. 2021. Deployment and communication patterns in microservice architectures: A systematic literature review. *Journal of Systems and Software* 180 (2021), 111014. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jss.2021.111014>
- [62] Ioanna Karageorgou, Panagiotis Liakos, and Alex Delis. 2020. A Sentiment Analysis Service Platform for Streamed Multilingual Tweets. In *2020 IEEE International Conference on Big Data (Big Data)*. 3262–3271. <https://doi.org/10.1109/BigData50022.2020.9377837>
- [63] Narsimlu Kemsaram, Anwesha Das, and Gijs Dubbelman. 2020. Architecture Design and Development of an On-board Stereo Vision System for Cooperative Automated Vehicles. *2020 IEEE 23rd International Conference on Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITSC)* (2020), 1–8.
- [64] Tom Killalea. 2016. The Hidden Dividends of Microservices. *Commun. ACM* 59, 8 (jul 2016), 42–45. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2948985>
- [65] Barbara Kitchenham and Pearl Brereton. 2013. A systematic review of systematic review process research in software engineering. *Information and Software Technology* 55, 12 (2013), 2049–2075. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.infsof.2013.07.010>
- [66] Barbara Ann Kitchenham and Stuart Charters. 2007. *Guidelines for performing Systematic Literature Reviews in Software Engineering*. Technical Report EBSE 2007-001. Keele University and Durham University Joint Report. https://www.elsevier.com/_data/promis_misc/525444systematicreviewsguide.pdf
- [67] Martin Kleppmann, Adam Wiggins, Peter van Hardenberg, and Mark McGranaghan. 2019. Local-First Software: You Own Your Data, in Spite of the Cloud. In *Proceedings of the 2019 ACM SIGPLAN International Symposium on New Ideas, New Paradigms, and Reflections on Programming and Software* (Athens, Greece) (Onward! 2019). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 154–178. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3359591.3359737>
- [68] Mohit Kumar, Kalka Dubey, and Rakesh Pandey. 2021. Evolution of Emerging Computing paradigm Cloud to Fog: Applications, Limitations and Research Challenges. In *2021 11th International Conference on Cloud Computing, Data Science & Engineering (Confluence)*. 257–261. <https://doi.org/10.1109/Confluence51648.2021.9377050>
- [69] Matthew Lebofsky, Steve Croft, Andrew P. V. Siemion, Danny C. Price, J. Emilio Enriquez, Howard Isaacson, David H. E. MacMahon, David Anderson, Bryan Brzycki, Jeff Cobb, Daniel Czech, David DeBoer, Julia DeMarines, Jamie Drew, Griffin Foster, Vishal Gajjar, Nectaria Gizani, Greg Hellbourg, Eric J. Korpela, Brian Lacki, Sofia Sheikh, Dan Werthimer, Pete Worden, Alex Yu, and Yunfan Gerry Zhang. 2019. The Breakthrough Listen Search for Intelligent Life: Public Data, Formats, Reduction, and Archiving. *Publications of the Astronomical Society of the Pacific* 131, 1006 (nov 2019), 124505. <https://doi.org/10.1088/1538-3873/ab3e82>
- [70] Yann LeCun, Yoshua Bengio, and Geoffrey Hinton. 2015. Deep learning. *nature* 521, 7553 (2015), 436–444.
- [71] Grace A Lewis and Dennis B Smith. 2008. Service-oriented architecture and its implications for software maintenance and evolution. In *2008 Frontiers of Software Maintenance*. IEEE, 1–10.
- [72] Qiuchen Lu, Ajith Kumar Parlikad, Philip Woodall, Gishan Don Ranasinghe, Xiang Xie, Zhenglin Liang, Eirini Konstantinou, James Heaton, and Jennifer Schooling. 2020. Developing a Digital Twin at Building and City Levels: Case Study of West Cambridge Campus. *Journal of Management in Engineering* 36, 3 (2020), 05020004. [https://doi.org/10.1061/\(ASCE\)ME.1943-5479.0000763](https://doi.org/10.1061/(ASCE)ME.1943-5479.0000763) arXiv:<https://ascelibrary.org/doi/pdf/10.1061/%28ASCE%29ME.1943-5479.0000763>
- [73] Lucy Ellen Lwakatare, Aiswarya Raj, Ivica Crnkovic, J. Bosch, and Helena Holmström Olsson. 2020. Large-scale machine learning systems in real-world industrial settings: A review of challenges and solutions. *Inf. Softw. Technol.* 127 (2020), 106368.
- [74] Patricia López Martínez, Ricardo Dintén, José María Drake, and Marta Zorrilla. 2021. A big data-centric architecture metamodel for Industry 4.0. *Future Generation Computer Systems* 125 (2021), 263–284. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.future.2021.06.020>
- [75] Fang Miao, Wenjie Fan, Wenhui Yang, and Yan Xie. 2019. The study of data-oriented and ownership-based security architecture in open Internet environment. In *Proceedings of the 3rd International Conference on Cryptography, Security and Privacy*. 121–129.
- [76] Timur Mironov, Lilia Motaylenko, Dmitry Andreev, Igor Antonov, and Mikhail Aristov. 2021. Comparison of object-oriented programming and data-oriented design for implementing trading strategies backtester. In *Proceedings of the International Scientific and Practical Conference*.

- [77] Kesari Mishra and Kishor S Trivedi. 2011. Uncertainty propagation through software dependability models. In *2011 IEEE 22nd International Symposium on Software Reliability Engineering*. IEEE, 80–89.
- [78] Jessica Montgomery and Neil D. Lawrence. 2021. Data Governance in the 21st century: Citizen Dialogue and the Development of Data Trusts. [/publications/data-governance-in-the-21st-century-citizen-dialogue-and-the-development-of-data-trusts.html](#)
- [79] Raja Mubashir Munaf, Jawwad Ahmed, Faraz Khakwani, and Tauseef Rana. 2019. Microservices Architecture: Challenges and Proposed Conceptual Design. In *2019 International Conference on Communication Technologies (ComTech)*. 82–87. <https://doi.org/10.1109/COMTECH.2019.8737831>
- [80] Martin M. Müller and Marcel Salathé. 2019. Crowdbreaks: Tracking Health Trends Using Public Social Media Data and Crowdsourcing. *Frontiers in Public Health* 7 (2019). <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpubh.2019.00081>
- [81] Alfredo Nazabal, Christopher KI Williams, Giovanni Colavizza, Camila Rangel Smith, and Angus Williams. 2020. Data engineering for data analytics: a classification of the issues, and case studies. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2004.12929* (2020).
- [82] Anh Tuan Nguyen, Markus W Drealan, Diu Khue Luu, Ming Jiang, Jian Xu, Jonathan Cheng, Qi Zhao, Edward W Keefer, and Zhi Yang. 2021. A portable, self-contained neuroprosthetic hand with deep learning-based finger control. *Journal of Neural Engineering* 18, 5 (oct 2021), 056051. <https://doi.org/10.1088/1741-2552/ac2a8d>
- [83] Stoyan Nikolov. 2018. OOP is dead, long live Data-Oriented Design. *CppCon*.(Retrieved 02.02. 2019). URL: <https://www.youtube.com/watch> (2018).
- [84] Long Niu, Sachio Saiki, and Masahide Nakamura. 2017. Recognizing ADLs of one person household based on non-intrusive environmental sensing. In *2017 18th IEEE/ACIS International Conference on Software Engineering, Artificial Intelligence, Networking and Parallel/Distributed Computing (SNPD)*. 477–482. <https://doi.org/10.1109/SNPD.2017.8022765>
- [85] Robert Olsson. 2014. *Applying REST principles on local client-side APIs*. Master’s thesis. KTH, School of Computer Science and Communication (CSC).
- [86] OpenAI. 2023. GPT-4 Technical Report. *ArXiv abs/2303.08774* (2023).
- [87] O’Reilly. 2020. *Microservices Adoption in 2020: A survey*. Available at <https://www.oreilly.com/radar/microservices-adoption-in-2020/>.
- [88] Genevieve B Orr and Klaus-Robert Müller. 2003. *Neural networks: tricks of the trade*. Springer.
- [89] Claus Pahl. 2023. Research challenges for machine learning-constructed software. *Service Oriented Computing and Applications* 17, 1 (2023), 1–4.
- [90] Tom Le Paine, Cosmin Paduraru, Andrea Michi, Caglar Gulcehre, Konrad Zolna, Alexander Novikov, Ziyu Wang, and Nando de Freitas. 2020. Hyperparameter selection for offline reinforcement learning. *Offline Reinforcement Learning Workshop, NeurIPS* (2020). <https://arxiv.org/abs/2007.09055>
- [91] Andrei Paleyes, Christian Cabrera, and Neil D. Lawrence. 2022. An Empirical Evaluation of Flow Based Programming in the Machine Learning Deployment Context. In *2022 IEEE/ACM 1st International Conference on AI Engineering – Software Engineering for AI (CAIN)*. 54–64.
- [92] Andrei Paleyes, Siyuan Guo, Bernhard Scholkopf, and Neil D. Lawrence. 2023. Dataflow graphs as complete causal graphs. In *2023 IEEE/ACM 2nd International Conference on AI Engineering – Software Engineering for AI (CAIN)*. 7–12. <https://doi.org/10.1109/CAIN58948.2023.00010>
- [93] Andrei Paleyes, Siyuan Guo, Bernhard Schölkopf, and Neil D Lawrence. 2023. Dataflow graphs as complete causal graphs. In *2023 IEEE/ACM 2nd International Conference on AI Engineering – Software Engineering for AI (CAIN)*.
- [94] Andrei Paleyes and Neil David Lawrence. 2023. Causal Fault Localisation in Dataflow Systems. In *Proceedings of the 3rd Workshop on Machine Learning and Systems (Rome, Italy) (EuroMLSys ’23)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 140–147. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3578356.3592593>
- [95] Andrei Paleyes, Henry B. Moss, Victor Picheny, Piotr Zulawski, and Felix Newman. 2022. A penalisation method for batch multi-objective Bayesian optimisation with application in heat exchanger design. *Workshop on Adaptive Experimental Design and Active Learning in the Real World, ICML* (2022). <https://doi.org/10.48550/ARXIV.2206.13326>
- [96] Andrei Paleyes, Mark Pullin, Maren Mahsereci, Neil Lawrence, and Javier González. 2019. Emulation of physical processes with Emukit. In *Second Workshop on Machine Learning and the Physical Sciences, NeurIPS*.
- [97] Andrei Paleyes, Raoul-Gabriel Urma, and Neil D. Lawrence. 2022. Challenges in Deploying Machine Learning: A Survey of Case Studies. *ACM Comput. Surv.* (apr 2022). <https://doi.org/10.1145/3533378>
- [98] Milan Patel, Brian Naughton, Caroline Chan, Nurit Sprecher, Sadayuki Abeta, Adrian Neal, et al. 2014. Mobile-edge computing introductory technical white paper. *White paper, mobile-edge computing (MEC) industry initiative* (2014), 1089–7801.
- [99] Jan Pennekamp, Martin Henze, Simo Schmidt, Philipp Niemietz, Marcel Fey, Daniel Trauth, Thomas Bergs, Christian Brecher, and Klaus Wehrle. 2019. Dataflow challenges in an internet of production: a security & privacy perspective. In *Proceedings of the ACM Workshop on Cyber-Physical Systems Security & Privacy*. 27–38.
- [100] Neoklis Polyzotis, Sudip Roy, Steven Euijong Whang, and Martin Zinkevich. 2018. Data lifecycle challenges in production machine learning: a survey. *ACM SIGMOD Record* 47, 2 (2018), 17–28.
- [101] S Joe Qin. 2012. Survey on data-driven industrial process monitoring and diagnosis. *Annual reviews in control* 36, 2 (2012), 220–234.

- [102] Xiwei Qiu, Yuanshun Dai, Peng Sun, and Xin Jin. 2020. PHM Technology for Memory Anomalies in Cloud Computing for IaaS. In *2020 IEEE 20th International Conference on Software Quality, Reliability and Security (QRS)*. 41–51. <https://doi.org/10.1109/QRS51102.2020.00018>
- [103] Luis Quintero, Panagiotis Papapetrou, John E. Muñoz, and Uno Fors. 2019. Implementation of Mobile-Based Real-Time Heart Rate Variability Detection for Personalized Healthcare. In *2019 International Conference on Data Mining Workshops (ICDMW)*. 838–846. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICDMW.2019.00123>
- [104] Marouane Salhaoui, Antonio Guerrero Gonzalez, Mounir Arioua, Juan Carlos Molina Molina, Francisco J. Ortiz, and Ahmed El Ouakadi. 2020. Edge-Cloud Architectures Using UAVs Dedicated To Industrial IoT Monitoring And Control Applications. In *2020 International Symposium on Advanced Electrical and Communication Technologies (ISAECT)*. 1–6. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ISAECT50560.2020.9523700>
- [105] Luis Sanchez, Luis Muñoz, Jose Antonio Galache, Pablo Sotres, Juan R. Santana, Veronica Gutierrez, Rajiv Ramdhany, Alex Gluhak, Srdjan Krco, Evangelos Theodoridis, and Dennis Pfisterer. 2014. SmartSantander: IoT experimentation over a smart city testbed. *Computer Networks* 61 (2014), 217–238. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bjp.2013.12.020>
- [106] Juan Ramón Santana, Luis Sánchez, Pablo Sotres, Jorge Lanza, Tomás Llorente, and Luis Muñoz. 2020. A Privacy-Aware Crowd Management System for Smart Cities and Smart Buildings. *IEEE Access* 8 (2020), 135394–135405. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ACCESS.2020.3010609>
- [107] David Sarabia-Jácome, Regel Usach, Carlos E. Palau, and Manuel Esteve. 2020. Highly-efficient fog-based deep learning AAL fall detection system. *Internet of Things* 11 (2020), 100185. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.iot.2020.100185>
- [108] Tim Schopf, Daniel Braun, and Florian Matthes. 2021. Lbl2Vec: An Embedding-based Approach for Unsupervised Document Retrieval on Predefined Topics. In *Proceedings of the 17th International Conference on Web Information Systems and Technologies - WEBIST*, 124–132. <https://doi.org/10.5220/0010710300003058>
- [109] Carson Schubert, Kevin Black, Daniel Fonseka, Abhimanyu Dhir, Jacob Deutsch, Nihal Dhamani, Gavin Martin, and Maruthi Akella. 2021. A Pipeline for Vision-Based On-Orbit Proximity Operations Using Deep Learning and Synthetic Imagery. In *2021 IEEE Aerospace Conference (50100)*. 1–15. <https://doi.org/10.1109/AERO50100.2021.9438232>
- [110] Robert Schuler, Carl Kesselman, and Karl Czajkowski. 2015. Data Centric Discovery with a Data-Oriented Architecture. In *Proceedings of the 1st Workshop on The Science of Cyberinfrastructure: Research, Experience, Applications and Models (Portland, Oregon, USA) (SCREAM '15)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 37–44. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2753524.2753532>
- [111] Johann Schumann, Timmy Mbaya, and Ole J Mengshoel. 2012. Software and system health management for autonomous robotics missions. (2012).
- [112] Malte Schwarzkopf, Eddie Kohler, M. Frans Kaashoek, and Robert Tappan Morris. 2019. Position: GDPR Compliance by Construction. In *Poly/DMAH@VLDB*.
- [113] Guohou Shan, Boxin Zhao, James R. Clavin, Haibin Zhang, and Sisi Duan. 2022. Poligraph: Intrusion-Tolerant and Distributed Fake News Detection System. *IEEE Transactions on Information Forensics and Security* 17 (2022), 28–41. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TIFS.2021.3131026>
- [114] Weisong Shi, Jie Cao, Quan Zhang, Youhuizi Li, and Lanyu Xu. 2016. Edge computing: Vision and challenges. *IEEE internet of things journal* 3, 5 (2016), 637–646.
- [115] Wanxin Shi, Qing Li, Chao Wang, Gengbiao Shen, Weichao Li, Yu Wu, and Yong Jiang. 2019. LEAP: Learning-Based Smart Edge with Caching and Prefetching for Adaptive Video Streaming. In *2019 IEEE/ACM 27th International Symposium on Quality of Service (IWQoS)*. 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3326285.3329051>
- [116] Chihhsiong Shih, Lai Youchen, Cheng-hsu Chen, and William Cheng-Chung Chu. 2020. An Early Warning System for Hemodialysis Complications Utilizing Transfer Learning from HD IoT Dataset. In *2020 IEEE 44th Annual Computers, Software, and Applications Conference (COMPSAC)*. 759–767. <https://doi.org/10.1109/COMPSAC48688.2020.0-168>
- [117] Jatinder Singh, Jennifer Cobbe, and Chris Norval. 2018. Decision provenance: Harnessing data flow for accountable systems. *IEEE Access* 7 (2018), 6562–6574.
- [118] Neha Singh and Kirti Tyagi. 2015. A Literature Review of the Reliability of Composite Web Service in Service-Oriented Architecture. *SIGSOFT Softw. Eng. Notes* 40, 1 (feb 2015), 1–8. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2693208.2693237>
- [119] Ben Stopford. 2016. *The Data Dichotomy: Rethinking the Way We Treat Data and Services*. Available at <https://www.confluent.io/blog/data-dichotomy-rethinking-the-way-we-treat-data-and-services/>.
- [120] Shabnam Sultana, Philippe Dooze, and Vijay Venkatesh Kumar. 2021. Realization of an Intrusion Detection use-case in ONAP with Acumos. In *2021 International Conference on Computer Communications and Networks (ICCCN)*. 1–6. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICCCN52240.2021.9522281>
- [121] Hadi Tabatabaee Malazi, Saqib Rasool Chaudhry, Aqeel Kazmi, Andrei Palade, Christian Cabrera, Gary White, and Siobhán Clarke. 2022. Dynamic Service Placement in Multi-Access Edge Computing: A Systematic Literature Review. *IEEE Access* 10 (2022), 32639–32688. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ACCESS.2022.3160738>
- [122] Davide Taibi, Valentina Lenarduzzi, and Claus Pahl. 2018. Architectural patterns for microservices: A systematic mapping study. In *CLOSER 2018 - Proceedings of the 8th International Conference on Cloud Computing and Services Science*. SCITEPRESS, 221–232. <https://doi.org/10.5220/0006798302210232> International Conference on Cloud Computing and Services Science ; Conference date:

- 19-03-2018 Through 21-03-2018.
- [123] Hugo Touvron, Thibaut Lavril, Gautier Izacard, Xavier Martinet, Marie-Anne Lachaux, Timothée Lacroix, Baptiste Rozière, Naman Goyal, Eric Hambro, Faisal Azhar, et al. 2023. Llama: Open and efficient foundation language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.13971* (2023).
 - [124] Lillian Tsai, Malte Schwarzkopf, and Eddie Kohler. 2021. Privacy heroes need data disguises. In *Proceedings of the Workshop on Hot Topics in Operating Systems*. 112–118.
 - [125] Lorenzo Vaccaro, Giuseppe Sansonetti, and Alessandro Micarelli. 2021. An Empirical Review of Automated Machine Learning. *Computers* 10, 1 (2021), 11.
 - [126] Christian Vorhемus and Erich Schikuta. 2017. A data-oriented architecture for loosely coupled real-time information systems. In *Proceedings of the 19th International Conference on Information Integration and Web-based Applications & Services*. 472–481.
 - [127] Jonathan Waring, Charlotta Lindvall, and Renato Umeton. 2020. Automated machine learning: Review of the state-of-the-art and opportunities for healthcare. *Artificial Intelligence in Medicine* 104 (2020), 101822.
 - [128] Dawei Wei, Huansheng Ning, Feifei Shi, Yueliang Wan, Jiabo Xu, Shunkun Yang, and Li Zhu. 2021. Dataflow management in the Internet of Things: Sensing, control, and security. *Tsinghua Science and Technology* 26, 6 (2021), 918–930.
 - [129] Danny Weyns. 2019. Software engineering of self-adaptive systems. *Handbook of software engineering* (2019), 399–443.
 - [130] Lauren J. Wong, IV William H. Clark, Bryse Flowers, R. Michael Buehrer, Alan J. Michaels, and William C. Headley. 2020. The RFML Ecosystem: A Look at the Unique Challenges of Applying Deep Learning to Radio Frequency Applications. *arXiv: Signal Processing* (2020).
 - [131] Hailu Xu, Boyuan Guan, Pinchao Liu, William Escudero, and Liting Hu. 2018. Harnessing the Nature of Spam in Scalable Online Social Spam Detection. In *2018 IEEE International Conference on Big Data (Big Data)*. 3733–3736. <https://doi.org/10.1109/BigData.2018.8621926>
 - [132] Deze Zeng, Lin Gu, Song Guo, Zixue Cheng, and Shui Yu. 2016. Joint Optimization of Task Scheduling and Image Placement in Fog Computing Supported Software-Defined Embedded System. *IEEE Trans. Comput.* 65, 12 (2016), 3702–3712. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TC.2016.2536019>
 - [133] Leihan Zhang, Jichang Zhao, and Ke Xu. 2016. Emotion-based social computing platform for streaming big-data: Architecture and application. In *2016 13th International Conference on Service Systems and Service Management (ICSSSM)*. 1–6. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICSSSM.2016.7538620>
 - [134] Tao Zhang, Biyun Ding, Xin Zhao, Ganjun Liu, and Zhibo Pang. 2021. LearningADD: Machine learning based acoustic defect detection in factory automation. *Journal of Manufacturing Systems* 60 (2021), 48–58. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jmsy.2021.04.005>
 - [135] Ruiqi Zheng, Liang Qu, Bin Cui, Yuhui Shi, and Hongzhi Yin. 2023. AutoML for Deep Recommender Systems: A Survey. *ACM Trans. Inf. Syst.* (jan 2023). <https://doi.org/10.1145/3579355>