
CSE 331

Software Design & Implementation

Hal Perkins

Fall 2015

Design Patterns, Part 1

(Based on slides by Mike Ernst, Dan Grossman, David Notkin, Hal Perkins)

Outline

- Introduction to design patterns
- Creational patterns (constructing objects)

Next lecture:

- Structural patterns (controlling heap layout)
- Behavioral patterns (affecting object semantics)

What is a design pattern?

A standard **solution** to a common programming problem

- A design or implementation structure that achieves a particular purpose
- A high-level programming idiom

A **technique** for making code more flexible

- Reduce coupling among program components

Shorthand **description** of a software design

- Well-known terminology improves communication/documentation
- Makes it easier to “think to use” a known technique

A few simple examples....

Example 1: Encapsulation (data hiding)

Problem: Exposed fields can be directly manipulated

- Violations of the representation invariant
- Dependences prevent changing the implementation

Solution: Hide some components

- Constrain ways to access the object

Disadvantages:

- Interface may not (efficiently) provide all desired operations to all clients
- Indirection may reduce performance

Example 2: Subclassing (inheritance)

Problem: Repetition in implementations

- Similar abstractions have similar components (fields, methods)

Solution: Inherit default members from a superclass

- Select an implementation via run-time dispatching

Disadvantages:

- Code for a class is spread out, and thus less understandable
- Run-time dispatching introduces overhead
- Hard to design and specify a superclass [as discussed]

Example 3: Iteration

Problem: To access all members of a collection, must perform a specialized traversal for each data structure

- Introduces undesirable dependences
- Does not generalize to other collections

Solution:

- The *implementation* performs traversals, does bookkeeping
- Results are communicated to clients via a standard interface (e.g., **hasNext ()** , **next ()**)

Disadvantages:

- Iteration order fixed by the implementation and not under the control of the client

Example 4: Exceptions

Problem:

- Errors in one part of the code should be handled elsewhere
- Code should not be cluttered with error-handling code
- Return values should not be preempted by error codes

Solution: Language structures for throwing and catching exceptions

Disadvantages:

- Code may still be cluttered
- Hard to remember and deal with code not running if an exception occurs in a callee
- It may be hard to know where an exception will be handled

Example 5: Generics

Problem:

- Well-designed (and used) data structures hold one type of object

Solution:

- Programming language checks for errors in contents
- **List<Date>** instead of just **List**

Disadvantages:

- More verbose types

Why (more) design patterns?

Advanced programming languages like Java provide many powerful constructs – subtyping, interfaces, rich types and libraries, etc.

- But it's not enough to “know everything in the language”
- Still many common problems not easy to solve

Design patterns are intended to capture common solutions / idioms, name them, make them easy to use to guide design

- For high-level design, not specific “coding tricks”

They increase your vocabulary and your intellectual toolset

Do not overuse them

- Not every program needs the complexity of advanced design patterns
- Instead, consider them to solve reuse/modularity problems that arise as your program evolves

Why should you care?

You could come up with these solutions on your own

- You shouldn't have to!

A design pattern is a known solution to a known problem

- A concise description of a successful “pro-tip”


Origin of term

The “Gang of Four” (GoF)

- Gamma, Helm, Johnson, Vlissides

Found they shared a number of “tricks” and decided to codify them

- A key rule was that nothing could become a pattern unless they could identify at least three real [different] examples
- Done for object-oriented programming
 - Some patterns more general; others compensate for OOP shortcomings
 - But any “paradigm” should have design patterns



P

atterns vs. patterns

The phrase *pattern* has been wildly overused since the GoF patterns have been introduced

Misused as a synonym for “[somebody says] X is a good way to write programs.”

- And “anti-pattern” has become a synonym for “[somebody says] Y is a bad way to write programs.”

GoF-style patterns have richness, history, language-independence, documentation and thus (most likely) far more staying power

An example GoF pattern

For some class **C**, guarantee that at run-time there is exactly one instance of **C**

- And that the instance is globally visible

First, *why* might you want this?

- What design goals are achieved?

Second, *how* might you achieve this?

- How to leverage language constructs to enforce the design

A pattern has a recognized *name*

- This is the *Singleton Pattern*

Possible reasons for Singleton

- One `RandomNumber` generator
- One `KeyboardReader`, `PrinterController`, etc...
- Have an object with fields/properties that are “like public, static fields” but you can have a constructor decide their values
 - Maybe strings in a particular language for messages
- Make it easier to ensure some key invariants
 - There is only one instance, so never mutate the wrong one
- Make it easier to control when that single instance is created
 - If expensive, delay until needed and then don't do it again

How: multiple approaches

```
public class Foo {
    private static final Foo instance = new Foo();
    // private constructor prevents instantiation outside class
    private Foo() { ... }
    public static Foo getInstance() {
        return instance;
    }
    ... instance methods as usual ...
}
```

**Eager allocation
of instance**

```
public class Foo {
    private static Foo instance;
    // private constructor prevents instantiation outside class
    private Foo() { ... }
    public static synchronized Foo getInstance() {
        if (instance == null) {
            instance = new Foo();
        }
        return instance;
    }
    ... instance methods as usual ...
}
```

**Lazy allocation
of instance**

GoF patterns: three categories

Creational Patterns are about the object-creation process

Factory Method, Abstract Factory, *Singleton*, Builder, Prototype, ...

Structural Patterns are about how objects/classes can be combined

Adapter, Bridge, *Composite*, Decorator, Façade, Flyweight, Proxy, ...

Behavioral Patterns are about communication among objects

Command, Interpreter, *Iterator*, Mediator, *Observer*, State, Strategy, Chain of Responsibility, Visitor, Template Method, ...

Green = ones we've seen already

Creational patterns

Constructors in Java are inflexible

1. Can't return a subtype of the class they belong to
2. Always return a fresh new object, never re-use one

Factories: Patterns for code that you call to get new objects other than constructors

- Factory method, Factory object, Prototype, Dependency injection

Sharing: Patterns for reusing objects (to save space *and* other reasons)

- Singleton, Interning, Flyweight

Motivation for factories: Changing implementations

Supertypes support multiple implementations

```
interface Matrix { ... }  
class SparseMatrix implements Matrix { ... }  
class DenseMatrix implements Matrix { ... }
```

Clients use the supertype (**Matrix**)

Still need to use a **SparseMatrix** or **DenseMatrix**
constructor

- Must decide concrete implementation *somewhere*
- Don't want to change code to use a different constructor
- Factory methods put this decision behind an abstraction

Use of factories

Factory

```
class MatrixFactory {  
    public static Matrix createMatrix() {  
        return new SparseMatrix();  
    }  
}
```

Clients call `createMatrix` instead of a particular constructor

Advantages:

- To switch the implementation, change only *one* place
- `createMatrix` can do arbitrary computations to decide what kind of matrix to make (unlike what's shown above)

DateFormat factory methods

`DateFormat` class encapsulates knowledge about how to format dates and times as text

- Options: just date? just time? date+time? where in the world?
- Instead of passing all options to constructor, use factories
- The subtype created by factory call need not be specified

```
DateFormat df1 = DateFormat.getDateInstance () ;  
DateFormat df2 = DateFormat.getTimeInstance () ;  
DateFormat df3 = DateFormat.getDateInstance  
                (DateFormat.FULL, Locale.FRANCE) ;
```

```
Date today = new Date () ;
```

```
df1.format(today) // "Jul 4, 1776"  
df2.format(today) // "10:15:00 AM"  
df3.format(today) ; // "jeudi 4 juillet 1776"
```

Example: Bicycle race

```
class Race {
    public Race() {
        Bicycle bike1 = new Bicycle();
        Bicycle bike2 = new Bicycle();
        ...
    }
    ...
}
```

New example:

- No factories yet
- Coming: factories for the *bicycles* to get flexibility and code reuse
- Could also use factories for the *races*, but that complicates the example, so will stick with constructors

Example: Tour de France

```
class TourDeFrance extends Race {  
    public TourDeFrance() {  
        Bicycle bike1 = new RoadBicycle();  
        Bicycle bike2 = new RoadBicycle();  
        ...  
    }  
    ...  
}
```

The problem: We are reimplementing the constructor in every **Race** subclass just to use a different subclass of **Bicycle**

Example: Cyclocross

```
class Cyclocross extends Race {  
    public Cyclocross() {  
        Bicycle bike1 = new MountainBicycle();  
        Bicycle bike2 = new MountainBicycle();  
        ...  
    }  
    ...  
}
```

The problem: We are reimplementing the constructor in every **Race** subclass just to use a different subclass of **Bicycle**

Factory *method* for Bicycle

```
class Race {  
    Bicycle createBicycle() { return new Bicycle(); }  
    public Race() {  
        Bicycle bike1 = createBicycle();  
        Bicycle bike2 = createBicycle();  
        ...  
    }  
}
```

Use a factory method to avoid dependence on specific new kind of bicycle in the constructor

- Call the factory method instead

Subclasses override factory method

```
class TourDeFrance extends Race {
    Bicycle createBicycle() {
        return new RoadBicycle();
    }
    public TourDeFrance() { super(); }
}
class Cyclocross extends Race {
    Bicycle createBicycle() {
        return new MountainBicycle();
    }
    public Cyclocross() { super(); }
}
```

- “Foresight” to use factory method in superclass constructor
- Then dynamic dispatch to call overridden method
- Subtyping in the overriding methods (covariant returns type also ok)
- Would look like even more code reuse outside of constructors
- Example: Can inherit an **addBicycle** that calls **createBicycle**

Next step

- `createBicycle` was just a factory method
- Now let's move the method into a separate class
 - So it's part of a *factory object*
- Advantages:
 1. Can group related factory methods together
 - Not shown: `repairBicycle`, `createSpareWheel`, ...
 2. Can pass factories around as objects for flexibility
 - Choose a factory at runtime
 - Use different factories in different objects (e.g., races)
 - Example...

Factory *objects*/classes

encapsulate factory method(s)

```
class BicycleFactory {
    Bicycle createBicycle() {
        return new Bicycle();
    }
}
class RoadBicycleFactory extends BicycleFactory {
    Bicycle createBicycle() {
        return new RoadBicycle();
    }
}
class MountainBicycleFactory extends BicycleFactory {
    Bicycle createBicycle() {
        return new MountainBicycle();
    }
}
```

Using a factory object

```
class Race {
    BicycleFactory bfactory;
    public Race(BicycleFactory f) {
        bfactory = f;
        Bicycle bike1 = bfactory.createBicycle();
        Bicycle bike2 = bfactory.createBicycle();
        ...
    }
    public Race() { this(new BicycleFactory()); }
    ...
}
```

Setting up the flexibility here:

- Factory object stored in a field, set by constructor
- Can take the factory as a constructor-argument
- But an implementation detail (?), so 0-argument constructor too
 - Java detail: call another constructor in same class with **this**

The subclasses

```
class TourDeFrance extends Race {  
    public TourDeFrance() {  
        super(new RoadBicycleFactory());  
    }  
}
```

```
class Cyclocross extends Race {  
    public Cyclocross() {  
        super(new MountainBicycleFactory());  
    }  
}
```

Voila!

- Just call the superclass constructor with a different factory
- **Race** class had foresight to delegate “what to do to create a bicycle” to the factory object, making it more reusable

Separate control over bicycles and races

```
class TourDeFrance extends Race {
    public TourDeFrance() {
        super(new RoadBicycleFactory()); // or this(...)
    }
    public TourDeFrance(BicycleFactory f) {
        super(f);
    }
    ...
}
```

By having factory-as-argument option, we can allow arbitrary mixing by client: `new TourDeFrance(new TricycleFactory())`

Less useful in this example (?): Swapping in different factory object whenever you want

Reminder: Not shown here is also using factories for creating *races*

Prototype pattern

- Every object is itself a factory
- Each class contains a `clone` method that creates a copy of the receiver object

```
class Bicycle {  
    Bicycle clone() { ... }  
}
```

Often, `Object` is the return type of `clone`

- `clone` is declared in `Object`
- Design flaw in Java 1.4 and earlier: the return type may not change covariantly in an overridden method
i.e., return type could not be made more restrictive

Using prototypes

```
class Race {
    Bicycle bproto;

    public Race(Bicycle bproto) {
        this.bproto = bproto;
        Bicycle bike1 = (Bicycle) bproto.clone();
        Bicycle bike2 = (Bicycle) bproto.clone();
        ...
    }
}
```

Again, we can specify the race and the bicycle separately:

```
new Race(new Tricycle())
```


Dependency injection

- Change the factory without changing the code
- With a regular in-code factory:

```
BicycleFactory f = new TricycleFactory();  
Race r = new TourDeFrance(f)
```

- With external dependency injection:

```
BicycleFactory f = ((BicycleFactory)  
    DependencyManager.get("BicycleFactory"));  
Race r = new TourDeFrance(f);
```

- *Plus* an external file:

```
<service-point id="BicycleFactory">  
  <invoke-factory>  
    <construct class="Bicycle">  
      <service>Tricycle</service>  
    </construct>  
  </invoke-factory>  
</service-point>
```

+ Change the factory without recompiling
- External file is essential part of program

Factories: summary

Problem: want more flexible abstractions for what class to instantiate

Factory method

- Call a method to create the object
- Method can do any computation and return any subtype

Factory object

- Bundles factory methods for a family of types
- Can store object in fields, pass to constructors, etc.

Prototype

- Every object is a factory, can create more objects like itself
- Call `clone` to get a new object of same subtype as receiver

Dependency Injection

- Put choice of subclass in a file to avoid source-code changes or even recompiling when decision changes

Sharing

Recall the second weakness of Java constructors

Java constructors always return a *new object*

Singleton: only one object exists at runtime

- Factory method returns the same object every time
- (we've seen this already)


Interning: only one object with a particular (abstract) value exists at runtime

- Factory method returns an existing object, not a new one

Flyweight: separate intrinsic and extrinsic state, represent them separately, and intern the intrinsic state

Interning pattern

- Reuse existing objects instead of creating new ones
 - Less space
 - May compare with `==` instead of `equals ()`
- Sensible only for immutable objects



Interning mechanism

- Maintain a collection of all objects
- If an object already appears, return that instead

```
HashMap<String, String> segnames;  
String canonicalName(String n) {  
    if (segnames.containsKey(n)) {  
        return segnames.get(n);  
    } else {  
        segnames.put(n, n);  
        return n;  
    }  
}
```

Why not Set<String> ?

Set supports contains but not get

- Java builds this in for strings: `String.intern()`
- Two approaches:
 - Create the object, but perhaps discard it and return another
 - Check against the arguments before creating the new object

Space leaks

- Interning can waste space if your collection:
 - Grows too big
 - With objects that will never be used again
- Not discussed here: The solution is to use *weak references*
 - This is their canonical purpose
- Do not reinvent your own way of keeping track of whether an object in the collection is being used
 - Too error-prone
 - Gives up key benefits of garbage-collection

java.lang.Boolean does not use the Interning pattern

```
public class Boolean {
    private final boolean value;
    // construct a new Boolean value
    public Boolean(boolean value) {
        this.value = value;
    }

    public static Boolean FALSE = new Boolean(false);
    public static Boolean TRUE = new Boolean(true);

    // factory method that uses interning
    public static Boolean valueOf(boolean value) {
        if (value) {
            return TRUE;
        } else {
            return FALSE;
        }
    }
}
```

Recognition of the problem

Javadoc for `Boolean` constructor:

Allocates a `Boolean` object representing the value argument.

Note: It is rarely appropriate to use this constructor. Unless a new instance is required, the static factory `valueOf(boolean)` is generally a better choice. It is likely to yield significantly better space and time performance.

Josh Bloch (JavaWorld, January 4, 2004):

The `Boolean` type should not have had public constructors.

There's really no great advantage to allow multiple `true`s or multiple `false`s, and I've seen programs that produce millions of `true`s and millions of `false`s, creating needless work for the garbage collector.

So, **in the case of immutables, I think factory methods are great.**

Flyweight pattern

Good when many objects are *mostly* the same

- Interning works only if objects are *entirely* the same (and immutable)

Intrinsic state: Independent of object's "context"


- Often same across many objects and immutable
- Technique: intern it

Extrinsic state: different for different objects; depends on "context"

- Have clients store it separately, or better:
- Advanced technique:
 - Make it implicit (clients *compute* it instead of represent it)
 - Saves space

Example without flyweight: bicycle spoke

```
class Wheel {
    FullSpoke[] spokes;
    ...
}
class FullSpoke {
    int length;
    int diameter;
    boolean tapered;
    Metal material;
    float weight;
    float threading;
    boolean crimped;
    int location; // position on the rim
}
```



- Typically 32 or 36 spokes per wheel but only 3 varieties per bicycle
- In a bike race, hundreds of spoke varieties, millions of instances

Alternatives to FullSpoke

```
class IntrinsicSpoke {
    int length;
    int diameter;
    boolean tapered;
    Metal material;
    float weight;
    float threading;
    boolean crimped;
}
```

This does *not* save space compared to FullSpoke

```
class InstalledSpokeFull extends IntrinsicSpoke {
    int location;
}
```

This *does* save space

```
class InstalledSpokeWrapper {
    IntrinsicSpoke s; // refer to interned object
    int location;
}
```

But flyweight version [still coming up] uses even less space...

Original code to true (align) a wheel

```
class FullSpoke {
    // Tension the spoke by turning the nipple the
    // specified number of turns.
    void tighten(int turns) {
        ... location ... // location is a field
    }
}

class Wheel {
    FullSpoke[] spokes;
    void align() {
        while (wheel is misaligned) {
            // tension the ith spoke
            ... spokes[i].tighten(numturns) ...
        }
    }
}
```

What is the value of the
location field in `spokes[i]`?

Flyweight code to true (align) a wheel

```
class IntrinsicSpoke {
    void tighten(int turns, int location) {
        ... location ... // location is a parameter
    }
}

class Wheel {
    IntrinsicSpoke[] spokes;

    void align() {
        while (wheel is misaligned) {
            // tension the ith spoke
            ... spokes[i].tighten(numturns, i) ...
        }
    }
}
```

What happened

- *Logically*, each spoke is a different object
 - A spoke “has” all the intrinsic state and a location
- But if that would be a lot of objects, i.e., space usage, we can instead...
- Create *one actual* flyweight object that is used “in place of” all logical objects that have that intrinsic state
 - Use interning to get the sharing
 - Clients store or compute the extrinsic state and pass it to methods to get the right behavior
 - Only do this when logical approach is cost-prohibitive and it’s not too complicated to manage the extrinsic state
 - Here spoke location was particularly easy and cheap because it was implicit in array location of reference

Flyweight discussion

What if **FullSpoke** contains a **wheel** field pointing at the **Wheel** containing it?

Wheel methods pass this to the methods that use the **wheel** field.

What if **FullSpoke** contains a **boolean** field **broken**?

Add an array of **booleans** in **Wheel**, parallel to the array of **Spokes**.

Flyweight: resist it

- Flyweight is manageable only if there are very few mutable (extrinsic) fields
- Flyweight complicates the code
- Use flyweight only when profiling has determined that space is a *serious* problem