A design exercise

Write a typing break reminder program

Offer the hard-working user occasional reminders of the perils of Repetitive Strain Injury, and encourage the user to take a break from typing.

Naive design:

Write a method to display messages and offer exercises. Write a loop to call that method from time to time.

(Let's ignore multi-threaded solutions for this discussion)
public class TimeToStretch {
    public void run() {
        System.out.println("Stop typing!");
        suggestExercise();
    }
    public void suggestExercise() {
        ...
    }
}
Timer calls run() periodically

```java
public class Timer {
    private TimeToStretch tts = new TimeToStretch();
    public void start() {
        while (true) {
            ...
            if (enoughTimeHasPassed) {
                tts.run();
            }
            ...
        }
    }
}
```
Main class puts it together

class Main {
    public static void main(String[] args) {
        Timer t = new Timer();
        t.start();
    }
}

This will work...
But we can do better
An arrow in a module dependency diagram (MDD) indicates “depends on” or “knows about” – simplistically, “any name mentioned in the source code”

Does Timer really need to depend on TimeToStretch?
Is Timer re-usable in a new context?
Decoupling

**Timer** needs to call the **run** method

**Timer** doesn't need to know what the **run** method does

Weaken the dependency of **Timer** on **TimeToStretch**

Introduce a weaker specification, in the form of an interface or abstract class

```java
public abstract class TimerTask {
    public abstract void run();
}
```

**Timer** only needs to know that something (e.g., **TimeToStretch**) meets the **TimerTask** specification
public class TimeToStretch extends TimerTask {
    public void run() {
        System.out.println("Stop typing!");
        suggestExercise();
    }

    public void suggestExercise() {
        ...
    }
}
public class Timer {
    private TimerTask task;
    public Timer(TimerTask task) { this.task = task; }
    public void start() {
        while (true) {
            ... 
            task.run();
        }
    }
}

Main creates the TimeToStretch object and passes it to Timer:
    Timer t = new Timer(new TimeToStretch());
    t.start();
Main still depends on Timer (is this necessary?)
Main depends on the constructor for TimeToStretch
Timer depends on TimerTask, not TimeToStretch
Unaffected by implementation details of TimeToStretch
Now Timer is much easier to reuse
The callback design pattern

_TimeToStretch_ creates a _Timer_, and passes in a reference to itself so the _Timer_ can _call it back_.

This is a _callback_ – a method call from a module to a client that it notifies about some condition.

Use a callback to invert a dependency

Inverted dependency: _TimeToStretch_ depends on _Timer_ (not vice versa).

Side benefit: _Main_ does not depend on _Timer_.
Callbacks

Synchronous callbacks:
Examples: `HashMap` calls its client’s `hashCode`, `equals`
Useful when the callback result is needed immediately by the library

Asynchronous callbacks:
Examples: GUI listeners
Register to indicate interest and where to call back
Useful when the callback should be performed later, when some interesting event occurs

A synchronous callback.
Time increases downward.
Solid lines: calls
Dotted lines: returns
public class TimeToStretch extends TimerTask {
    private Timer timer;
    public TimeToStretch() {
        timer = new Timer(this);
    }
    public void start() {
        timer.start();
    }
    public void run() {
        System.out.println("Stop typing!");
        suggestExercise();
    }
    ...
}
Main (version 3)

TimeToStretch  \texttt{tts} = \texttt{new TimeToStretch}();
\texttt{tts.start}();

Use a callback to invert a dependency
This diagram shows the inversion of the dependency between \texttt{Timer} and \texttt{TimeToStretch} (compared to ver. 1)
Decoupling and design

A good design has dependences (coupling) only where it makes sense.

While you design (*before* you code), examine dependences.

Don’t introduce unnecessary coupling.

Coupling is an easy temptation if you code first.

Suppose a method needs information from another object:

If you hack in a way to get it:

The hack might be easy to write.

It will damage the code’s modularity and reusability.

More complex code is harder to understand.
Design exercise #2

A program to display information about stocks
  stock tickers
  spreadsheets
  graphs
Naive design:
  Make a class to represent stock information
  That class updates all views of that information
    (tickers, graphs, etc.) when it changes
Main class gathers information and stores in **Stocks**

**Stocks** class updates viewers when necessary

Problem: To add/change a viewer, must change **Stocks**

Better: insulate **Stocks** from the vagaries of the viewers
Weaken the coupling

What should Stocks class know about viewers?

Only needs an update method to call when things change

Old:

```java
void updateViewers() {
    ticker.update(newPrice);
    spreadsheet.update(newPrice);
    graph.update(newPrice);
    // Edit this method whenever
    // different viewers are desired.
}
```

New (uses “observer pattern”):

```java
List<Observer> observers;

void notifyObserver() {
    for (Observer obs : observers) {
        obs.update(newPrice);
    }
}

interface Observer {
    void update(...);
}
```

How are observers created?
The observer pattern

**Stocks** not responsible for viewer creation

**Main** passes viewers to **Stocks** as Observers

**Stocks** keeps list of Observers, notifies them of changes

Problem: doesn't know what info each Observer needs
A different design: pull versus push

The Observer pattern implements *push* functionality

A *pull* model: give viewers access to **Stocks**, let them extract the data they need

Usually need way for **Stocks** to tell viewers when changes happen

The best design depends on frequency of operations

*(It's also possible to use both patterns simultaneously.)*
Another example of Observer pattern

// Represents a sign-up sheet of students
public class SignupSheet extends Observable {
    private List<String> students
        = new ArrayList<>();
    public void addStudent(String student) {
        students.add(student);
        notifyObservers();
    }
    public int size() {
        return students.size();
    }
}

Part of the JDK
public class SignupObserver implements Observer {
    // called whenever the observed object is changed
    public void update(Observable o, Object arg) {
        System.out.println("Signup count: "+
                         ((SignupSheet)o).size());
    }
}

---

Part of the JDK

Not relevant to us

cast because Observable is non-generic 😞
Using the observer

SignupSheet s = new SignupSheet();
s.addStudent("billg");
// nothing visible happens
s.addObserver(new SignupObserver());
s.addStudent("torvalds");
// now text appears: "Signup count: 2"

Java's “Listeners” (particularly in GUI classes) are examples of the Observer pattern
User interfaces: appearance vs. content

It is easy to tangle up appearance and content. Particularly when supporting direct manipulation (e.g., dragging line endpoints in a drawing program).

Another example: program state stored in widgets in dialog boxes.

Neither can be understood easily or changed easily. This destroys modularity and reusability. Over time, it leads to bizarre hacks and huge complexity. Code must be discarded.

Callbacks, listeners, and other patterns can help.