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Review: Satisfaction of a specification

Let P be an implementation and S a specification
Think “procedures/methods/functions” for the moment

\( P \text{ satisfies } S \) iff
Every behavior of P is permitted by S
“The behavior of P is a subset of S”

The statement “P is correct” is meaningless
Though often made!

If P does not satisfy S, either (or both!) could be “wrong”
“One person’s feature is another person’s bug.”
It’s usually better to change the program than the spec
Scaling Up Specifications

Procedural abstraction:
- Abstracts from details of procedures
- A specification mechanism
- Satisfy the specification with an implementation

Data abstraction:
- Abstracts from details of data representation
- A specification mechanism
  - A way of thinking about programs and design

Standard terminology: Abstract Data Type, or ADT
Why we need Data Abstractions (ADTs)

Organizing and manipulating data is pervasive
Inventing and describing algorithms is rare
Start your design by designing data structures
Potential problems with choosing a data abstraction:
  Decisions about data structures often made too early
  Duplication of effort in creating derived data
  Very hard to change key data structures
A Data Abstraction is a set of operations

ADT abstracts from the **organization** to **meaning** of data
ADT abstracts from **structure** to **use**

Representation does not matter; this choice is (or should be) irrelevant to the client:

```java
class RightTriangle {
    float base, altitude;
}
```

Instead, think of a type as a set of operations
create, getBase, getAltitude, getBottomAngle, ...

Force clients (users) to use operations to access data

```java
class RightTriangle {
    float base, hypot, angle;
}
```
Are these classes the same?

class Point {
    public float x;
    public float y;
}

class Point {
    public float r;
    public float theta;
}

Different: can't replace one with the other
Same: both classes implement the concept "2-d point"
Goal of ADT methodology is to express the sameness:
   Clients depend only on the concept "2-d point"
   Can delay implementation decisions, fix bugs, change algorithms without affecting clients
Abstract data type = objects + operations

The implementation is hidden
The only operations on objects of the type are those provided by the abstraction
Concept of 2-d point, as an ADT

class Point {
    // A 2-d point exists somewhere in the plane, ...
    public float x();
    public float y();
    public float r();
    public float theta();

    // ... can be created, ...
    public Point();       // new point at (0,0)
    public Point centroid(Set<Point> points);

    // ... can be moved, ...
    public void translate(float delta_x,
                          float delta_y);
    public void scaleAndRotate(float delta_r,
                                float delta_theta);
}

Observers

Creators/Producers

Mutators
A data abstraction is defined by a specification

A collection of procedural abstractions
   Not a collection of procedures
Together, these procedural abstractions provide a set of values
   All the ways of directly using that set of values
     Creating
     Manipulating
     Observing
Creators and producers: make new values
Mutators: change the value (but don’t affect ==)
Observers: allow one to tell values apart
Connecting specifications and implementations

Specification: describes ADT only in terms of the abstraction

Never mentions the representation

*Abstraction Function*: maps object $\rightarrow$ abstract value

What the data structure *means* as an abstract value
How the data structure is to be interpreted
Ex: point in the plane represented by Point object

*Representation Invariant*: maps object $\rightarrow$ boolean

Indicates whether a data structure is *well-formed*
Defines set of valid values of the data structure
Only well-formed representations (values) make sense as implementations of an abstract value
Implementing a Data Abstraction (ADT)

To implement a data abstraction
  Select the representation of instances, the “rep”
  Implement operations in terms of that rep
    In Java this is typically done with a class
Choose a representation so that:
  It is possible to implement required operations
  The most frequently used operations are efficient
    But which will these be?
  Abstraction allows the rep to change later
Example: CharSet Abstraction

// Overview: A CharSet is a finite mutable set of Characters

// effects: creates an empty CharSet
public CharSet ()

// modifies: this
// effects: this_{post} = this_{pre} U \{c\}
public void insert (Character c);

// modifies: this
// effects: this_{post} = this_{pre} - \{c\}
public void delete (Character c);

// returns: (c ∈ this)
public boolean member (Character c);

// returns: cardinality of this
public int size ();
A CharSet implementation: Is it OK?

class CharSet {
    private List<Character> elts =
        new ArrayList<Character>();
    public void insert(Character c) {
        elts.add(c);
    }
    public void delete(Character c) {
        elts.remove(c);
    }
    public boolean member(Character c) {
        return elts.contains(c);
    }
    public int size() {
        return elts.size();
    }
}

CharSet s = new CharSet();
Character a = new Character('a');
s.insert(a);
s.insert(a);
s.delete(a);
if (s.member(a))
    // print “wrong”;
else
    // print “right”;}
Where Is the Error?

Answer this and you know what to fix
Perhaps `delete` is wrong
   It should remove all occurrences
Perhaps `insert` is wrong
   It should not insert a character that is already there
How can we know?
   The `representation invariant` tells us
The representation invariant

States data structure well-formedness
Must hold before and after every CharSet operation
Operations (methods) may depend on it
Write it this way

```java
class CharSet {
    // Rep invariant:
    // elts has no nulls and no duplicates
    private List<Character> elts;
    ...
```

Or, more formally:

\[\forall \text{ indices } i \text{ of elts . } \text{elts.elementAt}(i) \neq \text{null}\]
\[\forall \text{ indices } i, j \text{ of elts .}
   \quad i \neq j \Rightarrow \neg \text{elts.elementAt}(i).\text{equals}(\text{elts.elementAt}(j))\]
Now, we can locate the error

// Rep invariant:
// elts has no nulls and no duplicates

public void insert(Character c) {
    elts.add(c);
}

public void delete(Character c) {
    elts.remove(c);
}
Listing the elements of a CharSet

Consider adding the following method to CharSet

```java
// returns: a List containing the members of this
public List<Character> getElts();
```

Consider this implementation:

```java
// Rep invariant: elts has no nulls and no dups.
public List<Character> getElts() { return elts; }
```

Does the implementation of `getElts` preserve the rep invariant?

Kind of, sort of, not really....
Representation exposure

Consider the client code (outside the CharSet implementation)

```java
CharSet s = new CharSet();
Character a = new Character('a');
s.insert(a);
s.getElts().add(a);
s.delete(a);
if (s.member(a)) …
```

Representation exposure is external access to the rep
Representation exposure is almost always **EVIL**
If you do it, document why and how
   And feel guilty about it! (even if you have to do it)
Ways to avoid rep exposure

1. Exploit immutability
   Character choose() {
       return elts.elementAt(0);
   }
   Character is immutable.

2. Make a copy
   List<Character> getElts() {
       return new ArrayList<Character>(elts);
       // or: return (ArrayList<Character>) elts.clone();
   }
   Mutating a copy doesn't affect the original.  
   Don't forget to make a copy on the way in!

3. Make an immutable copy
   List<Character> getElts() {
       return Collections.unmodifiableList<Character>(elts);
   }
   Client cannot mutate
   Still need to make a copy on the way in
Checking rep invariants

Should code check that the rep invariant holds?
  – Yes, if it’s inexpensive
  – Yes, for debugging (even when it’s expensive)
  – It’s quite hard to justify turning the checking off
  – Some private methods need not check (Why?)
Checking the rep invariant

Rule of thumb: check on entry \textit{and} on exit (why?)

public void delete(Character c) {
    checkRep();
    elts.remove(c)

    // Is this guaranteed to get called?
    // (there are ways to guarantee it)
    checkRep();
}

...
Practice defensive programming

Assume that you will make mistakes
Write and incorporate code designed to catch them

- On entry:
  - Check rep invariant
  - Check preconditions (**requires** clause)
- On exit:
  - Check rep invariant
  - Check postconditions

Checking the rep invariant helps you **discover** errors
Reasoning about the rep invariant helps you **avoid** errors
  - Or prove that they do not exist!
Rep inv. constrains structure, not meaning

New implementation of insert that preserves the rep invariant:

```java
public void insert(Character c) {
    Character cc = new Character(encrypt(c));
    if (!elts.contains(cc))
        elts.addElement(cc);
}
public boolean member(Character c) {
    return elts.contains(c);
}
```

The program is still wrong
Clients observe incorrect behavior
What client code exposes the error?
Where is the error?
We must consider the meaning
The *abstraction function* helps us

```java
CharSet s = new CharSet();
Character a = new Character(‘a’);
s.insert(a);
if (s.member(a))
    // print “right”;
else
    // print “wrong”;
```
Abstraction function: rep→abstract value

The abstraction function maps the concrete representation to the abstract value it represents.

AF: Object → abstract value

AF(CharSet this) = { c | c is contained in this.elts }

“set of Characters contained in this.elts”

Typically not executable

The abstraction function lets us reason about behavior from the client perspective.
Our real goal is to satisfy the specification of insert:

```java
// modifies: this
// effects: this\_post = this\_pre \cup \{c\}
public void insert (Character c);
```

Once again we can place the blame

Applying the abstraction function to the result of the call to `insert` yields $AF(\text{elts}) \cup \{\text{encrypt('a')}\}$

What if we used this abstraction function?

$$AF(\text{this}) = \{c | \text{encrypt}(c) \text{ is contained in } \text{this.elts} \}$$

$$= \{\text{decrypt}(c) | c \text{ is contained in } \text{this.elts} \}$$
Data Abstraction: Summary

Rep invariant

Which concrete values represent abstract values

Abstraction function

For each concrete value, which abstract value it represents

Together, they modularize the implementation

Can examine operators one at a time

Neither one is part of the abstraction (the ADT)

In practice

Always write a representation invariant

Write an abstraction function when you need it

Write an informal one for most non-trivial classes

A formal one is harder to write and usually less useful

Next time: more examples and perspective