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==, equals(), and all that
(Slides by David Notkin and Mike Ernst)
Programming: object equality

The basic intuition is simple: two objects are equal if they are indistinguishable (have the same value).

But our intuitions are incomplete in subtle ways:
- Must the objects be the same object or “just” indistinguishable?
- What is an object’s value? How do we interpret “the bits”?
- What does it mean for two collections of objects to be equal?
  - Does each need to hold the same objects? In the same order? What if a collection contains itself?
  - Who decides? The programming language designer? You?
- If a program uses inheritance, does equality change?
- Is equality always an efficient operation?
- Is equality temporary or forever?
Properties of equality
for any useful notion of equality

**Reflexive**  \( a\text{.equals}(a) \)

\( 3 \neq 3 \) would be confusing

**Symmetric**  \( a\text{.equals}(b) \iff b\text{.equals}(a) \)

\( 3 = 4 \land 4 \neq 3 \) would be confusing

**Transitive**  \( a\text{.equals}(b) \land b\text{.equals}(c) \)

\( \Rightarrow a\text{.equals}(c) \)

\( ((1+2) = 3 \land 3 = (5-2)) \land \\
((1+2) \neq (5-2)) \) would be confusing

A relation that is reflexive, transitive, and symmetric is an *equivalence relation*
Reference equality

• The simplest and strongest (most restrictive) definition is \textit{reference equality}
  
  \[ a == b \text{ if and only if } a \text{ and } b \text{ refer (point) to the same object} \]

• Easy to show that this definition ensures == is an equivalence relation

```java
Duration d1 = new Duration(5, 3);
Duration d2 = new Duration(5, 3);
Duration d3 = d2;

// T/F: d1 == d2 ?
// T/F: d1 == d3 ?
// T/F: d2 == d3 ?
// T/F: d1.equals(d2) ?
// T/F: d2.equals(d3) ?
```

\[
\begin{array}{c|c|c|c}
\text{min} & 5 & \text{sec} & 3 \\
\hline
\text{d1} & \text{d2} & \text{d3} & \\
\end{array}
\]
**Object.equals method**

```java
public class Object {
    public boolean equals(Object o) {
        return this == o;
    }
}
```

This implements reference equality

What about the specification of `Object.equals`? It’s a bit more complicated…
public boolean equals(Object obj)

Indicates whether some other object is "equal to" this one.

The equals method implements an equivalence relation:

- It is reflexive: for any reference value x, x.equals(x) should return true.
- It is symmetric: for any reference values x and y, x.equals(y) should return true if and only if y.equals(x) returns true.
- It is transitive: for any reference values x, y, and z, if x.equals(y) returns true and y.equals(z) returns true, then x.equals(z) should return true.
- It is consistent: for any reference values x and y, multiple invocations of x.equals(y) consistently return true or consistently return false, provided no information used in equals comparisons on the object is modified.
- For any non-null reference value x, x.equals(null) should return false.

The equals method for class Object implements the most discriminating possible equivalence relation on objects; that is, for any reference values x and y, this method returns true if and only if x and y refer to the same object (x==y has the value true).

Parameters:
obj - the reference object with which to compare.

Returns:
true if this object is the same as the obj argument; false otherwise.

See Also:
hashCode(), HashMap
The *Object* contract

Why so complicated?
Object class is designed for inheritance
Its specification will apply to all subtypes
  In other words, all Java classes
So, its specification must be flexible
  Specification for equals cannot later be weakened
If `a.equals(b)` were specified to test `a==b`, then no class could change this and still be a true subtype of *Object*
Instead spec for equals enumerates basic properties that clients can rely on it to have in subtypes of *Object*
  `a==b` is compatible with these properties, but so are other tests
Comparing objects less strictly

```java
public class Duration {
    private final int min;
    private final int sec;
    public Duration(int min, int sec) {
        this.min = min;
        this.sec = sec;
    }
}
...
Duration d1 = new Duration(10, 5);
Duration d2 = new Duration(10, 5);
System.out.println(d1.equals(d2));
```

false – but we likely prefer it to be true
An obvious improvement

```java
public boolean equals(Duration d) {
    return d.min == min && d.sec == sec;
}
```

This defines an equivalence relation for `Duration` objects (proof by partial example and handwaving)

```java
Duration d1 = new Duration(10, 5);
Duration d2 = new Duration(10, 5);
System.out.println(d1.equals(d2));
```

```java
Object o1 = new Duration(10, 5);
Object o2 = new Duration(10, 5);
System.out.println(o1.equals(o2)); // False!
```

But oops
Overloading

We have two equals methods:

\[
\text{equals(Object)} \quad \text{in class Object}
\]

\[
\text{equals(Duration)} \quad \text{in class Duration}
\]

The one in Duration does not override the inherited one – it overloads it (different parameter type)

If \(d\) has type Duration, \(d\).equals(Duration) invokes the method in Duration

If \(o\) has type Object, \(o\).equals(Duration) invokes the method declared in Object

Even if the dynamic type of \(o\) is Duration!

Object does not have an equals(Duration) method. Method types are resolved using static types.
Dynamic types are used to select appropriate method at runtime (dynamic dispatch), but selected from possible methods with the correct static type.
@Override 

public boolean equals(Object o) {
    if (! (o instanceof Duration)) { // Not equal if parameter is not a Duration
        return false;
    }
    Duration d = (Duration) o; // cast to treat o as a Duration
    return d.min == min && d.sec == sec;
}

Object d1 = new Duration(10,5);
Object d2 = new Duration(10,5);
System.out.println(d1.equals(d2)); // True

- **overriding** re-defines an inherited method from a superclass — same name & parameter list & return type
- **Durations** now have to be compared as **Durations** (or as **Objects**, but not as a mixture)
Equality and inheritance

Let’s add a nanosecond field for fractional seconds

public class NanoDuration extends Duration {
    private final int nano;
    public NanoDuration(int min, int sec, int nano) {
        super(min, sec);
        this.nano = nano;
    }
}

Inherited \texttt{equals()} from \texttt{Duration} ignores \texttt{nano} so \texttt{Duration} instances with different \texttt{nanos} will be \texttt{equal}
equals: account for nano

```java
public boolean equals(Object o) {
    if (! (o instanceof NanoDuration))
        return false;
    NanoDuration nd = (NanoDuration) o;
    return super.equals(nd) && nano == nd.nano;
}
```

But this is not symmetric!

Oops!

```java
Duration d1 = new NanoDuration(5,10,15);
Duration d2 = new Duration(5,10);
System.out.println(d1.equals(d2)); // false
System.out.println(d2.equals(d1)); // true
```
Let’s get symmetry

```java
public boolean equals(Object o) {
    if (! (o instanceof Duration))
        return false;
    // if o is a normal Duration, compare without nano
    if (! (o instanceof NanoDuration))
        return super.equals(o);
    NanoDuration nd = (NanoDuration) o;
    return super.equals(nd) && nano == nd.nano;
}
```

**But this is not transitive!**

Duration d1 = new NanoDuration(5,10,15);
Duration d2 = new Duration(5,10);
Duration d3 = new NanoDuration(5,10,30);
System.out.println(d1.equals(d2)); // true
System.out.println(d2.equals(d3)); // true
System.out.println(d1.equals(d3)); // false!
@Overrides
public boolean equals(Object o) {
    if (o == null)
        return false;
    if (!o.getClass().equals(getClass()))
        return false;
    Duration d = (Duration) o;
    return d.min == min && d.sec == sec;
}
General issues

Every subtype must override `equals`
even if it wants the identical definition
Take care when comparing subtypes to one another
Consider an `ArithmeticDuration` class that
adds operators but no new fields (on your own)
Another solution: avoid inheritance

Use composition instead

```java
public class NanoDuration {
    private final Duration duration;
    private final int nano;
    // ...
}
```

NanoDuration and Duration are unrelated

There is no presumption that they can be equal or unequal or even compared to one another...

Solves some problems, introduces others

Example: can’t use NanoDuration where Durations are expected (not a (Java) subtype)
Efficiency of equality

Equality tests can be slow: Are two objects with millions of sub-objects equal? Are two video files equal?
It is often useful to quickly pre-filter – for example
    if (video1.length() != video2.length())
        return false
    else do full equality check
Java requires each class to define a standard pre-filter – a `hashCode()` method that produces a single hash value (a 32-bit signed integer) from an instance of the class

If two objects have different hash codes, they are guaranteed to be different
If they have the same hash code, they may be equal objects and should be checked in full

**Unless you define `hashCode()` improperly!!!
public int hashCode()

“Returns a hash code value for the object. This method is supported for the benefit of hashtables such as those provided by java.util.HashMap.”

The general contract of hashCode is

Deterministic: o.hashCode() == o.hashCode()

... so long as o doesn’t change between the calls

Consistent with equality

a.equals(b) ⇒ a.hashCode()==b.hashCode()

Change equals()? Must you update hashCode()? ALMOST ALWAYS! I MEAN ALWAYS!
**hashCode and hash tables**

Classic use of hashing is selecting an index for an object in a hash table (e.g., map, set)

- $O(1)$ cost if done right

Java libraries do this too, but in two distinct steps:

- `hashCode` returns an `int` value that respects equality
- Collections scale this value as needed

See CSE 332 for much more…
Duration hashCode implementations

Many possibilities, which ones are safe? efficient?…

```java
public int hashCode() { // always safe, no pre-filtering
    return 1;
}

public int hashCode() { // safe, inefficient for Durations
    return min; // differing only in sec field
}

public int hashCode() { // safe and efficient
    return min+sec;
}

public int hashCode() { // danger! danger!
    return new Random().nextInt(50000);
}
```
Suppose we change the spec for `Duration.equals`:

```java
// Return true if o and this represent the same number of seconds
public boolean equals(Object o) {
    if (! (o instanceof Duration))
        return false;
    Duration d = (Duration) o;
    return 60*min+sec == 60*d.min+d.sec;
}
```

We must update `hashCode`, or we will get inconsistent behavior. (Why?)

This works:

```java
public int hashCode() {
    return 60*min+sec;
}
```
Equality, mutation, and time

If two objects are equal now, will they always be equal? 
   In mathematics, “yes” 
   In Java, “you choose” – the Object contract doesn’t specify this 

For immutable objects, equality is inherently forever 
   The object’s abstract value never changes (c.f. “abstract value” in the ADT lectures) – be sure equals does not depend on possibly changing internal values 

For mutable objects, equality can either 
   Compare abstract values field-by-field or 
   Be eternal (how can a class with mutable instances have eternal equality?) 
   But not both! (Since abstract value can change.)
**examples**

StringBuffer is mutable, and takes the “eternal” approach

```java
StringBuffer s1 = new StringBuffer("hello");
StringBuffer s2 = new StringBuffer("hello");
System.out.println(s1.equals(s1)); // true
System.out.println(s1.equals(s2)); // false
```

This is reference (==) equality, which is the only way to guarantee eternal equality for mutable objects. (Not a problem for immutable data)

By contrast:

```java
Date d1 = new Date(0); // Jan 1, 1970 00:00:00 GMT
Date d2 = new Date(0);
System.out.println(d1.equals(d2)); // true
d2.setTime(1); // a millisecond later
System.out.println(d1.equals(d2)); // false
```
Behavioral and observational equivalence

Two objects are “behaviorally equivalent” if:
- There is no sequence of operations that can distinguish them
- This is “eternal” equality
- Two Strings with same content are behaviorally equivalent, two Dates or StringBuffers with same content are not

Two objects are “observationally equivalent” if:
- There is no sequence of observer operations that can distinguish them
  - Excluding mutators
  - Excluding == (permitting == would require reference equality)
- Two Strings, Dates, or StringBuffers with same content are observationally equivalent
Equality and mutation

Date class implements observational equality
Can therefore violate rep invariant of a Set container by mutating after insertion

```java
Set<Date> s = new HashSet<Date>();
Date d1 = new Date(0);
Date d2 = new Date(1000);
s.add(d1);
s.add(d2);
d2.setTime(0);
for (Date d : s) { // prints two identical Dates
    System.out.println(d);
}
```
Pitfalls of observational equivalence

Equality for set elements would ideally be behavioral. Java makes no such guarantee (or requirement). So have to make do with caveats in specs:

“Note: Great care must be exercised if mutable objects are used as set elements. The behavior of a set is not specified if the value of an object is changed in a manner that affects equals comparisons while the object is an element in the set.”

Same problem applies to keys in maps.
Mutation and hash codes

Sets assume hash codes don't change
Mutation and observational equivalence can break this assumption too:

```java
List<String> friends =
    new LinkedList<String>(Arrays.asList("yoda","zaphod");
List<String> enemies = ...;  // any other list, say with "cthulhu"
Set<List<String>> h = new HashSet<List<String>>();
h.add(friends);
h.add(enemies);
friends.add("weatherwax");
System.out.println(h.contains(friends));  // probably false
for (List<String> lst : h) {
    System.out.println(lst.equals(friends));
}   // one "true" will be printed - inconsistent!
```
More container wrinkles: self-containment

equals and hashCode methods on containers are recursive:

```java
class ArrayList<E> {
    public int hashCode() {
        int code = 1;
        for (Object o : list)
            code = 31*code + (o==null ? 0 : o.hashCode());
        return code;
    }
}
```

This causes an infinite loop:

```java
List<Object> lst = new ArrayList<Object>();
lst.add(lst);
int code = lst.hashCode();
```
Summary:
All equals are not equal!

- reference equality
- behavioral equality
- observational equality
Summary: Java specifics

Mixes different types of equality
  Objects different from collections
Extendable specifications
  Objects, subtypes can be less strict
Only enforced by the specification
Essential for use with hash containers and speed hack
hashCode
Summary: object-oriented Issues

Inheritance
  Subtypes inheriting `equal` can break the spec
  Many subtle issues
  Forcing all subtypes to implement is cumbersome

Mutable objects
  Much more difficult to deal with
  Observational equality
  Can break reference equality in collections

Abstract classes
  If only the subclass is instantiated, we are ok…
Equality is such a simple concept
But...
  Programs are used in unintended ways
  Programs are extended in unintended ways
Many unintended consequences
In equality, these are addressed using a combination of:
  Flexibility
  Carefully written specifications
  Manual enforcement of the specifications
    perhaps by reasoning and/or testing