ALTHOUGH `Object` is a concrete class, it is designed primarily for extension. All of its nonfinal methods (`equals`, `hashCode`, `toString`, `clone`, and `finalize`) have explicit general contracts because they are designed to be overridden. It is the responsibility of any class overriding these methods to obey their general contracts; failure to do so will prevent other classes that depend on these contracts from functioning properly in conjunction with the class.

This chapter tells you when and how to override the nonfinal `Object` methods. The `finalize` method is omitted from this chapter because it was discussed in Item 6. While not an `Object` method, `Comparable.compareTo` is discussed in this chapter because it has a similar character.

**Item 7: Obey the general contract when overriding `equals`**

Overriding the `equals` method seems simple, but there are many ways to get it wrong, and the consequences can be dire. The easiest way to avoid problems is not to override the `equals` method, in which case each instance is equal only to itself. This is the right thing to do if any of the following conditions apply:

- **Each instance of the class is inherently unique.** This is true for classes that represent active entities rather than values, such as `Thread`. The `equals` implementation provided by `Object` has exactly the right behavior for these classes.

- **You don’t care whether the class provides a “logical equality” test.** For example, `java.util.Random` could have overridden `equals` to check whether two `Random` instances would produce the same sequence of random numbers going forward, but the designers didn’t think that clients would need or want this functionality. Under these circumstances, the `equals` implementation inherited from `Object` is adequate.
• A superclass has already overridden equals, and the behavior inherited from the superclass is appropriate for this class. For example, most Set implementations inherit their equals implementation from AbstractSet, List implementations from AbstractList, and Map implementations from AbstractMap.

• The class is private or package-private, and you are certain that its equals method will never be invoked. Arguably, the equals method should be overridden under these circumstances, in case it is accidentally invoked someday:

```java
public boolean equals(Object o) {
    throw new UnsupportedOperationException();
}
```

So when is it appropriate to override Object.equals? When a class has a notion of logical equality that differs from mere object identity, and a superclass has not already overridden equals to implement the desired behavior. This is generally the case for value classes, such as Integer or Date. A programmer who compares references to value objects using the equals method expects to find out whether they are logically equivalent, not whether they refer to the same object. Not only is overriding the equals method necessary to satisfy programmer expectations, it enables instances of the class to serve as map keys or set elements with predictable, desirable behavior.

One kind of value class that does not require the equals method to be overridden is the typesafe enum (Item 21). Because typesafe enum classes guarantee that at most one object exists with each value, Object’s equals method is equivalent to a logical equals method for such classes.

When you override the equals method, you must adhere to its general contract. Here is the contract, copied from the specification for java.lang.Object:

The equals method implements an equivalence relation:

- It is reflexive: For any reference value x, x.equals(x) must return true.
- It is symmetric: For any reference values x and y, x.equals(y) must 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) must 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) must return false.
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Unless you are mathematically inclined, this might look a bit scary, but do not ignore it! If you violate it, you may well find that your program behaves erratically or crashes, and it can be very difficult to pin down the source of the failure. To paraphrase John Donne, no class is an island. Instances of one class are frequently passed to another. Many classes, including all collections classes, depend on the objects passed to them obeying the equals contract.

Now that you are aware of the evils of violating the equals contract, let’s go over the contract in detail. The good news is that, appearances notwithstanding, the contract really isn’t very complicated. Once you understand it, it’s not hard to adhere to it. Let’s examine the five requirements in turn:

**Reflexivity**—The first requirement says merely that an object must be equal to itself. It is hard to imagine violating this requirement unintentionally. If you were to violate it and then add an instance of your class to a collection, the collection’s contains method would almost certainly say that the collection did not contain the instance that you just added.

**Symmetry**—The second requirement says that any two objects must agree on whether they are equal. Unlike the first requirement, it’s not hard to imagine violating this one unintentionally. For example, consider the following class:

```java
/**
 * Case-insensitive string. Case of the original string is preserved by toString, but ignored in comparisons.
 */
public final class CaseInsensitiveString {
    private String s;

    public CaseInsensitiveString(String s) {
        if (s == null)
            throw new NullPointerException();
        this.s = s;
    }

    // Broken - violates symmetry!
    public boolean equals(Object o) {
        if (o instanceof CaseInsensitiveString)
            return s.equalsIgnoreCase((CaseInsensitiveString)o).s;
        if (o instanceof String)  // One-way interoperability!
            return s.equalsIgnoreCase((String)o);
        return false;
    }

    // Remainder omitted
}
```
The well-intentioned equals method in this class naively attempts to interoperate with ordinary strings. Let’s suppose that we have one case-sensitive string and one ordinary one:

```java
CaseInsensitiveString cis = new CaseInsensitiveString("Polish");
String s = "polish";
```

As expected, `cis.equals(s)` returns true. The problem is that while the equals method in `CaseInsensitiveString` knows about ordinary strings, the equals method in `String` is oblivious to case-insensitive strings. Therefore `s.equals(cis)` returns false, a clear violation of symmetry. Suppose you put a case-insensitive string into a collection:

```java
List list = new ArrayList();
list.add(cis);
```

What does `list.contains(s)` return at this point? Who knows? In Sun’s current implementation, it happens to return false, but that’s just an implementation artifact. In another implementation, it could just as easily return true or throw a run-time exception. Once you’ve violated the equals contract, you simply don’t know how other objects will behave when confronted with your object.

To eliminate the problem, merely remove the ill-conceived attempt to interoperate with `String` from the equals method. Once you do this, you can refactor the method to give it a single return:

```java
public boolean equals(Object o) {
    return o instanceof CaseInsensitiveString &&
        ((CaseInsensitiveString)o).s.equalsIgnoreCase(s);
}
```

**Transitivity** — The third requirement of the equals contract says that if one object is equal to a second and the second object is equal to a third, then the first object must be equal to the third. Again, it’s not hard to imagine violating this requirement unintentionally. Consider the case of a programmer who creates a subclass that adds a new aspect to its superclass. In other words, the subclass adds
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a piece of information that affects `equals` comparisons. Let’s start with a simple immutable two-dimensional point class:

```java
public class Point {
    private final int x;
    private final int y;
    public Point(int x, int y) {
        this.x = x;
        this.y = y;
    }

    public boolean equals(Object o) {
        if (!(o instanceof Point))
            return false;
        Point p = (Point)o;
        return p.x == x && p.y == y;
    }
}
```

Suppose you want to extend this class, adding the notion of color to a point:

```java
public class ColorPoint extends Point {
    private Color color;

    public ColorPoint(int x, int y, Color color) {
        super(x, y);
        this.color = color;
    }
}
```

How should the `equals` method look? If you leave it out entirely, the implementation is inherited from `Point`, and color information is ignored in `equals` comparisons. While this does not violate the `equals` contract, it is clearly unacceptable. Suppose you write an `equals` method that returns `true` only if its argument is another color point with the same position and color:

```java
// Broken - violates symmetry!
public boolean equals(Object o) {
    if (!(o instanceof ColorPoint))
        return false;
    ColorPoint cp = (ColorPoint)o;
    return super.equals(o) && cp.color == color;
}
```
The problem with this method is that you might get different results when comparing a point to a color point and vice versa. The former comparison ignores color, while the latter comparison always returns false because the type of the argument is incorrect. To make this concrete, let’s create one point and one color point:

```java
Point p = new Point(1, 2);
ColorPoint cp = new ColorPoint(1, 2, Color.RED);
```

Then `p.equals(cp)` returns true, while `cp.equals(p)` returns false. You might try to fix the problem by having `ColorPoint.equals` ignore color when doing “mixed comparisons”:

```java
// Broken - violates transitivity.
public boolean equals(Object o) {
    if (!(o instanceof Point))
        return false;

    // If o is a normal Point, do a color-blind comparison
    if (!(o instanceof ColorPoint))
        return o.equals(this);

    // o is a ColorPoint; do a full comparison
    ColorPoint cp = (ColorPoint)o;
    return super.equals(o) && cp.color == color;
}
```

This approach does provide symmetry, but at the expense of transitivity:

```java
ColorPoint p1 = new ColorPoint(1, 2, Color.RED);
Point p2 = new Point(1, 2);
ColorPoint p3 = new ColorPoint(1, 2, Color.BLUE);
```

At this point, `p1.equals(p2)` and `p2.equals(p3)` return true, while `p1.equals(p3)` returns false, a clear violation of transitivity. The first two comparisons are “color-blind,” while the third takes color into account.

So what’s the solution? It turns out that this is a fundamental problem of equivalence relations in object-oriented languages. **There is simply no way to extend an instantiable class and add an aspect while preserving the equals contract.** There is, however, a fine workaround. Follow the advice of Item 14, “Favor composition over inheritance.” Instead of having `ColorPoint extend
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Point, give ColorPoint a private Point field and a public view method (Item 4) that returns the point at the same position as this color point:

```java
// Adds an aspect without violating the equals contract
public class ColorPoint {
    private Point point;
    private Color color;

    public ColorPoint(int x, int y, Color color) {
        point = new Point(x, y);
        this.color = color;
    }

    /**
     * Returns the point-view of this color point.
     */
    public Point asPoint() {
        return point;
    }

    public boolean equals(Object o) {
        if (!(o instanceof ColorPoint))
            return false;
        ColorPoint cp = (ColorPoint)o;
        return cp.point.equals(point) && cp.color.equals(color);
    }

    ... // Remainder omitted
}
```

There are some classes in the Java platform libraries that subclass an instantiable class and add an aspect. For example, java.sql.Timestamp subclasses java.util.Date adding a nanoseconds field. The equals implementation for Timestamp does violate symmetry and can cause erratic behavior if Timestamp and Date objects are used in the same collection or are otherwise intermixed. The Timestamp class has a disclaimer cautioning the programmer against mixing dates and timestamps. While you won’t get into trouble as long as you don’t mix them, there’s nothing preventing you from doing so, and the resulting errors could be hard to debug. The TimeStamp class is an anomaly and should not be emulated.

Note that you can add an aspect to a subclass of an abstract class without violating the equals contract. This is important for the sort of class hierarchies that you get by following the advice in Item 20, “Replace unions with class hierarchies.” For example, you could have an abstract Shape class with no aspects, a Circle subclass that adds a radius field, and a Rectangle subclass that adds
length and width fields. Problems of the sort just shown will not occur as long as it is impossible to create an instance of the superclass.

**Consistency** — The fourth requirement of the equals contract says that if two objects are equal, they must remain equal for all time, unless one (or both) of them is modified. This isn’t so much a true requirement as a reminder that mutable objects can be equal to different objects at different times while immutable objects can’t. When you write a class, think hard about whether it should be immutable (Item 13). If you conclude that it should, make sure that your equals method enforces the restriction that equal objects remain equal and unequal objects remain unequal for all time.

**“Non-nullity”** — The final requirement, which in the absence of a name I have taken the liberty of calling “non-nullity,” says that all objects must be unequal to null. While it is hard to imagine accidentally returning true in response to the invocation o.equals(null), it isn’t hard to imagine accidentally throwing a NullPointerException. The general contract does not allow this. Many classes have equals methods that guard against it with an explicit test for null:

```java
public boolean equals(Object o) {
    if (o == null)
        return false;
    ...
}
```

This test is not necessary. To test its argument for equality, the equals method must first cast the argument to an appropriate type so its accessors may be invoked or its fields accessed. Before doing the cast, the method must use the instanceof operator to check that its argument is of the correct type:

```java
public boolean equals(Object o) {
    if (!(o instanceof MyType))
        return false;
    ...
}
```

If this type check were missing and the equals method were passed an argument of the wrong type, the equals method would throw a ClassCastException, which violates the equals contract. But the instanceof operator is specified to return false if its first operand is null, regardless of what type appears in the second operand [JLS, 15.19.2]. Therefore the type check will return false if null is passed in, so you don’t need a separate null check. Putting it all together, here’s a recipe for a high-quality equals method:
1. **Use the == operator to check if the argument is a reference to this object.** If so, return `true`. This is just a performance optimization, but one that is worth doing if the comparison is potentially expensive.

2. **Use the instanceof operator to check if the argument is of the correct type.** If not, return `false`. Typically, the correct type is the class in which the method occurs. Occasionally, it is some interface implemented by this class. Use an interface if the class implements an interface that refines the `equals` contract to permit comparisons across classes that implement the interface. The collection interfaces `Set`, `List`, `Map`, and `Map.Entry` have this property.

3. **Cast the argument to the correct type.** Because this cast was preceded by an `instanceof` test, it is guaranteed to succeed.

4. **For each “significant” field in the class, check to see if that field of the argument matches the corresponding field of this object.** If all these tests succeed, return `true`; otherwise, return `false`. If the type in Step 2 is an interface, you must access the argument’s significant fields via interface methods; if the type is a class, you may be able to access the fields directly, depending on their accessibility. For primitive fields whose type is not `float` or `double`, use the `==` operator for comparisons; for object reference fields, invoke the `equals` method recursively; for `float` fields, translate to `int` values using `Float.floatToIntBits` and compare the `int` values using the `==` operator; for `double` fields, translate to `long` values using `Double.doubleToLongBits` and compare the `long` values using the `==` operator. (The special treatment of `float` and `double` fields is made necessary by the existence of `Float.NaN`, `-0.0f`, and the analogous `double` constants; see the `Float.equals` documentation for details.) For array fields, apply these guidelines to each element. Some object reference fields may legitimately contain `null`. To avoid the possibility of a `NullPointerException`, use the following idiom to compare such fields:

   ```java
   (field == null ? o.field == null : field.equals(o.field))
   ```

   This alternative may be faster if `field` and `o.field` are often identical object references:

   ```java
   (field == o.field || (field != null && field.equals(o.field)))
   ```

   For some classes, like `CaseInsensitiveString` shown earlier, the field comparisons are more complex than simple equality tests. It should be apparent from the specification for a class if this is the case. If so, you may want to store
a canonical form in each object, so that the equals method can do cheap exact comparisons on these canonical forms rather than more costly inexact comparisons. This technique is most appropriate for immutable classes (Item 13), as the canonical form would have to be kept up to date if the object could change.

The performance of the equals method may be affected by the order in which fields are compared. For best performance, you should first compare fields that are more likely to differ, less expensive to compare, or, ideally, both. You must not compare fields that are not part of an object’s logical state, such as Object fields used to synchronize operations. You need not compare redundant fields, which can be calculated from “significant fields,” but doing so may improve the performance of the equals method. If a redundant field amounts to a summary description of the entire object, comparing this field will save you the expense of comparing the actual data if the comparison fails.

5. When you are finished writing your equals method, ask yourself three questions: Is it symmetric, is it transitive, and is it consistent? (The other two properties generally take care of themselves.) If not, figure out why these properties fail to hold, and modify the method accordingly.

For a concrete example of an equals method constructed according to the above recipe, see PhoneNumber.equals in Item 8. Here are a few final caveats:

• Always override hashCode when you override equals (Item 8).

• Don’t try to be too clever. If you simply test fields for equality, it’s not hard to adhere to the equals contract. If you are overly aggressive in searching for equivalence, it’s easy to get into trouble. It is generally a bad idea to take any form of aliasing into account. For example, the File class shouldn’t attempt to equate symbolic links referring to the same file. Thankfully, it doesn’t.

• Don’t write an equals method that relies on unreliable resources. It’s extremely difficult to satisfy the consistency requirement if you do this. For example, java.net.URL’s equals method relies on the IP addresses of the hosts in URLs being compared. Translating a host name to an IP address can require network access, and it isn’t guaranteed to yield the same results over time. This can cause the URL equals method to violate the equals contract, and it has caused problems in practice. (Unfortunately, this behavior cannot be changed due to compatibility requirements.) With few exceptions, equals methods should perform deterministic computations on memory-resident objects.
• **Don’t substitute another type for `Object` in the `equals` declaration.** It is not uncommon for a programmer to write an `equals` method that looks like the following, and then spend hours puzzling over why it doesn’t work properly:

```java
public boolean equals(MyClass o) {
    ...
}
```

The problem is that this method does not **override** `Object.equals`, whose argument is of type `Object`, but **overloads** it instead (Item 26). It is acceptable to provide such a “strongly typed” `equals` method *in addition* to the normal one as long as the two methods return the same result but there is no compelling reason to do so. It may provide minor performance gains under certain circumstances, but it isn’t worth the added complexity (Item 37).
**Item 8: Always override `hashCode` when you override `equals`**

A common source of bugs is the failure to override the `hashCode` method. **You must override `hashCode` in every class that overrides `equals`**. Failure to do so will result in a violation of the general contract for `Object.hashCode`, which will prevent your class from functioning properly in conjunction with all hash-based collections, including `HashMap`, `HashSet`, and `Hashtable`.

Here is the contract, copied from the `java.lang.Object` specification:

- Whenever it is invoked on the same object more than once during an execution of an application, the `hashCode` method must consistently return the same integer, provided no information used in `equals` comparisons on the object is modified. This integer need not remain consistent from one execution of an application to another execution of the same application.
- If two objects are equal according to the `equals(Object)` method, then calling the `hashCode` method on each of the two objects must produce the same integer result.
- It is not required that if two objects are unequal according to the `equals(Object)` method, then calling the `hashCode` method on each of the two objects must produce distinct integer results. However, the programmer should be aware that producing distinct integer results for unequal objects may improve the performance of hash tables.

The key provision that is violated when you fail to override `hashCode` is the second one: **Equal objects must have equal hash codes**. Two distinct instances may be logically equal according to the class’s `equals` method, but to the `Object` class’s `hashCode` method, they’re just two objects with nothing much in common. Therefore object’s `hashCode` method returns two seemingly random numbers instead of two equal numbers as required by the contract.

For example, consider the following simplistic `PhoneNumber` class, whose `equals` method is constructed according to the recipe in Item 7:

```java
public final class PhoneNumber {
    private final short areaCode;
    private final short exchange;
    private final short extension;

    public PhoneNumber(int areaCode, int exchange, int extension) {
        rangeCheck(areaCode, 999, "area code");
        rangeCheck(exchange, 999, "exchange");
        rangeCheck(extension, 9999, "extension");
    }
}
```
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```java
private static void rangeCheck(int arg, int max, String name) {
    if (arg < 0 || arg > max)
        throw new IllegalArgumentException(name +": " + arg);
}

public boolean equals(Object o) {
    if (o == this)
        return true;
    if (!(o instanceof PhoneNumber))
        return false;
    PhoneNumber pn = (PhoneNumber)o;
    return pn.extension == extension &&
           pn.exchange == exchange &&
           pn.areaCode == areaCode;
}

// No hashCode method!

... // Remainder omitted
```

Suppose you attempt to use this class with a HashMap:

```java
Map m = new HashMap();
m.put(new PhoneNumber(408, 867, 5309), "Jenny");
```

At this point, you might expect `m.get(new PhoneNumber(408, 867, 5309))` to return "Jenny", but it returns `null`. Notice that two PhoneNumber instances are involved: One is used for insertion into the HashMap, and a second, equal, instance is used for (attempted) retrieval. The PhoneNumber class’s failure to override `hashCode` causes the two equal instances to have unequal hash codes, in violation of the `hashCode` contract. Therefore the `get` method looks for the phone number in a different hash bucket from the one in which it was stored by the `put` method. Fixing this problem is as simple as providing a proper `hashCode` method for the PhoneNumber class.
So what should a `hashCode` method look like? It’s trivial to write one that is legal but not good. This one, for example, is always legal, but it should never be used:

```java
// The worst possible legal hash function - never use!
public int hashCode() { return 42; }
```

It’s legal because it ensures that equal objects have the same hash code. It’s atrocious because it ensures that every object has the same hash code. Therefore every object hashes to the same bucket, and hash tables degenerate to linked lists. Programs that should run in linear time run instead in quadratic time. For large hash tables, this is the difference between working and not working.

A good hash function tends to produce unequal hash codes for unequal objects. This is exactly what is meant by the third provision of the `hashCode` contract. Ideally, a hash function should distribute any reasonable collection of unequal instances uniformly across all possible hash values. Achieving this ideal can be extremely difficult. Luckily it is not too difficult to achieve a fair approximation. Here is a simple recipe:

1. Store some constant nonzero value, say 17, in an `int` variable called `result`.
2. For each significant field `f` in your object (each field taken into account by the `equals` method, that is), do the following:
   a. Compute an `int` hash code `c` for the field:
      i. If the field is a `boolean`, compute `(f ? 0 : 1)`.
      ii. If the field is a `byte`, `char`, `short`, or `int`, compute `(int)f`.
      iii. If the field is a `long`, compute `(int)(f ^ (f >>> 32))`.
      iv. If the field is a `float` compute `Float.floatToIntBits(f)`.
      v. If the field is a `double`, compute `Double.doubleToLongBits(f)`, and then hash the resulting `long` as in step 2.a.iii.
   vi. If the field is an object reference and this class’s `equals` method compares the field by recursively invoking `equals`, recursively invoke `hashCode` on the field. If a more complex comparison is required, compute a “canonical representation” for this field and invoke `hashCode` on the canonical representation. If the value of the field is `null`, return 0 (or some other constant, but 0 is traditional).
vii. If the field is an array, treat it as if each element were a separate field. That is, compute a hash code for each significant element by applying these rules recursively, and combine these values as described in step 2.b.

b. Combine the hash code \( c \) computed in step a into \( \text{result} \) as follows:

\[
\text{result} = 37 \times \text{result} + c;
\]

3. Return \( \text{result} \).

4. When you are done writing the \textit{hashCode} method, ask yourself whether equal instances have equal hash codes. If not, figure out why and fix the problem.

It is acceptable to exclude \textit{redundant fields} from the hash code computation. In other words, it is acceptable to exclude any field whose value can be computed from fields that are included in the computation. It is \textit{required} that you exclude any fields that are not used in equality comparisons. Failure to exclude these fields may result in a violation of the second provision of the \textit{hashCode} contract.

A nonzero initial value is used in step 1, so the hash value will be affected by initial fields whose hash value, as computed in step 2.a, is zero. If zero was used as the initial value in step 1, the overall hash value would be unaffected by any such initial fields, which could increase collisions. The value 17 is arbitrary.

The multiplication in step 2.b makes the hash value depend on the order of the fields, which results in a much better hash function if the class contains multiple similar fields. For example, if the multiplication were omitted from a \texttt{String} hash function built according to this recipe, all anagrams would have identical hash codes. The multiplier 37 was chosen because it is an odd prime. If it was even and the multiplication overflowed, information would be lost because multiplication by two is equivalent to shifting. The advantages of using a prime number are less clear, but it is traditional to use primes for this purpose.

Let's apply this recipe to the \texttt{PhoneNumber} class. There are three significant fields, all of type \texttt{short}. A straightforward application of the recipe yields this hash function:

```java
public int hashCode() {
    int result = 17;
    result = 37*result + areaCode;
    result = 37*result + exchange;
    result = 37*result + extension;
    return result;
}
```
Because this method returns the result of a simple deterministic computation whose only inputs are the three significant fields in a PhoneNumber instance, it should be clear that equal PhoneNumber instances have equal hash codes. This method is, in fact, a perfectly reasonable hashCode implementation for PhoneNumber, on a par with those in the Java platform libraries as of release 1.4. It is simple, is reasonably fast, and does a reasonable job of dispersing unequal phone numbers into different hash buckets.

If a class is immutable and the cost of computing the hash code is significant, you might consider caching the hash code in the object rather than recalculating it each time it is requested. If you believe that most objects of this type will be used as hash keys, then you should calculate the hash code when the instance is created. Otherwise, you might choose to lazily initialize it the first time hashCode is invoked (Item 48). It is not clear that our PhoneNumber class merits this treatment, but just to show you how it’s done:

```
// Lazily initialized, cached hashCode
private volatile int hashCode = 0;  // (See Item 48)

public int hashCode() {
    if (hashCode == 0) {
        int result = 17;
        result = 37*result + areaCode;
        result = 37*result + exchange;
        result = 37*result + extension;
        hashCode = result;
    }
    return hashCode;
}
```

While the recipe in this item yields reasonably good hash functions, it does not yield state-of-the-art hash functions, nor do the Java platform libraries provide such hash functions as of release 1.4. Writing such hash functions is a topic of active research and an activity best left to mathematicians and theoretical computer scientists. Perhaps a later release of the Java platform will provide state-of-the-art hash functions for its classes and utility methods to allow average programmers to construct such hash functions. In the meantime, the techniques described in this item should be adequate for most applications.

Do not be tempted to exclude significant parts of an object from the hash code computation to improve performance. While the resulting hash function may run faster, its quality may degrade to the point where hash tables become unusably slow. In particular, the hash function may, in practice, be confronted
with a large collection of instances that differ largely in the regions that you’ve chosen to ignore. If this happens, the hash function will map all of the instances to a very few hash codes, and hash-based collections will display quadratic performance. This is not just a theoretical problem. The String hash function implemented in all Java platform releases prior to release 1.2 examined at most sixteen characters, evenly spaced throughout the string, starting with the first character. For large collections of hierarchical names such as URLs, this hash function displayed exactly the pathological behavior noted here.

Many classes in the Java platform libraries, such as String, Integer, and Date, specify the exact value returned by their hashCode method as a function of the instance value. This is generally not a good idea, as it severely limits your ability to improve the hash function in future releases. If you leave the details of a hash function unspecified and a flaw is found in it, you can fix the hash function in the next release without fear of breaking compatibility with clients who depend on the exact values returned by the hash function.
Item 9: Always override toString

While java.lang.Object provides an implementation of the toString method, the string that it returns is generally not what the user of your class wants to see. It consists of the class name followed by an “at” sign (@) and the unsigned hexadecimal representation of the hash code, for example, “PhoneNumber@163b91.” The general contract for toString says that the returned string should be “a concise but informative representation that is easy for a person to read.” While it could be argued that “PhoneNumber@163b91” is concise and easy to read, it isn’t very informative when compared to “(408) 867-5309”. The toString contract goes on to say, “It is recommended that all subclasses override this method.” Good advice, indeed.

While it isn’t as important as obeying the equals and hashCode contracts (Item 7, Item 8), providing a good toString implementation makes your class much more pleasant to use. The toString method is automatically invoked when your object is passed to println, the string concatenation operator (+), or, as of release 1.4, assert. If you’ve provided a good toString method, generating a useful diagnostic message is as easy as:

```java
System.out.println("Failed to connect: " + phoneNumber);
```

Programmers will generate diagnostic messages in this fashion whether or not you override toString, but the messages won’t be intelligible unless you do. The benefits of providing a good toString method extend beyond instances of the class to objects containing references to these instances, especially collections. Which would you rather see when printing a map, “{Jenny=PhoneNumber@163b91}” or “{Jenny=(408) 867-5309}”?

When practical, the toString method should return all of the interesting information contained in the object, as in the phone number example just shown. It is impractical if the object is large or if it contains state that is not conducive to string representation. Under these circumstances, toString should return a summary such as “Manhattan white pages (1487536 listings)” or “Thread[main, 5, main]”. Ideally, the string should be self-explanatory. (The Thread example flunks this test.)

One important decision you’ll have to make when implementing a toString method is whether to specify the format of the return value in the documentation. It is recommended that you do this for value classes, such as phone numbers or matrices. The advantage of specifying the format is that it serves as a standard,
unambiguous, human-readable representation of the object. This representation can be used for input and output and in persistent human-readable data objects such as XML documents. If you specify the format, it’s usually a good idea to provide a matching String constructor (or static factory, see Item 1), so programmers can easily translate back and forth between the object and its string representation. This approach is taken by many value classes in the Java platform libraries, including BigInteger, BigDecimal, and most of the primitive wrapper classes.

The disadvantage of specifying the format of the toString return value is that once you’ve specified it, you’re stuck with it for life, assuming your class is widely used. Programmers will write code to parse the representation, to generate it, and to embed it into persistent data. If you change the representation in a future release, you’ll break their code and data, and they will yowl. By failing to specify a format, you preserve the flexibility to add information or improve the format in a subsequent release.

Whether or not you decide to specify the format, you should clearly document your intentions. If you specify the format, you should do so precisely. For example, here’s a toString method to go with the PhoneNumber class in Item 8:

```java
/**
 * Returns the string representation of this phone number.
 * The string consists of fourteen characters whose format
 * is "(XXX) YYY-ZZZZ", where XXX is the area code, YYY is
 * the extension, and ZZZZ is the exchange. (Each of the
 * capital letters represents a single decimal digit.)
 * *
 * If any of the three parts of this phone number is too small
 * to fill up its field, the field is padded with leading zeros.
 * For example, if the value of the exchange is 123, the last
 * four characters of the string representation will be "0123".
 * *
 * Note that there is a single space separating the closing
 * parenthesis after the area code from the first digit of the
 * exchange.
 */
public String toString() {
    return "(" + toPaddedString(areaCode, 3) + ") " +
           toPaddedString(exchange, 3) + "-" +
           toPaddedString(extension, 4);
}

private static String[] ZEROS = {
    "", "0", "00", "000", "0000", "00000",
    "000000", "0000000", "00000000", "000000000"};
```
/**
 * Translates an int to a string of the specified length, padded with leading zeros. Assumes i >= 0,
 * 1 <= length <= 10, and Integer.toString(i) <= length.
 */
private static String toPaddedString(int i, int length) {
    String s = Integer.toString(i);
    return ZEROS[length - s.length()] + s;
}

If you decide not to specify a format, the documentation comment should read something like this:

/**
 * Returns a brief description of this potion. The exact details of the representation are unspecified and subject to change,
 * but the following may be regarded as typical:
 * "[Potion #9: type=love, smell=turpentine, look=india ink]"
 */
public String toString() { ... }

After reading this comment, programmers who produce code or persistent data that depend on the details of the format will have no one but themselves to blame when the format is changed.

Whether or not you specify the format, it is always a good idea to provide programmatic access to all of the information contained in the value returned by toString. For example, the PhoneNumber class should contain accessors for the area code, exchange, and extension. If you fail to do this, you force programmers who need this information to parse the string. Besides reducing performance and making unnecessary work for programmers, this process is error prone and results in fragile systems that break if you change the format. By failing to provide accessors, you turn the string format into a de facto API, even if you’ve specified that it’s subject to change.