CSE 331
Software Design & Implementation

Hal Perkins
Winter 2018
Representation Invariants
A data abstraction is defined by a specification

A collection of procedural *abstractions*
  – Not a collection of procedures

Together, these procedural abstractions provide some *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 distinguish different values
ADTs and specifications

• So far, we have only specified ADTs
  – Specification makes no reference to the implementation

• Of course, we need [guidelines for how] to implement ADTs

• Of course, we need [guidelines for how] to ensure our implementations satisfy our specifications

• Two intellectual tools are really helpful…
Connecting implementations to specs

**Representation Invariant**: maps Object → boolean
- Indicates if an instance is *well-formed*
- Defines the set of valid concrete values
- Only values in the valid set make sense as implementations of an abstract value
- **For implementors/debuggers/maintainers of the abstraction**: no object should ever violate the rep invariant
  - Such an object has no useful meaning

**Abstraction Function**: maps Object → abstract value
- What the data structure *means* as an abstract value
- How the data structure is to be interpreted
- Only defined on objects meeting the rep invariant
- **For implementors/debuggers/maintainers of the abstraction**: Each procedure should meet its spec (abstract values) by “doing the right thing” with the concrete representation
Implementing a Data Abstraction (ADT)

To implement a data abstraction:

- Select the representation of instances, “the rep”
  - In Java, typically instances of some class you define
- Implement operations in terms of that rep

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 a fresh, empty CharSet
public CharSet() {...}

// @modifies: this
// @effects: this_post = this_pre + {c}
public void insert(Character c) {...}

// @modifies: this
// @effects: this_post = this_pre - {c}
public void delete(Character c) {...}

// @return: (c ∈ this)
public boolean member(Character c) {...}

// @return: cardinality of this
public int size() {...}
An implementation: Is it right?

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))
    System.out.print("wrong");
else
    System.out.print("right");

Where is the error?
Where Is the Error?

• Answer this and you know what to fix

• *Perhaps delete* is wrong
  – Should remove all occurrences?

• *Perhaps insert* is wrong
  – Should not insert a character that is already there?

• How can we know?
  – The *representation invariant* tells us
  – If it’s “our code”, this is how we document our choice for “the right answer”
The representation invariant

• Defines data structure well-formedness
• Must hold before and after every CharSet operation
• Operations (methods) may depend on it
• Write it like this:

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

    ...
}
```

Or, more formally (if you prefer):

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

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

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

public void delete(Character c) {
    els.remove(c);
}
Another example

class Account {
    private int balance;
    // history of all transactions
    private List<Transaction> transactions;
    ...
}

Real-world constraints:
- balance ≥ 0
- balance = \( \sum_i \) transactions.get(i).amount

Implementation-related constraints:
- transactions ≠ null
- No nulls in transactions
Checking rep invariants

Should code check that the rep invariant holds?

- Yes, if it’s inexpensive [depends on the invariant]
- Yes, for debugging [even when it’s expensive]
- Often hard to justify turning the checking off
- Some private methods need not check (Why?)

A great debugging technique:

*Design your code to catch bugs by implementing and using rep-invariant checking*
Checking the rep invariant

Rule of thumb: check on entry and on exit (why?)

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

    // Is this guaranteed to get called?
    // (could guarantee it with a finally block)
    checkRep();
}
...

/** Verify that elts contains no duplicates. */
private void checkRep() {
    for (int i = 0; i < elts.size(); i++) {
        assert elts.indexOf(elts.elementAt(i)) == i;
    }
}
```
Practice *defensive programming*

- Assume that you will make mistakes
- Write and incorporate code designed to catch them
  - On entry:
    - Check rep invariant
    - Check preconditions
  - On exit:
    - Check rep invariant
    - Check postconditions
- Checking the rep invariant helps you *discover* errors
- Reasoning about the rep invariant helps you *avoid* errors
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 this 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**
  - **A BIG DEAL, A COMMON BUG, YOU NOW HAVE A NAME FOR IT!**
- If you do it, document how and why
  - And feel guilty about it!
Avoiding representation exposure

The first step for getting help is to recognize you have a problem 😊

- *Understand* what representation exposure is

- *Design* ADT implementations to make sure it doesn’t happen

- Treat rep exposure as a bug: *fix* your bugs

- *Test* for it with *adversarial clients*:
  - Pass values to methods and then mutate them
  - Mutate values returned from methods
private is not enough

- Making fields private does not suffice to prevent rep exposure
  - See our example
  - Issue is aliasing of mutable data inside and outside the abstraction

- So private is a hint to you: no aliases outside abstraction to references to mutable data reachable from private fields
- Two general ways to avoid representation exposure…
Avoiding rep exposure (way #1)

- One way to avoid rep exposure is to make copies of all data that cross the abstraction barrier
  - Copy in [parameters that become part of the implementation]
  - Copy out [results that are part of the implementation]

- Examples of copying (assume Point is a mutable ADT):
  ```java
class Line {
    private Point s, e;
    public Line(Point s, Point e) {
      this.s = new Point(s.x, s.y);
      this.e = new Point(e.x, e.y);
    }
    public Point getStart() {
      return new Point(this.s.x, this.s.y);
    }
    ...
  }
```
Need deep copying

• “Shallow” copying is not enough
  – Prevent any aliasing to mutable data inside/outside abstraction

• What’s the bug (assuming Point is a mutable ADT)?
  ```java
class PointSet {
    private List<Point> points = ...
    public List<Point> getElts() {
      return new ArrayList<Point>(points);
    }
  }
```

• Not in example: Also need deep copying on “copy in”
Avoiding rep exposure (way #2)

- One way to avoid rep exposure is to exploit the immutability of (other) ADTs the implementation uses
  - Aliasing is no problem if nobody can change data
    - Have to mutate the rep to break the rep invariant

- Examples (assuming Point is an immutable ADT):

```java
class Line {
  private Point s, e;
  public Line(Point s, Point e) {
    this.s = s;
    this.e = e;
  }
  public Point getStart() {
    return this.s;
  }
  ...
```

Why [not] immutability?

• Several advantages of immutability
  – Aliasing does not matter
  – No need to make copies with identical contents
  – Rep invariants cannot be broken
  – See CSE341 for more!

• Does require different designs (e.g., if Point immutable)
  ```java
  void raiseLine(double deltaY) {
    this.s = new Point(s.x, s.y+deltaY);
    this.e = new Point(e.x, e.y+deltaY);
  }
  ```

• Immutable classes in Java libraries include String, Character, Integer, …
Deepness, redux

- An immutable ADT must be immutable “all the way down”
  - No references reachable to data that may be mutated

- So combining our two ways to avoid rep exposure:
  - Must copy-in, copy-out “all the way down” to immutable parts
Recall our initial rep-exposure example:

class CharSet {
    // Rep invariant: elts has no nulls and no dups
    private List<Character> elts = …;

    // returns: elts currently in the set
    public List<Character> getElts() {
        return new ArrayList<Character>(elts); // copy out!
    }

    ...
}

An alternative

// returns: elts currently in the set
public List<Character> getElts() { // version 1
    return new ArrayList<Character>(elts); // copy out!
}

public List<Character> getElts() { // version 2
    return Collections.unmodifiableList<Character>(elts);
}

From the JavaDoc for Collections.unmodifiableList:
Returns an unmodifiable view of the specified list. This method allows modules to provide users with "read-only" access to internal lists. Query operations on the returned list "read through" to the specified list, and attempts to modify the returned list… result in an UnsupportedOperation Exception.
The good news

```java
public List<Character> getElts() { // version 2
    return Collections.unmodifiableList<Character>(elts);
}
```

- Clients cannot modify (mutate) the rep
  - So they cannot break the rep invariant
- (For long lists,) more efficient than copy out
- Uses standard libraries
The bad news

```java
public List<Character> getElts() { // version 1
    return new ArrayList<Character>(elts); // copy out!
}

public List<Character> getElts() { // version 2
    return Collections.unmodifiableList<Character>(elts);
}
```

The two implementations do not do the same thing!
- Both avoid allowing clients to break the rep invariant
- Both return a list containing the elements

But consider:
```java
xs = s.getElts();
    s.insert('a');
    xs.contains('a');
```

Version 2 is observing an exposed rep, leading to different behavior
Different specifications

Ambiguity of “returns a list containing the current set elements”

“returns a fresh mutable list containing the elements in the set at the time of the call”
versus

“returns read-only access to a list that the ADT continues to update to hold the current elements in the set”

A third spec weaker than both [but less simple and useful!]

“returns a list containing the current set elements. Behavior is unspecified (!) if client attempts to mutate the list or to access the list after the set’s elements are changed”

Also note: Version 2’s spec also makes changing the rep later harder
– Only “simple” to implement with rep as a List