
CSE 331

Software Design & Implementation

James Wilcox
Autumn 2021
Design Patterns

What is a design pattern?

A standard **solution** to a common programming problem

- solution is usually language independent
- sometimes a problem with some programming languages

Often a **technique** for making code more flexible [modularity]

- reduces coupling among program components (at some cost)

Shorthand **description** of a software design [readability]

- a high-level programming idiom
- well-known terminology improves communication
- makes it easier to think of using the technique

A couple *familiar* examples....

Example 1: Observer

Problem: other code needs to be called each time state changes
but we would like the component to be reusable

- can't hard-code calls to everything that needs to be called

Solution:

- object maintains a list of observers with a known interface
- calls a method on each observer when state changes

Disadvantages:

- code can be harder to understand
- wastes memory by maintaining a list of objects that are known a priori (and are always the same)

Example 2: Iteration

Problem: accessing all members of a collection requires performing a specialized traversal for each data structure

- (makes clients strongly coupled to that data structure)

Solution:

- the *implementation* performs traversals, does bookkeeping
- results are communicated to clients via a standard interface (e.g., `hasNext()`, `next()`)

Disadvantages:

- less efficient: creates extra objects, runs extra code
- iteration order fixed by the implementation, not the client (you can have return different types of iterators though...)

Why (more) design patterns?

Design patterns are intended to capture common solutions / idioms, name them, make them easy to use to guide design

- language independent
- high-level designs, not specific “coding tricks”

They increase your vocabulary and your intellectual toolset

Often important to fix a problem in the underlying language:

- limitations of Java constructors
- lack of named parameters to methods
- lack of multiple dispatch

Why not (more) design patterns?

As with everything else, do not **overuse** them

- introducing new abstractions to your program has a cost
 - it can make the code more complicated
 - it takes time
- don't fix what isn't broken
 - wait until you have good evidence that you will run into the problem that pattern is designed to solve


Origin of term

The “Gang of Four” (GoF)

- Gamma, Helm, Johnson, Vlissides
- examples in C++ and SmallTalk

Found they shared several “tricks” and decided to codify them

- a key rule was that nothing could become a pattern unless they could identify at least three real [different] examples
- for object-oriented programming
 - some patterns more general
 - others compensate for OOP shortcomings



Patterns vs patterns

The phrase *pattern* has been overused since GoF book

Often used as “[somebody says] X is a good way to write programs”
– and “anti-pattern” as “Y is a bad way to write programs”

These are useful, but GoF-style patterns are more important
– they have richness, history, language-independence, documentation and (most likely) more staying power

An example GoF pattern

For some class **C**, guarantee that at run-time there is exactly one (globally visible) instance of **C**

First, *why* might you want this?

- what design goals are achieved?

Second, *how* might you achieve this?

- how to leverage language constructs to enforce the design

A pattern has a recognized *name*

- this is the *Singleton* pattern

Possible reasons for Singleton

- One `RandomNumber` generator
- One `KeyboardReader`, `PrinterController`, etc...
- One `CampusPaths`?

- Have an object with fields / methods that are “like public, **static** fields / methods” but have a **constructor** decide their values
 - cannot be static because need run time info to create
 - e.g., have `main` decide which files to give `CampusPaths`
 - rest of the code can assume it exists

- Other benefits in certain situations
 - could delay expensive constructor until needed

How: multiple approaches

```
public class Foo {
    private static final Foo instance = new Foo();
    // private constructor prevents instantiation outside class
    private Foo() { ... }
    public static Foo getInstance() {
        return instance;
    }
    ... instance methods as usual ...
}
```

**Eager allocation
of instance**

```
public class Foo {
    private static Foo instance;
    // private constructor prevents instantiation outside class
    private Foo() { ... }
    public static synchronized Foo getInstance() {
        if (instance == null) {
            instance = new Foo();
        }
        return instance;
    }
    ... instance methods as usual ...
}
```

**Lazy allocation
of instance**

GoF patterns: three categories

Creational Patterns are about the object-creation process

Factory Method, Abstract Factory, *Singleton*, Builder, Prototype, ...

Structural Patterns are about how objects/classes can be combined

Adapter, Bridge, *Composite*, Decorator, Façade, Flyweight, Proxy, ...

Behavioral Patterns are about communication among objects

Command, Interpreter, *Iterator*, Mediator, *Observer*, State, Strategy, Chain of Responsibility, Visitor, Template Method, ...

Green = ones we've seen already

Creational patterns

Especially large number of **creational** patterns

Key reason is that Java constructors have limitations...

1. Can't return a subtype of the class
2. Can't reuse an existing object
3. Don't have useful names

Factories: patterns for how to create new objects

- Factory method, Factory object / Builder, Prototype

Sharing: patterns for reusing objects

- Singleton, Interning

Motivation for factories: Changing implementations

Super-types support multiple implementations

```
interface Matrix { ... }  
class SparseMatrix implements Matrix { ... }  
class DenseMatrix implements Matrix { ... }
```

Clients use the supertype (**Matrix**)

BUT still call **SparseMatrix** or **DenseMatrix** constructor

- must decide concrete implementation *somewhere*
- might want to make the decision in one place
 - rather than all over in the code
- part that knows what to create could be far from uses
- factory methods put this decision behind an abstraction

Use of factories

```
class MatrixFactory {
    public static Matrix createMatrix(float density) {
        return (density <= 0.1) ?
            new SparseMatrix() : new DenseMatrix();
    }
}
```

Clients call `createMatrix` instead of a particular constructor

Advantages:

- to switch the implementation, change only *one* place

DateFormat factory methods

DateFormat class encapsulates how to format dates & times

- options: just date, just time, date+time, w/ timezone, etc.
- instead of passing all options to constructor, use factories
- the subtype created by factory call need not be specified
- factory methods (unlike constructors) have useful names

```
DateFormat df1 = DateFormat.getDateInstance ();
DateFormat df2 = DateFormat.getTimeInstance ();
DateFormat df3 = DateFormat.getDateInstance (
    DateFormat.FULL, Locale.FRANCE) ;
```

```
Date today = new Date ();
```

```
df1.format(today); // "Jul 4, 1776"
df2.format(today); // "10:15:00 AM"
df3.format(today); // "jeudi 4 juillet 1776"
```


Example: Bicycle race

```
class BikeRace {  
    public BikeRace() {  
        Bicycle bike1 = new Bicycle();  
        Bicycle bike2 = new Bicycle();  
        ... // assume lots of other code here  
    }  
    ...  
}
```

Suppose there are different types of races
Each race needs its own type of bicycle...

Example: Tour de France

```
class TourDeFrance extends BikeRace {  
    public TourDeFrance() {  
        Bicycle bike1 = new RoadBicycle();  
        Bicycle bike2 = new RoadBicycle();  
        ...  
    }  
    ...  
}
```

The Tour de France needs a road bike...

Example: Cyclocross

```
class Cyclocross extends BikeRace {
    public Cyclocross() {
        Bicycle bike1 = new MountainBicycle();
        Bicycle bike2 = new MountainBicycle();
        ...
    }
    ...
}
```

And the cyclocross needs a mountain bike.

Problem: must override the constructor in every **BikeRace** subclass just to use a different subclass of **Bicycle**

Factory *method* for Bicycle

```
class BikeRace {
    Bicycle createBicycle() { return new Bicycle(); }
    public BikeRace() {
        Bicycle bike1 = createBicycle();
        Bicycle bike2 = createBicycle();
        ...
    }
}
```

- Solution:** use a factory method to avoid choosing which type to create
- let the subclass decide by overriding `createBicycle`

Subclasses override factory method

```
class TourDeFrance extends BikeRace {  
    Bicycle createBicycle() {  
        return new RoadBicycle();  
    }  
}
```

```
class Cyclocross extends BikeRace {  
    Bicycle createBicycle() {  
        return new MountainBicycle();  
    }  
}
```

- Requires foresight to use factory method in superclass constructor
- Subtyping in the overriding methods!
- Supports other types of reuse (e.g. `addBicycle` could use it too)

A Brief Aside

Did you see what that code just did?

- it called a subclass method from a *constructor*!
- factory methods should usually be **static** methods



Super/Subclass Coupling

Examples of tight coupling between subclass and superclass:

- presence of self-calls
 - subclass can see which methods call which others
- order of calls self-calls
 - subclass can see which method is called first
 - (distinct from the previous case)
- subclass calls where rep invariant does not hold
 - sometimes necessary in the superclass (e.g., when mutating)
 - subclass can see that the state is invalid

EJ: Either design for inheritance or **prohibit** it (make class final)

Factory objects

- Let's move the method into a separate class
 - so that it is part of a *factory object*
- Advantages:
 - no longer risks horrifying bugs
 - can pass factories around at runtime
 - e.g., let `main` decide which one to use
- Disadvantages:
 - uses bit of extra memory
 - debugging can be more complex when decision of which object to create is far from where it is used

Factory *objects*/classes

encapsulate factory method(s)

```
class BicycleFactory {
    Bicycle createBicycle() {
        return new Bicycle();
    }
}
class RoadBicycleFactory extends BicycleFactory {
    Bicycle createBicycle() {
        return new RoadBicycle();
    }
}
class MountainBicycleFactory extends BicycleFactory {
    Bicycle createBicycle() {
        return new MountainBicycle();
    }
}
```

These are returning subtypes

Using a factory object

```
class BikeRace {
    BicycleFactory bfactory;
    public BikeRace(BicycleFactory f) {
        bfactory = f;
        Bicycle bike1 = bfactory.createBicycle();
        Bicycle bike2 = bfactory.createBicycle();
        ...
    }
    public BikeRace() { this(new BicycleFactory()); }
    ...
}
```

Setting up the flexibility here:

- Factory object stored in a field, set by constructor
- Can take the factory as a constructor-argument
- But an implementation detail (?), so 0-argument constructor too
 - Java detail: call another constructor in same class with **this**

The subclasses

```
class TourDeFrance extends BikeRace {
    public TourDeFrance() {
        super(new RoadBicycleFactory());
    }
}
```

```
class Cyclocross extends BikeRace {
    public Cyclocross() {
        super(new MountainBicycleFactory());
    }
}
```

Voila!

- Just call the superclass constructor with a different factory
- **BikeRace** class had foresight to delegate “what to do to create a bicycle” to the factory object, making it more reusable

Separate control over bicycles and races

```
class TourDeFrance extends BikeRace {
    public TourDeFrance() {
        super(new RoadBicycleFactory()); // or this(...)
    }
    public TourDeFrance(BicycleFactory f) {
        super(f);
    }
    ...
}
```

By having factory-as-argument option, we can allow arbitrary mixing by client: `new TourDeFrance(new TricycleFactory())`

Less useful in this example: Swapping in different factory object whenever you want

Reminder: Not shown here is also using factories for creating *races*

Builder

- Builder:** object with methods to describe object and then create it
- fits especially well with immutable classes when clients want to add data a bit at a time
 - (mutable Builder creates immutable object)

Example 1: **StringBuilder**

```
StringBuilder buf = new StringBuilder();  
buf.append("Total distance: ");  
buf.append(dist);  
buf.append(" meters");  
return buf.toString();
```

Builder

Builder: object with methods to describe object and then create it

- fits especially well with immutable classes when clients want to add data a bit at a time
 - (mutable Builder creates immutable object)

Example 2: Graph.Builder

- `addNode`, `addEdge`, and `createGraph` methods
- (static inner class `Builder` can use **private** constructors)
- `containsNode` etc. may not need to be especially fast

Enforcing Constraints with Types

- These examples use the type system to enforce constraints
- Constraint is that some methods should not be called until after the “finish” method has been called
 - solve by splitting type into two parts
 - Builder part has everything that can be called before “finish”
 - normal object has everything that can be called after “finish”
- This approach can be used with other types of constraints
- Instead of asking clients to remember not to violate them, see if you can use type system to enforce them
 - use tools rather than just reasoning
- (This can be done in a general manner, but it’s way out of scope for this class.)

Builder Idioms

Builder classes are often written like this:

```
class FooBuilder {
    public FooBuilder setX(int x) {
        this.x = x;
        return this;
    }
    public Foo build() { ... }
}
```

so that you can use them like this:

```
Foo f = new FooBuilder().setX(1).setY(2).build();
```


Methods with Many Arguments

- Builders useful for cleaning up methods with too many arguments
 - recall the problem that clients can easily mix up argument order

E.g., turn this

```
myMethod(x, y, true, false, true);
```

into this

```
myMethod(x, y, Options.create()  
        .setA(true)  
        .setB(false)  
        .setC(true).build());
```

This simulates named (rather than positional) argument passing.

Prototype pattern

- Each object is itself a factory:
 - objects contain a `clone` method that creates a copy
- Useful for objects that are created via a process
 - Example: `java.awt.geom.AffineTransform`
 - create by a sequence of calls to translate, scale, etc.
 - easiest to make a similar one by copying and changing
 - Example: `android.graphics.Paint`
 - Example: JavaScript classes
 - use prototypes so every instance doesn't have all methods stored as fields

Factories: summary

Goal: want more flexible abstractions for what class to instantiate

Factory method

- call a method to create the object
- method can do any computation and return any subtype

Factory object (also Builder)

- **Factory** has factory methods for some type(s)
- **Builder** has methods to describe object and then create it

Prototype

- every object is a factory, can create more objects like itself
- call **clone** to get a new object of same subtype as receiver