

---

# CSE 331

# Software Design & Implementation

Hal Perkins  
Winter 2022  
Specifications

# Administrivia 1

---

- Next two assignments:
  - HW2: Written problems on loops, due Tue. night **11 pm**
  - HW3: Java warmup & project logistics (out later today)
    - Due next Thur. night, **11 pm**
    - You should get gitlab email later today when repo created. Feel free to ignore until section tomorrow.
    - Shouldn't take much time, but start early so we can chase down any configuration problems
      - & read and follow instructions carefully!
    - Warning: Stackoverflow and Google are probably **not** your friends for configuration problems. Our setup is intended to work, not to require random web searches and tinkering. If something isn't working right, check handouts, post on the discussion board, and/or use office hours.

# Administrivia 2

---

- Sections tomorrow on hw3 & project logistics
  - If you're using your computer (recommended):
    - Install OpenJDK Java 11 JDK (not JRE), IntelliJ Ultimate, and git before section
      - See hw3-setup-guide handout on Resources page for details
      - (Java 12+ also ok, but we use Java 11 for testing)
      - Students can get a free IntelliJ Ultimate license
    - Windows users: Best practice: remove all existing Java JDKs and JREs before installing current one
    - Everyone: be sure you have a clean IntelliJ with no strange plugins, customized options, etc.

# New Administrivia (added Friday)

---

- We're continuing online for next couple of weeks
  - Zoom lectures, sections, office hours
  - Links will appear on calendars next few days – zoom links on canvas/zoom calendars as usual
- UW closed Monday (MLK day) – no class
  - But we will have some office hours thanks to our great TAs!
    - Links on canvas/zoom calendar

# New Administrivia (added Friday)

---

- HW2 due Tuesday night **11PM** (not 11:30, not 11:59)
- HW3 due Thursday night, 11 PM
  - But please be sure you've got things set up and have been able to clone your gitlab repo way before then so we have time to fix problems.  
Email `cse331-staff[at]cs` if individual setup bugs
- We will post videos from a couple of yesterday's sections (one windows, one mac)

# 2 Goals of Software System Building

---

- Building the *right system*
  - Does the program meet the user's needs?
  - Determining this is usually called *validation*
- Building the *system right*
  - Does the program meet the specification?
  - Determining this is usually called *verification*
- CSE 331: the second goal is the focus – creating a correctly functioning artifact
  - Surprisingly hard to specify, design, implement, test, and debug even simple programs

# Where we are

---

- We've started to see how to reason about code
- We'll build on those skills in many places:
  - *Specification*: What are we supposed to build?
  - *Design*: How do we decompose the job into manageable pieces? Which designs are “better”?
  - *Implementation*: Building code that meets the specification
  - *Testing*: Systematically finding problems
  - *Debugging*: Systematically fixing problems
  - *Maintenance*: How does the artifact adapt over time?
  - *Documentation*: What do we need to know to do these things? How/where do we write that down?

# The challenge of scaling software

---

- Small programs are simple and malleable
  - Easy to write
  - Easy to change
- Big programs are (often) complex and inflexible
  - Hard to write
  - Hard to change
- Why does this happen?
  - Because *interactions* become unmanageable
- How do we keep things simple and malleable?
  - Divide and conquer!



# A discipline of modularity

---

- Two ways to view a program:
  - The client's view (how to use it)
  - The implementer's view (how to build it)
- Apply implementer and client views to system parts:
  - While implementing one part, consider yourself a client of any other parts it depends on
  - Ignore the implementation of those other parts
  - Minimizes interactions between parts
- Formalized through the idea of a *specification*

# A specification is a contract

---



- A set of requirements agreed to by the user and the manufacturer of the product
  - Describes their expectations of each other
- Facilitates simplicity via *two-way* isolation
  - Isolate client from implementation details
  - Isolate implementer from how the part is used
  - Discourages implicit, unwritten expectations
- Facilitates change
  - reduces the “Medusa effect”: the specification, rather than the code, gets “turned to stone” by client dependencies



# Importance of Specifications

---

Specifications are essential to **correctness**

They are also essential to **changeability**

- need to know what changes will break code using it

They are also essential to **understandability**

- need to tell readers what it is supposed to do

They are also essential to **modularity**...

# Method Specifications

---

To prove correctness of a method, we need

- precondition
- postcondition

Correctness =  
Validity of  
 $\{ P \} S \{ Q \}$

Without these, we can't say whether the code is correct

These tell us what it means to be correct

They are the *specification* for the method

# Isn't the interface sufficient?

---

An interface defines the boundary between implementers and users:

```
public class BadList<E> implements List<E> {
    public E get(int x) { return null; }
    public void set(int x, E y){}
    public void add(E x) {}
    public void add(int x, E y){}
    ...
    public static <T> boolean isSub(List<T>, List<T>){
        return false;
    }
}
```

Interface provides the *syntax and types*

But nothing about the *behavior and effects*

- *Provides too little information to clients*

*Note: Code above is right concept but might not be (completely) legal Java*

- slides will often gloss over details to get main ideas to fit

# Why not just read code?

---

```
static <T> boolean sub(List<T> src, List<T> part) {
    int part_index = 0;
    for (T elt : src) {
        if (elt.equals(part.get(part_index))) {
            part_index++;
            if (part_index == part.size()) {
                return true;
            }
        } else {
            part_index = 0;
        }
    }
    return false;
}
```

Why are you better off with a specification?

# Code is complicated

---

- Code gives more detail than needed by client
- Understanding or even reading every line of code is an excessive burden
  - Suppose you had to read source code of Java libraries to use them
  - Same applies to developers of different parts of the libraries
- Client cares only about *what* the code does, not *how* it does it

# Code is ambiguous

---

- Code seems unambiguous and concrete
  - But which details of code's behavior are **essential**, and which are **incidental**?
- Code invariably gets rewritten
  - Clients need to know what they can rely on
    - What properties will be maintained over time?
    - What properties might be changed by future optimization, improved algorithms, or bug fixes?
  - Implementer needs to know what features the client depends on, and which can be changed



# Comments are essential

---

Typical comments often convey only an informal, general idea of what that the code does:

```
// This method checks if "part" appears as a
// sub-sequence in "src"
static <T> boolean sub(List<T> src, List<T> part) {
    ...
}
```

Problem: ambiguity remains

- What if `src` and `part` are both empty lists?
- When does the function return `true`?

# From vague comments to specifications

---

- Roles of a specification:
  - Client agrees to rely *only* on information in the description in their use of the part
  - Implementer of the part promises to support everything in the description
    - Otherwise is perfectly at liberty
- Sadly, much code lacks a specification
  - Clients often work out what a method/class does in ambiguous cases by running it and depending on the results
  - Leads to bugs and programs with unclear dependencies, reducing simplicity and flexibility

# Recall the sublist example

---

```
static <T> boolean sub(List<T> src, List<T> part) {
    int part_index = 0;
    for (T elt : src) {
        if (elt.equals(part.get(part_index))) {
            part_index++;
            if (part_index == part.size()) {
                return true;
            }
        } else {
            part_index = 0;
        }
    }
    return false;
}
```

# A more careful description of `sub`

---

***// Check whether “part” appears as a sub-sequence in “src”***

needs to be given some caveats (why?):

- // \* src and part cannot be null*
- // \* If src is empty list, always returns false*
- // \* Results may be unexpected if partial matches*
  - // can happen right before a real match; e.g.,*
  - // list (1,2,1,3) will not be identified as a*
  - // sub sequence of (1,2,1,2,1,3).*

or replaced with a more detailed description:

- // This method scans the “src” list from beginning*
- // to end, building up a match for “part”, and*
- // resetting that match every time that...*

# It's better to *simplify* than to *describe* complexity!

---

A complicated description suggests poor design

- Rewrite `sub` to be more sensible, and easier to describe

*// returns true iff possibly empty sequences A, B exist such that*

*// src = A + part + B*

*// where “+” is sequence concatenation*

```
static <T> boolean sub(List<T> src, List<T> part) {
```

- Mathematical flavor not always necessary, but often helps avoid ambiguity
- “Declarative” style is important
  - Avoid reciting or depending on implementation details

# Sneaky fringe benefit of specs #1

---

- The discipline of writing specifications changes the **incentive structure** of coding
  - Rewards code that is easy to describe and understand
  - Punishes code that is hard to describe and understand
    - Even if it is shorter or easier to write
- If you find yourself writing complicated specifications, it is an incentive to redesign
  - In **sub**, code that does exactly the right thing may be slightly slower than a hack that assumes no partial matches before true matches, but cost of forcing client to understand the details is too high

# Writing specifications with Javadoc

---

- Javadoc
  - Sometimes can be daunting; get used to using it
- Javadoc convention for writing specifications
  - Method signature (prototype – name, parameters, result type)
  - Text description of method
  - **@param**: description of what gets passed in
  - **@return**: description of what gets returned
  - **@throws**: exceptions that may occur

# Example: Javadoc for `String.contains`

---

```
public boolean contains(CharSequence s)
```

Returns true if and only if this string contains the specified sequence of char values.

Parameters:

`s` - the sequence to search for

Returns:

true if this string contains `s`, false otherwise

Throws:

`NullPointerException` – if `s` is null

Since:

1.5



# CSE 331 specifications

---

**Note:** slides are abbreviated. In your code, it must be `@spec.requires`, `@spec.modifies`, etc. but `@throws`, `@returns` for standard Javadoc tags

- The *precondition*: constraints that hold before the method is called (if not, all bets are off – no guarantees about what method will do)
  - **@requires**: spells out any obligations on client
- The *postcondition*: constraints that hold after the method is called (if the precondition held)
  - **@modifies**: lists objects that may be affected by method; any object not listed is guaranteed to be unchanged
  - **@effects**: gives guarantees on final state of modified objects
  - **@throws**: lists possible exceptions and conditions under which they are thrown (Javadoc uses this too)
  - **@returns**: describes return value (Javadoc uses this too)

# Example 1

---

`static <T> int change(List<T> lst, T oldelt, T newelt)`  
**requires** lst, oldelt, and newelt are non-null.  
oldelt occurs in lst.  
**modifies** lst  
**effects** change the first occurrence of oldelt in lst to newelt  
& makes no other changes to lst  
**returns** the position of the element in lst that was oldelt and  
is now newelt

---

```
static <T> int change(List<T> lst,  
                    T oldelt, T newelt) {  
    int i = 0;  
    for (T curr : lst) {  
        if (curr == oldelt) {  
            lst.set(newelt, i);  
            return i;  
        }  
        i = i + 1;  
    }  
    return -1;  
}
```

# Example 2

---

static List<Integer> zipSum(List<Integer> lst1, List<Integer> lst2)

requires     lst1 and lst2 are non-null.  
              lst1 and lst2 are the same size.

modifies    none

effects     none

returns     a list of same size where the ith element is  
              the sum of the ith elements of lst1 and lst2

---

```
static List<Integer> zipSum(List<Integer> lst1
                             List<Integer> lst2) {
    List<Integer> res = new ArrayList<Integer>();
    for(int i = 0; i < lst1.size(); i++) {
        res.add(lst1.get(i) + lst2.get(i));
    }
    return res;
}
```

# Example 3

---

static void `listAdd`(List<Integer> `lst1`, List<Integer> `lst2`)

`requires`     `lst1` and `lst2` are non-null.

`lst1` and `lst2` are the same size.

`modifies`    `lst1`

`effects`     `i`th element of `lst2` is added to the `i`th element of `lst1`

`returns`     none

---

```
static void listAdd(List<Integer> lst1,
                   List<Integer> lst2) {
    for(int i = 0; i < lst1.size(); i++) {
        lst1.set(i, lst1.get(i) + lst2.get(i));
    }
}
```

# A method should do only one thing

---

- Either return a value, or have some *side effect* (modification of program state)
  - Poor style to have *both* `@effects` and `@returns`
  - Exception: methods like `HashMap.put` that return an old value as part of an update

# Should requires clause be checked?

---

- If the client calls a method without meeting the precondition, the code is free to do *anything*
  - Including pass corrupted data back
  - It is polite, nevertheless, to *fail fast*: to provide an immediate error, rather than permitting mysterious/silent bad behavior
- Preconditions are common in “helper” methods/classes
  - In public libraries, it’s friendlier to deal with all possible input
  - *But: binary search would normally impose a pre-condition rather than simply failing if list is not sorted. Why?*
- Rule of thumb: Check if cheap to do so
  - *Example: list has to be non-null → check*
  - *Example: list has to be sorted → skip*
  - A quality implementation will check preconditions whenever it is inexpensive and convenient to do so
    - Defensive programming

# @throws vs @requires

---

- Require a precondition or throw an exception if it's cheap enough to check? Which is better?
  - @requires size > 0
  - @throws IllegalArgumentException if size <= 0
- Tradeoffs
  - @throws describes exactly what will happen – it is part of the spec.
  - @requires says “if this precondition isn't met, who knows what might happen?”
- **Must** choose one or the other – can't include both.
  - Can't specify “who knows what might happen” and “this is guaranteed to happen” for the same input!

# Sneaky fringe benefit of specs #2

---

- Specification means that client doesn't need to look at implementation
  - So the code might not even exist yet!
- Write specifications first, make sure system will fit together, and then assign separate implementers to different modules
  - Allows teamwork and parallel development
  - Also helps with testing (future topic)



# Upgrading a library

---

- Your program uses a library
- Can you use a different library?
- Can you use a new version?

We want an objective test

You can upgrade if the specification of the new version is **stronger**

- It makes at least as many promises and doesn't require more from your program
- Example:
  - Weaker spec: returns the elements
  - Stronger spec: returns the elements in sorted order

# Satisfaction of a specification

---

Let  $M$  be an implementation and  $S$  a specification

$M$  satisfies  $S$  if and only if

- for every input allowed by the spec precondition,  
M produces an output allowed by the spec postcondition

If  $M$  does not satisfy  $S$ , either  $M$  or  $S$  (or both!) could be “wrong”

- “*one person’s feature is another person’s bug.*”
- usually better to change the implementation than the spec

# Stronger vs Weaker Specifications

---

- **Definition 1:** specification  $S_2$  is stronger than  $S_1$  iff
  - for any implementation  $M$ :  $M$  satisfies  $S_2 \Rightarrow M$  satisfies  $S_1$
  - i.e.,  $S_2$  is harder to satisfy




- Two specifications may be *incomparable*
  - but we are usually choosing between stronger vs weaker

# Stronger vs Weaker Specifications

---

- An implementation satisfying a stronger specification can be **used anywhere** that a weaker specification is required
  - can **use** a method satisfying  $S_2$  anywhere  $S_1$  is expected



Making changes to a specification...

- changing from  $S_1$  to  $S_2$  should not break clients
  - but it could break implementation
- changing from  $S_2$  to  $S_1$  should not break implementation
  - but it could break clients!

# Stronger vs Weaker Specifications

---

- **Definition 2:** specification  $S_2$  is stronger than  $S_1$  iff
  - precondition of  $S_2$  is weaker than that of  $S_1$ , and/or
  - postcondition of  $S_2$  is stronger than that of  $S_1$   
(on all inputs allowed by both)
- A **stronger** specification:
  - is harder to satisfy
  - gives more guarantees to the caller
- A **weaker** specification:
  - is easier to satisfy
  - gives more freedom to the implementer

# Two specifications for find which is stronger? #1

---

```
int find(int[] a, int value) {
    for (int i=0; i<a.length; i++) {
        if (a[i]==value)
            return i;
    }
    return -1;
}
```

- Specification A
  - requires: value occurs in **a**
  - returns: **i** such that **a[i] = value**
- Specification B
  - requires: value occurs in **a**
  - returns: *smallest* **i** such that **a[i] = value**

# Two specifications for find

## Which is stronger? #2

---

```
int find(int[] a, int value) {
    for (int i=0; i<a.length; i++) {
        if (a[i]==value)
            return i;
    }
    return -1;
}
```

- Specification A
  - requires: value occurs in **a**
  - returns: **i** such that **a[i] = value**
- Specification C
  - returns: **i** such that **a[i] = value**, or **-1** if value is not in **a**

# Two specifications for find

## Which is stronger? #3

---

```
int find(int[] a, int value) {
    for (int i=0; i<a.length; i++) {
        if (a[i]==value)
            return i;
    }
    return -1;
}
```

- Specification B
  - requires: value occurs in **a**
  - returns: *smallest* **i** such that **a[i] = value**
- Specification C
  - returns: **i** such that **a[i] = value**, or **-1** if value is not in **a**



# Why compare specifications?

---

We wish to relate **procedures to specifications**

- Does the procedure satisfy the specification?
- Has the implementer succeeded?

We wish to compare **specifications to one another**

- Which specification (if either) is stronger?
- A procedure satisfying a stronger specification can be used anywhere that a weaker specification is required
  - Substitutability principle

Given two specifications, they may be *incomparable*

- Neither is weaker/stronger than the other
- *Some* implementations might still satisfy them both

# Substitutability

---

- Suppose that
  - $I_1$  and  $I_2$  satisfy specification  $S$
  - $P$  uses  $I_1$  as a component (and relies only on  $S$ )
- Then  $P$  can use  $I_2$
  
- Further, suppose that
  - $I_3$  satisfies  $S_3$  which is stronger than  $S$
- Then  $P$  can use  $I_3$
  
- Fact: If specification  $S_3$  is stronger than  $S_1$ , then for any implementation  $I$ ,  $I$  satisfies  $S_3 \Rightarrow I$  satisfies  $S_1$

# “Strange” case: @throws

---

[Prior versions of course, including old exams, were clumsy/wrong about this]

Compare:

S1:

@throws FooException if  $x < 0$

@return  $x + 3$

S2:

@return  $x + 3$

- These are *incomparable* because they promise different, incomparable things when  $x < 0$
- Both are *stronger* than @requires  $x \geq 0$ ; @return  $x + 3$

# Strengthening a specification

---



- Strengthen a specification by:
  - Promising more (stronger postcondition):
    - returns clause harder to satisfy
    - effects clause harder to satisfy
    - fewer objects in modifies clause
    - more specific exceptions (subclasses)
  - Asking less of client (weaker precondition)
    - requires clause easier to satisfy
- Weaken a specification by:
  - (Opposite of everything above)

# Which is better?

---

- Stronger does not always mean better!
- Weaker does not always mean better!
- Strength of specification trades off:
  - Usefulness to client
  - Ease of simple, efficient, correct implementation
  - Promotion of reuse and modularity
  - Clarity of specification itself
- “It depends”

# Review:

## Ways to compare specifications

---

- A *stronger* specification is satisfied by fewer implementations
- A stronger specification has
  - *weaker* preconditions (note contravariance)
  - stronger postcondition
  - fewer modificationsCan be checked by hand
- A stronger specification has a (logically) stronger formula – can be checked by tools

# Specification style

---

- The point of a specification is to be helpful
  - Formalism helps, excessive formalism doesn't
- A specification should be
  - coherent: not too many cases
  - informative: (bad example in Java library, `HashMap.get`; what does result of `null` mean?)
  - strong enough: to do something useful, to provide guarantees
  - weak enough: to permit (efficient) implementation

# Warnings on Specifications

---

Specifications are also the products of human design, so...

- They will contain **bugs**
  - (recall the central dogma of this course)
  - harder to fix the more people that have seen it
    - “turns to stone” a bit more with each viewer
- Creating them requires **judgement**
  - no “turn the crank” way to produce good specs (or invariants)
  - harder but that’s why it’s interesting work