Wider vs Narrower Interfaces

- Recall behavioral subtyping
- Substitution principle
  - If a client is correct wrt a “wide” type, that same client is still correct wrt a “narrower” one
- Question: When designing an interface, how wide/narrow should it be?

Diagram:

1. Creature
2. Person
3. Student
4. Undergrad
Design Issue #1: Which is Better?

- Answer: It depends!
- A wider spec:
  - Demanding on inputs, tolerant on outputs
  - Easier to implement
  - Harder to use
  - Less powerful
- A narrower spec:
  - Tolerant on inputs, demanding on outputs
  - Harder to implement
  - Easier to use
  - More powerful
- High-level tradeoff
  - Generality/flexibility, vs power/performance

To Ponder

- Consider the following two phrases:
  - “Congratulations! You’ve just won a ____”
  - “In Lab 8, you are asked to build a ____”
- Fill in the blanks with one of:
  A. vehicle
  B. 4-wheeled vehicle
  C. car
  D. Volvo S60
Wider vs Narrower Methods

Consider a method `selectTransport`
- Return value: Vehicle or Bicycle?
- Argument: Person or Student?

Vehicle                  Person
                  ? selectTransport( ? a)
Bicycle                  Student

Vehicle is wider than Bicycle
Person is wider than Student

Vehicle                  Person
                  ? selectTransport( ? a)
Bicycle                  Student

Wider vs Narrower Methods

Vehicle m(Person a)  
Bicycle m(Student a)  
Vehicle m(Person a)  
Bicycle m(Person a)  

Easier to implement

Easier to use
Good Practice: Which Declared Type?

- How specific should the declared type of an argument / return value be?
  - Vehicle selectTransport(Person a)
  - Bicycle selectTransport(Person a)
  - Vehicle selectTransport(Student a)
  - Bicycle selectTransport(Student a)

- Typical advice:
  - “As specific as possible, without revealing implementation details”
  - “As general as possible, while still being useful to client”

- The right way to think about it:
  - The type is dictated by the mathematical (abstract, client-side) model

Requires Clause

- Obligation on client
  - If client satisfies this obligation, component method must terminate without an exception, satisfying ensures

- If requires is not satisfied, method could do anything, including:
  - Terminate in whatever state it wants
  - Not terminate
  - Throw an exception

- This last case, though, should be included in specification
  - Document the “exceptional requires clause”
    - Condition under which method throws exception
    - Also document this case’s ensures clause
Requires and Throws

@requires n is even
void f(int n) { ... }

@requires n is even
@throws IllegalArgumentException if n is odd
void g(int n) { ... }

f(5); // anything could happen
g(7); // must throw exception

---

Design Issue #2: Violated Requires

- How should a violation of the requires clause be handled?
  - What to include in “exceptional requires”?
- Answer: Use checked exceptions when
  - Client can not unilaterally guarantee that the requires holds (lack of control)
  - It is likely to be prohibitively expensive for the client to check whether the requires holds
- Recall example of lack of control
  - Guaranteeing existence of a file
- Wrong answer:
  - Include everything outside of requires clause
  - Exceptional requires clause is !requires
Example: BigNatural Constructors

- BigNatural has 2 constructors
  ```
  //@requires v >= 0
  SlowBigNatural(int v) { ... }
  //@requires s is a well-formed representation of
  // natural number with no leading 0's
  SlowBigNatural(String s) { ... }
  ```
- Checking first requires is easy for client
  - So, do NOT use an exception for negative argument
- Checking second requires is hard for client
  - So, CAN use an exception for malformed argument
- Or, another design:
  - Provide a (static) boolean method that returns whether or not a String is well-formed
  - Burden now back on client to check that the requires holds, presumably by using this method
  - Performance cost for checking twice?

Comparison

```java
if (v >= 0) { //sometimes safe to omit
    b = new SlowBigNatural(v);
    . . .
}
```

```java
try {
    b = new SlowBigNatural(v);
    . . .
} catch (NegativeArgumentException e) {
    . . . //some code to recover?
} //compiler: can never omit!
```
Disjoint Normal/Exception’l Requires

- Prefer mutually exclusive requires and exceptional requires clauses

```java
class Collections {
    /**
     * Copies all of the elements from one list into
     * another. After the operation, the index of each
     * copied element in the destination list will be
     * identical to its index in the source list. The
     * destination list must be at least as long as the
     * source list. If it is longer, the remaining elements
     * in the destination list are unaffected.
     * @param dest The destination list.
     * @param src The source list.
     * @throws IndexOutOfBoundsException if the destination
     * list is too small to contain the entire source List.
     */
    static <T> void copy (List<T> dest, List<T> src)
}
```

Disjoint Normal/Exception’l Requires

```java
class Collections {
    /**
     * @requires |dest| >= |src|
     * @alters dest
     * @ensures |dest| =|#dest|
     * Exists a list suf such that
     * (#dest ends in suf and
     * dest = src + suf)
     * @param dest the destination list
     * @param src the source list
     * @throws IndexOutOfBoundsException
     * if |dest| < |src|, dest = #dest
     */
    static <T> void copy (List<T> dest, List<T> src)
}
```
**Good Practice: Doc Exceptions**

- Document every checked exception
  - `@throws` clause for each, giving exceptional requires
- Throw (and document) exceptions at the right level of abstraction
  - Avoid revealing implementation specifics
  - E.g. `IndexOutOfBoundsException` vs `ArrayIndexOutOfBoundsException`
- Document “some” runtime exceptions
  - The ones the client should reasonably care about (?)
  - Never include these in method signature
  - Danger: no real enforcement mechanism
    - Consistency within project? Client attention?
  - Parent’s `@throws` for unchecked exceptions *not* inherited
    - Use `{@inheritdoc}` to explicitly bring this in
- Documentation for checked exceptions *is* inherited (if child declares)

**Implications for JUnit**

- Throwing exceptions is part of promised behavior
  - JUnit test cases should exercise this behavior
  - Seeing exception is a “pass” for test case
- `@Test` annotation with “expected” parameter
  ```java
  @Test(expected=IndexOutOfBoundsException.class)
  public void empty() {
      (new ArrayList<Object>()).get(0);
  }
  ```
Assertions

- An assertion is a statement that should always evaluate to true
- Keyword: assert
  - `assert eval-expr [: detail-expr];`
  - `assert tail.next == null : "No list end";`
- If the eval-expr does not evaluate to true, an AssertionError is thrown
  - An error (ie extends Error) since an assertion violation is unrecoverable
  - detail-expr can be either
    - A String (becomes the informal description)
    - A Throwable (gets chained as the cause)

Roles of Assertions

- Checking convention (ie representation invariant)
  - At the end of the constructor
  - At the end of every (mutator) method
- Checking requires
  - Defensive programming: check assumptions
- Checking ensures
  - Verify implementation has delivered promised behavior
- Checking flow-of-control
  - Example: “assert false” at a point that should never be reached
  - Style note: “throw (new AssertionError())” usually preferred to “assert false”
- Checking loop invariants
Turning Assertions On (and Off)

- Assertions are disabled by default
  - Enabled with a command-line argument
    $ java MyProg -enableassertions
  - Class-level and package-level control
    -ea (-da) to enable (disable) all assertions
    -ea:edu.osu.Tester to enable only in class Tester
    -ea:edu.osu... to enable only in package edu.osu
- In Eclipse, use “VM arguments”
  - Java > Installed JREs > Edit > Default VM Args
  - (Or use Run Configurations for finer control)
- Never use assertions with side-effects
  - Example: assert i++ < max;
  - Program behavior changes if assertions are on/off
- Resist temptation to disable assertions for performance
  - Benefit is likely to be negligible
  - Robustness always outweighs speed

Good Practice: Public Methods

- Widely-accepted Java coding practice:
  - Never use assert to check requires of public methods
  - Prefer a RuntimeException (eg IllegalArgumentException)
  - OK for requires of private methods
  - OK for ensures of all methods (private and public)
- But a violation of requires clause is not recoverable (by client), so it should be an Error, not an Exception!
  - Really, these contract checks belong in a separate component (a checking wrapper)
  - But without better linguistic support for such things, assertions will have to do
- Contrary to Sun recommendations, use asserts liberally, even for public methods
  - assert (requires || exceptional-requires)
Summary

- Interface design: How wide should a specification be?
  - Trade-off: Generality vs power
- Interface design: How should a violation of requires be handled?
  - Exceptions when client lacks enough control
  - Exceptions when check is too expensive for client
- Exceptions
  - Part of component’s interface (visible)
  - Requires vs exceptional requires clauses
- Testing exceptions with JUnit
- Assertions
  - Can be turned on/off at execution time