Design Patterns

CS169
Lecture 6

Announcements

• Groups mostly announced online
  - Meet with your whole team ASAP

• The first assignment will be out tomorrow (but not due for a while)

Review: Thoughts on UML

• UML is useful

• But hype is more than the reality

• Overdesigning is as bad as underdesigning
  - Underdesign
    • make mistakes that could be avoided
  - Overdesign
    • go past the point of diminishing returns,

How Do We Design Software?

• We all understand
  - Algorithms
  - Data structures
  - Classes

• When describing a design, algorithms/data structures/classes form the vocabulary

• But there are higher levels of design

History

• Who is Christopher Alexander?

• An architect
• A Berkeley professor
• The father of design patterns
  - As applied to architecture
  - "Pattern Languages" (1977)

What are Design Patterns?

"A pattern describes a problem that occurs often, along with a tried solution to the problem”
- Christopher Alexander, 1977

• Descriptions of communicating objects and classes that are customized to solve a general design problem in a particular context
  - Not individual classes or libraries
    • Such as lists, hash tables
    • Not full designs
Elements of a Design Pattern

1. Pattern name
   - Useful part of design vocabulary
2. Problem solved and applicability
   - When to apply the pattern
3. Solution
   - Participants and their relationships
4. Consequences
   - Costs of applying the pattern, space and time trade-offs

Improved Communication

One of the main benefits of design patterns is that they name common (and successful) ways of building software.

More Specifically

- Teaching and learning
  - It is much easier to learn architecture from descriptions of design patterns than from reading code
- Teamwork
  - Members of a team have a way to name and discuss the elements of their design

Example: A Text Editor

- Describe a text editor using patterns
  - A running example
- Introduces several important patterns
- Gives an overall flavor of pattern culture

Note: This example is from the book "Design Patterns: Elements of Reusable Object Oriented Software", Gamma, et al.

Text Editor Requirements

- A WYSIWYG editor
- Text and graphics can be freely mixed
- Graphical user interface
  - Toolbars, scrollbars, etc.
- Multiple windowing systems
- Traversal operations: spell checking, hyphenation
- Simple enough for one lecture!

The Game

- I describe a design problem for the editor
- I ask "What is your design?"
  - This is audience participation time
- I give you the wise and insightful pattern
Problem: Document Structure

A document is represented by its physical structure:
- Primitive glyphs
  - characters, rectangles, circles, pictures, ...
- Lines
  - A sequence of glyphs
- Columns
  - A sequence of lines
- Pages
  - A sequence of columns
- Documents
  - A sequence of pages

What is your design?

Alternative Designs

- Classes for Character, Circle, Line, Column, Page, ...
  - Not so good
  - A lot of code duplication
- One (abstract) class of Glyph
  - Each element realized by a subclass of Glyph
  - All elements present the same interface
    - How to draw
    - Compute bounding rectangle
    - Mouse hit detection
    - ...
  - Makes extending the class easy
  - Treats all elements uniformly

Example of Hierarchical Composition

Diagram

Notes

- Drawing
  - Each primitive element draws itself
    - At its assigned location
  - Each compound element recursively calls draw on its elements
    - But doesn’t care what those elements are

Line: Draw(Window w) {
  for each c in children do
    c->Draw(w);
}

Composites

- This is the composite pattern
  - Goes by many other names
    - Recursive composition, structural induction, tree walk, ...
    - Predates design patterns
- Applies to any hierarchical structure
  - Leaves and internal nodes have same functionality
  - Composite implements the same interface as the contained elements
Problem: Formatting

- A particular physical structure for a document
  - Decisions about layout
  - Must deal with e.g., line breaking

- Design issues
  - Layout is complicated
  - No best algorithm
    - Many alternatives, simple to complex

What is your design?

Not So Good

- Add a format method to each Glyph class

- Problems
  - Can’t modify the algorithm without modifying Glyph
  - Can’t easily add new formatting algorithms

The Core Issue

- Formatting is complex
  - We don’t want that complexity to pollute Glyph
  - We may want to change the formatting method

- Encapsulate formatting behind an interface
  - Each formatting algorithm an instance
  - Glyph only deals with the interface

Diagram

Strategies

- This is the strategy pattern
  - Isolates variations in algorithms we might use
  - Formatter is the strategy, Compositor is context

- General principle
  - encapsulate variation

- In OO languages, this means defining abstract classes for things that are likely to change

Problem: Enhancing the User Interface

- We will want to decorate elements of the UI
  - Add borders
  - Scrollbars
  - Etc.

- How do we incorporate this into the physical structure?

What is your design?
Not So Good

- Object behavior can be extended using inheritance
  - Major drawback: inheritance structure is static
- Subclass elements of Glyph
  - BorderedComposition
  - ScrolledComposition
  - BorderedAndScrolledComposition
  - ScrolledAndBorderedComposition
  - ...
- Leads to an explosion of classes

Decorators

- Want to have a number of decorations (e.g., Border, ScrollBar, Menu) that we can mix independently
  \[ x = \text{new ScrollBar(new Border(new Character))} \]
  - We have \( n \) decorators and \( 2^n \) combinations

Transparent Enclosure

- Define Decorator
  - Implements Glyph
  - Has one member Glyph decorated
  - Border, ScrollBar, Menu extend Decorator

  ```cpp
  Border::Draw(Window w) {
    decorated->draw(w);
    drawBorder(decorated->bounds());
  }
  ```

Decorators

- This is the decorator pattern
  - A way of adding responsibilities to an object
  - Commonly extending a composite
    - As in this example

Problem: Supporting Look-and-Feel Standards

- Different look-and-feel standards
  - Appearance of scrollbars, menus, etc.
  - We want the editor to support them all
    - What do we write in code like
      ```java
      ScrollBar scr = new ?
      ```

What is your design?
The Not-so-Good Strawmen

- Terrible
  ```java
  ScrollBar scr = new MotifScrollBar
  ```

- Little better
  ```java
  ScrollBar scr;
  if (style == MOTIF) then scr = new MotifScrollBar
  else if (style == ...) then ...
  - will have similar conditionals for menus, borders, etc.
  ```

Abstract Object Creation

- Encapsulate what varies in a class

- Here object creation varies
  - Want to create different menu, scrollbar, etc
  - Depending on current look-and-feel

- Define a `GUIFactory` class
  - One method to create each look-and-feel dependent object
  - One `GUIFactory` object for each look-and-feel
  - Created itself using conditionals

Diagram

```
GuiFactory
  CreateScrollBar()
  CreateMenu()

MotifFactory
  CreateScrollBar() {
    return new MotifScrollBar();
  }
  CreateMenu() {
    return new MotifMenu();
  }

MacFactory
  CreateScrollBar() {
    return new MacScrollBar();
  }
  CreateMenu() {
    return new MacMenu();
  }
```

Diagram 2: Abstract Products

```
Glyph
  ...Glyph

ScrollBar
  scrollTo(int);

MotifScrollBar
  scrollTo(int);

```

Factories

- This is the abstract factory pattern

- A class which
  - Abstracts the creation of a family of objects
  - Different instances provide alternative implementations of that family

- Note
  - The "current" factory is still a global variable
  - The factory can be changed even at runtime

Problem: Supporting Multiple Window Systems

- We want to run on multiple window systems

- Problem: Wide variation in standards
  - Big interfaces
  - Can't afford to implement our own windowing system
  - Different models of window operations
  - Resizing, drawing, raising, etc.
  - Different functionality

What is your design?
A First Cut

- Take the intersection of all functionality
  - A feature is in our window model if it is in every real-world windowing system we want to support
- Define an abstract factory to hide variation
  - Create windowing objects for current window system using the factory
- Problem: intersection of functionality may not be large enough

Second Cut

- Define our own abstract window hierarchy
  - All operations we need represented
  - Model is tuned to our application
- Define a parallel hierarchy
  - Abstracts concrete window systems
  - Has all functionality we need
    - I.e., could be more than the intersection of functions
    - Requires writing methods for systems missing functionality

Diagram

User Commands

- User has a vocabulary of operations
  - E.g., jump to a particular page
  - Operations can be invoked multiple ways
    - By a menu
    - By clicking an icon
    - By keyboard shortcut
    - Want undo/redo/command line option/menu option
- How do we represent user commands?

Bridges

- This is the bridge pattern
- Note we have two hierarchies
  - Logical
    - The view of our application, tuned to our needs
  - Implementation
    - The interface to the outside world
    - Abstract base class, with multiple implementations
- Logical, implementations views can evolve
  - independently,
  - So long as the "bridge" is maintained

A Good Design

- Define a class of user operations
  - Abstract class
  - Presents interface common to all operations
    - E.g., undo/redo
- Each operation is a subclass
  - Jump to a page, cut, paste, ...
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**Diagram**

- **Command**
  - Execute()
  - Undo()

- **CutCommand**
  - Execute()
  - Undo()

- **SaveCommand**
  - Execute()
  - Undo()

- **…”**

**Commands**

- This is the command pattern
- Note the user has a small “programming language”
  - The abstraction makes this explicit
  - In this case the language is finite
    - Class structure can represent all possibilities explicitly
- Other patterns for richer languages
  - E.g., the Interpreter Pattern

**Problem: Spell Checking**

- Considerations
  - Spell-checking requires traversing the document
    - Need to see every glyph, in order
    - Information we need is scattered all over the document
  - There may be other analyses we want to perform
    - E.g., grammar analysis

  *What is your design?*

**One Possibility**

- Iterators
  - Hide the structure of a container from clients
  - A method for
    - Pointing to the first element
    - Advancing to the next element
    - Getting the current element
    - Testing for termination

  ```
  iterator i = CreateIterator(composition);
  for(i = i->first(); !(i->isdone()); i = i->next())
  { ... do something with Glyph i->current() ...; }
  ```

**Notes**

- Iterators work well if we don’t need to know the type of the elements being iterated over
  - E.g., send kill message to all processes in a queue
- Not a good fit for spell-checking
  ```
  for(i = i->first(); !(i->isdone()); i = i->next())
  { ... do something with Glyph i->current() ...; }
  ```
- Must cast `i->current()` to spell-check it...
  ```
  if(i instanceof Char) { ... } else { ... }
  ```
Visitors

- The visitor pattern is more general
  - Iterators provide traversal of containers
  - Visitors allow
    - Traversal
    - And type-specific actions

- The idea
  - Separate traversal from the action
  - Have a "do it" method for each element type
    - Can be overridden in a particular traversal

Visitor Comments

- The dynamic dispatch on Glyph::Visit achieves type-safe casting
  - dynamic dispatch to Char::Visit, Picture::Visit, ...
- Each of the Glyph::Visit
  - calls the visitor-specific action (e.g., Visitor::visitChar)
  - implements the search (e.g., in Line::Visit)
- Have a visitor for each action (e.g., spell check, search and replace)

Diagram

Design Patterns

- A good idea
  - Simple
  - Describe useful "micro-architectures"
  - Capture common organizations of classes/objects
  - Give us a richer vocabulary of design

- Relatively few patterns of real generality

- Watch out for the hype...