Software Architecture

Bertrand Meyer, Carlo A. Furia, Martin Nordio

ETH Zurich, February-May 2011

Lecture 4: Design patterns
What is a pattern?

- First developed by Christopher Alexander for constructing and designing buildings and urban areas
- “Each pattern is a three-part rule, which expresses a relation between a certain context, a problem, and a solution.”
What is a pattern?

- First developed by Christopher Alexander for constructing and designing buildings and urban areas.
- “Each pattern is a three-part rule, which expresses a relation between a certain context, a problem, and a solution.”

Example **Web of Shopping** (C. Alexander, A pattern language)

**Conflict:** Shops rarely place themselves where they best serve people's needs and guarantee their own stability.

**Resolution:** Locate a shop by the following steps:
1) Identify and locate all shops offering the same service.
2) Identify and map the location of potential consumers.
3) Find the biggest gap in the web of similar shops with potential consumers.
4) Within the gap locate your shop next to the largest cluster of other kinds of shops.
What is a pattern?

- First developed by Christopher Alexander for constructing and designing buildings and urban areas.
- “Each pattern is a three-part rule, which expresses a relation between a certain context, a problem, and a solution.”
- Patterns can be applied to many areas, including software development.
Design pattern:

- A document that describes a general solution to a design problem that recurs in many applications.

Developers adapt the pattern to their specific application.
“Designing object-oriented software is hard and designing reusable object-oriented software is even harder.” Erich Gamma

- Experienced object-oriented designers make good designs while novices struggle
- Object-oriented systems have recurring patterns of classes and objects
- Patterns solve specific design problems and make OO designs more flexible, elegant, and ultimately reusable
Benefits of design patterns

- Capture the knowledge of experienced developers
- Publicly available repository
- Common pattern language
- Newcomers can learn & apply patterns
- Yield better software structure
- Facilitate discussions: programmers, managers
History of software design patterns

1987: Ward Cunningham and Kent Beck develop a pattern language with five Smalltalk patterns
1991: Erich Gamma and Richard Helm start jotting down catalog of patterns; first presentation at TOOLS
1991: First Patterns Workshop at OOPSLA
1993: Kent Beck and Grady Booch sponsor the first meeting of the Hillside Group
1994: First Pattern Languages of Programs (PLoP) conference
1994: The Gang of Four (GoF: Erich Gamma and Richard Helm, Ralph Johnson, and John Vlissides) publish the Design Patterns book
A design pattern is an architectural scheme — a certain organization of classes and features — that provides applications with a standardized solution to a common problem.

Since 1994, various books have catalogued important patterns. Best known is *Design Patterns* by Erich Gamma, Richard Helm, Ralph Johnson, John Vlissides, Addison-Wesley 1994.
Levels of abstraction for design patterns

- Complex design for an entire application or subsystem
- Solution to a general design problem in a particular context
- Simple reusable design class such as a linked list, hash table, etc.

Based on a slide by Bob Tarr, Design Patterns in Java
Gang of Four Design Patterns

- Middle level of abstraction
- “A design pattern names, abstracts, and identifies the key aspects of a common design structure that make it useful for creating a reusable object-oriented design.”
  Gamma et. al.
Design patterns (GoF)

**Creational**
- Abstract Factory
- Singleton
- Factory Method
- Builder
- Prototype

**Structural**
- Adapter
- Bridge
- Composite
- Decorator
- Façade
- Flyweight
- Proxy

**Behavioral**
- Chain of Responsibility
- Command (undo/redo)
- Interpreter
- Iterator
- Mediator
- Memento
- Observer
- State
- Strategy
- Template Method
- Visitor

**Non-GoF patterns**
- Model-View-Controller
A pattern is not a reusable solution

Solution to a particular recurring design issue in a particular context:

“Each pattern describes a problem that occurs over and over again in our environment, and then describes the core of the solution to this problem in such a way that you can use this solution a million times over, without ever doing it the same way twice.”

Gamma et al.

NOT REUSABLE
A step backwards?

Patterns are not reusable solutions:

- You must implement every pattern every time
- Pedagogical tools, not components

We have done work at ETH to correct this situation:

"A successful pattern cannot just be a book description: it must be a software component"

Result: Pattern Library and Pattern Wizard (see following lectures)
Classification of design patterns:
- Fully componentizable
- Partially componentizable
- Wizard- or library-supported
- Non-componentizable

- Fully componentizable (48%)
- Partially componentizable (17%)
- Wizard or Library Support (26%)
- Not Componentizable (9%)
Design patterns (GoF)

**Creational**
- Abstract Factory
- Singleton
- Factory Method
- Builder
- Prototype

**Structural**
- Adapter
- Bridge
- Composite
- Decorator
- Façade
- Flyweight
- Proxy

**Behavioral**
- Chain of Responsibility
- Command (undo/redo)
- Interpreter
- Iterator
- Mediator
- Memento
- Observer
- State
- Strategy
- Template Method
- Visitor

**Non-GoF patterns**
- Model-View-Controller

Already covered in Info1
Observer pattern and event-driven progr.

**Intent:** “Define a one-to-many dependency between objects so that when one object changes state, all its dependents are notified and updated automatically.”

[Gamma et al., p 331]

- Implements publish-subscribe mechanism
- Used in Model-View-Controller patterns, interface toolkits, event
- Reduces tight coupling of classes
Handling input with modern GUIs

User drives program:

“When a user presses this button, execute that action from my program”
Event-driven programming: an example

Specify that when a user clicks this button the system must execute

\[ \text{find\_station}(x, y) \]

where \( x \) and \( y \) are the mouse coordinates and \text{find\_station} is a specific procedure of your system.
Event-driven programming: a metaphor

Publishers

Subscribers

Routine

Routine

Routine

Routine

Routine
Alternative terminologies

- Observed / Observer
- Subject / Observer
- Publish / Subscribe
- Event-driven design/programming

In this presentation: Publisher and Subscriber
A solution: the Observer Pattern (GoF)

PUBLISHER
+ PUB_1
+ PUB_2

* Deferred (abstract)
+ Effective (implemented)

SUBSCRIBER
+ SUB_1
+ SUB_2

subscribe* unsubscribe*
update*
update+
attach
detach

subscribe* unsubscribe*
publish*

Inherits from
Client (uses)
Observer pattern

Publisher keeps a (secret) list of observers:

\[\text{subscribed} : \text{LINKED\_LIST[SUBSCRIBER]}\]

To register itself, an observer executes

\[\text{subscribe (some\_publisher)}\]

where \text{subscribe} is defined in \text{SUBSCRIBER}:

\[
\text{subscribe (p: PUBLISHER)}
\]

\[\text{-- Make current object observe } p.\]

\text{require}

\[\text{publisher\_exists: p /= Void}\]

\text{do}

\[\text{p.attach (Current)}\]

\text{end}
Attaching an observer

In class PUBLISHER:

```pascal
feature {SUBSCRIBER}
attach (s: SUBSCRIBER)
-- Register s as subscriber to this publisher.

require
subscriber_exists: s /= Void

do
subscribed.extend(s)
end
```

Note that the invariant of PUBLISHER includes the clause
```
subscribed /= Void
```
(List `subscribed` is created by creation procedures of PUBLISHER)
Triggering an event

```
publish
-- Ask all observers to
-- react to current event.
do across subscribed as s loop s.item. update end end
```

Each descendant of `SUBSCRIBER` defines its own version of `update`
Observer - Participants

Publisher

- knows its subscribers. Any number of Subscriber objects may observe a publisher.
- provides an interface for attaching and detaching subscribers.

Subscriber

defines an updating interface for objects that should be notified of changes in a publisher.

Concrete Publisher

- stores state of interest to ConcreteSubscriber objects.
- sends a notification to its subscribers when its state changes.

Concrete Subscriber

- maintains a reference to a ConcretePublisher object.
- stores state that should stay consistent with the publisher's.
- implements the Subscriber updating interface to keep its state consistent with the publisher's.
Observer pattern (in basic form)

- Subscriber may subscribe:
  - At most one operation
  - To at most one publisher

- Event arguments are tricky to handle

- Subscriber knows publisher
  (More indirection is desirable)

- Not reusable — must be coded anew for each application
Using agents in EiffelVision

Paris_map.click.subscribe(agent find_station)
Mechanisms in other languages

- C and C++: “function pointers”
- C#: delegates (more limited form of agents)
Using agents (Event Library)

**Event**: each event type will be an object
*Example*: left click

**Context**: an object, usually representing a user interface element
*Example*: the map

**Action**: an agent representing a routine
*Example*: `find_station`
The Event library

Basically:

- One generic class: `EVENT_TYPE`
- Two features: `publish` and `subscribe`

For example: A map widget `Paris_map` that reacts in a way defined in `find_station` when clicked (event `left_click`):
class

   EVENT_TYPE[ARGS -> TUPLE]

inherit ANY

redefine default_create end

feature {NONE} -- Implementation

   subscribers: LINKED_LIST[PROCEDURE[ANY, ARGS]]

feature {NONE} -- Initialization

   default_create

       -- Initialize list.
       do

       create subscribers . make

       subscribers . compare_equal

   end
Simplified event library (end)

feature -- Basic operations

subscribe (action: PROCEDURE [ANY, ARGS])
  -- Add action to subscription list.
  require
    exists: action /= Void
  do
    subscribers • extend (action)
  ensure
    subscribed: subscribers • has (action)
end

publish (arguments: ARGS)
  -- Call subscribers.
  require
    exist: arguments /= Void
  do
    across subscribers as s loop s • item • call (arguments) end
end
Event Library style

The basic class is \textit{EVENT\_TYPE}

On the publisher side, e.g. GUI library:

- (Once) declare event type:
  \begin{verbatim}
  click: EVENT\_TYPE [ TUPLE [INTEGER, INTEGER]]
  \end{verbatim}

- (Once) create event type object:
  \begin{verbatim}
  create click
  \end{verbatim}

- To trigger one occurrence of the event:
  \begin{verbatim}
  click.publish ([x\_coordinate, y\_coordinate])
  \end{verbatim}

On the subscriber side, e.g. an application:

\begin{verbatim}
click.subscribe (agent find_station)
\end{verbatim}
Example using the Event library

The subscribers (“observers”) subscribe to events:

```plaintext
Paris_map.click.subscribe(agent find_station)
```

The publisher (“subject”) triggers the event:

```plaintext
click.publish([x_position, y_position])
```

Someone (generally the publisher) defines the event type:

```plaintext
click: EVENT_TYPE[TUPLE[INTEGER, INTEGER]]
-- Mouse click events
```
```
  once
  create Result
  ensure
  exists: Result /= Void
end
```
Subscriber variants

\[ \text{click.subscribe}(\text{agent \ find\_station}) \]

\[ \text{Paris\_map.click.subscribe}(\text{agent \ find\_station}) \]

\[ \text{click.subscribe}(\text{agent \ your\_procedure}(a, ?, ?, b)) \]

\[ \text{click.subscribe}(\text{agent \ other\_object.\ other\_procedure}) \]
Observer pattern vs. Event Library

In case of an existing class *MY_CLASS*:

- **With the Observer pattern:**
  - Need to write a descendant of *SUBSCRIBER* and *MY_CLASS*
  - Useless multiplication of classes

- **With the Event Library:**
  - Can reuse the existing routines directly as agents
Observer and event-driven design

A = 50%
B = 30%
C = 20%
Some issues

1. Keeping the “business model” and the GUI separate
   - Business model (or just model): core functionality of the application
   - GUI: interaction with users

2. Minimizing “glue code” between the two

3. Making sure we keep track of what’s going on
Model-View Controller

(Trygve Reenskaug, 1979)
Observer pattern makes the coupling between publishers and subscribers abstract.

Supports broadcast communication since publisher automatically notifies to all subscribers.

Changes to the publisher that trigger a publication may lead to unexpected updates in subscribers.
Design patterns (GoF)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Creational</th>
<th>Behavioral</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Abstract Factory</td>
<td>- Abstract Factory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Singleton</td>
<td>- Singleton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Factory Method</td>
<td>- Factory Method</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Builder</td>
<td>- Builder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Prototype</td>
<td>- Prototype</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Structural</th>
<th>Behavioral</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Adapter</td>
<td>- Adapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Bridge</td>
<td>- Bridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Composite</td>
<td>- Composite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Decorator</td>
<td>- Decorator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Façade</td>
<td>- Façade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Flyweight</td>
<td>- Flyweight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Proxy</td>
<td>- Proxy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behavioral</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Chain of Responsibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Command (undo/redo)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Interpreter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Iterator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Mediator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Memento</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Observer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Observer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Observer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Template Method</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Visitor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Non-GoF patterns

- ✓ Model-View-Controller
Command pattern

**Intent:**

“Way to implement an undo-redo mechanism, e.g. in text editors.” [OOSC, p 285-290]

“Way to encapsulate a request as an object, thereby letting you parameterize clients with different requests, queue or log requests, and support undoable operations.” [Gamma et al., p 233]

**Application example**

_EiffelStudio_
Enabling users of an interactive system to cancel the effect of the last command

Often implemented as “Control-Z”

Should support multi-level undo-redo (“Control-Y”), with no limitation other than a possible maximum set by the user
Example: a text editor

- Notion of “current line”.
- Assume commands such as:
  - **Remove** current line
  - **Replace** current line by specified text
  - **Insert** line before current position
  - **Swap** current line with next if any
  - “Global search and replace” (hereafter **GSR**): replace every occurrence of a specified string by another
  - ...

- This is a line-oriented view for simplicity, but the discussion applies to more sophisticated views
Key step in devising a software architecture

Finding the right abstractions

(the interesting object types)

Here:

The notion of “command”
Keeping the history of the session

The history list:

- Insertion
- Removal
- Insertion
- Swap

Oldest  Most recent

history: TWO WAY LIST [COMMAND]
What’s a “command” object?

- A command object includes information about one execution of a command by the user, sufficient to:
  - Execute the command
  - Cancel the command if requested later

For example, in a **Removal** command object, we need:
- The position of the line being removed
- The content of that line
General notion of command

defered class COMMAND feature

done: BOOLEAN
  -- Has this command been executed?

execute
  -- Carry out one execution of this command.

done: BOOLEAN
  -- Has this command been executed?

either:
done

execute
  -- Carry out one execution of this command.

done: BOOLEAN
  -- Has this command been executed?

undo
  -- Cancel an earlier execution of this command.

require
  already: done

defered

end

done: BOOLEAN
  -- Has this command been executed?

undo
  -- Cancel an earlier execution of this command.

require
  already: done

deferred

done: BOOLEAN
  -- Has this command been executed?

end

done: BOOLEAN
  -- Has this command been executed?
class REMOVAL inherit COMMAND feature
   controller: EDIT_CONTROLLER
       -- Access to business model
   line: STRING
       -- Line being removed
   index: INTEGER
       -- Position of line being removed

execute
   -- Remove current line and remember it.
   do
      line := controller.item; index := controller.index
   end
   controller.remove; done := True

undo
   -- Re-insert previously removed line.
   do
      controller.go_i_th(index)
   end
   controller.put_left(line)
Command class hierarchy

- execute*
- undo*

COMMAND

- REMOVAL
  - execute+
  - undo+
  - line: STRING
  - index: INTEGER
  - ...

- INSERTION
  - execute+
  - undo+
  - index
  - ...

- deferred
- effective

...
Executing a user command

decode_user_request

if “Request is normal command” then
    “Create command object c corresponding to user request”
    history.extend(c)
c.execute
elseif “Request is UNDO” then
    if not history.before then
        -- Ignore excessive requests
        history.item.undo
        history.back
    end
elseif “Request is REDO” then
    if not history.is_last then
        -- Ignore excessive requests
        history.forth
        history.item.execute
    end
end
Command pattern: original architecture (GoF)

- **APPLICATION**
  - history

- **HISTORY**
  - commands
  - execute
  - can_undo, can_redo
  - undo, redo
  - undo_all, redo_all
  - extend

- **COMMAND**
  - execute*
  - undo*
  - redo*

- **COMMAND_1+**
  - execute+
  - undo+
  - redo+

- **COMMAND_2+**
  - execute+
  - undo+
  - redo+
The undo-redo (or “command”) pattern

- Has been extensively used (e.g. in EiffelStudio and other Eiffel tools)
- Fairly easy to implement
- Details must be handled carefully (e.g. some commands may not be undoable)
- Elegant use of O-O techniques
- Disadvantage: explosion of small classes
Using agents

For each user command, have two routines:

- The routine to do it
- The routine to undo it
The history list in the undo-redo pattern

\[ \text{history: \texttt{TWO\_WAY\_LIST [COMMAND]}} \]

Oldest: Insertion -> Removal -> Insertion -> Swap

Most recent
The history list simply becomes a list of agents pairs:

\[ \text{history: } \text{TWO\_WAY\_LIST[ TUPLE} \]

\[ \text{[doer: } \text{PROCEDURE[ ANY, TUPLE]}, \]

\[ \text{undoer: } \text{PROCEDURE[ ANY, TUPLE]]} \]

Basic scheme remains the same, but no need for command objects any more; the history list simply contains agents.
Executing a user command (before)

```plaintext
decode_user_request

if "Request is normal command" then
    "Create command object c corresponding to user request"
    history.extend(c)
    c.execute
elseif "Request is UNDO" then
    if not history.before then
        -- Ignore excessive requests
        history.item.undo
        history.back
    end
elseif "Request is REDO" then
    if not history.is_last then
        -- Ignore excessive requests
        history.forth
        history.item.execute
    end
end
```
Executing a user command (now)

"Decode user_request giving two agents *do_it and undo_it*"
if "Request is normal command" then

```
  history.extend([do_it, undo_it])
  do_it.call([])
```
elseif "Request is UNDO" then

```
if not history.before then
  history.item.undoer.call([])
  history.back
end
```
elseif "Request is REDO" then

```
if not history.is_last then
  history.forth
  history.item.doer.call([])
end
```
end
Command - Consequences

Command decouples the object that invokes the operation from the one that knows how to perform it.

Commands are first-class objects. They can be manipulated and extended like any other object.

You can assemble commands into a composite command.

It is easy to add new Commands, because you do not have to change existing classes.
Command - Participants

**Command**

declares an interface for executing an operation.

**Concrete command**

- defines a binding between a Receiver object and an action.
- implements Execute by invoking the corresponding operation(s) on Receiver.

**Client**

creates a ConcreteCommand object and sets its receiver.

**Invoker**

asks the command to carry out the request.

**Receiver**

knows how to perform the operations associated with carrying out a request. Any class may serve as a Receiver.
Design patterns – Pattern categories

**Creational**
- Abstract Factory
- Singleton
- Factory Method
- Builder
- Prototype

**Structural**
- Adapter
- Bridge
- Composite
- Decorator
- Façade
- Flyweight
- Proxy

**Behavioral**
- Chain of Responsibility
- Command (undo/redo)
- Interpreter
- Iterator
- Mediator
- Memento
- Observer
- State
- Strategy
- Template Method
- Visitor

**Non-GoF patterns**
- Model-View-Controller

---

*Non-GoF patterns*
Design patterns (GoF)

**Creational**
- Abstract Factory
- Singleton
- Factory Method
- Builder
- Prototype

**Structural**
- Adapter
- Bridge
- Composite
- Decorator
- Façade
- Flyweight
- Proxy

**Behavioral**
- Chain of Responsibility
- Command (undo/redo)
- Interpreter
- Iterator
- Mediator
- Memento
- Observer
- State
- Strategy
- Template Method
- Visitor

**Non-GoF patterns**
- Model-View-Controller
Design patterns (GoF)

**Creational**
- Abstract Factory
- Singleton
- Factory Method
- Builder
- Prototype

**Structural**
- Adapter
- Bridge
- Composite
- Decorator
- Façade
- Flyweight
- Proxy

**Behavioral**
- Chain of Responsibility
- Command (undo/redo)
- Interpreter
- Iterator
- Mediator
- Memento
- Observer
- State
- Strategy
- Template Method
- Visitor

**Non-GoF patterns**
- Model-View-Controller
**Intent:**

“Decouple[s] an abstraction from its implementation so that the two can vary.”

In other words:

It separates the class interface (visible to the clients) from the implementation (that may change later)
Bridge: an example

- EiffelVision 2 library: multi-platform GUI library

- Supports wide range of interaction “widgets” (or “controls”)

- Must run under various environments, including Windows and Unix/Linux/VMS (X Windows system)

- Must conform to local look-and-feel of every platform
Bridge: Original pattern

**APPLICATION**

- **APP1**
- **APP2**

**IMPLEMENTATION**

- **APP1_IMP**
- **APP2_IMP**

- **perform**
- **impl**

- **perform***
- **perform+**

The diagram illustrates the original pattern of the Bridge design pattern, showing how applications can interact with different implementations.
Bridge: Classes

deferred class APPLICATION

feature {NONE} -- Initialization

make (i: like impl)
-- Set i as implementation.
  do impl := i end

feature {NONE} -- Implementation

impl: IMPLEMENTATION
-- Implementation

feature -- Basic operations

perform
-- Perform desired operation.
  do impl.perform end
end

deferred class IMPLEMENTATION

feature -- Basic operations

perform
-- Perform basic operation.
deferred end
end
class **APP1** inherit **APPLICATION** create

```
make
...
end
```

```ruby
end
```

class **IMP1** inherit **IMPLEMENTATION** feature

```
perform
```

```
-- Perform desired operation.
do ... end
end
```
class CLIENT
make

feature -- Basic operations
make

local
app1: APP1
app2: APP2

do
create app1.make (create {IMP1})
app1.perform
create app2.make (create {IMP2})
app2.perform
end
end

-- Do something.
Bridge: A variation used in EiffelVision 2
Bridge: EiffelVision 2 example

class 

    BUTTON

feature \{ANY, ANY_I\} -- Implementation

    implementation: BUTTON_I -- Implementation

feature \{NONE\} -- Implementation

    create_implementation

        -- Create corresponding button implementation.

        do

            create \{BUTTON_IMP\} implementation.make (Current)

        end

    end

end
Bridge: Advantages (or when to use it)

- No permanent binding between abstraction and implementation
- Abstraction and implementation extendible by subclassing
- Implementation changes have no impact on clients
- Implementation of an abstraction completely hidden from clients
- Implementation share with several objects, hidden from clients
Bridge: Componentization

- Non-componentizable (no library support)
## Design patterns (GoF)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Creational</th>
<th>Behavioral</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Abstract Factory</td>
<td>• Chain of Responsibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Singleton</td>
<td>✓ Command (undo/redo)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Factory Method</td>
<td>• Interpreter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Builder</td>
<td>• Iterator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Prototype</td>
<td>• Mediator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Memento</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✓ Observer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structural</td>
<td>• State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Adapter</td>
<td>• Strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Bridge</td>
<td>• Template Method</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Composite</td>
<td>• Visitor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Decorator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Façade</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Flyweight</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Proxy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Non-GoF patterns
- ✓ Model-View-Controller
Composite pattern

**Intent:**

“Way to compose objects into tree structures to represent part-whole hierarchies. Composite lets clients treat individual objects and compositions of objects uniformly.”
Composite pattern, safety version (1/5)

defferred class
  \begin{center}
  \textit{COMPONENT}
  \end{center}

\textbf{feature} -- Basic operation
\begin{center}
\textit{perform}
\end{center}
\begin{center}
\texttt{perform} -- Do something.
\end{center}
\begin{center}
deferred
\end{center}
\begin{center}
end
\end{center}

\textbf{feature} -- Status report
\begin{center}
\textit{is\_composite: BOOLEAN}
\end{center}
\begin{center}
\texttt{is\_composite} -- Is component a composite?
\end{center}
\begin{center}
do
\end{center}
\begin{center}
Result := False
\end{center}
\begin{center}
end
\end{center}
\begin{center}
end
\end{center}
class COMPOSITE
    inherit COMPONENT
        redefine is_composite
    end

create
    make, make_from_components

feature {NONE} -- Initialization
    make
        -- Initialize component parts.
        do
            create parts.make
        end
end
Composite pattern, safety version (3/5)

```plaintext
make_from_components(part_list: like parts)
   -- Initialize from part_list.
   require
      parts_not_void: part_list /= Void
      no_void_component: not some_components.has(Void)
   do
      parts := part_list
   ensure
      parts_set: parts = part_list
   end

feature -- Status report
   is_composite: BOOLEAN
      -- Is component a composite?
      do
         Result := True
      end
```
feature -- Basic operation
perform
  -- Performed desired operation on all components.
  do
    from parts.start until parts.after loop
      parts.item.perform
      parts.forth
  end
end

feature -- Access
item: COMPONENT
  -- Current part of composite
  do
    Result := parts.item
  ensure
    definition: Result = parts.item
    component_not_void: Result /= Void
  end
feature -- Others
   -- Access: \textit{i\_th, first, last}
   -- Status report: \textit{has, is\_empty, off, after, before}
   -- Measurement: \textit{count}
   -- Element change: \textit{add}
   -- Removal: \textit{remove}
   -- Cursor movement: \textit{start, forth, finish, back}

feature \{NONE\} - Implementation
\textit{parts: LINKED\_LIST[like item]}
   -- Component parts
   -- (which are themselves components)

\textbf{invariant}
\begin{align*}
\text{is\_composite: } & \text{is\_composite} \\
\text{parts\_not\_void: } & \text{parts} \neq \text{Void} \\
\text{no\_void\_part: } & \text{not parts\_has(Void)}
\end{align*}

\textbf{end}
Composite: Variation used in EiffelMedia
Composite: Advantages (or when to use it)

- Represent part-whole hierarchies
- Clients treat compositions and individual objects uniformly
Figures

Simple figures

A composite figure
Defining the notion of composite figure

center
display
hide
rotate
move
...

FIGURE

LIST[FIGURE]

COMPOSITE FIGURE
count
put
remove
...

...
In the overall structure
A composite figure as a list

Cursor

forth

after
Composite figures

class COMPOSITE FIGURE inherit FIGURE
   LIST[FIGURE]

feature
   display
      -- Display each constituent figure in turn.
      do
         from start until after loop
            item.display
            forth
      end
   end

... Similarly for move, rotate etc. ...
end
Composite: Componentization

- Fully componentizable
- Library support
- Main idea: Use genericity

- But: the library version lacks flexibility and makes the structure difficult to understand
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Decorator pattern

Intent:
“Attach additional responsibilities to an object dynamically. Decorators provide a flexible alternative to subclassing for extending functionality.”
Decorator: Example
Decorator: example

Display an area with a border of a certain color

```plaintext
class BORDERED_AREA
  inherit DECORATED_COMPONENT

  feature
    color: COLOR
    set_color(c: like color) ...

    draw
      do
        draw_border(color)
        component.draw
      end
  end
end
```
Decorator: Exporting additional features?

Newly introduced features do not need to be visible to clients, but they may.

* e.g. Display an area with a border of a certain color

```plaintext
class BORDERED_AREA
  inherit DECORATED_COMPONENT
...
feature
  color: COLOR
  set_color(c: like color) ...
  draw do
    draw_border(color)
    component.draw
  end
end
```

Client can change the `color` by calling `set_color` if it has direct access to the `BORDERED_AREA`
Decorator: Advantages (or when to use it)

- Add responsibilities to individual objects dynamically and transparently
- Responsibilities can be withdrawn
- Avoid explosion of subclasses to support combinations of responsibilities
Decorator: Componentization

- Non-componentizable
- Skeleton classes can be generated
Decorator skeleton, attribute (1/2)

**note**

**description:** “Skeleton of a component decorated with additional attributes”

**class**

**DECORATED_COMPONENT** -- You may want to change the class name.

**inherit**

**COMPONENT** -- You may need to change the class name

**redefine**

-- List all features of **COMPONENT** that are not deferred.

**create**

**make**

-- You may want to add creation procedures to initialize the additional attributes.

**feature** **{NONE}** -- Initialization

**make** *(a_component: like component)*

-- Set component to a_component.

**require**

a_component_not_void: a_component /= Void

**do**

component := a_component

**ensure**

component_set: component = a_component

**end**

-- List additional creation procedures taking into account additional attributes.
Decorator skeleton, attribute (2/2)

**feature** -- Access
   -- List additional attributes.

**feature** -- To be completed
   -- List all features from \textit{COMPONENT} and implement them by
   -- delegating calls to \textit{component} as follows:
   -- do
   --   \textit{component.feature_from_component}
   -- end

**feature** \{\textit{NONE}\} -- Implementation
   \textit{component}: \textit{COMPONENT}
      -- Component that will be used decorated

**invariant**
   \textit{component_not_void}: \textit{component} /= \textit{Void}

end
note
description: “Skeleton of a component decorated with additional behavior”

class

DECORATED_COMPONENT -- You may want to change the class name.

inherit

COMPONENT -- You may need to change the class name

redefine

-- List all features of COMPONENT that are not deferred.

end

create

make

feature {NONE} -- Initialization

make (a_component: like component)

-- Set component to a_component.

require

a_component_not_void: a_component /= Void

do

component := a_component

ensure

component_set: component = a_component

end
feature -- To be completed
   -- List all features from COMPONENT and implement them by
   -- delegating calls to component as follows:
   -- do
   --    component.feature_from_component
   -- end

   -- For some of these features, you may want to do something more:
   -- do
   --    component.feature_from_component
   --    perform_more
   -- end

feature {NONE} -- Implementation
   component: COMPONENT
   -- Component that will be used for the “decoration”

invariant
   component_not_void: component /= Void
end
Decorator skeleton: Limitations

**feature** -- To be completed

-- List all features from `COMPONENT` and implement them by
-- delegating calls to `component` as follows:

-- do
--    `component.feature_from_component`
-- end

Does not work if `feature_from_component` is:

- an *attribute*: cannot redefine an attribute into a function
  (Discussed at ECMA)

- a frozen feature (rare): cannot be redefined, but typically:
  - Feature whose behavior does not need to be redefined (e.g. `standard_equal`, ... from `ANY`)
  - Feature defined in terms of another feature, which can be redefined (e.g. `clone` defined in terms of `copy`
Design patterns (GoF)

**Creational**
- Abstract Factory
- Singleton
- Factory Method
- Builder
- Prototype

**Structural**
- Adapter
  - Bridge
  - Composite
  - Decorator
  - Façade
- Flyweight
- Proxy

**Behavioral**
- Chain of Responsibility
- Command (undo/redo)
- Interpreter
- Iterator
- Mediator
- Memento
- Observer
- State
- Strategy
- Template Method
- Visitor

**Non-GoF patterns**
- Model-View-Controller
Façade

**Intent:**

“Provides a unified interface to a set of interfaces in a subsystem. Façade defines a higher-level interface that makes the subsystem easier to use.” [GoF, p 185]
Façade: Original pattern

CLIENT  \rightarrow \text{FACADE}  \rightarrow \text{internal}
Façade: Example

Other example: Compiler, where clients should not need to know about all internally used classes.
Façade: Advantages (or when to use it)

- Provides a simple interface to a complex subsystem
- Decouples clients from the subsystem and fosters portability
- Can be used to layer subsystems by using façades to define entry points for each subsystem level
Facade: Componentization

- Non-componentizable
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Flyweight pattern

**Intent:**

"Use sharing to support large numbers of fine-grained objects efficiently."
Without the Flyweight pattern (1/2)

class

  CLIENT

...  

feature -- Basic operation
draw_lines

  -- Draw some lines in color.

  local

  line1, line2: LINE
  red: INTEGER

  do

  ...  

  create line1.make (red, 100, 200)
  line1.draw

  create line2.make (red, 100, 400)
  line2.draw

  ...

  end

...  

end

...  

end

Creates one LINE object for each line to draw
Without the Flyweight pattern (2/2)

class interface
  LINE
create
  make
feature -- Initialization
  make (c, x, y: INTEGER)
    -- Set color to c, x as x_position, and y as y_position.
    ensure
      color_set: color = c
      x_set: x_position = x
      y_set: y_position = y
feature -- Access
  color: INTEGER
    -- Line color
  x_position, y_position: INTEGER
    -- Line position
feature -- Basic operation
draw
  -- Draw line at position (x_position, y_position) with color.
end
With the Flyweight pattern (1/3)

class
   CLIENT
feature -- Basic operation
draw_lines
   -- Draw some lines in color.
   local
      line_factory: LINE_FACTORY
      red_line: LINE
      red: INTEGER
   do
      ...  
      red_line := line_factory.new_line(red)
      red_line.draw(100, 200)
      red_line.draw(100, 400)
   end
end

Creates only one LINE object per color
With the Flyweight pattern (2/3)

class interface
  LINE_FACTORY

feature -- Initialization
  new_line (c: INTEGER): LINE
    -- New line with color c
    ensure
      new_line_not_void: Result /= Void

...
With the Flyweight pattern (3/3)

class interface
  LINE
create
  make
feature -- Initialization
  make (c: INTEGER)
      -- Set color to c.
      ensure
          color_set: color = c
feature -- Access
  color: INTEGER
      -- Line color
feature -- Basic operation
  draw (x, y: INTEGER)
      -- Draw line at position (x, y) with color.
end
Another example: Document processing

1. Removing extrinsic state. The pattern’s applicability is determined largely by how easy it is to identify extrinsic state and remove it from shared objects. Removing extrinsic state won’t help reduce storage costs if there are as many different kinds of extrinsic state as there are objects before sharing. Ideally, extrinsic state can be computed from a separate object structure, one with far fewer storage requirements. In our document editor, for example, we can store a map of typographic information in a separate structure rather than store the font and type style with each character object. The map keeps track of runs of characters with the same typographic attributes. When a character draws itself, it receives its typographic attributes as a side-effect of the draw traversal. Because documents normally use just a few different fonts, storing this information externally to each character object is far more efficient than storing it internally.

2. Managing shared objects. Because objects are shared, clients shouldn’t instantiate them directly. FlyweightFactory lets clients locate a particular flyweight. FlyweightFactory objects often use an associative store to let clients look up flyweights of interest. For example, the flyweight factory in the document editor example can keep a table of flyweights indexed by character codes. The manager returns the proper flyweight given its code, creating the flyweight if it does not already exist. Sharability also implies some form of reference counting or garbage collection to reclaim a flyweight’s storage when it’s no longer needed. However, neither is necessary if the number of flyweights is fixed and small (e.g., flyweights for the ASCII character set). In that case, the flyweights are worth keeping around permanently.

next: Known Uses Sample

Returning to our document formatter example, we’ll define a class base class for Glyph graphical objects. Logically, glyphs are Composites (see Composite (163)) that have graphical attributes and can draw themselves. The concept of flyweight objects was first described and explored as a design technique in InterViews 3.0 [CL90]. Its developers built a powerful document editor called Doc as a proof of concept [CL92]. Doc uses glyph objects to represent each character in the document. The editor loads a single instance for each character in a particular style, which defines its font, size, and other attributes, from a separate character code and style information (an index into a style table). That keeps only position to extrinsics, making Doc fast. Parameters are represented by a client extension, which acts as the FlyweightFactory. Measurements on Doc have shown that sharing flyweight characters is quite effective. In a typical case, a document containing 180,000 characters required allocation of only 480 character objects.

ET++ [WGM88] uses flyweights to support look-and-feel independence. The look-and-feel standard affects the layout of user interface elements (e.g., scroll bars, buttons, menus—known collectively as “widgets”) and their decorations (e.g., shadows, beveling). A widget delegates all its layout and drawing behavior to a separate Layout object. Changing the Layout object changes the look and feel, even at run-time. For each widget class there is a corresponding Layout class (e.g., ScrollbarLayout, MenubarLayout, etc.). The look-and-feel problem with this approach is that using separate layout objects requires thousands of separate objects. For each user interface object there is a separate object that keeps track of its layout and drawing behavior, and it’s easy to run out of what little extrinsic state they need to lay out or draw an object.
Object structure without flyweight

```
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```

Diagram:
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Object structure with flyweight
Text processing

- In document processing system: one flyweight per character code

- Other properties, such as font, position in document etc. are stored in client.

- Basic distinction:
  - Intrinsic properties of state: stored in flyweight
  - “Extrinsic” properties: stored in “context” for each use.
Text processing class hierarchy

- **FLYWEIGHT_FACTORY**
- **GLYPH**
- **COLUMN**
- **ROW**
- **CHARACTER_GLYPH**

Key methods and attributes:
- `new_flyweight`
- `flyweights` (from FLYWEIGHT_FACTORY)
- `draw*` (from GLYPH)
- `draw+` (from COLUMN and ROW)
- `character` (from CHARACTER_GLYPH)
- `perform+` (from ROW)
- `children` (from COLUMN, ROW, and CHARACTER_GLYPH)
Shared/unshared and (non-)composite objects

Two kinds of property:
- **Intrinsic characteristics** stored in the flyweight
- **Extrinsic characteristics** moved to the client (typically a "flyweight context")

- The color of the *LINE*
- The coordinates of the *LINE*
Flyweight: Original pattern

- **new_flyweight**
- **flyweights**
- **intrinsic_state**
- **perform+**
- **perform***
- **entire_state**
- **perform+**
Flyweight pattern: Description

Intent: “Use sharing to support large numbers of fine-grained objects efficiently.”

Participants:

- **FLYWEIGHT**: Offers a service `perform` to which the extrinsic characteristic will be passed
- **SHARED_FLYWEIGHT**: Adds storage for intrinsic characteristic
- **UNSHARED_FLYWEIGHT**: Not all flyweights need to be shared
- **FACTORY**: Creates and manages the flyweight objects
- **CLIENT**: Maintains a reference to flyweight, and computes or stores the extrinsic characteristics of flyweight
Two kinds of flyweights:

Composites (shared or unshared)
Non-composites (shared)
Flyweight: Advantages (or when to use it)

- If a large number of objects are used, can reduce storage use:
  - By reducing the number of objects by using shared objects
  - By reducing the replication of intrinsic state
  - By computing (rather than storing) extrinsic state
Flyweight: Componentization

- Fully componentizable

Mechanisms enabling componentization:
- Constrained genericity, agents
- Uses Factory Library and Composite Library

But: Structure is difficult to understand
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Visitor pattern

**Intent:**

“Represents an operation to be performed on the elements of an object structure. Visitor lets you define a new operation without changing the classes of the elements on which it operates.”

[Gamma et al., p 331]

- Static class hierarchy
- Need to perform traversal operations on corresponding data structures
- Avoid changing the original class structure
Visitor application examples

Set of classes to deal with an Eiffel or Java program (in EiffelStudio, Eclipse ...)

Or: Set of classes to deal with XML documents
\(XML_{\text{NODE}}, \text{XML\_DOCUMENT}, \text{XML\_ELEMENT},\)
\(\text{XML\_ATTRIBUTE}, \text{XML\_CONTENT}...\)

One parser (or several: keep comments or not...)

Many formatters:
- Pretty-print
- Compress
- Convert to different encoding
- Generate documentation
- Refactor
- ...

Inheritance hierarchy

**FIGURE**
- center
- display
- rotate

**OPEN FIGURE**
- SEGMENT
- POLYLINE

**CLOSED FIGURE**
- POLYGON
- ELLIPSE
- RECTANGLE
- SQUARE
- CIRCLE

* deferred
+ effective
++ redefined
Polymorphic data structures

figs : LIST [FIGURE]

from figs.start until figs.after loop figs.item.display figs.forth end
The dirty secret of O-O architecture

Is it easy to add types (e.g. TRIANGLE) to existing operations
The dirty secret of O-O architecture

Is it easy to add types (e.g. **TRIANGLE**) to existing operations?

What about the reverse: adding an operation to existing types?
Adding operations – solution 1

Add them directly to the classes

Dynamic binding will take care of finding the right version
Adding operations – solution 1

But:

- operations may clutter the classes
- classes might belong to libraries out of your control
Adding operations – solution 2

**write\_xml (f: FIGURE)**

```python
-- Write figure to xml.
require exists: f/= Void

do
...
  if attached {RECT} f as r
    doc.put_string ("<rect/>")
  end
if attached {CIRCLE} f as c
  doc.put_string ("<circle/>")
end
... Other cases ...
end
end
```

**write\_ps (f: FIGURE)**

```python
-- Write figure to xml.
require exists: f/= Void

do
...
  if attached {RECT} f as r
    doc.put_string (r.side_a.out)
  end
if attached {CIRCLE} f as c
  doc.put_string (c.diameter)
end
... Other cases ...
end
end
```

But:

- Loose benefits of dynamic binding
- Many large conditionals
Adding operations – solution 3

Combine solution 1 & 2:

- Put operations into a separate class
- Add one placeholder operation \textit{accept} (dynamic binding)
Adding operations – solution 3

class FIGURE
feature
accept (v : VISITOR)
    --Call procedure of visitor.
defered
end
    ... Other features ...
end

class CIRCLE
feature
accept (v : VISITOR)
    --Call procedure of visitor.
do
    v.visit_circle (Current)
end
    ... Other features ...
end
The visitor ballet

- Client (calls)
- Client (knows about)

CLIENT

\( t.\text{accept}(v) \)

\( v.\text{visit}_T(\text{Current}) \)

T_TARGET

V_VISITOR
We want to add external functionality, for example:

- Maintenance
- Schedule a vehicle for a particular day
Visitor participants

**Target** classes
Example: *BUS, TAXI*

**Client** classes
Application classes that need to perform operations on target objects

**Visitor** classes
Written only to smooth out the collaboration between the other two
Visitor participants

Visitor

*General notion of visitor*

Concrete visitor

*Specific visit operation, applicable to all target elements*

Target

*General notion of visitable element*

Concrete target

*Specific visitable element*
Visitor class hierarchies

**Target classes**

- *VEHICLE*
  - + TAXI
  - + BUS

**Visitor classes**

- *VISITOR*
  - v.visit_T(Current )
  - * MAINTENANCE_VISITOR
    - visit_taxi+
    - visit_bus+
  - * SCHEDULE_VISITOR
    - visit_taxi+
    - visit_bus+

accept*
The maintenance visitor

class MAINTENANCE_VISITOR inherit VISITOR

feature -- Basic operations

visit_taxi(t: TAXI)

-- Perform maintenance operations on t.

do

\[ t.send\_to\_garage\text{ (Next\_monday)} \]
end

visit_bus(b: BUS)

-- Perform maintenance operations on b.

do

\[ b.send\_to\_depot \]
end
class MAINTENANCE_VISITOR inherit VISITOR

feature -- Basic operations

visit_taxi(t: TAXI)
  -- Perform scheduling operations on t.
  do
    ...
  end

visit_bus(b: BUS)
  -- Perform scheduling operations on b.
  do
    ...
  end

end
Changes to the target classes

defered class VEHICLE
    feature
        ... Normal VEHICLE features ...
        accept (v: VISITOR)
            -- Apply vehicle visit to v.
        deferred
    end
end

class BUS inherit VEHICLE
    feature
        accept (v: VISITOR)
            -- Apply bus visit to v.
        do
            v.visit_bus (Current)
        end
end

class TAXI inherit VEHICLE
    feature
        accept (v: VISITOR)
            -- Apply taxi visit to v.
        do
            v.visit_taxi (Current)
        end
end
The visitor pattern

Target classes

* VEHICLE

TAXI

BUS

Visitor classes

* VISITOR

MAINT_VISITOR

SCHEDULE_VISITOR

CLIENT

V_VISITOR

Example client calls:

bus21.accept (maint_visitor)

fleet.item.accept (maint_visitor)
Visitor provides double dispatch

Client:

\[ t.\text{accept}(v) \]

Target class (in \textit{accept}):

\[ v.\text{visit}_T(t) \]

Visitor class \textit{V_VISITOR} (in \textit{visit}_T):

\[ \textit{visit}_T(t) \]

-- For the right \( V \) and \( T \)!
Visitor - Consequences

Makes adding new operations easy
Gathers related operations, separates unrelated ones
Avoids assignment attempts
  ➢ Better type checking
Adding new concrete element is hard
Visitor vs dynamic binding

Dynamic binding:
- Easy to add types
- Hard to add operations

Visitor:
- Easy to add operations
- Hard to add types
Visitor – Componentization

Fully componentizable

One generic class $\text{VISITOR}[G]$
  e.g. $\text{maintenance\_visitor}: \text{VISITOR}[\text{VEHICLE}]$

Actions represented as agents
  $\text{actions}: \text{LIST}[	ext{PROCEDURE}[\text{ANY, TUPLE}[G]]]$  

No need for $\text{accept}$ features
  $\text{visit}$ determines the action applicable to the given element

For efficiency
  Topological sort of actions (by conformance)
  Cache (to avoid useless linear traversals)
class

   VISITOR [G]

create

   make

feature \{NONE\} -- Initialization

   make

      -- Initialize actions.

feature -- Visitor

   visit (e : G)

      -- Select action applicable to \( e \).

      require

         e_exists: e \ ne Void

feature -- Access

   actions: LIST[PROCEDURE[ANY, TUPLE[G]]]

      -- Actions to be performed depending on the element
Visitor Library interface (2/2)

**feature** -- Element change

```plaintext
extend (action: PROCEDURE [ANY, TUPLE [G]])
    -- Add action to list.

require
    action_exists: action /= Void

ensure
    one_more: actions.count = old actions.count + 1
    inserted: actions.last = action
```

```plaintext
append (some_actions: ARRAY [PROCEDURE [ANY, TUPLE [G]])]
    -- Append actions in some_actions
    -- to the end of the actions list.

require
    actions_exit: some_actions /= Void
    noVoidAction: not some_actions.has (Void)

invariant
    actions_exist: actions /= Void
    noVoidAction: not actions.has (Void)

end
```
Using the Visitor Library

\[ \textit{maintenance visitor}: \textit{VISITOR} [\textit{VEHICLE}] \]

\textbf{create} \textit{maintenance visitor.make}

\textit{maintenance visitor.append} ([
    \textit{agent} \textit{maintain_taxi},
    \textit{agent} \textit{maintain_trolley},
    \textit{agent} \textit{maintain_tram}
])

\textit{maintain_taxi} (a\_taxi: \textit{TAXI}) ...
\textit{maintain_trolley} (a\_trolley: \textit{TROLLEY}) ...
\textit{maintain_tram} (a\_tram: \textit{TRAM}) ...
Topological sorting of agents (1/2)
Topological sorting of agents (2/2)

\[
\text{schedule\_visitor.extend} \quad (\text{agent schedule\_taxi})
\]
\[
\text{schedule\_visitor.extend} \quad (\text{agent schedule\_bus})
\]
\[
\text{schedule\_visitor.extend} \quad (\text{agent schedule\_vehicle})
\]
\[
\text{schedule\_visitor.extend} \quad (\text{agent schedule\_tram})
\]
\[
\text{schedule\_visitor.extend} \quad (\text{agent schedule\_trolley})
\]

For agent \textit{schedule\_a} (a: A) and \textit{schedule\_b} (b: B), if A conforms to B, then position of \textit{schedule\_a} is before position of \textit{schedule\_b} in the agent list.
Visitor library vs. visitor pattern

Visitor library:  
• Removes the need to change existing classes  
• More flexibility (may provide a procedure for an intermediate class, may provide no procedure)  
• More prone to errors - does not use dynamic binding to detect correct procedure, no type checking

Visitor pattern  
• Need to change existing classes  
• Dynamic binding governs the use of the correct procedure (type checking that all procedures are available)  
• Less flexibility (need to implement all procedures always)
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Strategy

**Intent:**

“Define a family of algorithms, encapsulate each one, and make them interchangeable. Strategy lets the algorithm vary independently from clients that use it”.

[Gamma et al., p 315]

**Example application**

selecting a sorting algorithm on-the-fly
Life without strategy: a sorting example

feature -- Sorting

\[
\text{sort}(il: \text{LIST}[\text{INTEGER}]; st: \text{INTEGER})
\]

-- Sort \( il \) using algorithm indicated by \( st \).

require

\[
\text{is\_valid\_strategy}(st)
\]

do

inspect

\[
st
\]

when \text{binary} then …

when \text{quick} then …

when \text{bubble} then …

else …

end

ensure

\[
\text{list\_sorted}: …
\]

end

What if a new algorithm is needed?
Strategy pattern: overall architecture

+ CONTEXT

strategy

* STRATEGY

perform*

+ STRATEGY_A

perform+

+ STRATEGY_B

perform+

+ STRATEGY_C

perform+
Class STRATEGY

defered class
    STRATEGY

feature -- Basic operation

    perform
        -- Perform algorithm according to chosen strategy.
        deferred
    end

end
Using a strategy

class

    CONTEXT

create

    make

feature -- Initialization

    make (s: like strategy)
        -- Make s the new strategy.
        -- (Serves both as creation procedure and to reset strategy.)
    do
        strategy := s
    ensure
        strategy_set: strategy = s
    end
Using a strategy

**feature** - Basic operations

```plaintext
perform
  -- Perform algorithm according to chosen strategy.
  do
    strategy.perform
  end
end
```

**feature** `{NONE}` - Implementation

```plaintext
strategy: STRATEGY
  -- Strategy to be used
end
```
Using the strategy pattern

```python
sorter_context: SORTER_CONTEXT
bubble_strategy: BUBBLE_STRATEGY
quick_strategy: QUICK_STRATEGY
hash_strategy: HASH_STRATEGY

create sorter_context.make(bubble_strategy)
sorter_context.sort(a_list)
sorter_context.make(quick_strategy)
sorter_context.sort(a_list)
sorter_context.make(hash_strategy)
sorter_context.sort(a_list)
```

Now, what if a new algorithm is needed?

Application classes can also inherit from `CONTEXT` (rather than use it as clients)
Strategy - Consequences

- Pattern covers classes of related algorithms
- Provides alternative implementations without conditional instructions
- Clients must be aware of different strategies
- Communication overhead between Strategy and Context
- Increased number of objects
Strategy - Participants

**Strategy**

declares an interface common to all supported algorithms.

**Concrete strategy**

implements the algorithm using the Strategy interface.

**Context**

- is configured with a concrete strategy object.
- maintains a reference to a strategy object.
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Chain of responsibility - Intent

Intent:

"Avoid coupling the sender of a request to its receiver by giving more than one object a chance to handle the request. Chain the receiving objects and pass the request along the chain until an object handles it."

Example application

A GUI event is passed from level to level (such as from button to dialog and then to application)
Example: e-mail filtering

If a filter can handle the request (e-mail) it will. Otherwise it will pass it on to the next filter, until it drops out of the chain of responsibility.
Example implementation

APPLICATION → FILTER

FILTER:
- * can_handle
- do_handle
- handled
- set_next

SPAM_FILTER:
- + can_handle
- do_handle

MAILINGLIST_FILTER:
- + can_handle
- do_handle
deferred class FILTER

feature - Access

next : FILTER  -- Successor in the chain of responsibility

feature -- Element change

set_next (n : like next)

-- Set next to n.

do

next := n

ensure

next_set: next = n

end

feature -- Status report

can_handle (r : E_MAIL): BOOLEAN deferred end

-- Can this handler handle r?

handled: BOOLEAN  -- Has request been handled?
Filter

feature {NONE} -- Implementation

  do_handle (r: G)
    -- Handle r.
    require
      can_handle: can_handle (r)
    deferred
  end

feature -- Basic operations

  handle (r: E_MAIL)
    -- Handle r if can_handle otherwise forward to next.
    -- If no next, set handled to False.
    do
      if can_handle (r) then do_handle (r); handled := True
      else
        if next /= Void then next.handle (r); handled := next.handled
        else handled := False end
      end
    ensure
      can_handle (r) implies handled
      (not can_handle (r) and next /= Void) implies handled = next.handled
      (not can_handle (r) and next = Void) implies not handled
    end
Concrete filters

class SPAM_FILTER inherit FILTER
create set_next, default_create
feature -- Status report
can_handle (r : E_MAIL)
  -- Can this handler handle r?
  do
    -- Find out whether it
    -- classifies as spam.
  end

feature {NONE} -- Implementation
do_handle (r : G)
  -- Handle r.
  do
    -- Mark e-mail as spam.
  end
end

class MAILINGLIST_FILTER inherit FILTER
create set_next, default_create
feature -- Status report
can_handle (r : E_MAIL)
  -- Can this handler handle r?
  do
    -- Is it an e-mail sent to a
    -- mailinglist?
  end

feature {NONE} -- Implementation
do_handle (r : G)
  -- Handle r.
  do
    -- Move to correct folder.
  end

folder : FOLDER -- Folder to move mail

... -- Implementation of set_folder
end
Chain of responsibility: overall architecture

APPLICATION

HANDLER

* can_handle
    + do_handle

INTERMEDIATE_HANDLER +

  can_handle
    + do_handle

FINAL_HANDLER +

  can_handle
    + do_handle

next handle
can_handle*
do_handle*
handled
set_next
Chain of responsibility: Componentization

Fully componentizable
Chain of responsibility: library

APPLICATION

HANDLER [G]

INTERMEDIATE_HANDLER [G]

FINAL_HANDLER [G]

next
handle
can_handle*
do_handle*
handled
set_next
Handlers

defered class
  HANDLER [G]
create default_create, make

feature {NONE} -- Initialization
  make (n: like next)
    do
      next := n
    ensure
      next_set: next = n
  end

feature -- Access
  next: HANDLER [G]
    -- Successor in the chain of responsibility

feature -- Status report
  can_handle (r: G): BOOLEAN deferred end
    -- Can this handler handle r?

  handled: BOOLEAN
    -- Has request been handled?
Handlers

feature -- Basic operations
    handle (r : G)
        -- Handle r if can_handle otherwise forward it to next.
        -- If no next, set handled to False.
        do
            if can_handle (r) then
                do_handle (r) ; handled := True
            else
                if next /= Void then
                    next.handle (r) ; handled := next.handled
                else
                    handled := False
                end
            end
        end
    ensure
        can_handle (r) implies handled
        (not can_handle (r) and next /= Void) implies handled = next.handled
        (not can_handle (r) and next = Void) implies not handled
    end
Class HANDLER [G] (3/3)

feature -- Element change
    set_next (n: like next)
        -- Set next to n.
        do
            next := n
        ensure
            next_set: next = n
        end

feature {NONE} - Implementation

    do_handle (r: G)
        -- Handle r.
        require
            can_handle: can_handle (r)
        deferred
        end

end
Chain of responsibility - Consequences

Reduced coupling

An object only has to know that a request will be handled "appropriately". Both the receiver and the sender have no explicit knowledge of each other.

Added flexibility in assigning responsibilities to objects

Ability to add or change responsibilities for handling a request by adding to or otherwise changing the chain at run-time.

Receipt is not guaranteed

The request can fall off the end of the chain without ever being handled.
Chain of responsibility - Participants

**Handler**
- defines an interface for handling requests.
- (optional) implements the successor link.

**Concrete handler**
- handles requests it is responsible for.
- can access its successor.
- if the Concrete handler can handle the request, it does so; otherwise it forwards the request to its successor.

**Application (Client)**
- initiates the request to a Concrete handler object on the chain.
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Intent:

“Allows an object to alter its behavior when its internal state changes. The object will appear to change its class”.

Application example:

- Add attributes without changing class.
- Simulate the (impossible) case of an object changing its type during execution.
- State machine simulation.
Example application: Drawing tool

Mouse actions have different behavior

- **Pen tool**
  - Mouse down: Start point of line
  - Mouse move: Continue draw of line
  - Mouse up: End draw line, change back to selection mode

- **Selection tool**
  - Mouse down: Start point selection rectangle
  - Mouse move: Update size of selection rectangle
  - Mouse up: Select everything inside selection rectangle

- **Rectangle tool**
  - Mouse down: Start point of rectangle
  - Mouse move: Draw rectangle with current size
  - Mouse up: End draw rectangle, change back to selection mode

- ...
deferred class TOOL_STATE feature
  process_mouse_down (pos: POSITION)
      -- Perform operation in response to mouse down.
  deferred end

  process_mouse_up (pos: POSITION)
      -- Perform operation in response to mouse up.
  deferred end

  process_mouse_move (pos: POSITION)
      -- Perform operation in response to mouse move.
  deferred end

-- Continued on next slide
Tool states know their context (in this solution)

feature -- Element change

    set_context (c: CONTEXT)
        -- Attach current state to c.
        do
            context := c
        end

feature {NONE} - Implementation

    context: CONTEXT
        -- The client context using this state.

end
A particular state

class RECTANGLE_STATE inherit TOOL_STATE

feature -- Access
  start_position: POSITION

feature -- Basic operations
  process_mouse_down (pos: POSITION)
    -- Perform operation in response to mouse down.
    do start_position := pos end

  process_mouse_up (pos: POSITION)
    -- Perform operation in response to mouse up.
    do context.set_state (context.selection_tool) end

  process_mouse_move (pos: POSITION)
    -- Perform edit operation in response to mouse move.
    do context.draw_rectangle (start_position, pos) end

end
A stateful environment client

class CONTEXT feature -- Basic operations
  process_mouse_down (pos:POSITION)
    -- Perform operation in response to mouse down.
    do
      state. process_mouse_down (pos)
    end

  process_mouse_up (pos:POSITION)
    -- Perform operation in response to mouse up.
    do
      state. process_mouse_up (pos)
    end

  process_mouse_move (pos: POSITION)
    -- Perform operation in response to mouse move.
    do
      state. process_mouse_move (pos)
    end
Stateful client: status and element change

**feature -- Access**

\[\text{pen\_tool, selection\_tool, rectangle\_tool: like state}\]

-- Available (next) states.

\[\text{state: TOOL\_STATE}\]

**feature -- Element change**

\[\text{set\_state (s: STATE)}\]

-- Make \( s \) the next state.

\[\text{do}\]

\[\text{state := s}\]

\[\text{end}\]

... -- Initialization of different state attributes

end
State pattern: overall architecture

In the example: \textit{process\_mouse\_X}
State pattern - componentization

Componentizable, but not comprehensive
State - Consequences

The pattern localizes state-specific behavior and partitions behavior for different states

It makes state transitions explicit

State objects can be shared
Stateful

- defines the interface of interest to clients.
- maintains an instance of a Concrete state subclass that defines the current state.

State

defines an interface for encapsulating the behavior associated with a particular state of the Context.

Concrete state

each subclass implements a behavior associated with a state of the Context
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Creational patterns

- Hide the creation process of objects
- Hide the concrete type of these objects
- Allow dynamic and static configuration of the system
Explicit creation in O-O languages

Eiffel:

```eiffel
create x.make (a, b, c)
```

C++, Java, C#:

```csharp
x = new T (a, b, c)
```
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Factory Method pattern

Intent:
“Define[s] an interface for creating an object, but let subclasses decide which class to instantiate. Factory Method lets a class defer instantiation to subclasses.” [Gamma et al.]

C++, Java, C#: emulates constructors with different names
Factory method

In client, instead of

\[
\text{create } \{T\} \ x. \text{make}
\]

use

\[
x := \text{new}_t
\]

with \text{new}_t defined as

\[
\text{new}_t (\text{args: } G): T
\]

-- New instance of T

do

\[
\text{create } \{S\} \ \text{Result.make} (\text{args})
\]

-- S conforms to T
end
Benefits of factory method

Factory method is not just the syntactic replacement of

\[
\text{create } \{ T \} \ x.\text{make} \ (1)
\]

by

\[
x := \text{factory.\ new\_t} (2)
\]

because:

- \( T \) could be a deferred class
- then (1) would not be possible

\text{factory} can take advantage of polymorphism
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Abstract factory pattern

**Intent:**

“Provide[s] an interface for creating families of related or dependent objects without specifying their concrete classes.” [Gamma et al.]
Abstract Factory: example

Widget toolkit (EiffelVision, Java Swing)
- Different look and feel, e.g. for Unix & Windows
- Family of widgets: Scroll bars, buttons, dialogs...
- Want to allow change of look & feel

→ Most parts of the system need not know which look & feel is used
→ Creation of widget objects should not be distributed
Managing parallel hierarchies with factories

We want to use factories to create \texttt{WINDOW}s
Abstract widget factory example
deferred class

  WINDOW_FACTORY

feature -- Factory functions

  new_window: WINDOW deferred end
  new_button: BUTTON deferred end
  new_menu_bar: MENU_BAR deferred end

  ...
end
With an Abstract Factory (2/6)

class WEL_WINDOW_FACTORY
inherit WINDOW_FACTORY
create make feature
   NONE} -- Initialization
   make (...) do ...
feature -- Factory functions
   new_window: WEL_WINDOW do ...
   new_button: WEL_BUTTON do ...
   new_menu_bar: WEL_MENU_BAR do ...
   ...
end

Factory ensures that all widgets of the window are Windows widgets
With an Abstract Factory (3/6)

class

`GTK_WINDOW_FACTORY`

inherit

`WINDOW_FACTORY`

create

`make`

feature {NONE} -- Initialization

`make (...) do ...`

feature -- Factory functions

`new_window: GTK_WINDOW do ...`

`new_button: GTK_BUTTON do ...`

`new_menu_bar: GTK_MENU_BAR do ...`

...

dend

Factory ensures that all widgets of the window are Gtk widgets
With an Abstract Factory (4/6)

defered class
  APPLICATION
  ...
feature -- Initialization
  build_window is
    local
      window : WINDOW
    do
      window := window_factory.new_window
    ...
  end

feature {NONE} -- Implementation
  window_factory : WINDOW_FACTORY
    -- Factory of windows

invariant
  window_factory_not.Void: window_factory /= Void
end
With an Abstract Factory (5/6)

class
  \textit{WEL\_APPLICATION}
inherit
  \textit{APPLICATION}
create
  \textit{make}
feature \{NONE\} -- Initialization
  \textit{make is}
    \textit{make is}
      -- Create \textit{window\_factory}.
      \textit{do}
        \textit{create} \{\textit{WEL\_WINDOW\_FACTORY}\}
        \textit{window\_factory.make(\ldots)}
      \textit{end}
    \textit{end}
...
end
With an Abstract Factory (6/6)

class

    GTK_APPLICATION

inherit

    APPLICATION

create

    make

feature \{NONE\}  -- Initialization

    make is

        -- Create window_factory.

        do

            create \{GTK_WINDOW_FACTORY\}

            window_factory.make(...)

        end

... end
Abstract factory: overall architecture

FACTORY

PRODUCT_A

PRODUCT_A1

PRODUCT_A2

PRODUCT_B1

PRODUCT_B2

PRODUCT_B

FACTORY_1

FACTORY_2

new_product_a*

new_product_a+

new_product_b*

new_product_b+

new_product_a*

new_product_a+
Reasons for using an abstract factory

- Most parts of a system should be independent of how its objects are created, are represented and collaborate.
- The system needs to be configured with one of multiple families.
- A family of objects is to be designed and only used together.
- You want to support a whole palette of products, but only show the public interface.
Abstract factory pattern: properties

- Isolates concrete classes
- Makes exchanging product families easy
- Promotes consistency among products
- Supporting new kinds of products is difficult
Abstract factory pattern: criticism

**Code redundancy:**

The factory classes, e.g. `GTK_FACTORY` and `WEL_FACTORY` will be similar.

**Lack of flexibility:**

`FACTORY` fixes the set of factory functions `new_button` and `new_box`
Abstract factory – Componentization

Fully componentizable
class FACTORY[G]
create
  make
feature -- Initialization
  make (f: like factory_function)
    -- Initialize with factory_function set to f.
    require
      exists: f /= Void
      do
        factory_function := f
      end
feature -- Access

  factory_function: FUNCTION[ANY, TUPLE[], G]
    -- Factory function creating new instances of type G
The Factory Library can create only one kind of product

**feature**  -- Factory operations

**new**: $G$

```plaintext
  do
  factory_function.call([])
  Result := factory_function.last_result
  ensure
  exists: Result /= Void
end
```

**new_with_args**(args: TUPLE): $G$

```plaintext
  do
  factory_function.call(args)
  Result := factory_function.last_result
  ensure
  exists: Result /= Void
end
```

**invariant**

```plaintext
  exists: factory_function /= Void
end
```
With the Factory Library (1/2)

```verbatim
deferred class APPLICATION
...
feature -- Initialization
  build_window
    -- Build window.
    local
      window: WINDOW
      do
        window := window_factory.new
      end
  ...

feature {NONE} -- Implementation
  window_factory: FACTORY[WINDOW]
  button_factory: FACTORY[BUTTON]
  menu_bar_factory: FACTORY[MENU_BAR]
...
end
```

Use several factory objects to create several products
With the Factory Library (2/2)

class  
WEL_APPLICATION
inherit 
APPLICATION
create 
make
feature 
make
--- Create factories.
do
create {FACTORY [WEL_WINDOW]} window_factory.make (...) 
create {FACTORY [WEL_BUTTON]} button_factory.make (...) 
create {FACTORY [WEL_MENU_BAR]} menu_bar_factory.make (...) 
end

... 
end

- Client must make sure that all factories are configured to create Windows widgets
- More error-prone with several factories

However, the problem already existed in the Abstract Factory pattern; it is concentrated in class WINDOW_FACTORY
Factory library vs. factory pattern

Advantages of the library:

- Get rid of some code duplication
- Fewer classes
- Reusability

Limitations of the library:

- Likely to yield a bigger client class (because similarities cannot be factorized through inheritance)
Factory method vs. abstract factory

Factory method:
- Creates one object
- Works at routine level
- Helps a class perform an operation, which requires creating an object

Abstract factory:
- Creates families of object
- Works at class level
- Uses factory methods (e.g. features `new` and `new_with_args` of the Factory Library are factory methods)
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Prototype pattern

Intent:
“Specify the kinds of objects to create using a prototypical instance, and create new objects by copying this prototype.” [Gamma 1995]

CLIENT \rightarrow \text{prototype} \rightarrow \text{PROTOTYPE} \rightarrow \text{twin} \rightarrow \text{Class} \rightarrow \text{Client}

No need for this in Eiffel: just use function twin from class \text{ANY}.

\[
y := x \cdot \text{twin}
\]

In Eiffel, every object is a prototype
Cloning in Java, C#, and Eiffel

Java

Class must implement the interface `Cloneable` defining `clone` (to have the right to call `clone` defined in `Object`)

C#

Class must implement the interface `ICloneable` defining `Clone` (to have the right to call `MemberwiseClone` defined in `Object`)

Next version of Eiffel

Class must broaden the export status of `clone`, `deep_clone` inherited from `ANY` (not exported in `ANY`)
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Builder pattern

**Intent:**

“Separate the construction of a complex object from its representation so that the same construction process can create different representations” (Gamma et al.)

Example use: build a document out of components (table of contents, chapters, index…) which may have some variants.
RTF example
Builder pattern

CLIENT

* BUILDER

MY_BUILDER

+ MY_PRODUCT

PART_A

PART_B

build

build*

last_product*

build*

last_product+

build+

build_product

build_part_a

build_part_b

set_part_a

set_part_b

part_a

part_b
deferred class 
  \textit{BUILDER} [G]
feature -- Access
  \textit{last\_product}: G
    
    -- Product under construction
    deferred
    end
feature -- Status report
  \textit{is\_ready}: \textit{BOOLEAN}
    
    -- Ready to build \textit{last\_product}? 
    deferred
    end
feature -- Basic operations
  \textit{build}
    
    -- Build \textit{last\_product}.
    require
      \textit{is\_ready}: \textit{is\_ready}
    deferred
    ensure
      \textit{last\_product\_exists}: \textit{last\_product} \neq \textit{Void}
    end
Two-part builder

class

\texttt{TWO\_PART\_BUILDER} [F \to BUILDABLE, G, H]

-- \( F \): type of product to build
-- \( G \): type of first part of the product
-- \( H \): type of second part of the product

The builder knows the type of product to build and number of parts

In the original Builder pattern:
- Deferred builder does not know the type of product to build
- Concrete builders know the type of product to build

\texttt{TWO\_PART\_BUILDER} is a concrete builder
\Rightarrow compatible with the pattern
Example using a two-part builder

class
   APPLICATION
create
   make
feature {NONE} -- Initialization
   make is
      -- Build a new two-part product with a two-part builder.
      local
         my_builder: TWO_PART_BUILDER [TWO_PART_PRODUCT,
                                       PART_A, PART_B]
         my_product: TWO_PART_PRODUCT
      do
         create my_builder.make(agent new_product, agent new_part_a,
                                agent new_part_b)
         my_builder.build_with_args ("Two-part product", ["Part A", "Part B"])
         my_product := my_builder.last_product
      end
feature -- Factory functions
   new_product (a_name: STRING): TWO_PART_PRODUCT do ...
   new_part_a (a_name: STRING): PART_A do ...
   new_part_b (a_name: STRING): PART_B do ...
end
class interface
  \textit{TWO\_PART\_BUILDER} [\textit{F} \rightarrow \textit{BUILDABLE}, \textit{G}, \textit{H}]

inherit
  \textit{BUILDER} [\textit{F}]

create
  \textit{make}

feature \{NONE\} -- Initialization
  \textit{make} (\textit{f}: \textit{like} \textit{factory\_function\_f}; \textit{g}: \textit{like} \textit{factory\_function\_g};
      \textit{h}: \textit{like} \textit{factory\_function\_h})
    -- Set \textit{factory\_function\_f} to \textit{f}. Set \textit{factory\_function\_g} to \textit{g}.
    -- Set \textit{factory\_function\_h} to \textit{h}.

require
  \textit{f\_not\_void}: \textit{f} \neq \textit{Void}
  \textit{g\_not\_void}: \textit{g} \neq \textit{Void}
  \textit{h\_not\_void}: \textit{h} \neq \textit{Void}

ensure
  \textit{factory\_function\_f\_set}: \textit{factory\_function\_f} = \textit{f}
  \textit{factory\_function\_g\_set}: \textit{factory\_function\_g} = \textit{g}
  \textit{factory\_function\_h\_set}: \textit{factory\_function\_h} = \textit{h}

feature -- Access
  \textit{last\_product}: \textit{F}
    -- Product under construction
Two-part builder (2/4)

**feature** -- Status report

\[
\text{is\_ready: BOOLEAN}
\]

-- Is builder ready to build \text{last\_product}?

\[
\text{valid\_args}(\text{args\_f, args\_g, args\_h: TUPLE): BOOLEAN}
\]

-- Are \text{args\_f, args\_g and args\_h} valid arguments to

-- build \text{last\_product}?

**feature** -- Basic operations

\[
\text{build}
\]

-- Build \text{last\_product}. (Successively call \text{build\_g} and

-- \text{build\_h} to build product parts.)

\[
\text{do}
\]

\[
\text{last\_product := f\_factory.new}
\]

\[
\text{build\_g ([]}\]

\[
\text{build\_h ([]}\]

\[
\text{ensure then}
\]

\[
\text{g\_not\_void: last\_product.g /= Void}
\]

\[
\text{h\_not\_void: last\_product.h /= Void}
\]

\[
\text{end}
\]
Two-part builder (3/4)

\[ \text{build_with_args}(\text{args}_f, \text{args}_g, \text{args}_h: \text{TUPLE}) \]

-- Build \text{last_product} with \text{args}_f. (Successively
-- call \text{build}_g with \text{args}_g and \text{build}_h with
-- \text{args}_h to build product parts.)

\text{require} 
valid_args : valid_args(\text{args}_f, \text{args}_g, \text{args}_h)

\text{ensure} 
g\text{not_void} : \text{last_product}.g /= \text{Void} 
h\text{not_void} : \text{last_product}.h /= \text{Void}

\text{feature} -- Factory functions

\text{factory_function}_f : \text{FUNCTION}[\text{ANY, TUPLE, F}]
-- Factory function creating new instances of type \text{F}

\text{factory_function}_g : \text{FUNCTION}[\text{ANY, TUPLE, G}]
-- Factory function creating new instances of type \text{G}

\text{factory_function}_h : \text{FUNCTION}[\text{ANY, TUPLE, H}]
-- Factory function creating new instances of type \text{H}
feature {NONE} -- Basic operations

build_g (args_g: TUPLE) do ...
build_h (args_h: TUPLE) do ...

feature {NONE} -- Factories

f_factory: FACTORY[F]
    -- Factory of objects of type F

g_factory: FACTORY[G]
    -- Factory of objects of type G

h_factory: FACTORY[H]
    -- Factory of objects of type H

invariant

factory_function_f_not_void: factory_function_f /= Void
factory_function_g_not_void: factory_function_g /= Void
factory_function_h_not_void: factory_function_h /= Void
f_factory_not_void: f_factory /= Void
g_factory_not_void: g_factory /= Void
h_factory_not_void: h_factory /= Void

end
Builder Library using factories?

class TWO_PART_BUILDER [F -> BUILDABLE, G, H]

inherit BUILDER [F]

...

feature -- Factory functions

factory_function_f: FUNCTION [ANY, TUPLE, F]
  -- Factory function creating new instances of type F

factory_function_g: FUNCTION [ANY, TUPLE, G]
  -- Factory function creating new instances of type G

factory_function_h: FUNCTION [ANY, TUPLE, H]
  -- Factory function creating new instances of type H

feature {NONE} -- Implementation

build_g (args_g: TUPLE) is
  -- Set last_product.g with a new instance of type G created with
  -- arguments args_g.
  do
    last_product.set_g (g_factory.new_with_args (args_g))
  end

  ...

end
Builder Library: completeness?

Supports builders that need to create two-part or three-part products

Cannot know the number of parts of product to be built in general

⇒ Incomplete support of the Builder pattern ("Componentizable but non-comprehensive")
## Design patterns (GoF)

### Creational
- Abstract Factory
  - Singleton
- Factory Method
- Builder
- Prototype

### Structural
- Adapter
- Bridge
- Composite
- Decorator
- Façade
- Flyweight
- Proxy

### Behavioral
- Chain of Responsibility
- Command (undo/redo)
- Interpreter
- Iterator
- Mediator
- Memento
- Observer
- State
- Strategy
- Template Method
- Visitor

### Non-GoF patterns
- Model-View-Controller
Singleton pattern

**Intent:**
Way to “ensure a class only has one instance, and to provide a global point of access to it.” [Gamma et al.]
Singleton pattern

Way to “ensure a class only has one instance, and to provide a global point of access to it.” [GoF, p 127]

Global point of access
Singletons in Eiffel

Once routines

But: does not prevent cloning
Once routines

If instead of

```
  r
  do
    ... Instructions ...
  end
```

you write

```
  r
  once
    ... Instructions ...
  end
```

then *Instructions* will be executed only for the first call by any client during execution. Subsequent calls return immediately.

In the case of a function, subsequent calls return the result computed by the first call.
Scheme for shared objects

class MARKET_INFO feature
  Christmas: DATE
    once
      create Result.make(...)
    end
  off_days: LIST[DATE]
    once
      create Result.make(...) Result.extend(Christmas)
    end
  ...
end

Will always return the same instance for all instances of MARKET_INFO (also descendant instances)
→ Provides global point of access

class APPLICATION_CLASS inherit MARKET_INFO
  feature
    r
      do
        print(off_days)
      ...
    end
  ...
end
Cloning:
Class ANY has features clone (twin), deep_clone, ...

One can duplicate any Eiffel object, which rules out the Singleton pattern

clone, deep_clone, ... will be exported to NONE in the next version of Eiffel
Ensuring the existence of only one instance

Exporting creation procedure:
Creation procedure of \textit{SINGLETON} should not be exported to any other than the \textit{SHARED\_SINGLETON} class:

\begin{verbatim}
class SINGLETON
create {SHARED\_SINGLETON} default_create
end
\end{verbatim}

Ensures that no other classes can create instances

But: Descendants of \textit{SHARED\_SINGLETON} may change the export status and clone it!
Ensuring the existence of only one instance

Prohibit classes to inherit from `SHARED_SINGLETON`:
Make `SHARED_SINGLETON` frozen

Frozen means:
- Class that may not have any descendant
- Marked by a keyword `frozen`
- A class cannot be both `frozen` and `deferred`

Advantages:
- Straightforward way to implement singletons
- No problem of different once statuses
- Compilers can optimize code of frozen classes

Weakness:
- Goes against the Open-Closed principle
Singleton with frozen classes

frozen class
   \textit{SHARED\_SINGLETON}

feature -- Access
   \texttt{singleton}: \textit{SINGLETON} is
   \hspace{1cm} -- Global access point to singleton
     once
     create \texttt{Result}
   ensure
     \texttt{singleton\_not\_void}: \texttt{Result} \neq \texttt{Void}
end

class
   \textit{SINGLETON}
create \{\textit{SHARED\_SINGLETON}\}
   \hspace{1cm} \texttt{default\_create}
end
Singleton in Eiffel – The four ingredients

- **once** feature for creating *SINGLETON*
- *frozen* class (prohibit inheritance)

- allow creation only to *SHARED_SINGLETON* instances
- no *copy/clone* features available to clients

But: currently **once** is once-per-per-thread (multi-threading will break the guarantee)
Singleton without frozen classes

Frozen classes require the ability to restrict the exportation of creation procedures (constructors)

⇒ Not applicable in C++, Java or C#

C++, Java and C# use static features to implement the singleton pattern
Singletons in C++/Java/C#

Static classes

Making SINGLETON a static class is not enough:

- Multiple declarations of a static object are possible (no global point of access)
- Static classes are initialized at initialization time (which varies according to the details of the language), but the initialization of SINGLETON may require a later initialization at some precise point during the program’s execution
- If multiple SINGLETON classes exist, it may be impossible to implement a particular initialization order among them
A more flexible solution uses a (non-static) Singleton class with hidden constructor, accessed only through a public static method `Instance` to retrieve the real singleton.

Compared with the class diagram seen before, this solution coalesces `SINGLETON` and `SHARED_SINGLETON`.

Similar results can be obtained by hiding the declaration of `SINGLETON` inside `SHARED_SINGLETON`. 
Singletons in Java

class Singleton {

    public static Singleton Instance() {
        if (_instance == null) {
            _instance = new Singleton();
        }
        return _instance;
    }

    protected Singleton() {
        // ...
    }

    private static Singleton _instance = null;
}
Creational patterns - Discussion

- Abstract the creation process
- Make system independent of how objects are created, composed and represented

Creational patterns become important as systems evolve

Two recurring themes:
- encapsulate knowledge about concrete classes used
- hide how instances are created and composed

Freedom: *What* specific instances get created, *who* creates instances, *how* they get created and *when*. 
Design patterns (GoF)

**Creational**
- Abstract Factory
- Singleton
- Factory Method
- Builder
- Prototype

**Structural**
- Adapter
- Bridge
- Composite
- Decorator
- Façade
- Flyweight

**Behavioral**
- Chain of Responsibility
- Command (undo/redo)
  - Interpreter
  - Iterator
  - Mediator
  - Memento
- Observer
- State
- Strategy
  - Template Method
- Visitor

**Non-GoF patterns**
- Model-View-Controller
Adapter pattern

**Intent:** “Convert the interface of a class into another interface clients expect. Adapter lets classes work together that couldn’t otherwise because of incompatible interfaces.”

Adapters are also called *wrappers*.

**Motivation:** Reuse available components through a different interface.
Example: integrating different components

You want to extend a graphical editor to support the manipulation and visualization of text elements. The current implementation relies on a class hierarchy based on the abstraction of shape:

```
EDITOR

* SHAPE
  + LINE
    draw+
    move+
    ...
  + CIRCLE
    draw+
    move+
    ...
```

```
shapes

draw*
move*
...```
Example: integrating different components

You want to extend a graphical editor to support the manipulation and visualization of text elements.

A class TEXT provides the services by adapting to the SHAPE interface an available implementation H_TEXT.
This version of the pattern is called **object adapter**, because ADAPTER uses an instance of ADAPTEE.
This version of the pattern is called *class adapter*, because ADAPTER inherits from ADAPTEE to adapt its services.
Adapter pattern: participants

**Target**

defines the (specific) interface used by CLIENT

**Client**

uses objects conforming to the interface of TARGET

**Adaptee**

offers services through an existing interface that needs adapting

**Adapter**

adapts the ADAPTEE’s interface to the TARGET’s
Design patterns (GoF)

**Creational**
- ✓ Abstract Factory
- ✓ Singleton
- ✓ Factory Method
- ✓ Builder
- ✓ Prototype

**Structural**
- ✓ Adapter
- ✓ Bridge
- ✓ Composite
- ✓ Decorator
- ✓ Façade
- ✓ Flyweight
  - • Proxy

**Behavioral**
- ✓ Chain of Responsibility
- ✓ Command (undo/redo)
  - • Interpreter
  - • Iterator
  - • Mediator
  - • Memento
- ✓ Observer
- ✓ State
- ✓ Strategy
  - • Template Method
- ✓ Visitor

**Non-GoF patterns**
- ✓ Model-View-Controller
Proxy pattern

**Intent:** “Provide a surrogate or placeholder for another object to control access to it.”

**Motivation:** Controlling when the various parts of an object are created – for example to delay creation of the most expensive parts until when they are actually needed.
Example: a document editor

A document editor uses a class DOCUMENT that encapsulates all data about an open document. If a new document includes large bitmap images, opening it takes time unless the creation of the objects for the images is postponed to when it is actually needed (e.g., when the client wants to display a page with images).

Could use Composite pattern
Proxy pattern

CLIENT \[\text{subject}\] \rightarrow \text{SUBJECT} \[\text{request}^*\]

\text{REAL_SUBJECT} \[\text{request}^+\] \rightarrow \text{real_one} \rightarrow \text{PROXY} \[\text{request}^+\]
Proxy class: implementation

class PROXY
inherit SUBJECT
feature
  request
    do
      if not attached real_one then
        create {REAL_PROXY} real_one
      end
      real_one.request
    end
feature {PROXY}
  real_one: SUBJECT
end
Proxy patterns: participants

Proxy
- Maintains a reference to access REAL_SUBJECT
- Provides an interface identical to SUBJECT's
- Controls access to REAL_SUBJECT
  (the control policy is application dependent)

Subject
- Defines a common interface for REAL_SUBJECT and PROXY so that a PROXY can replace a REAL_SUBJECT

Real Subject
- Defines the real object that PROXY represents
Types of proxy

Remote proxy
- The real subject is in a different physical or logical location
- The proxy is responsible for sending requests
- Decoupling between client and actual provider

Virtual proxy
- Mediate object creation
- Provide caching and sharing (as in the example)

Protection proxy
- Authorize or reject access to the real object according to the permissions of the client
Design patterns (GoF)

**Creational**
- Abstract Factory
- Singleton
- Factory Method
- Builder
- Prototype

**Structural**
- Adapter
- Bridge
- Composite
- Decorator
- Façade
- Flyweight
- Proxy

**Behavioral**
- Chain of Responsibility
- Command (undo/redo)
  - Interpreter
  - **Iterator**
  - Mediator
  - Memento
- Observer
- State
- Strategy
  - Template Method
- Visitor

**Non-GoF patterns**
- Model-View-Controller
Intent: “Provide a way to access the elements of an aggregate object sequentially without exposing its underlying representation.”

Motivation: decouple different types of “sequentialization” routines from the interface of the aggregate object.

Example: a tree data structure, with different iterators providing pre-order, post-order, in-order, and breadth-first traversals.
Iterator pattern

AGGREGATE

AGGREGATE_X

default_iterator*

item*

default_iterator+

item+

ITERATOR

ITERATOR_Y

start*

forth*

after*

...
Iterator pattern: participants

**Iterator**
- Defines an interface for accessing and traversing elements

**Concrete iterator**
- Implements the actual traversal algorithm

**Aggregate**
- Provides a default iterator in the interface

**Concrete aggregate**
- Is linked to a concrete iterator as default
- Makes it possible to implement certain traversals
Iterator pattern: features

- Different traversals of the same aggregate
  - Adding new traversals does not change the interface of aggregates
  - A cursor is the simplest form of an iterator, which only maintains a reference to the current element. The client defines its own traversal algorithm using the other features of the iterator.

- Several iterators can traverse the same aggregate simultaneously

- The features of a default iterator can be included in the aggregate's interface
  - This is done extensively in EiffelBase
Design patterns (GoF)

**Creational**
- ✓ Abstract Factory
- ✓ Singleton
- ✓ Factory Method
- ✓ Builder
- ✓ Prototype

**Structural**
- ✓ Adapter
- ✓ Bridge
- ✓ Composite
- ✓ Decorator
- ✓ Façade
- ✓ Flyweight
- ✓ Proxy

**Behavioral**
- ✓ Chain of Responsibility
- ✓ Command (undo/redo)
  - Interpreter
- ✓ Iterator
  - Mediator
  - Memento
- ✓ Observer
- ✓ State
- ✓ Strategy
  - Template Method
- ✓ Visitor

**Non-GoF patterns**
- ✓ Model-View-Controller
Template method pattern

**Intent**: “Define the skeleton of an algorithm in an operation, deferring some steps to subclasses. Template method lets subclasses redefine certain steps of an algorithm without changing the algorithm’s structure.”

A template method is similar to pseudo-code, where the deferred operations are refined by effecting (implementation) in subclasses.
Example: two-player games (1/2)

defered class \texttt{GAME}

feature \{\texttt{GAME}\} -- Deferred operations

\begin{itemize}
  \item \texttt{initialize} deferred end -- initialize the game
  \item \texttt{play\_one} deferred end -- player one moves
  \item \texttt{play\_two} deferred end -- player two moves
\end{itemize}

feature \{\texttt{ANY}\} -- Status

\begin{itemize}
  \item \texttt{done}: BOOLEAN
  \item \texttt{winner}: BOOLEAN -- True iff player one has won
\end{itemize}

require \texttt{game\_over}: \texttt{done}

attribute end
Example: two-player games (2/2)

feature \{ANY\} -- template method
  play_until_winner
    -- play until somebody wins
  require not_over: not done
  local turn: INTEGER
  do
    from initialize
    until done
    loop
      if turn.is_even then play_one
      else play_two end
      turn := turn + 1
    end
  if turn.is_even then winner := False
  else winner := True end
  ensure game_over: done
end
Template method pattern

May have partial or default implementations (hooks)

Primitive operations exported only to descendants

Primitive operations exported only to any client

exported
partial
or default
implementations
(hooks)

primitive_operation_1*
primitive_operation_2*
primitive_operation_3*
...

template_method+

primitive_operation_1+
primitive_operation_2+
primitive_operation_3+
...

exported
only to
descendants

exported to
any client

* TEMPLATE

+ INSTANCE
Template method pattern: when to use

To implement the invariant parts of an algorithm

To factor out common behavior among subclasses and avoid code duplication
  “refactoring to generalize”

To control behavior of subclasses: only primitive operations should be implemented or redefined
  → **frozen** routines in Eiffel
Classes with template methods can be implemented as components

- primitive operations provided as agents
- disadvantage: fewer static checks of complete implementations
# Design patterns (GoF)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Creational</th>
<th>Behavioral</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓ Abstract Factory</td>
<td>✓ Chain of Responsibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Singleton</td>
<td>✓ Command (undo/redo)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Factory Method</td>
<td>• Interpreter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Builder</td>
<td>✓ Observer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Prototype</td>
<td>✓ State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✓ Strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✓ Template Method</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✓ Visitor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Structural</th>
<th>Non-GoF patterns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓ Adapter</td>
<td>✓ Model-View-Controller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Bridge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Composite</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Decorator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Façade</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Flyweight</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Proxy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Non-GoF patterns:

* Model-View-Controller
Mediator pattern

**Intent**: “Define an object that encapsulates how a set of objects interact. Mediator promotes loose coupling by keeping objects from referring to each other explicitly, and it lets you vary their interaction independently.”

**Motivation**: OO design encourages distribution of behavior among objects. Strong distribution:

- Can result in structure with many connections between objects
- Objects less likely to work without support of other objects
- More difficult to change system’s behavior significantly, since behavior distributed
Mediator pattern: Example

Example:

• Dialog box presents collection of widgets

• Dependencies between widgets (fonts have different styles and sizes; Check boxes are dependent)
Mediator pattern: Example

• Different dialog boxes have different dependencies between widgets
  • Cannot simply reuse stock widget classes
  • Customizing (through subclassing) could be tedious since many classes are involved

• Avoid these problems by encapsulating collective behavior in a separate mediator object

A mediator serves as an intermediary that keeps objects in a group from referring to each other explicitly. The objects only know the mediator, thereby reducing the number of interconnections.
• *Mediator acts as a hub of communication for widgets*

Client calls director to show dialog.

List box tells director that it’s changed.

Director passes selection to text field.

Director gets the selection from the list box.
Mediator pattern: Structure
Mediator pattern: participants

**MEDIATOR**
- Defines an interface for communicating with COLLEAGUE objects

**CONCRETE_MEDIATOR**
- Implements cooperative behavior by coordinating COLLEAGUE objects
- Knows and maintains colleagues

**COLLEAGUE classes**
- Each COLLEAGUE class knows its MEDIATOR object
- Each colleague communicates with its mediator whenever it would have otherwise communicated with another colleague
Mediation pattern: when to use

Use the Mediator pattern when

- Objects communicate in well-defined but complex ways → Resulting dependencies are unstructured and difficult to understand

- Object reuse is difficult because it refers to/communicates with many other objects

- Behavior distributed over several classes should be customizable without a lot of subclassing
Design patterns (GoF)

**Creational**
- ✓ Abstract Factory
- ✓ Singleton
- ✓ Factory Method
- ✓ Builder
- ✓ Prototype

**Structural**
- ✓ Adapter
- ✓ Bridge
- ✓ Composite
- ✓ Decorator
- ✓ Façade
- ✓ Flyweight
- ✓ Proxy

**Behavioral**
- ✓ Chain of Responsibility
- ✓ Command (undo/redo)
  - Interpreter
- ✓ Iterator
- ✓ Mediator
  - Memento
- ✓ Observer
- ✓ State
- ✓ Strategy
- ✓ Template Method
- ✓ Visitor

**Non-GoF patterns**
- ✓ Model-View-Controller
Memento pattern

**Intent**: “Without violating encapsulation, capture and externalize an object’s internal state so that the object can be restored to this state later.”

**Motivation**: want to record internal state of an object (e.g. as checkpoint or for undo). Objects normally encapsulate some or all of their state; exposing it would violate encapsulation, thus compromising reliability and extensibility of the application.
Memento pattern: Example

Example

• An object stores form information
• We allow users to make changes to values in the form
• In case of a mistake, users can revert to the previous values in the form.

Instead of exposing all information of the form object, the form object offers a mechanism to store its state → it allows for the creation of a memento object.

A memento is an object that stores a snapshot of another object – the memento’s originator.
Memento pattern: Structure

- set_memento restores the originator’s state based on the information stored in MEMENTO object \( m \).
- Caretaker calls create_memento before changing originator; stores resulting MEMENTO object.

Diagram:

- ORIGINATOR
  - create_memento
  - set_memento(\( m: MEMENTO \))
  - state

- MEMENTO
  - state
  - memento

- CARETAKER
  - +
  - set_memento restores the originator’s state based on the information stored in MEMENTO object \( m \).
  - Caretaker calls create_memento before changing originator; stores resulting MEMENTO object.
Memento pattern: participants

**MEMENTO**
- Stores internal state of the ORIGINATOR object
- Protects against access by objects other than the originator
  - CARETAKER sees *narrow* interface – can only pass the memento to other objects
  - Originators sees *wide* interface – allows access to all data necessary to restore the state

**ORIGINATOR**
- Creates a memento containing a snapshot of its current internal state
- Uses the memento to restore its internal state

**CARETAKER**
- Responsible for the memento’s safekeeping
- Never operates on or examines the contents of a memento
Memento pattern: when to use

Use the Memento pattern when

• A snapshot of (some portion of) an object’s state must be saved so that it can be restored to that state later,

  \textit{and}

• A direct interface to obtaining the state would expose implementation details and break the object’s encapsulation
# Design patterns (GoF)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Creational</th>
<th>Behavioral</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓ Abstract Factory</td>
<td>✓ Chain of Responsibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Singleton</td>
<td>✓ Command (undo/redo)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Factory Method</td>
<td>✓ Interpreter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Builder</td>
<td>✓ Iterator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Prototype</td>
<td>✓ Mediator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✓ Memento</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✓ Observer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✓ State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✓ Strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✓ Template Method</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✓ Visitor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structural</td>
<td>Non-GoF patterns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Adapter</td>
<td>✓ Model-View-Controller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Bridge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Composite</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Decorator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Façade</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Flyweight</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Proxy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Interceptor pattern

**Intent**: “Given a language, define a representation for its grammar along with an interpreter that uses the representation to interpret sentences in the language.”

**Motivation**: if sentences of a simple language occur often enough, it might be worthwhile to build an interpreter for them.

**Example**: check whether a string matches a regular expression

- **String**: dog dog cat weather
- **Reg. expr.**: ((`dog `|` cat `)) & `weather`
A grammar for regular expressions:

expression ::= literal | alternation | sequence | repetition | `(expression)`
alternation ::= expression `|` expression
sequence ::= expression `&` expression
repetition ::= expression `*`
literal ::= `a` | `b` | `c` | ... { `a` | `b` | `c` | ... }*

Start symbol: expression  Terminal symbol: literal

Given inputs

- regular expression (as an AST)
- a string

the Interpreter implements an interpretation/evaluation of the input (check if string matches reg. Expr)
Interpreter pattern

- Interpreter pattern uses a class to represent each grammar rule
- Each class has an “interpret” procedure
- Symbols on the right-hand side of the rule are attributes of the classes
Interpreter pattern: Example

Class diagram for AST
Interpreter pattern: Example

- Input AST: `((`dog `|`cat `)* & `weather)`
Interpreter pattern: Example

- Create interpreter for regular expression by defining the `interpret` procedure on each subclass of EXPRESSION

- `interpret` takes as argument a `context` in which to interpret the expression; context contains the input string and information on how much of it has been matched so far

- `interpret` for LITERAL: checks if input matches the literal it defines
- `interpret` for ALTERNATION: checks if input matches any of its alternatives
- `interpret` for REPETITION: checks if the input has multiple copies of expression it repeats
Interpreter pattern: Structure

```
CLIENT (+)

CONTEXT (+)

ABSTRACT_EXPR (*)

TERMINAL_EXPR (+)

NONTERMINAL_EXPR (+)

interpret+

expression+

...```

**i**nterpret**+**

**i**nterpret**+**

**i**nterpret**+**
ABSTRACT_EXPR
• Declares an abstract interpret operation that is common to all nodes in the abstract syntax tree

TERMINAL_EXPR
• Implements and Interpret operation associated with terminal symbols in the grammar
• An instance is required for every terminal symbol in a sentence

NONTERMINAL_EXPR
• One such class is required for every rule in the grammar
• Maintains attributes of type ABSTRACT_EXPR for each rule’s subexpressions
• Implements an Interpret procedure for nonterminal symbols in the grammar
CONTEXT
• Contains information that is global to the interpreter

CLIENT
• Builds (or is given) an AST representing a particular sentence in the language the grammar defines (AST is assembled from instances of the NONTERMINAL_EXPR and TERMINAL_EXPR classes)
• Invokes the interpret operation
Interpreter pattern: when to use

Use the Interpreter pattern when

• The grammar is simple. For complex grammars, the class hierarchy becomes large and unmanageable. Parser generators are a better alternative then.

• Efficiency is not a critical concern. More efficient interpreters usually don’t work on the AST but translate it first into another form (e.g. regular expression are translated into state machines)
Design patterns (GoF): that’s all, folks

**Creational**
- Abstract Factory
- Singleton
- Factory Method
- Builder
- Prototype

**Structural**
- Adapter
- Bridge
- Composite
- Decorator
- Façade
- Flyweight
- Proxy

**Behavioral**
- Chain of Responsibility
- Command (undo/redo)
- Interpreter
- Iterator
- Mediator
- Memento
- Observer
- State
- Strategy
- Template Method
- Visitor

**Non-GoF patterns**
- Model-View-Controller
Summary of patterns – Structural patterns

**Bridge:**
Separation of interface from implementation

**Composite:**
Uniform handling of compound and individual objects

**Decorator:**
Attaching responsibilities to objects without subclassing

**Facade:**
A unified interface to a subsystem

**Flyweight:**
Share objects and externalize state
Summary of patterns – Behavioral patterns

**Observer; MVC:** Publish-subscribe mechanism (use EVENT_TYPE with agents!); Separation of model and view

**Command:** History with undo/redo (use version with agents!)

**Visitor:** Add operations to object hierarchies without changing classes

**Strategy:** Make algorithms interchangeable

**Chain of responsibility:** Allow multiple objects to handle request

**State:** Object appears to change behavior if state changes
Summary of patterns – Creational patterns

Abstract factory: Hiding the creation of product families

Factory Method pattern

Intent:
"Define[s] an interface for creating an object, but let subclasses decide which class to instantiate. Factory Method lets a class defer instantiation to subclasses." [Gamma et al.]

C++, Java, C#: emulates constructors with names

Factory Method vs. Abstract Factory:
- Creates one object, not families of objects.
- Works at the routine level, not class level.
- Helps a class perform an operation, which requires creating an object.
- Features new and new_with_args of the Factory Library are factory methods.

Prototype: Use twin or clone to duplicate an object

Prototype pattern

Intent:
"Specify the kinds of objects to create using a prototypical instance, and create new objects by copying this prototype." [Gamma 1995]

In Eiffel, every object is a prototype.

Factory method: Interface for creating an object, but hiding its concrete type (used in abstract factory)

Builder: Encapsulate construction process of a complex object

Builder pattern

Singleton pattern

Way to "ensure a class only has one instance, and to provide a global point of access to it." [GoF, p 127]

Singleton: Restrict a class to globally have only one instance and provide a global access point to it
From Patterns to Components:
   Chapter 18: Singleton

Further reading:

  (Singleton, p 127-134)

Further reading:


Further reading:

  http://groups.google.com/groups?q=dq=&hl=en&lr=&ie=UTF-8&threadm=GJnJzK.9v6%40ecf.utoronto.ca&prev=/groups%3Fd&q%3D%26hl%3Den%26lr%3D%26ie%3DUTF-8%26group%3Dcomp.lang.eiffel%26start%3D525.
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