Subcontracting

Readings: OOSCS2 Chapters 14 – 16

EECS3311 A: Software Design
Fall 2019

CHEN-WEI WANG

Aspects of Inheritance

- ***Code Reuse***
- Substitutability
  - ***Polymorphism*** and ***Dynamic Binding***

    [compile-time type checks]
  - *Sub-contracting*

    [runtime behaviour checks]

Background of Logic (1)

Given *preconditions* P_1 and P_2, we say that

P_2 ***requires less*** than P_1 if

P_2 is ***less strict*** on (thus ***allowing more***) inputs than P_1 does.

$$\{ x \mid P_1(x) \} \subseteq \{ x \mid P_2(x) \}$$

More concisely:

$$P_1 \Rightarrow P_2$$

e.g., For command `withdraw(amount: amount)`,

$P_2 : amount \geq 0$ ***requires less*** than $P_1 : amount > 0$

What is the *precondition* that ***requires the least***? [***true***]

Background of Logic (2)

Given *postconditions* or *invariants* Q_1 and Q_2, we say that

Q_2 ***ensures more*** than Q_1 if

Q_2 is ***stricter*** on (thus ***allowing less***) outputs than Q_1 does.

$$\{ x \mid Q_2(x) \} \subseteq \{ x \mid Q_1(x) \}$$

More concisely:

$$Q_2 \Rightarrow Q_1$$

e.g., For query `q(i: INTEGER): BOOLEAN`,

$Q_2 : \mathbf{Result} = (i > 0) \wedge (i \ \mathbf{mod}\ 2 = 0)$ ***ensures more*** than

$Q_1 : \mathbf{Result} = (i > 0) \vee (i \ \mathbf{mod}\ 2 = 0)$

What is the *postcondition* that ***ensures the most***? [***false***]

Inheritance and Contracts (1)

- The fact that we allow *polymorphism*:

```
local my_phone: SMART_PHONE
      i_phone: IPHONE_11_PRO
      samsung_phone: GALAXY_S10_PLUS
      htc_phone: HUAWEI_P30_PRO
do my_phone := i_phone
   my_phone := samsung_phone
   my_phone := htc_phone
```

  suggests that these instances may *substitute* for each other.
- Intuitively, when expecting `SMART_PHONE`, we can substitute it by instances of any of its **descendant** classes.
  - ∵ Descendants *accumulate code* from its ancestors and can thus *meet expectations* on their ancestors.
- Such *substitutability* can be reflected on contracts, where a *substitutable instance* will:
  - ***Not*** require more from clients for using the services.
  - ***Not*** ensure less to clients for using the services.

Inheritance and Contracts (2.1)



Inheritance and Contracts (2.2)

```
class SMART_PHONE
  get_reminders: LIST[EVENT]
    require
      α: battery_level ≥ 0.1 -- 10%
    ensure
      β: ∀e : Result | e happens today
end
```

```
class IPHONE_11_PRO
inherit SMART_PHONE redefine get_reminders end
  get_reminders: LIST[EVENT]
    require else
      γ: battery_level ≥ 0.15 -- 15%
    ensure then
      δ: ∀e : Result | e happens today or tomorrow
end
```

Contracts in descendant class *IPHONE_11_PRO* are *not suitable*.

($battery\_level \geq 0.1 \Rightarrow battery\_level \geq 0.15$) is not a tautology.

e.g., A client able to get reminders on a *SMART_PHONE*, when battery level is 12%, will fail to do so on an *IPHONE_11_PRO*.

Inheritance and Contracts (2.3)

```
class SMART_PHONE
  get_reminders: LIST[EVENT]
    require
      α: battery_level ≥ 0.1 -- 10%
    ensure
      β: ∀e : Result | e happens today
end
```

```
class IPHONE_11_PRO
inherit SMART_PHONE redefine get_reminders end
  get_reminders: LIST[EVENT]
    require else
      γ: battery_level ≥ 0.15 -- 15%
    ensure then
      δ: ∀e : Result | e happens today or tomorrow
end
```

Contracts in descendant class *IPHONE_11_PRO* are *not suitable*.

(*e* happens ty. or tw.) ⇒ (*e* happens ty.) not tautology.

e.g., A client receiving today's reminders from *SMART_PHONE* are shocked by tomorrow-only reminders from *IPHONE_11_PRO*.

Inheritance and Contracts (2.4)

```
class SMART_PHONE
  get_reminders: LIST[EVENT]
    require
      α: battery_level ≥ 0.1 -- 10%
    ensure
      β: ∀e : Result | e happens today
end
```

```
class IPHONE_11_PRO
inherit SMART_PHONE redefine get_reminders end
  get_reminders: LIST[EVENT]
    require else
      γ: battery_level ≥ 0.05 -- 5%
    ensure then
      δ: ∀e : Result | e happens today between 9am and 5pm
end
```

Contracts in descendant class *IPHONE_11_PRO* are *suitable*.

- ***Require the same or less*** $\alpha \Rightarrow \gamma$

  Clients satisfying the precondition for *SMART_PHONE* are ***not*** shocked by not being to use the same feature for *IPHONE_11_PRO*.

Inheritance and Contracts (2.5)

```
class SMART_PHONE
  get_reminders: LIST[EVENT]
    require
      α: battery_level ≥ 0.1 -- 10%
    ensure
      β: ∀e : Result | e happens today
end
```

```
class IPHONE_11_PRO
inherit SMART_PHONE redefine get_reminders end
  get_reminders: LIST[EVENT]
    require else
      γ: battery_level ≥ 0.05 -- 5%
    ensure then
      δ: ∀e : Result | e happens today between 9am and 5pm
end
```

Contracts in descendant class `IPHONE_11_PRO` are *suitable*.

- ***Ensure the same or more*** $\delta \Rightarrow \beta$

  Clients benefiting from `SMART_PHONE` are ***not*** shocked by failing to gain at least those benefits from same feature in `IPHONE_11_PRO`.

Contract Redeclaration Rule (1)

- In the context of some feature in a descendant class:
  - Use `require else` to redeclare its precondition.
  - Use `ensure then` to redeclare its precondition.
- The resulting *runtime assertions checks* are:
  - `original_pre or else new_pre`

    ⇒ Clients ***able to satisfy*** *original_pre* will not be shocked.

    ∵ ***true*** ∨ *new_pre* ≡ ***true***

    A *precondition violation* will ***not*** occur as long as clients are able to satisfy what is required from the ancestor classes.
  - `original_post and then new_post`

    ⇒ ***Failing to gain*** *original_post* will be reported as an issue.

    ∵ ***false*** ∧ *new_post* ≡ ***false***

    A *postcondition violation* occurs (as expected) if clients do not receive at least those benefits promised from the ancestor classes.

Contract Redeclaration Rule (2.1)

```
class FOO
  f
    do ...
    end
end
```

```
class BAR
inherit FOO redefine f end
  f require else new_pre
    do ...
    end
end
```

- Unspecified *original_pre* is as if declaring `require true`

$\because$ ***true*** $\vee$ *new_pre* $\equiv$ ***true***

```
class FOO
  f
    do ...
    end
end
```

```
class BAR
inherit FOO redefine f end
  f
    do ...
    ensure then new_post
    end
end
```

- Unspecified *original_post* is as if declaring `ensure true`

$\because$ ***true*** $\wedge$ *new_post* $\equiv$ *new_post*

Contract Redeclaration Rule (2.2)

```
class FOO
  f require
      original_pre
    do ...
    end
end
```

```
class BAR
inherit FOO redefine f end
  f
    do ...
    end
end
```

- Unspecified *new_pre* is as if declaring `require else false`

$\because$ *original_pre* $\vee$ ***false*** $\equiv$ *original_pre*

```
class FOO
  f
    do ...
    ensure
      original_post
    end
end
```

```
class BAR
inherit FOO redefine f end
  f
    do ...
    end
end
```

- Unspecified *new_post* is as if declaring `ensure then true`

$\because$ *original_post* $\wedge$ ***true*** $\equiv$ *original_post*

Invariant Accumulation

- Every class inherits *invariants* from all its ancestor classes.
- Since invariants are like postconditions of all features, they are "***conjoined***" to be checked at runtime.

```
class POLYGON
  vertices: ARRAY[POINT]
invariant
  vertices.count ≥ 3
end
```

```
class RECTANGLE
inherit POLYGON
invariant
  vertices.count = 4
end
```

- What is checked on a `RECTANGLE` instance at runtime:

$$(vertices.count \geq 3) \wedge (vertices.count = 4) \equiv (vertices.count = 4)$$

- Can `PENTAGON` be a descendant class of `RECTANGLE`?

$$(vertices.count = 5) \wedge (vertices.count = 4) \equiv \textbf{\textit{false}}$$

Inheritance and Contracts (3)

```
class FOO
  f
    require
      original_pre
    ensure
      original_post
    end
end
```

```
class BAR
inherit FOO redefine f end
  f
    require else
      new_pre
    ensure then
      new_post
    end
end
```

(Static) *Design Time*:

- $original\_pre \Rightarrow new\_pre$ should be proved as a tautology
- $new\_post \Rightarrow original\_post$ should be proved as a tautology

(Dynamic) *Runtime*:

- $original\_pre \vee new\_pre$ is checked
- $original\_post \wedge new\_post$ is checked

Index (1)