Abstractions via Mathematical Models

CHEN-WEI WANG

Motivating Problem: Complete Contracts



LASSONDE

- Recall what we learned in the *Complete Contracts* lecture:
 - In *post-condition*, for *each attribute*, specify the relationship between its *pre-state* value and its *post-state* value.
 - Use the **old** keyword to refer to *post-state* values of expressions.
 - For a *composite*-structured attribute (e.g., arrays, linked-lists, hash-tables, *etc.*), we should specify that after the update:
 - 1. The intended change is present; and
 - **2.** The rest of the structure is unchanged .
- Let's now revisit this technique by specifying a *LIFO stack*.

3 of 19

Learning Objectives



Motivating Problem: LIFO Stack (1)

• Let's consider three different implementation strategies:

Stack Feature	Array	Linked List	
	Strategy 1	Strategy 2	Strategy 3
count	imp.count		
top	imp[imp.count]	imp.first	imp.last
push(g)	imp.force(g, imp.count + 1)	imp.put_front(g)	imp.extend(g)
рор	imp.list.remove_tail (1)	list.start	imp.finish
		list.remove	imp.remove

• Given that all strategies are meant for implementing the *same ADT*, will they have *identical* contracts?

Upon completing this lecture, you are expected to understand:

- 1. Creating a *mathematical abstraction* for alternative *implementations*
- 2. Two design principles: *Information Hiding* and *Single Choice*
- 3. Review of the basic discrete math (self-guided)

2 of 19

Motivating Problem: LIFO Stack (2.1)



class LIFO_STACK[G] create make		
<pre>feature {NONE} Strategy 1: array</pre>		
<pre>imp: ARRAY[G]</pre>		
feature Initialization		
<pre>make do create imp.make_empty ensure imp.count = 0 end</pre>		
feature Commands		
push (g: G)		
<pre>do imp.force(g, imp.count + 1)</pre>		
ensure		
changed: imp[count] ~ g		
unchanged: across 1 count - 1 as i all		
<pre>imp[i.item] ~ (old imp.deep_twin) [i.item] end</pre>		
end		
pop		
<pre>do imp.remove_tail(1)</pre>		
ensure		
changed: count = old count - 1		
unchanged: across 1 count as i all		
<pre>imp[i.item] ~ (old imp.deep_twin)[i.item] end</pre>		
end		
5 of 19		

Motivating Problem: LIFO Stack (2.3)

```
class LIFO_STACK[G] create make
feature {NONE} -- Strategy 3: linked-list last item as top
imp: LINKED_LIST[G]
feature -- Initialization
 make do create imp.make ensure imp.count = 0 end
feature -- Commands
 push(q: G)
  do imp.extend(g)
  ensure
    changed: imp.last ~ g
    unchanged: across 1 |.. | count - 1 as i all
                 imp[i.item] ~ (old imp.deep_twin) [i.item] end
  end
 pop
  do imp.finish ; imp.remove
  ensure
    changed: count = old count - 1
    unchanged: across 1 |.. | count as i all
                 imp[i.item] ~ (old imp.deep_twin) [i.item] end
  end
```

LASSONDE



7 of 19

Motivating Problem: LIFO Stack (3)



LASSONDE

- *Postconditions* of all 3 versions of stack are *complete*.
 i.e., Not only the new item is *pushed/popped*, but also the remaining part of the stack is *unchanged*.
- But they violate the principle of *information hiding*: Changing the *secret*, internal workings of data structures should not affect any existing clients.

• How so?

The private attribute imp is referenced in the *postconditions*, exposing the implementation strategy not relevant to clients:

- Top of stack may be imp[count], imp.first, or imp.last
- Remaining part of stack may be across 1 |.. | count 1 or

```
across 2 |..| count
```

- \Rightarrow Changing the implementation strategy from one to another will also change the contracts for **all** features.
- \rightarrow This also violates the Single Choice Principle.

```
9 of 19
```

Implementing an Abstraction Function (1)

LASSONDE

LASSONDE



11 of 19

Math Models: Command vs Query

- Use MATHMODELS library to create math objects (SET, REL, SEQ).
- State-changing *commands*: Implement an *Abstraction Function*

```
class LIFO_STACK[G -> attached ANY] create make
feature {NONE} -- Implementation
    imp: LINKED_LIST[G]
feature -- Abstraction function of the stack ADT
    model: SEQ[G]
    do create Result.make_empty
        across imp as cursor loop Result.append(cursor.item) end
    end
```

• Side-effect-free *queries*: Write Complete Contracts

```
class LIFO_STACK[G -> attached ANY] create make
feature -- Abstraction function of the stack ADT
model: SEQ[G]
feature -- Commands
  push (g: G)
    ensure model ~ (old model.deep_twin).appended(g) end
```

Abstracting ADTs as Math Models (1)



array to its corresponding *model sequence*.

• Contract for the put (g: G) feature remains the same:

model ~ (old model.deep_twin).appended(g)

Implementing an Abstraction Function (2)



<pre>class LIFO_STACK[G -> attached ANY] create make</pre>		
<pre>feature {NONE} Implementation Strategy 2 (first as top)</pre>		
<pre>imp: LINKED_LIST[G]</pre>		
feature Abstraction function of the stack ADT		
model: SEQ[G]		
do create Result.make_empty		
<pre>across imp as cursor loop Result.prepend(cursor.item) end</pre>		
ensure		
counts: imp.count = Result.count		
contents: across 1 Result.count as i all		
Result [<i>i.item</i>] ~ <i>imp</i> [<i>count</i> - <i>i.item</i> + 1]		
end		
feature Commands		
make do create imp.make ensure <pre>model.count = 0</pre> end		
<pre>push (g: G) do imp.put_front(g)</pre>		
ensure pushed: model ~ (old model.deep_twin).appended(g) end		
pop do imp.start ; imp.remove		
ensure popped: model ~ (old model.deep_twin).front end		
end		
13 of 19		

Implementing an Abstraction Function (3)

LASSONDE









LASSONDE

Solution: Abstracting ADTs as Math Models

• Writing contracts in terms of *implementation attributes* (arrays, LL's, hash tables, *etc.*) violates *information hiding* principle.

- Instead:
 - For each ADT, create an *abstraction* via a *mathematical model*. e.g., Abstract a LIFO_STACK as a mathematical sequence.
 - For each ADT, define an *abstraction function* (i.e., a query) whose return type is a kind of *mathematical model*.
 e.g., Convert *implementation array* to *mathematical sequence*
 - Write contracts in terms of the *abstract math model*.
 e.g., When pushing an item g onto the stack, specify it as appending g into its model sequence.
 - Upon changing the implementation:
 - No change on what the abstraction is, hence no change on contracts.
 - **Only** change <u>how</u> the abstraction is constructed, hence *changes on the body of the abstraction function.*
 - e.g., Convert implementation linked-list to mathematical sequence
 - \Rightarrow The Single Choice Principle is obeyed.
- 17 of 19

Index (1)

Learning Objectives

Motivating Problem: Complete Contracts

Motivating Problem: LIFO Stack (1)

Motivating Problem: LIFO Stack (2.1)

Motivating Problem: LIFO Stack (2.2)

Motivating Problem: LIFO Stack (2.3)

Design Principles:

Information Hiding & Single Choice

Motivating Problem: LIFO Stack (3)

Math Models: Command vs Query

Implementing an Abstraction Function (1)

19 of 19

Beyond this lecture ...



• Familiarize yourself with the features of class SEQ.

Index (2)

Abstracting ADTs as Math Models (1)

Implementing an Abstraction Function (2)

Abstracting ADTs as Math Models (2)

Implementing an Abstraction Function (3)

Abstracting ADTs as Math Models (3)

Solution: Abstracting ADTs as Math Models

Beyond this lecture ...