



Decomposition

Principles of Functional Programming

Decomposition

Suppose you want to write a small interpreter for arithmetic expressions.

To keep it simple, let's restrict ourselves to numbers and additions.

Expressions can be represented as a class hierarchy, with a base trait `Expr` and two subclasses, `Number` and `Sum`.

To treat an expression, it's necessary to know the expression's shape and its components.

This brings us to the following implementation.

Expressions

```
trait Expr {  
  def isNumber: Boolean  
  def isSum: Boolean  
  def numValue: Int  
  def leftOp: Expr  
  def rightOp: Expr  
}  
  
class Number(n: Int) extends Expr {  
  def isNumber: Boolean = true  
  def isSum: Boolean = false  
  def numValue: Int = n  
  def leftOp: Expr = throw Error("Number.leftOp")  
  def rightOp: Expr = throw Error("Number.rightOp")  
}
```

Expressions (2)

```
class Sum(e1: Expr, e2: Expr) extends Expr {  
  def isNumber: Boolean = false  
  def isSum: Boolean = true  
  def numValue: Int = throw Error("Sum.numValue")  
  def leftOp: Expr = e1  
  def rightOp: Expr = e2  
}
```

Evaluation of Expressions

You can now write an evaluation function as follows.

```
def eval(e: Expr): Int =  
  if e.isNumber then e.numValue  
  else if e.isSum then eval(e.leftOp) + eval(e.rightOp)  
  else throw Error("Unknown expression " + e)
```

Problem: Writing all these classification and accessor functions quickly becomes tedious!

Adding New Forms of Expressions

So, what happens if you want to add new expression forms, say

```
class Prod(e1: Expr, e2: Expr) extends Expr    // e1 * e2
class Var(x: String) extends Expr              // Variable 'x'
```

You need to add methods for classification and access to all classes defined above.

Question

To integrate Prod and Var into the hierarchy, how many new method definitions do you need?

(including method definitions in Prod and Var themselves, but not counting methods that were already given on the slides)

Possible Answers

- | | |
|-----------------------|----|
| <input type="radio"/> | 9 |
| <input type="radio"/> | 10 |
| <input type="radio"/> | 19 |
| <input type="radio"/> | 25 |
| <input type="radio"/> | 35 |
| <input type="radio"/> | 40 |

Question

To integrate Prod and Var into the hierarchy, how many new method definitions do you need?

(including method definitions in Prod and Var themselves, but not counting methods that were already given on the slides)

Possible Answers

- | | |
|-----------------------|----|
| <input type="radio"/> | 9 |
| <input type="radio"/> | 10 |
| <input type="radio"/> | 19 |
| <input type="radio"/> | 25 |
| <input type="radio"/> | 35 |
| <input type="radio"/> | 40 |

Non-Solution: Type Tests and Type Casts

A “hacky” solution could use type tests and type casts.

Scala let's you do these using methods defined in class Any:

```
def isInstanceOf[T]: Boolean // checks whether this object's type conforms to
def asInstanceOf[T]: T      // treats this object as an instance of type 'T'
                             // throws 'ClassCastException' if it isn't.
```

These correspond to Java's type tests and casts

Scala

`x.isInstanceOf[T]`

`x.asInstanceOf[T]`

Java

`x instanceof T`

`(T) x`

But their use in Scala is discouraged, because there are better alternatives.

Eval with Type Tests and Type Casts

Here's a formulation of the eval method using type tests and casts:

```
def eval(e: Expr): Int =  
  if e.isInstanceOf[Number] then  
    e.asInstanceOf[Number].numValue  
  else if e.isInstanceOf[Sum] then  
    eval(e.asInstanceOf[Sum].leftOp)  
    + eval(e.asInstanceOf[Sum].rightOp)  
  else throw Error("Unknown expression " + e)
```

Assessment of this solution:

Eval with Type Tests and Type Casts

Here's a formulation of the eval method using type tests and casts:

```
def eval(e: Expr): Int =  
  if e.isInstanceOf[Number] then  
    e.asInstanceOf[Number].numValue  
  else if e.isInstanceOf[Sum] then  
    eval(e.asInstanceOf[Sum].leftOp)  
    + eval(e.asInstanceOf[Sum].rightOp)  
  else throw Error("Unknown expression " + e)
```

Assessment of this solution:

- + no need for classification methods, access methods only for classes where the value is defined.
- low-level and potentially unsafe.

Solution 1: Object-Oriented Decomposition

For example, suppose that all you want to do is *evaluate* expressions.

You could then define:

```
trait Expr {  
  def eval: Int  
}  
class Number(n: Int) extends Expr {  
  def eval: Int = n  
}  
class Sum(e1: Expr, e2: Expr) extends Expr {  
  def eval: Int = e1.eval + e2.eval  
}
```

But what happens if you'd like to display expressions now?

You have to define new methods in all the subclasses.

Assessment of OO Decomposition

- ▶ OO decomposition mixes *data* with *operations* on the data.
- ▶ This can sometimes be good for encapsulation.
- ▶ On the other hand, it increases complexity(*) and adds new dependencies to classes.
- ▶ It makes it easy to add new kinds of data but hard to add new kinds of operations.

(*) In the original sense of the word:
complex = plaited (*tressé in French*).

Thus, complexity arises from mixing several things together.

Limitations of OO Decomposition

OO decomposition only works well if operations are on a single object.

What if you want to simplify expressions, say using the rule:

$$a * b + a * c \quad \rightarrow \quad a * (b + c)$$

Problem: This is a non-local simplification. It cannot be encapsulated in the method of a single object.

You are back to square one; you need test and access methods for all the different subclasses.