#### CLOJURE MEETUP - 17/05/2017

# CLOJURE.SPEC IN PRACTICE

## GOALS FOR TODAY

Intro to Clojure Spec

Practical examples

What works, what does not

## TOPICS FOR TODAY

Support for generative testing

Contracts vs Types

Entities vs Associations

#### IN THEORY...

# SPECS: THE GOOD PARTS

#### GOALS FOR CLOJURE.SPEC?

Specify shape and invariants on data

Add robustness, keep flexibility (change)

Offer leverage on specification

#### SPECIFICATION ON DATA

```
{:player/blue 24
:player/red 17
:player/green 19}
```

## SPECIFICATION ON DATA

```
(s/def :player/players
#{:player/blue
    :player/red
    :player/green})
```

#### SPECIFICATION ON DATA

#### ROBUSTNESS

Access to run-time values

Access to good granularity

Access to relation between instances

### ROBUSTNESS

```
(s/def :game/board
  (s/every
    (s/every
      :player/players
      :count height)
      :count width))
```

### **FLEXIBILITY**

Avoid the coupling of type systems

Express a commitment, a contract

With evolution of software in mind

#### **FLEXIBILITY**

```
{:game/board board
```

:game/scores scores

:game/transitions transitions}

## WHAT YOU HAVE, NOT CAN'T HAVE

#### PRESENCE VS CONFORMANCE

```
(s/def :game/transitions map?)
{:game/board board
   :game/scores scores
   :game/transitions []} ;;BOOM!
```

### LEVERAGE ON SPECIFICATION

Validation, Instrumentation

Parsing, Destructuring

Generate samples / tests

#### GENERATING SAMPLES

```
(gen/valid? :game/turn turn)
(gen/conform :game/turn turn)
(gen/sample (s/gen :game/turn) 1)
```

#### SPECS IN PRACTICE...

# SPECIFYING OUR GAME TURN

#### EXPRESSING COMMITMENT

- Define a contract with the client
  - Preconditions (never ask for more)
  - Postconditions (never provide less)

Allows change, provides flexibility

#### EXPRESSING COMMITMENT

#### SYMMETRY FORCES FULL COMMITMENT

Need transitions for next-turn

Cannot provide the service without

But no desire to commit to its presence

## A DESIGN SIGN OF BAD DESIGN

Implementation vs Informational

Even if full commitment, bad generation

▶ Best spec is in term of succession => types

# A BETTER DESIGN?

> Separate information from mechanism

Generation with succession

Provide spec for information only

#### SPECS IN PRACTICE...

# ENTITIES VS ASSOCIATIONS

#### A DIFFERENT SPEC FOR SCORES

```
(s/def :player/red
                     int?)
(s/def :player/green int?)
(s/def :player/blue
                     int?)
(s/def :game/scores
  (s/keys :req
    [:player/red
     :player/green
    :player/blue])
```

#### ENTITY VS ASSOCIATIONS

Cannot use the key for other entity

Use key sets for entities (membership)

Use map-of for association

#### SPECS IN PRACTICE...

# THE BINARY TREE CHALLENGE

### THE BINARY TREE CHALLENGE

```
class BinaryTree<A>
  A value;
  BinaryTree<A>Ihs;
  BinaryTree<A> rhs;
```

### ASSOCIATIONS

```
(s/def :int-tree
  (s/cat
    :value int?
    :children
    (s/map-of #{:lhs :rhs}
               :int-tree)
```

#### USING MACROS FOR GENERICS

```
(def-btree-of
   :int-tree int?)

(def-btree-of
   :string-tree string?)
```

#### CLOJURE SPEC IN PRACTICE

# CONCLUSION & LINKS

#### FINDING PROPERTIES

> Spec information, not implementation

Contract system, not a type system

Distinguish associations from entities

#### RESOURCES

- https://github.com/QuentinDuval/ ClojureMeetup-2017-05-17
- https://clojure.org/about/spec
- https://clojure.org/guides/spec
- https://www.youtube.com/watch? v=oyLBGkS5ICk