FIT5SE1 Software Engineering 1

Lecture 11-12:
Design evaluation & Implementation

Outline


- Design evaluation
 - design review
 - criteria
 - walk through (informal)

Lecture 11

- Implementation:
 - plan: top down, bottom up, hybrid

Lecture 12

- code
- Case study: KEngine implementation



Development process

- Evaluate design
- Plan implementation
- Code the implementation
- Test the code
- Output:
 - (tested) prototypes
 - test drivers



Design evaluation

- Goal: determine whether the design is adequate
- Participants:
 - analysts
 - designers
 - developers

Design review

A technique used to check design specifications against a set of criteria

Tasks:

- verify using symbolic test data
- specify performance constraints when necessary
- discuss support for modifications
- Carried out in two phases:
 - review each component
 - review how the components work together

Design criteria

- Correctness
- Performance
- Modifiability
- Modularity

Correctness

- Correct w.r.t requirement specification
- Common technique is design review
- ♦ Check:
 - sequence diagram against functional requirement
 - class diagram against data requirement
- Check design specification:
 - consistency and completeness
 - rep reflects associations with others
 - operations usage in sequence diagram(s)

Design walk through

- A design review technique
- Walk through the design using symbolic test data
- Two basic steps:
 - identify symbolic test cases
 - "run" the test cases (on paper) through each sequence diagram

Example: KEngine

Engine

Engine()
queryfirst(String): Query
queryMore(String): Query
findDoc(String): Doc
addDocs(String): Query

Symbolic test cases

- ♦ Doc d1 (title = t1):
 - <w1, <d1,6>>, <w2, <d1,12>>
- ♦ Doc d2 (title = t2):
 - <w1,<d2,10>>
- Opening Doc d3 (title = t3):
 - <<mark>w2</mark>,<d3,4>>


Engine()

- Check the exceptional case:
 - failure to read the word file → throws exception


addDocs

- Create 3 Doc objects: d1, d2, d3
- Doc objects are added to TitleTable:
 - <t1,d1>, <t2,d2>, <t3,d3>
- Doc objects are added to WordTable:
 - <w1,<d1,6>>, <w2,<d1,12>>
 - <w1,<d2,10>>
 - <w2,<d3,4>>


sd.addDocs (1)



sd.addDocs (2)




sd.addDocs (3)




queryFirst(w1) (1)

- Query(wt, w1) is invoked
 - looks up w1 in wt and finds <d1,6> and <d2,10>
 - sorts to yeild order d2, d1




queryFirst(w1) (2)




queryMore(w2) (1)


update the current matches to yeild <d1,6> &



queryMore(w2) (2)




queryMore(w2) (3)




findDoc (1)

findDoc(t1) yeilds d1



findDoc (2)



Performance

- Translate performance requirements (if any) into performance constraints in spec
- Performance constraint: an expression over input size(s) or an upper bound
- For example: sort(int[] a) constraints:
 - worst case time = n*log(n) (n = a.length)
 - max storage allocated is a small constant

Modifiability

- The extent to which the design is changed to accommodate a modification
- Crude measure of impact:
 - number of abstractions affected

Example: KEngine

- Modification:
 - store only document URLs not the documents themselves
- Impact measure = 5

Change impact 1

♦ Doc:

replaces body by an URL attribute

Change impact 2

- FullDoc: a new abstraction containing the original Doc:
 - document body
 - words(): Iterator
 - getDoc(): Doc

Change impact 3

- Engine.addDocs:
 - uses FullDoc to parse and process documents
 - pass FullDocs (objects) to WordTable.addDoc and TitleTable.addDoc:
 - store Docs and not FullDocs into the tables
 - discard FullDocs afterwards

Change impact 4 & 5

- WordTable.addDoc
 - change parameter type to FullDoc
 - processes FullDoc but maps keywords to Doc
- ♦ TitleTable.addDoc
 - change parameter type to FullDoc
 - processes FullDoc but maps titles to Doc

Modularity


- Modular design eases implementation and maintenance
- Two modularity criteria:
 - cohesion
 - coupling

Cohesion

- Extent to which parts of an abstraction perform the same task
- Applies to both procedural abstraction and data abstraction

Cohesion of operation

- Performs a single task w.r.t arguments
 - determined based on the specification
- ♦ Two types:
 - conjunctive
 - disjunctive



Conjunctive coherence

Performs a combination of logically related tasks

```
A && B && C && ...
```

- Example: WordTable.isInteresting():
 - conjunctive: two related checks for non-word and uninteresting
 - non-conjunctive if also canonicalise

Disjunctive coherence

- @effects clause states a disjunction of tasks
- Avoid if:
 - operation is not a proper generalisation of the tasks
 - tasks can be separated

Bad disjunctive coherence


```
/**
 * @requires <tt>0 < j < 3 and all
    elements of a are Integers</tt>
  @effects 
    If j = 1
      returns first element of a
    else
      returns the last element of a 
*/
public static int getEnd(List a, int j)
                         getLast(List)
getFirst(List)
```

Acceptable disjunctive coherence

```
/**
  @requires <tt>a is not null && a is not
         empty && all elements of a are
         integers && 0 <= j < a.size </tt>
  @effects 
     if a is a List
 *
      returns element a[j]
     else
      returns the jth element in
      a.iterator
public static int getElement(Collection a,
int j)
```

Cohesion of type

- Each operation is coherent
- All operations belong to the type
 - adequate for common use




Example

- \$\lorenterright\text{Stack.sqrtTop():}
 - returns the square root of the top element
- Should this be defined in Stack?
 - no, because Stack is adequate without it

Coupling

- Extent to which related operations/types exchange information
- Applies to both PA and DA




Coupling of operations

- Operations with a "narrow" interface
- Narrow interface:
 - consisted of input parameters (no global variables)
 - use data abstractions as parameter types where applicable
 - use "narrow" data abstractions where possible

Coupling of data abstractions

- Degree of dependency: strong or weak
- To minimise dependencies:
 - use well-defined design solutions (design patterns)
 - convert strong dependency into weak
- Example: strong to weak conversion
 - WordTable.addDoc(Doc) →
 addDoc(Iterator, Doc)
 - move invocation of Doc.words() out of WordTable (dependent) and pass the result (an Iterator object) in as input

Updated design diagram





Implementation


- Implementation & test =
 - transform design into code &
 - test code
- Implementation in small iterations, in tandem with design's
- Three methods for structuring implementation iterations:
 - top-down
 - bottom-up
 - hybrid

Top-down implementation

- Implement a module before those that it uses
- Applicable if implementation is performed after design
 - required for type hierarchy
- Features:
 - integrate one component at a time
 - use stubs for lower level components
- A stub is a fully specified program unit that has a dummy implementation:
 - empty body or body that returns a default value

Top down example


- ♦ A, B, C, D, E
- ♦ A, B, D, C, E



Class diagram

Pros & Cons

- Advantages
 - early detection of design errors
 - eases testing: test driver re-use
 - early prototypes of the system
- Disadvantages
 - more resource up front




Bottom-up implementation

- Implement a module before those that use it
- Applicable if design is fully completed OR for bottom-level abstractions that are completed early


Bottom up example

- ♦ D, E, B, C, A
- ♦ D, B, E, C, A



Pros & Cons

- Advantages:
 - less resource up front
 - early prototypes of sub-systems
- Disadvantages:
 - late detection of design errors
 - more test driver coding:
 one driver per component



Hybrid implementation

- Mix top down and bottom up to minimise slag time
- Basically a top-down strategy that:
 - uses concrete implementations (instead of stubs)
 where possible
 - components may be partially implemented
- Example: KEngine

Hybrid example


- completed
- ♦ partial 3

KEngine hybrid implementation

- Four iterations producing 4 versions:
 - 1.0
 - 2.0
 - 3.0
 - 4.0
- May be carried out in tandem with design
- A version is a system prototype

KEngine v1.0


- Scope: design iteration 1
- Components:
 - Doc: partial (without stubs)
 - not yet extract words
 - Comm: completed
 - Query: partial with stubs
 - TitleTable: partial with stubs
 - WordTable: partial with stubs
 - Engine: partial w.r.t other abstractions
 - empty query (words assumed uninteresting)



KEngine v2.0

- Scope: design iteration 2, part 1
- Components:
 - TitleTable: completed
 - Helpers: completed


KEngine v2.0



KEngine v3.0


- Scope: design iteration 2, part 2
- Components:
 - WordTable: completed
 - Doc: completed
 - DocCnt: partial
 - not yet implement Comparable interface

KEngine v3.0



KEngine v4.0

- Scope: design iteration 2, part 3
- Components:
 - Engine: completed
 - Query
 - Sorting
 - DocCnt: completed
 - implement Comparable





KEngine

Summary

- Design review helps informally evaluate a design before implementation
- Design is evaluated for correctness, performance and modularity
- Design walk through using symbolic test cases
 - Implementation can be carried out in top-down, bottom-up or a mixture of the two (hybrid)

Questions?