

ECE 473/573  
Cloud Computing and Cloud Native Systems  
Lecture 20 Loose Coupling

Professor Jia Wang  
Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering  
Illinois Institute of Technology

October 27, 2025

# Outline

Tight Coupling

Communication Patterns

# Reading Assignment

- ▶ This lecture: 8
- ▶ Next Lecture: Apache Kafka  
<https://kafka.apache.org/documentation/#design>

# Outline

Tight Coupling

Communication Patterns

# Coupling

- ▶ Degree of direct knowledge between components.
  - ▶ E.g. a client that sends requests to a service.
  - ▶ Cannot be avoided for a system to function.
- ▶ Tightly coupled: a great deal of knowledge.
  - ▶ E.g. to require same version of shared library.
  - ▶ An easy choice for short-term.
  - ▶ Problematic for long-term evolutions – one must change all tightly coupled components at the same time.
- ▶ Loosely coupled: minimal direct knowledge.
  - ▶ Components are relatively independent, interacting through mechanisms that are stable and mature.
  - ▶ Require more up-front planning but easier to upgrade or even be rewritten, without affecting existing systems.

# Forms of Tight Coupling

- ▶ Things that are wrongly assumed to not change.
  - ▶ Modern software engineering practices are based on the assumption that requirements will change frequently.
- ▶ Fragile exchange protocols
  - ▶ Clients and servers communicating via SOAP/XML messages rely on strict formats that cannot be updated independently.
  - ▶ REST messages have less coupling because both clients and servers may choose to ignore attributes they don't understand.
- ▶ Shared dependencies
  - ▶ Require to use specific libraries and even specific versions of libraries for communication, e.g. Java RMI.
- ▶ Shared point-in-time
  - ▶ A request-response messaging creates coupling in time as the service must be available at the time.
  - ▶ A bad choice if users are not waiting for immediate answers.
- ▶ Fixed addresses
  - ▶ Have you ever hardcoded a file path to read data from?
  - ▶ Network services may relocate, and having multiple of them helps to separate production, testing, and development.

# Outline

Tight Coupling

Communication Patterns

# Communications Between Services

- ▶ Via message passing
  - ▶ Shared memory communications are less popular nowadays among servers as they make communication implicit and thus prevent optimizations toward delays and failures.
- ▶ Make use of a contract.
  - ▶ Backward-compatible with existing components.
  - ▶ Forward-compatible with future components.
- ▶ Messaging patterns
  - ▶ Request-response (synchronous): requester (client) issues a request to a receiver (server) and waits for a response.
  - ▶ Publish-subscribe (asynchronous): publisher send a message to a middleware (event bus, message exchange, etc.) and subscribers pick it up later.
- ▶ We will focus on request-response for this lecture and leave publish-subscribe to the next.



# Request-Response Messaging

- ▶ A layered approach where structures can be introduced
  - ▶ TCP/UDP: messages in bytes, need to handle message length for TCP, and ordering and retrying for UDP.
  - ▶ Remote procedure calls (RPC): use messages to provide illusions to call a function on another server by sending function name and parameters and receiving returned values.
  - ▶ HTTP: messages as text, e.g. HTML, XML, json.
  - ▶ REST: messages in json to represent complex data.
  - ▶ GraphQL: json as a query language.
- ▶ Synchronous communications like request-response are easy to reason and straightforward to implement.
  - ▶ Point-to-point
  - ▶ Responses are either available or not, indicating failures that can be handled further.
- ▶ Not ideal for one-to-many communications or when requester needs to wait for long time.

# HTTP Requests in Go

```
// Get issues a GET to the specified URL
func Get(url string) (*http.Response, error)
// Post issues a POST to the specified URL
func Post(url, contentType string, body io.Reader) (*Response, error)
type Response struct {
    Status      string // e.g. "200 OK"
    StatusCode  int    // e.g. 200
    // Header maps header keys to values.
    Header http.Header
    // Body represents the response body.
    Body io.ReadCloser
    // ContentLength records the length of the associated content. The
    // value -1 indicates that the length is unknown.
    ContentLength int64
    // Request is the request that was sent to obtain this Response.
    Request *Request
}
```

- ▶ From the [net/http](#) package.
- ▶ Provide convenience functions like [Get](#) and [Post](#).
  - ▶ That one can call directly without the need to create some objects for the request first.

# HTTP GET Example

```
package main
import (
    "fmt"
    "io"
    "net/http"
)
func main() {
    resp, err := http.Get("http://example.com") // Send an HTTP GET
    if err != nil {
        panic(err)
    }
    defer resp.Body.Close() // Close your response!
    body, err := io.ReadAll(resp.Body) // Read body as []byte
    if err != nil {
        panic(err)
    }
    fmt.Println(string(body))
}
```

# HTTP POST Example

```
package main
import (
    "fmt"
    "io"
    "net/http"
    "strings"
)
const json = `{ "name":"Matt", "age":44 }` // This is our JSON
func main() {
    in := strings.NewReader(json)           // Wrap JSON with an io.Reader
    // Issue HTTP POST, declaring our content-type as "text/json"
    resp, err := http.Post("http://example.com/upload", "text/json", in)
    if err != nil {
        panic(err)
    }
    defer resp.Body.Close()                // Close your response!
    message, err := io.ReadAll(resp.Body)
    if err != nil {
        panic(err)
    }
    fmt.Printf(string(message))
}
```

# Remote Procedure Calls (RPC) with gRPC

- ▶ gRPC is a full-featured data exchange framework.
  - ▶ Open sourced in 2015 by Google, and with CNCF from 2017.
  - ▶ A modern RPC solution as an alternative to RESTful services.
- ▶ Advantages
  - ▶ Conciseness: more compact than json, less network I/O.
  - ▶ Speed: binary format is much faster to produce and consume.
  - ▶ Strong-typing: avoid conversions, easier for troubleshooting.
  - ▶ Feature-rich: e.g. authentication, encryption, timeout, and compression.
- ▶ Disadvantages
  - ▶ Contract-driven: more coupling, less suitable for external facing services.
  - ▶ Binary format: not human-readable, complicating troubleshooting.

# gRPC Message Definition

```
syntax = "proto3";  
option go_package = "github.com/cloud-native-go/ch08/keyvalue";  
message GetRequest {  
    string key = 1;  
}  
message GetResponse {  
    string value = 1;  
}  
message PutRequest {  
    string key = 1;  
    string value = 2;  
}  
message PutResponse {}  
message DeleteRequest {  
    string key = 1;  
}  
message DeleteResponse {}
```

- ▶ Make use of protocol buffers, fairly straightforward to follow.
- ▶ The protocol compiler generates code for clients and servers.
  - ▶ Available for most programming languages.

# gRPC Service Definition

```
service KeyValue {  
    rpc Get(GetRequest) returns (GetResponse);  
    rpc Put(PutRequest) returns (PutResponse);  
    rpc Delete(DeleteRequest) returns (DeleteResponse);  
}
```

- ▶ A service consists of a group of methods.
- ▶ Define an interface without providing implementations.
  - ▶ Methods are used in the client program with your choice of programming language.
  - ▶ Methods are implemented in the server program with your choice of programming language.
  - ▶ Clients and servers can use different programming languages.

# Implementing gRPC Server

```
// generated server interface to be implemented
type KeyValueServer interface {
    Get(context.Context, *GetRequest) (*GetResponse, error)
    Put(context.Context, *PutRequest) (*PutResponse, error)
    Delete(context.Context, *DeleteRequest) (*PutResponse, error)
}

// server.go
... // package, import etc.
type server struct {
    pb.UnimplementedKeyValueServer // embed the generated struct
}
func (s *server) Get(ctx context.Context, r *pb.GetRequest) (*pb.GetResponse, error) {
    log.Printf("Received GET key=%v", r.Key)
    value, err := Get(r.Key)
    return &pb.GetResponse{Value: value}, err
}
... // Put, Delete, etc.
```



# Implementing gRPC Server (cont.)

```
...  
func main() {  
    // Create a gRPC server and register our KeyValueServer with it  
    s := grpc.NewServer()  
    pb.RegisterKeyValueServer(s, &server{})  
    // Open a listening port on 50051  
    lis, err := net.Listen("tcp", ":50051")  
    if err != nil {  
        log.Fatalf("failed to listen: %v", err)  
    }  
    // Start accepting connections on the listening port  
    if err := s.Serve(lis); err != nil {  
        log.Fatalf("failed to serve: %v", err)  
    }  
}
```

# Implementing gRPC Client

```
// generated client interface to be used
type KeyValueClient interface {
    Get(ctx context.Context, in *GetRequest, opts ...grpc.CallOption) (*GetResponse, error)
    Put(ctx context.Context, in *PutRequest, opts ...grpc.CallOption) (*PutResponse, error)
    Delete(ctx context.Context, in *DeleteRequest, opts ...grpc.CallOption) (*PutResponse, error)
}

// client.go
... // package, import etc.
func main() {
    // Set up a connection to the gRPC server
    conn, err := grpc.Dial("localhost:50051", grpc.WithInsecure(),
        grpc.WithBlock(), grpc.WithTimeout(time.Second))
    ... // error handling
    defer conn.Close()
    // Get a new instance of our client
    client := pb.NewKeyValueClient(conn)
    ...
}
```

# Implementing gRPC Client (cont.)

```
...
var action, key, value string
if len(os.Args) > 2 {
    action, key = os.Args[1], os.Args[2]
    value = strings.Join(os.Args[3:], " ")
}
// Use context to establish a 1-second timeout.
ctx, cancel := context.WithTimeout(context.Background(), time.Second)
defer cancel()
switch action {
case "get":
    r, err := client.Get(ctx, &pb.GetRequest{Key: key})
    ... // error handling
    log.Printf("Get %s returns: %s", key, r.Value)
case "put":
    _, err := client.Put(ctx, &pb.PutRequest{Key: key, Value: value})
    ... // error handling
    log.Printf("Put %s", key)
default:
    log.Fatalf("Syntax: go run [get|put] KEY VALUE...")
}
}
```

# Summary

- ▶ Coupling is unavoidable.
- ▶ But we can keep it minimal with a good choice of communication patterns.