State pattern

- Problem
  - An object is always in one of several known states
  - The state an object is in determines the behavior of several methods

- Solution
  - Could use if/case statements in each method
  - Better: use dynamic dispatch

State pattern Approach

- Encode different states as objects with the same superclass
- To change state, change the state object
- Methods delegate to state object

FSM Example – cont.

```java
class State1 implements State {
    static State1 instance = new State1();
    private State1() {}
    public State move(char c) {
        switch(c) {
            case 'a': return State2.instance;
            case 'b': return State1.instance;
            default: throw new IllegalArgumentException();
        }
    }
    public boolean accept() { return false; }
}
class State2 implements State {
    static State2 instance = new State2();
    private State2() {}
    public State move(char c) {
        switch(c) {
            case 'a': return State1.instance;
            case 'b': return State1.instance;
            default: throw new IllegalArgumentException();
        }
    }
    public boolean accept() { return true; }
}
```

Example – Finite State Machine

```java
class FSM {
    State state;
    FSM(State s) { state = s; }
    public void move(char c) { state = state.move(c); }
    public boolean accept() { return state.accept(); }
}
```

Structure of State pattern

Instance of State Pattern
State pattern notes

- Can use singletons for instances of each state class
  - State objects don’t encapsulate (mutable) state, so can be shared
- Easy to add new states
  - New states can extend the base class, or
  - New states can extend other states
    - Override only selected functions

More OMT Notation

- Arrow beginning with diamond
  - “part-of” or aggregation
  - Only accessed by object pointing to it
- Arrow ending in filled circle
  - More than one

Design Issues

- Representation and manipulation of document
- Formatting a document
- Adding scroll bars and borders to Lexi windows
- Support multiple look and feel standards
  - Motif and Presentation Manager (!)
- Handle multiple windowing systems
- Support user operations
- Advanced features
  - spell-checking and hyphenation

Lexi: Simple GUI-Based Editor

- Lexi is a WYSIWYG editor
  - supports documents with textual and graphical objects
  - scroll bars to select portions of the document
  - be easy to port to another platform
  - support multiple look-and-feel interfaces
- Highlights several OO design issues
- Case study of design patterns in the design of Lexi

Structure of a Lexi Document

- Goals:
  - store text and graphics in document
  - generate visual display
  - maintain info about location of display elements
- Caveats:
  - treat different objects uniformly
    - e.g., text, pictures, graphics
  - treat individual objects and groups of objects uniformly
    - e.g., characters and lines of text
Structure of a Lexi Document

- Use recursive composition for defining and handling complex objects
  - Abstract class Glyph for all displayed objects
  - Glyph responsibilities:
    - know how to draw itself
    - knows what space it occupies
    - knows its children and parent
  - Glyph instances can recursively compose other Glyph instances

The Composite Pattern

- Motivation:
  - support recursive composition in such a way that a client need not know the difference between a single and a composite object (as with Glyphs)
- Applicability:
  - when dealing with hierarchically-organized objects (e.g., columns containing rows containing words …)

Recursive Composition

Composite Pattern Structure

Glyph Class Diagram

Composite Pattern Consequences

- Class hierarchy has both simple and composite objects
- Simplifies clients
- Aids extensibility
  - clients do not have to be modified
- Too general a pattern?
  - difficult to to restrict functionality of concrete leaf subclasses
Formatting Lexi Documents: Strategy

- We know that documents are represented as Glyphs, but not how documents are constructed.
- Formatting:
  - Document structure will be determined based on rules for justification, margins, line breaking, etc.
  - Many good algorithms exist.
  - Different trade-offs between quality and speed
- Design decision: implement different algorithms, decide at run-time which algorithm to use
  - Define root class that supports many algorithms
  - Each algorithm implemented in a subclass

Strategy Pattern

- Name
  - Strategy (aka Policy)
- Applicability
  - Many related classes differ only in their behavior
  - Many different variants of an algorithm
  - Need to encapsulate algorithmic information

Lexi: Using Strategy

- Compositor and Composition classes
  - Compositor: class encapsulating formatting algorithm
    - Pass Composition objects to be formatted as parameters to Compositor methods
  - Composition: things being formatted
    - Glyph subclass
    - Each Composition object refers to its Compositor object
    - When a Composition needs to format itself, it sends a message to its Compositor instance

Strategy Pattern: Consequences

- Clear separation of algorithm definition and use
  - Glyphs and formatting algorithms are independent
  - Alternative (many subclasses) is unappealing
    - Proliferation of classes
    - Algorithms cannot be changed dynamically
- Elimination of conditional statements
  - Like State, Template, ...
  - Typical in OO programming

Strategy Pattern: Consequences (cont’d)

- Clients must be aware of different strategies
  - When initializing objects
- Proliferation of instances at run time
  - Each Glyph has a strategy object with formatting information
  - If strategy is stateless, share strategy objects
Adding Scroll Bars and Borders: Decorator

- How to define classes for scrollbars and borders?
- Define as subclasses of Glyph
  - Scrollbars and borders are displayable objects
  - Will use notion of transparent enclosure
    - Clients don’t need to know whether they are dealing with a component or with an enclosure
  - Inheritance increases number of classes
    - Use composition instead (“has a”)

Changing look-and-feel: Abstract Factory

- Goal: easily change Lexi’s look and feel
  - When new libraries are available (future variability)
  - At run-time by switching between them (present variability)
- Thoughtless implementation technique:
  - use distinct class for each widget and standard
  - let clients handle different instances for each standard
    - Button pb = new MotifButton(); // bad
**Abstracting Creation**

- Concrete Creation problems:
  - Class of object is fixed at compile-time
    - can’t change standard at run-time
  - Changing the class means making changes all over the code
- Instead:
  - Use a class to create abstract classes:
    - `Button pb = guiFactory.createButton();` // better

**Solution: Use Abstract Factory**

- Define abstract class GUIFactory with creation methods for widgets
  - Concrete subclasses of GUIFactory actually define creation methods for each look-and-feel standard
    - MotifFactory, MacFactory, etc.
  - Specialize each widget into subclasses for each look-and-feel standard
- Thus, can easily change the kind of factory without changes all over the place

**Abstract Factory pattern**

- **Name**
  - Abstract Factory or Kit
- **Applicability**
  - different families of components (products)
  - must be used in mutually exclusive and consistent way
  - hide existence of multiple families from clients
Abstract Factory: Consequences

- Isolate instance creation and handling from clients
- Can easily change look and feel standard
  - Reassign a global variable;
  - Recompute and redisplay the interface
- Enforce consistency among products in each family
- Adding to family of products is difficult
  - Have to update factory abstract class and all concrete classes