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Mastering Complexity

- The technique of mastering complexity has been known since ancient times: *Divide et impera* (Divide and Rule). [Dijkstra, 1965]

- Benefits of decomposition
  - Partition the overall development effort
  - Support independent testing and analysis
  - Decouple parts of a system so that changes to one part do not affect other parts
  - Permit system to be understood as a composition of mind-sized chunks with one issue at a time
  - Enable reuse of components
Coupling

- Coupling measures interdependence between different modules

- Tightly-coupled modules cannot be developed, tested, changed, understood, or reused in isolation
4. Modularity
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Representation Exposure

- Modules that expose their internal data representation become tightly coupled to their clients
Problems of Representation Exposure

- Data representation is difficult to change during maintenance
- Modules cannot maintain strong invariants
- Concurrency requires complex synchronization

```java
class Coordinate {
    public double x, y;

    public double getX() {
        return x;
    }
}
```

```java
class Coordinate {
    public double radius, angle;
    invariant 0 <= radius;

    public double getX() {
        synchronized(this) {
            return Math.cos(angle) * radius;
        }
    }
}
```
The data representation often includes sub-objects or entire sub-object structures.

In addition to the problems above, exposing sub-objects may lead to unexpected side effects.

class List<E> {
    E[ ] elems;
    int len;
    
    void set( int index, E e )
    { elems[ index ] = e; }

    E[ ] toArray( )
    { return elems; }
}
Shared Data Structures

- Modules get coupled by operating on shared data structures
  - Including databases and files

- Problems caused by
  - Changes in data structure
  - Unexpected side effects
  - Concurrency
Approach 1: Restricting Access to Data

- Force clients to access the data representation through a narrow interface
- Information hiding: Hide implementation details behind interface
- Use interface for necessary checks

```java
class Coordinate {
    private double radius, angle;
    invariant 0 <= radius;

    public void setRadius( double r )
        requires 0 <= r;
    { synchronized( this ) { radius = r; } }

    public double getX( )
        synchronized( this ){
            return Math.cos( angle ) * radius;
        }
}
```
Restricting Access to Data (cont’d)

- **Avoid exposure of sub-objects**
  - **No leaking**: Do not return references to sub-objects
  - **No capturing**: Do not store arguments as sub-objects
- **Clone objects** if necessary

```java
class List<E> {
    E[] elems;
    int len;

    E[] toArray() {
        E[] res = new E[len];
        System.arraycopy( ... );
        return res;
    }
}
```

- **Modularity – Coupling**
Design Patterns

- Design patterns are general, reusable solutions to commonly occurring design problems.

- They capture best practices in detailed design.

- They describe relationships and interactions among classes and objects.
Facade Pattern

- Facade objects provide a single, simplified interface to the more general facilities of a module without hiding the details completely.

- Example: Access scanner, parser, AST node, etc. through a compiler object.
Approach 2: Making Shared Data Immutable

- Some drawbacks of shared data apply only to mutable shared data
  - Maintaining invariants
  - Thread synchronization
  - Unexpected side effects

- Changing the data representation remains a problem

- Copies can lead to runtime and memory overhead
Flyweight Pattern

- The flyweight pattern maximizes sharing of immutable objects

```java
FlyweightFactory
get(key)

if (pool contains flyweight for key ) {
    return existing flyweight;
} else {
    create new flyweight;
    add it to the pool;
    return it;
}
```
Flyweight Pattern: Example

- Java uses the flyweight pattern for constant strings

![Diagram showing the flyweight pattern example]
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Approach 3: Avoiding Shared Data

- Working with immutable shared data is often cumbersome

- Sorting a selection is not supported

- Sorting and Selection can be combined flexibly
Architectural Styles

- Architectural styles are idiomatic patterns of system organization
- They capture best practices in system design
- They describe the components and connectors of a software architecture
Pipe-and-Filter Style

- Data flow is the only form of communication between components
  - No shared state

- Components (**Filters**)  
  - Read data from input ports, compute, write data to output ports

- Connectors (**Pipes**)  
  - Streams (typically asynchronous first-in-first-out buffers)  
  - Split-join connectors

[Diagram of filters and connectors]
Pipe-and-Filter Style: Properties

- Data is processed **incrementally** as it arrives
- Output usually begins before input is consumed
- Filters must be **independent** --- no shared state
- Filters don’t know upstream or downstream filters

**Examples**

- Unix pipes
  
  `grep search-text file | sort`
  
  `sort file | grep search-text`

- Stream processing

  ![Dow Jones Industrial Average 2 Minute Graph]

  Dow Jones Indices: DJI - Feb 15 4:36pm ET
  
  **13981.76 +8.37 (0.06%)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Open</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Volume</th>
<th>Avg Vol</th>
<th>Mkt Cap</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13973.39</td>
<td>14001.93</td>
<td>13906.73</td>
<td>195,667,218</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Pipe-and-Filter Style: Example

- For a stream of stock quotes, compute the 30-days and 200-days simple moving average (SMA) and determine trend
Pipe-and-Filter Style: Example (cont’d)

- **Architecture**

  - We sketch an implementation in MIT’s StreamIt language
    - [http://groups.csail.mit.edu/cag/streamit/](http://groups.csail.mit.edu/cag/streamit/)
StreamIT Language: Filters

```
int->int filter Averager( int n ){
  work pop 1 push 1 peek n {
    int sum = 0;
    for ( int i = 0; i < n; i++ )
      sum += peek( i );
    push( sum/n );
    pop( );
  }
}
```

- Input and output streams are typed
- Work function is executed repeatedly
- Filters may have local state
- Parameter is provided when filter is instantiated
- Each work function declares its data rate
- Filters may look ahead
StreamIt Language: SplitJoins
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StreamIt Language: SplitJoin Example

```c
int -> int splitjoin
dualAverager( int n, int m ) {
  split duplicate;
  add Averager( n );
  add Averager( m );
  join roundrobin;
}
```
StreamIt Language: Composition Example

```
int -> int filter Trender {
  work pop 2 push 1 {
    int a = pop( );
    int b = pop( );
    if(a > b) { push( 1 ); }
    else { push( 0 ); }
  }
}

int -> int pipeline System {
  add dualAverager( 30, 200 );
  add Trender;
}
```
Fusion and Fission

- Fusion reduces communication cost at the expense of parallelism.
- Fission is profitable if the benefits of parallelization outweigh the overhead introduced by fission.
Pipe-and-Filter Style: Discussion

**Strengths**
- Reuse: any two filters can be connected if they agree on the data format that is transmitted
- Ease of maintenance: filters can be added or replaced
- Potential for parallelism: filters implemented as separate tasks, consuming and producing data incrementally

**Weaknesses**
- Sharing global data is expensive or limiting
- Can be difficult to design incremental filters
- Not appropriate for interactive applications
- Error handling is Achilles heel, e.g., some intermediate filter crashes
- Often smallest common denominator on data transmission, e.g., ASCII in Unix pipes
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Problems of Procedural Coupling: Reuse

- Modules are coupled to other modules whose methods they call
- Callers cannot be reused without callee modules

```java
class Controller {
    Sensor sensor;

    public boolean selfTest() {
        List<LogEntry> log = sensor.log();
        for (LogEntry e: log)
            if (e.isError()) return false;
        return true;
    }
}
```

```java
class LogEntry {
    ...
    boolean isError() { ... }  
}
```

```java
class Sensor {
    List<LogEntry> logData;
    List<LogEntry> log() { return logData; }
}
```
Problems of Procedural Coupling: Adaptation

- When modules are procedurally coupled, any change in the callees may require changes in the caller
  - Change in signatures
  - Adding or removing callees
- Example: Display stack trace when breakpoint is reached

```java
class Editor {
    void showContext( ...) { ... }
}

class Debugger {
    Editor editor;
    ...
    void processBreakPoint( ...) {
        ...
        editor.showContext( ... );
    }
}

class StackViewer {
    void showStackTrace( ...) { ... }
}
```
Approach 1: Moving Code

```java
class Controller {
    Sensor sensor;

    boolean selfTest() {
        List<LogEntry> log = sensor.log();
        for (LogEntry e: log)
            if (e.isError()) return false;
        return true;
    }
}
```

```java
class Sensor {
    List<LogEntry> logData;

    List<LogEntry> log() {
        return logData;
    }
}
```

```java
class LogEntry {
    ...

    boolean isError() { ... }
}
```

Loop does not use data from Controller
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Approach 1: Moving Code (cont’d)

- Moving code may reduce procedural coupling
- It is common to even duplicate functionality to avoid dependencies on code from other projects or companies

```java
class Controller {
    Sensor sensor;

    boolean selfTest() {
        return sensor.noError();
    }
}

class Sensor {
    List<LogEntry> logData;

    boolean noError() {
        for (LogEntry e: logData)
            if (e.isError())
                return false;
        return true;
    }
}

class LogEntry {
    ...

    boolean isError() {
        ...
    }
}
```
Approach 2: Event-Based Style

- Components may
  - Generate events
  - Register for events of other components with a callback

- Generators of events do not know which components will be affected by their events

- Examples
  - Programming environment tool integration
  - User interfaces, web sites, Android
Observer Pattern: Structure

Subject
- Attach(Observer)
- Detach(Observer)
- Notify()

ConcreteSubject
- subjectState
- GetState()
- SetState(…)

Observer
- Update()

ConcreteObserver
- observerState
- Update()

forall o in observers:
o.Update()

return subjectState

observerState = subject.GetState()
Observer Pattern: Collaborations

- `aConcreteSubject`:
  - `setState( … )`
  - `notify( )`
  - `update( )`
  - `update( )`

- `concreteObserver1`:
  - `getState( )`

- `concreteObserver2`:
  - `getState( )`
Observer Pattern: Example

- Debugger has a **generic list of observers**
- Debugger **generates event** when breakpoint is reached
- Observers decide how to handle this event (**no control by debugger**)

```java
class Debugger extends Subject {
    ...
    void processBreakPoint( ...) {
        ...
        notify( ... );
    }
}

class Editor implements Observer {
    void showContext( ... ) { ... }
    void update ( ... ) {
        showContext( ... );
    }
}
```
Adaptation: Add StackViewer

- New requirement: Display stack trace when breakpoint is reached

- StackViewer is just another observer

- Debugger does not have to be adapted

```java
class StackViewer implements Observer {
    ...
    void showStackTrace( ... )
    {
        ...
    }

    void update( ... ) {
        showStackTrace( ... );
    }
}
```
Model-View-Controller Architecture

- **Components**
  - Model contains the core functionality and data
  - One or more views display information to the user
  - One or more controllers handle user input

- **Communication**
  - Change-propagation mechanism via events ensures consistency between user interface and model
  - If the user changes the model through the controller of one view, the other views will be updated automatically
Model-View-Controller Example

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>a</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>c</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Change notification
- Requests, modifications

\[ a = 50\% \]
\[ b = 30\% \]
\[ c = 20\% \]
Model-View-Controller Architecture

- View
  - Send events
  - Update view
- Controller
  - Change state
  - Report change events
- Model
  - (Application Interface)
Event-Based Style: Discussion

**Strengths**
- Strong support for reuse: plug in new components by registering it for events
- Adaptation: add, remove, and replace components with minimum effect on other components in the system

**Weaknesses**
- Loss of control
  - What components will respond to an event?
  - In which order will components be invoked?
  - Are invoked components finished?
- Ensuring correctness is difficult because it depends on context in which invoked
Loss of Control: Example

```html
<html><body>
<script>document.Messi = "great";</script>
<iframe src="a.html"></iframe>
<iframe src="b.html"></iframe>
</body></html>

<html><body>
<script>parent.document.Messi = "poor";</script>
</body></html>

<html><body>
<script>alert(parent.document.Messi);</script>
</body></html>
```
Loss of Control: Example (cont’d)

```
<html><body>
<script>document.Messi = "great";</script>
<iframe src="a.html" /></iframe>
<iframe src="b.html" /></iframe>
</body></html>
```

```
<html><body>
<script>parent.document.Messi = "poor"; </script>
</body></html>
```

```
<html><body>
<script>alert(parent.document.Messi);</script>
</body></html>
```

set Messi to “great”

request a.html

request b.html

a.html is loaded

b.html is loaded

alert box with "poor"
Approach 3: Restricting Calls

- Enforce a policy that restricts which other modules a module may call
- Example: Layered architectures
  - A layer depends only on lower layers
  - Has no knowledge of higher layers
  - Layers can be exchanged
Example: Three-Tier Architecture

- **Data Tier** (persistent storage)
- **Logic Tier** (business functionality)
- **Presentation Tier** (user interface)

**Front-end web server**
**Back-end application server**
**Database**
Layered Style: Discussion

**Strengths**
- Increasing levels of abstraction as we move up through layers: partitions complex problems
- Maintenance: in theory, a layer only interacts with layer below (low coupling)
- Reuse: different implementations of the same level can be interchanged

**Weaknesses**
- Performance: communicating down through layers and back up, hence bypassing may occur for efficiency reasons
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Inheritance

- Inheritance couples the subclass to the superclass

class SymbolTable
    extends TreeMap<Ident, Type> {
}

- Changes in the superclass may break the subclass
  - Fragile base class problem

- Limits options for other inheritance relations
  - Not possible in single-inheritance languages
  - May cause conflicts with multiple inheritance
Approach 1: Replacing Inheritance w/ Aggreg.

- Inheritance can be replaced by subtyping, aggregation, and delegation

- The same technique can be used to avoid coupling through inheritance

```java
class SymbolTable {
    TreeMap<Ident, Type> types;
    Type getType( Ident id ) {
        return types.get( id );
    }
}
```
Type declarations

- Using class names in declarations of methods, fields, and local variables couples the client to the used classes.

- Data structures are difficult to change during maintenance.

```java
class SymbolTable {
    TreeMap<Ident, Type> types;
    TreeMap<Ident, Type> getTypes() {
        return types.clone();
    }
}
```
Approach 2: Using Interfaces

- Replace occurrences of class names by supertypes
- Use the most general supertype that offers all required operations
- Data structures can be changed without affecting the code

```java
class SymbolTable {
    TreeMap<Ident, Type> types;
    TreeMap<Ident, Type> getTypes() {
        return types.clone();
    }
}
```

```java
class SymbolTable {
    Map<Ident, Type> types;
    Map<Ident, Type> getTypes() {
        return types.clone();
    }
}
```
Object Allocation

- Allocations couple clients to the instantiated class
- Problem is shifted to clients
- Difficult to create objects for testing

```java
class SymbolTable {
    Map<Ident, Type> types;
    SymbolTable( ) {
        types = new TreeMap<Ident, Type>( );
    }
}

class SymbolTable {
    Map<Ident, Type> types;
    SymbolTable( Map<Ident, Type> t ) {
        types = t;
    }
}
```
Approach 3: Delegating Allocations

- **Dependency injection**
  - The dependencies between classes are defined in a separate configuration file (e.g., in XML)
  - Frameworks use this information to initialize fields (e.g., via reflection)

- **Factories**
  - Delegate allocations to a dedicated class called an abstract factory
  - Different concrete factory classes make objects of different classes
  - The concrete factory to be used is chosen by the client
Abstract Factory Pattern

Client

Abstract Product

Concrete Product1

Concrete Product2

Abstract Factory

Concrete Factory1

Concrete Factory2

make() make()

Creates object
4. Modularity – Coupling

Abstract Factory Example

```java
interface MapFactory<K, V> { Map<K, V> make(); }

class TreeMapFactory implements MapFactory<K, V> {
    Map<K, V> make() { return new TreeMap<K, V>(); }
}

class SymbolTable {
    MapFactory<Ident, Type> factory;
    Map<Ident, Type> types;

    SymbolTable(MapFactory<Ident, Type> f) {
        factory = f;
        types = factory.make();
    }
}

SymbolTable is no longer coupled to TreeMap
```
Coupling: Summary

- **Low coupling** is a general design goal

- However, there are **trade-offs**
  - Cohesion: each module has a clear responsibility
  - Performance and convenience (e.g., List and Iterator access nodes)
  - Adaptability: some design patterns increase coupling to improve adaptability
  - Code duplication

- Coupling to **stable classes** is less critical
  - For example, using or inheriting from library classes
4. Modularity
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4.2.2 Specialization
Change

- Since software is (perceived as being) easy to change, software systems often deviate from their initial design

- Typical changes include
  - New features (requested by customers or management)
  - New interfaces (new hardware, new or changed interfaces to other software systems)
  - Bug fixing, performance tuning

- Changes often erode the structure of the system
Parameterization

- Modules can be prepared for change by allowing clients to influence their behavior

- Make modules parametric in:
  - The values they manipulate
  - The data structures they operate on
  - The types they operate on
  - The algorithms they apply
Parameterization: Example

Source of data is a fixed class

\begin{verbatim}
\textbf{class} Merger {
        \textbf{StringStream} f1, f2;
        \textbf{boolean} toggle;

        \textbf{String} getNext() {
            \textbf{String} res = \textbf{null};
            \textbf{do} {
                res = (toggle ? f1.getNext() : f2.getNext());
            } \textbf{while} (res == \textbf{null});
            toggle = !toggle;
            \textbf{return} res;
        }
    }
\end{verbatim}

Type of data is fixed

Number of sources is fixed

Alternation between sources is fixed

Filter criterion is fixed

\begin{verbatim}
\textbf{class} StringStream {
        \textbf{String} getNext() { \ldots }
    }
\end{verbatim}

Source of data is a fixed class

Type of data is fixed

Number of sources is fixed

Alternation between sources is fixed

Filter criterion is fixed
Parameterizing Values

- Modules can be made parametric by using variable values instead of constant values.

```java
class Merger {
    StringStream[] streams;
    int next;

    String getNext() {
        String res = null;
        do {
            res = streams[next].getNext();
        } while (res == null);
        next = (next + 1) % streams.length;
        return res;
    }
}
```
Parameterizing Data Structures

- Modules can be made parametric by using interfaces and factories instead of concrete classes.

```java
class Merger {
    Filter[ ] filters;
    int next;
    
    String getNext( ) {
        String res = null;
        do {
            res = filters[ next ].getNext( );
        } while ( res == null );
        next = (next + 1) % filters.length;
        return res;
    }
}
```

```java
class StringStream implements Filter {  
    String getNext( ) {  …  }
}
```
Parameterizing Types

- Modules can be made parametric by using generic types

```java
class Merger<D> {
    Filter<D>[] filters;
    int next;

    D getNext() {
        D res = null;
        do {
            res = filters[next].getNext();
        } while (res == null);
        next = (next + 1) % filters.length;
        return res;
    }
}
```

```java
class StringStream implements Filter<String> {
    String getNext() { … }
}
```
Parameterizing Algorithms

- Modules can be made parametric by using function objects
  - Closures (Scala)
  - Delegates (C#)
  - Function pointers (C++)
  - Agents (Eiffel)
  - Lambda expressions (Java)

```java
class Merger<D> {
    Filter<D>[] filters;
    int next;
    Selector<D> s;

    D getNext( ) {
        D res = null;
        do {
            res = filters[ next ].getNext( );
        } while( !s.select( res ) );
        next = (next + 1) % filters.length;
        return res;
    }
}
```
4. Modularity – Adaptation

Strategy Pattern

interface Selector<D> {
    boolean select( D val );
}

class NonNullSelector<D> implements Selector<D> {
    boolean select( D val ) {
        return val != null;
    }
}

Client → Strategy

Strategy1
  apply( )

Strategy2
  apply( )

apply( )

4. Modularity

4.1 Coupling

4.2 Adaptation

   4.2.1 Parameterization

   4.2.2 Specialization
In object-oriented programs, behaviors can be specialized via overriding and dynamic method binding.

```java
class Merger<D> {
    Filter<D>[] filters;
    int next;
    Selector<D> s;
    D getNext( ) {
        D res = null;
        do {
            res = filters[next].getNext( );
        } while( !s.select(res) );
        next = (next + 1) % filters.length;
        return res;
    }
}
```
Dynamic Method Binding as Case Distinction

- Dynamic method binding is a case distinction on the dynamic type of the receiver object

```java
if ( s instanceof NonNullSelector )
    s.NonNullSelector::select( res );
else if ( s instanceof TimeStampSelector )
    s.TimeStampSelector::select( res );
else if ...
```

- Adding or removing cases (method overrides) does not require changes in the caller
  - Client code is adaptable
Static vs. Dynamic Method Binding

- Dynamic method binding has drawbacks
  - **Reasoning**: Subclasses share responsibility for maintaining invariants
  - **Testing**: Dynamic binding increases the number of possible behaviors that need to be tested
  - **Versioning**: Dynamic binding makes it harder to evolve code without breaking subclasses
  - **Performance**: Overhead of method look-up at run-time

Choose binding carefully for each method
- Java: Consider making methods final
- C++, C#: Consider making methods virtual
Replacing Case Distinctions by Dyn. Binding

```java
class Movie {
    static final int REGULAR = 0;
    static final int CHILDREN = 1;
    int _priceCode;
    int getPriceCode( int days ) {
        if( _priceCode == REGULAR )
            return days * 3;
        else
            return days * 2;
    }
}

abstract class Movie {
    abstract int getCharge( int days );
}

abstract class RegularMovie extends Movie {
    int getCharge( int days ) {
        return days * 3;
    }
}

abstract class ChildrenMovie extends Movie {
    int getCharge( int days ) {
        return days * 2;
    }
}
```

Introducing new price codes requires changes
Adaptation to New Cases

A movie needs to change its classification

```
Movie
  getCharge()

RegularMovie
  getCharge()

ChildrenMovie
  getCharge()

NewReleaseMovie
  getCharge()
```
Using Aggregation Plus Dynamic Binding

```
return
_price.getCharge()
```

Movie
getCharge()

_Price
getCharge()

RegularPrice
getCharge()

ChildrenPrice
getCharge()

NewReleasePrice
getCharge()
State Pattern

Context
m(param)

AbstractState
m(param)

ConcreteStateA
m(param)

ConcreteStateB
m(param)

state.m(param);
Case Distinction on Several Arguments

- Dynamic method binding is a case distinction on the dynamic type of the receiver object

```java
if( s instanceof NonNullSelector )
    s.NonNullSelector::select( res );
else if( s instanceof TimeStampSelector )
    s.TimeStampSelector::select( res );
else if ...
```

- In some cases, it is useful to select an operation based on the dynamic type of the receiver object and of the argument(s)
Example: Operations on a Syntax Tree

- Consider a data structures with nodes of different types
- The behavior of operations depends on the type of node it is applied to
- The set of operations is not fixed

Operations
- Type checking
- Evaluation
- Code generation
- Pretty printing
Double Invocation

```java
abstract class Expr {
    abstract void accept(Visitor v);
}

class Literal extends Expr {
    int val;
    void accept(Visitor v) {
        v.visitLiteral(this);
    }
}

class Binary extends Expr {
    void accept(Visitor v) {
        v.visitBinary(this);
    }
}

abstract class Visitor {
    abstract void visitLiteral(Literal e);
    abstract void visitBinary(Binary e);
}

class Evaluator extends Visitor {
    int value;
    void visitLiteral(Literal e) {
        value = e.val;
    }
    void visitBinary(Binary e) {
        ...}
}

class PrettyPrinter extends Visitor {
    ...
}
```
Visitor Pattern

Visitor

visitElementA( ElementA )
visitElementB( ElementB )

ConcreteVisitor1

visitElementA( ElementA )
visitElementB( ElementB )

ConcreteVisitor2

visitElementA( ElementA )
visitElementB( ElementB )

Element

accept( Visitor v )

ElementA

accept( Visitor v )

ElementB

accept( Visitor v )
Adaptation: Summary

- Designing adaptable modules
  - Makes inevitable changes easier
  - Facilitates reuse

- Parameterization allows clients to customize the behavior by supplying different parameters

- Specialization allows clients to customize behavior by adding subclasses and overriding methods