

A smart home has many features that are controlled automatically: Heating, Lighting, Shutters, ...

We want to develop a software that helps us to control our smart home.



Location is the base class that declares the functionality that some location can offer (optionally!). Hence, it takes multiple responsibilities.



Assessment

In the prototypical solution all (optional) features are declared by the main interface (Location).

We should split the code, if we want to be able to make functional "packages", such as heating control, lighting control, or security, optional. Consider, e.g., the case that the provider may want to sell several configurations of a smart home, each with a specific selection of features.

How to model interacting/depending features? E.g., a sensor that closes the shutters in the evening and turns on the lights.



So far we are just modeling the basic structure of a building ('House').



Given the shown code/the proposed solution, we can identify several issues:

• class FloorWithLights extends ...

The class should inherit from (CompositeLocationWithLights and Floor) ? (we don't want code duplication!)

• class HouseWithLights extends ...

The class should inherit from ? (we don't want code duplication!)

• Imagine that we have another additional feature; e.g., shutters and we want to avoid code duplication!

Ideally, we would like to have several versions of class definitions - one per responsibility - which can be "mixed and matched" as needed.

... In Java, we have to use a Pattern to solve the Design Problem (there is no language support!)



In Scala, traits are a unit of code reuse that encapsulate abstract and concrete method, field and type definitions. Traits are reused by mixing them into classes. Multiple traits can be mixed into a class (mixin composition).

Unlike classes, traits cannot have constructor parameters. Traits are always initialized after the superclass is initialized.

One major difference when compared to multiple inheritance is that the target method of **super** calls is not statically bound as in case of (multiple) inheritance. The target is determined anew whenever the trait is mixed in. This (the dynamic nature of super calls) makes it possible to stack multiple modifications on top of each other.

The following code snippets are taken from:

- Scala for the Impatient
- Programming in Scala 1.1
- Scala in Depth
- The Scala Specification



Mixin Composition in Scala

 In Scala, if you mixin multiple traits into a class the inheritance relationship on base classes forms a directed acyclic graph.

```
A linearization of that graph is performed.
The Linearization (`Lin`) of a class `C` (`class C extends C1 with ... with Cn`) is defined as:
Lin(C) = C, Lin(Cn) ≫ ... ≫ Lin(C1)
where ≫ concatenates the elements of the left operand with the right operand, but elements of the right operand replace those of the left operand.
{a,A} ≫ B = a,(A ≫ B) if a ∉ B
= (A ≫ B) if a ∈ B
```

Recall: The result of the linearization in particular determines the target of super calls made in traits.



In case of multiple inheritance, the method called by a super call is statically determined based on the place where the call appears. With traits, the called method is determined by the linearization of the class. In a way, **super** is much more flexible.



An abstract type declaration is a placeholder for a type that will be defined concretely in a subclass. In the given example, SuitableFood refers to some type of Food (Food is an upper bound) that is still unknown. Different subclasses can provide different realizations of SuitableFood - depending on the needs of the respective animal.

Remark: Generics and abstract types can sometimes be used interchangeably.



- In Scala objects can have types as members.
- The meaning of a type depends on the path you use to access it.
- The path is determined by the reference to an Object.
- Different paths give rise to different types.
- In general, a path-dependent type names an outer object



What we want to achieve is that:

- Features that are developed independently (such as heating, cooling or lighting) can be (freely) combined
- The solution is type safe even in the presence of new optional features (which requires appropriate support by the available programming language)
- We do not duplicate code (Copy & Paste programming).

Additionally, the underlying programming language should also support separate compilation to enable us to deploy our solution independently.



Note, that the buildHouse method constructs a House object though the concrete type is not yet known.





Though we got the features that we wanted, the code feels like "Assembler Code" at the type level. Scala lacks support for deep, nested mixin composition (i.e., it does not support Virtual Classes/Dependent Classes).



Basically, in the first 4 lines we create type aliases for location, room, floor and house which "fixes" our abstract type definitions. After that we implement the factory methods as required. For the method parameter types and return types, we still use the names of the type definitions.

Example Usage

val r1 = BuildingsWithLightsAndShutters.createRoom()
val r0 = BuildingsWithLights.createRoom()
BuildingsWithLightsAndShutters.createFloor(List(r1, r0))

• For further information search for the Cake Pattern in Scala.

• More advanced language concepts such as Virtual Classes and Dependent Classes would make the solution even easier (much less boilerplate code!)