

Software Engineering Design & Construction

Dr. Michael Eichberg
Fachgebiet Softwaretechnik
Technische Universität Darmstadt

Decorator Pattern

Intent of the Decorator Pattern

We need to **add functionality to existing objects**
such that the extension are reusable!


- dynamically, i.e., during runtime after the object is created,
- without having to implement conditional logic to use the new functionality.

The usual way to add new functionality to an existing design is by means of inheritance. But, as we have already discussed, dynamic/flexible extensions are not supported, the extensions are non-reusable, and multiple extensions are hard to combine.

These problems are targeted by Decorator. *Decorator is also suggested to solve the fragile base-class problem, [but is that so?].*


Decorator can be an alternative to Strategy with different trade-offs.

The Structure of a Decorator-Based Design



- ConcreteComponent is a representative for all classes whose objects should be dynamically extensible with new functionality.
- Component can be:
 - an interface that declares all operations of ConcreteComponent objects whose functionality we want to extend dynamically (here represented by operation),
 - a common (abstract) superclass of all ConcreteComponent classes, which implements common functionality.
- Any Decorator is also a Component:
 - Maintains a field comp of type Component
 - Implements the operations declared in Component
 - Default implementation forwards the same operation to comp.
 - Special decorators perform some additional functionality before or after forwarding to comp.

The Decorator Pattern - *by Example*



```

DataInputStream dis = new DataInputStream(new FileInputStream(file));
dis.readUnsignedByte();


```

`java.io` abstracts various data sources and destinations.

It uses Decorator to modularize various processing algorithms that operate on raw data.

Each Variation Defined Once


No Code Duplication



Decorator-based designs share the desired properties of corresponding designs based on inheritance only that **variations are well modularized**. We define one class per variation of base and decorative functionality.

Unlike inheritance-based designs, decorator-based designs yield **variations that are reusable** with any class in the Component hierarchy. Furthermore, **variations are applied dynamically**. (The former property is often the (more) relevant one.)

Using the Decorator Pattern



5

Improved Flexibility

- Decorative functionality can be added / removed at run-time.
- Combining different decorator classes for a component class enables to mix and match responsibilities as needed.

```
is = new FileInputStream(file);
is.read(_);

DataInputStream dis = new DataInputStream(is);
dis.readUnsignedByte();

(new BufferedInputStream(dis)).readLine(_);
```

- Easy to add functionality twice.
E.g., given a class **BorderDecorator** for a **TextField**, to add a double border, attach two instances of **BorderDecorator**.

6

Decorator

Avoids Incoherent Classes

- No need for feature-bloated classes positioned high up in the inheritance hierarchy to avoid code duplication.
- **Pay-as-you-go approach:** Do not bloat, but extend using fine-grained Decorator classes.
 - Functionality can be composed from simple pieces.
 - A client does not need to pay for features it does not use.

7

Advantages of Decorator-Based Designs

A fine-grained Decorator hierarchy is easy to extend.

Decorator helps to design software that better supports OCP.

8


Consequences of Decorator-Based Designs

(in Java)

- Lots of Little Objects
- A decorator and its component are not identical (Object identity)

```
FileInputStream fin = new FileInputStream("a.txt");
BufferedInputStream din = new BufferedInputStream(fin);
```

- No Late Binding




9

- Lots of little objects:
 - A design that uses Decorator often results in systems composed of lots of little objects that all look alike. Objects differ only in the way they are interconnected, not in their interface or in the value of their variables.
 - Such systems are easy to customize by those who understand them, but can be hard to learn and debug. **The responsibility for combining features is put on the shoulders of a library user.**
- Object identity (A decorator and its component are not identical!):
 - From an object identity point of view, a decorated component is not identical to the component itself.
 - You should not rely on object identity when you use decorators.
 - Easy to "forget" the "decorative" functionality.
- No late binding:
 - A decorator and its component interact via forward semantics.
 - **Forward semantics does not ensure late binding** as we know from inheritance.
 - **Delegation semantics is not available in mainstream class-based OO languages.**

No Late Binding Illustrated

Task:

- Extend the design to enable online access to accounts.
- Decorator seems to be the right choice!
- Among other things, we decorate the description of accounts with the label "online".
- The way the history is calculated does not need to be decorated, hence, the decorator just forwards.




The diagram shows a simplified extract of the design of a banking application:


- There are two kinds of accounts:
 - Checking accounts for day-to-day bank transactions.
 - Saving accounts for depositing money with a fixed interest rate.
- Accounts know how to return a string that describes them.
- Accounts declare a method for printing a history of recently performed transactions.

No Late Binding Illustrated

Do you see where we hit the "no-late binding" problem?



No Late Binding Illustrated



Does the call to `printHistory` on `onlineAcc` behave as expected?

```

...
Account checkingAcc = new CheckingAccount(...);
...
Account onlineAcc = new OnlineAccount(checkingAcc);
...
onlineAcc.printHistory();
...

```

Answer: `OnlineAccount` (the Decorator) decorates `getType()`. Yet, since `CheckingAccount.printHistory()` calls `getType()` via this, the execution escapes the decoration of `getType()`.
 Call to `onlineDec.printHistory()`.

- a) Call to `checkingAcc.printHistory()` as the result of the forwarding by the call to `account.printHistory()` in the implementation of `OnlineDecorator.printHistory()`.
- b) Execution of `CheckingAccount.printHistory()`. Call to `getType()` inherited from `Account`, not `OnlineAccount`!

Implementation Issues

- Keep the common class (**Component**) lightweight!
- A decorator's interface must conform to the interface of the component it decorates.
- There is no need to define an abstract **Decorator** class when you only need to add one responsibility.

13

The common class should focus on defining an interface. Defer defining data representation to subclasses. Otherwise, the complexity of **Component** might make the decorators too heavyweight to use in quantity.

Putting a lot of functionality into **Component** makes it likely that subclasses will pay for features they do not need.

These issues require pre-planning. Difficult to apply the decorator pattern to 3rd-party component class.

It is often the case that you do not need to define an abstract **Decorator** class when you're dealing with an existing class hierarchy rather than designing a new one. In this case, you can merge **Decorator's** responsibility for forwarding requests to the **component** into the **concrete Decorator**.

Decorator and the Fragile Base-Class Problem

Does the use of the Decorator Pattern solve the fragile base-class problem?

14

The Decorator pattern is suggested in several books (e.g., Effective Java by Joshua Bloch) as a solution to the fragile base-class problem.

The InstrumentedHashSet again...

```
public class InstrumentedHashSet<E> extends java.util.HashSet<E> {
    private int addCount = 0;

    @Override public boolean add(E e) {
        addCount++; return super.add(e);
    }
    @Override public boolean addAll(java.util.Collection<? extends E> c) {
        addCount += c.size(); return super.addAll(c);
    }
    public int getAddCount() { return addCount; }
}

public static void main(String[] args) {
    InstrumentedHashSet<String> s = new InstrumentedHashSet<String>();
    s.addAll(Arrays.asList("aaa", "bbb", "ccc"));
    System.out.println(s.getAddCount());
}
```

Ask yourself (again): What is printed on the screen?

15

A Decorator-Based InstrumentedSet

1. Declare an interface `Set<E>`
2. Let `HashSet<E>` implement `Set<E>`
3. Define `ForwardingSet<E>` as an implementation of `Set<E>`
4. `ForwardingSet<E>` (our root Decorator)
 1. Has a field `s` of type `Set<E>`
 2. Implements methods in `Set<E>` by forwarding them to `s`
5. `InstrumentedSet<E>` (a concrete Decorator) extends `ForwardingSet<E>` and overrides methods `add` and `addAll`

16

Recipe For Using Decorator

Instead of inheriting from a class `C` to define `EC`:

- Declare the interface of `C`, `IC`
- Let `C` implement `IC`
- If more than one decoration is planned:
 - Let a class `ForwardingC` implement `IC`.
 - `ForwardingC` has a field `ic` that holds an object of type `IC`.
 - `ForwardingC` implements methods in `IC` by forwarding to `ic`.
 - Let `EC` extend `ForwardingC` and override methods in `IC` affected by the extension.
- * Otherwise:
 - Let `EC` implement `IC`.
 - `EC` has a field `ic` that holds an object of type `IC`.
 - `EC` implements methods in `IC` affected by the extension and forwards the rest to `ic`.

A ForwardingSet<E>

```
import java.util.*;
public class ForwardingSet<E> implements Set<E> {
    private final Set<E> s;

    public ForwardingSet(Set<E> s) { this.s = s; }
    public void clear() { s.clear();}
    public boolean contains(Object o) { return s.contains(o); }
    public boolean isEmpty(){ return s.isEmpty();}
    public int size(){ return s.size();}
    public Iterator<E> iterator(){ return s.iterator();}
    public boolean add(E e){ return s.add(e);}
    public boolean remove(Object o) { return s.remove(o);}
    public boolean containsAll(Collection<?> c) { ... }
    public boolean addAll(Collection<? extends E> c) { ... }
    public boolean removeAll(Collection<?> c) {...}
}
=
```

17

An Alternative InstrumentedSet

```
import java.util.*;
public class InstrumentedSet<E> extends ForwardingSet<E> {
    private int addCount = 0;
    public InstrumentedSet(Set<E> s) { super(s); }
    @Override public boolean add(E e) {
        addCount++;
        return super.add(e);
    }
    @Override public boolean addAll(Collection<? extends E> c){
        addCount += c.size();
        return super.addAll(c);
    }
    public int getAddCount() { return addCount; }
}
public static void main(String[] args) {
    InstrumentedSet<String> s =
        new InstrumentedSet<String>(new HashSet<String>());
    s.addAll(Arrays.asList("aaa", "bbb", "ccc"));
    System.out.println(s.getAddCount());
}
```

What is printed on the screen?

18

In this case, the value 3 is printed on the screen. The internal call to add in the implementation of addAll in HashSet does not come back to the decorators (*we have forwarding semantics (only)*); hence, it does not increase the counter.

Using Decorator shields us from problems related to the self-call structure.

Bloch's Conclusion:

The Decorator-based solution is better.

There are only few disadvantages:

- No late binding.
- Tedious to write forwarding methods, „but you do it only once“.
- Efficiency impact of forwarding and memory footprint, but „neither turns out to have much impact in practice“

Decorator and the Fragile Base-Class Problem

Does the use of the Decorator Pattern **really** solve the fragile base-class problem?

19

Ask yourself:

What happens if I add a new method to the interface?

Doesn't the same problems reappear as with inheritance?

Fragile Base Class Related Issues:


- **Adding a method to the interface may escape the decoration** (e.g., imagine a method `add(Collection,Filter)` is added to `Set<E>` and to `ForwardingSet<E>`; after that all compile-time requirements are satisfied, but `InstrumentedSet<E>` does not override the method and, hence, does not update the counter correctly.)
- Adding a method to the interface may conflict (signature) with the methods defined by the concrete decorator.

Other Issues:

- **"Some logic" needs to be reimplemented.** E.g., imagine that a method is added to set a filter (`setFilter(Filter)`) and after that always only those elements are added to the set that pass the filter. Such a change would require to duplicate the logic in our decorator (there is no delegation semantics...).

Decorator and Strategy

Decorator and Strategy share the goal of supporting *dynamic behavior adaptation*.




20

Decorator and Strategy can be used to simulate the effect of each other.

Simulate the Effect of Each Other

By extending the number of strategies from just one to an open-ended list, we achieve principally the same effect as nesting decorators.




21

Example:


- We can use Strategy to simulate data processing decoration of streams.
- Different processing steps can be supported by having the component forward data-processing functionality to a `DataProcessing` object, which in turn may encapsulate another `DataProcessing` object. (`DataProcessing` objects encapsulate data-processing strategies.)

Transparent vs. Non-Transparent Change

Decorator changes a component from the outside:
The *component* does not know about its decorators.



Strategy changes a component from the inside:
Component knows about Strategy-based extensions.



22

Changing the Skin versus Changing the Guts

Decorator can be viewed as a skin over an object that changes its behavior.
Strategy can be viewed as guts inside an object that changes its behavior.

Preferring Decorator over Strategy

The Decorator has two principal advantages over Strategy:

1. **Improved modularity**: The Decorator “infrastructure” does not leave any footprint in the implementation of the decorated object.
2. **Extensible interface**: Decorators can extend the interface of the decorated component “on-demand”; No need to plan an “one-size-fits-all” interface.

Consequently, the decorator is better when:

- We cannot foresee variations.
- It is hard to design an interface that fits all needs of the variations.

Preferring Strategy over Decorator

The **Strategy pattern is better when the varying object type is intrinsically heavyweight**. (Think of the JTable and the Cell Rendering Strategy...)

The Decorator pattern is too costly to apply in this case. A Decorator's interface must conform to Component's interface.

Takeaway Decorator vs. Strategy

- Like the Strategy, the Decorator pattern also uses a combination of object composition and inheritance/subtype polymorphism to support dynamic and reusable variations.
- Unlike the Strategy, it adapts object behavior from the outside rather than inside.
- Unlike Strategy, variations encapsulated in decorator objects do not leave any footprint in the behavior of the objects being adapted.
- In that sense, it has a stronger “inheritance” resemblance than Strategy.

23

Takeaway

Decorator may lead to error-prone and hard to understand designs.

- Many little objects emulate the behavior of a conceptually single object.
- No object identity.
- No late-binding.
- Not appropriate for modeling the variability of heavy-weight objects with a lot of functionality.
- Might not be applicable to third-party library objects.
- **It does not really solve the fragile base-class problem.**

24

A "Static" Decorator

Using mixins we can statically decorate classes (class composition vs. object composition) and also get delegation semantics.

```
trait Component {
  def state : String
  def name: String
}
trait ComponentDecoratorA extends Component {
  abstract override def name = "ByADecorated:"+super.name
}
trait ComponentDecoratorB extends Component {
  abstract override def name = "ByBDecorated:"+super.name
}
case class AComponent(id : String) extends Component {
  def state = name+": "+id
  def name = "A"
}
object DemoStructuralDecorator extends App {
  val c = new AComponent("42") // static decoration
  with ComponentDecoratorA with ComponentDecoratorB
  println(c.state)
}
```

25

Output:
ByBDecorated:ByADecorated: A 42

Assessment:

- Each "Static" Decorator is well modularized, reusable and can extend the original interface.
- We (implicitly) get delegation semantics.
- No overhead (no little objects).
- No dynamic decoration. (⇒ using the same decorator multiple times is not possible)

Task: Apply this example to the Account example.

Ask yourself: Does Mixin-Composition solve the fragile base-class problem?

Further reading: Stackable Traits: http://www.artima.com/scalazine/articles/stackable_trait_pattern.html