Software Design, Modelling and Analysis in UML

Lecture 08: Class Diagrams II

2014-11-20

Prof. Dr. Andreas Podelski, **Dr. Bernd Westphal**

Albert-Ludwigs-Universität Freiburg, Germany

Contents & Goals

Last Lectures:

- completed class diagrams... except for visibility and associations

This Lecture:

- **Educational Objectives:** Capabilities for following tasks/questions.
  - Please explain this class diagram with associations.
  - Which annotations of an association arrow are semantically relevant?
  - What's a role name? What's it good for?
  - What is "multiplicity"? How did we treat them semantically?
  - What is "reading direction", "navigability", "ownership", ...?
  - What's the difference between "aggregation" and "composition"?
- **Content:**
  - Study concrete syntax for "associations".
  - (**Temporarily**) extend signature, define mapping from diagram to signature.
  - Study effect on OCL.
  - Btw.: where do we put OCL constraints?

Visibility Cont'd

The Intuition by Example

$\mathscr{S} = (\{Int\}, \{C, D\}, \{n : D_{0,1}, m : D_{0,1}, \langle x : Int, \xi, expr_0, \emptyset\rangle\}, \{C \mapsto \{n\}, D \mapsto \{x, m\}\})$



Assume $w_1 : \tau_C$ and $w_2 : \tau_D$ are logical variables. **Which** of the following **syntactically correct** (?) OCL expressions **shall** we consider to be **well-typed**?

ξ of x:	public	private	protected	package
$w_1 \,.\, n \,.\, x = 0$	✓	✓	later	not
	✗	✗		
	?	?		
$w_2 \,.\, m \,.\, x = 0$	✓	✓	later	not
	✗	✗		
	?	?		

Context

$\mathscr{S} = (\{Int\}, \{C, D\}, \{r : D_{0,1}, \langle v : Int, \xi, \star, \emptyset\rangle\}, \{C \mapsto \{r\}, D \mapsto \{v, r\}\})$

- **Example**:



$self_D \,.\, v > 0$ ✓

$self_D \,.\, r \,.\, v > 0$ ✓

$self_C \,.\, r \,.\, v > 0$ ✗

- That is, whether an expression involving attributes with visibility is well-typed **depends** on the class of objects for which it is evaluated.

Attribute Access in Context

Recall: attribute access in OCL Expressions, $C, D \in \mathscr{C}$.

$v(expr_1) : \tau_C \to \tau(v)$ • $v : \tau(v) \in atr(C)$, $\tau(v) \in \mathscr{T}$,

$r_1(expr_1) : \tau_C \to \tau_D$ • $r_1 : D_{0,1} \in atr(C)$,

$r_2(expr_1) : \tau_C \to Set(\tau_D)$ • $r_2 : D_* \in atr(C)$,

New rules:

$v(w) : \tau_C \to \tau(v)$ $\quad \langle v : \tau, \xi, expr_0, P_{\mathscr{C}}\rangle \in atr(C)$

$r_1(w) : \tau_C \to \tau_D$ $\quad \langle r_1 : D_{0,1}, \xi, expr_0, P_{\mathscr{C}}\rangle \in atr(C)$

$r_2(w) : \tau_C \to Set(\tau_D)$ $\quad \langle r_1 : D_*, \xi, expr_0, P_{\mathscr{C}}\rangle \in atr(C)$

$v(expr_1(w)) : \tau_{C_2} \to \tau(v)$ $\quad \langle v : \tau, \xi, expr_0, P_{\mathscr{C}}\rangle \in atr(C)$,

$expr_1(w) : \tau_{C_2}$, $w : \tau_{C_1}$, and $C_1 = C_2$ or $\xi = +$

$r_1(expr_1(w)) : \tau_{C_2} \to \tau_D$ $\quad \langle v : D_{0,1}, \xi, expr_0, P_{\mathscr{C}}\rangle \in atr(C)$,

$expr_1(w) : \tau_{C_2}$, $w : \tau_{C_1}$, and $C_1 = C_2$ or $\xi = +$

Example

① $v(w)$	:	$\tau_C \to \tau(v)$	$\langle v : \tau, \xi, expr_0, P_\xi \rangle \in atr(C)$
② $r_1(w)$	:	$\tau_C \to \tau_D$	$\langle r_1 : D_{0,1}, \xi, expr_0, P_\xi \rangle \in atr(C)$
③ $v(expr_1(w))$	:	$\tau_{C_2} \to \tau(v)$	$\langle v : \tau, \xi, expr_0, P_\xi \rangle \in atr(C)$, $expr_1(w) : \tau_{C_2}$, $w : \tau_{C_1}$, and $C_1 = C_2$ or $\xi = +$
④ $r_1(expr_1(w))$	:	$\tau_{C_2} \to \tau_D$	$\langle v : D_{0,1}, \xi, expr_0, P_\xi \rangle \in atr(C)$, $expr_1(w) : \tau_{C_2}$, $w : \tau_{C_1}$, and $C_1 = C_2$ or $\xi = +$



- $self_D \,.\, v > 0$ ⇝ $v(self_D) > 0$ ok by ①
- $self_D \,.\, r \,.\, v > 0$ ⇝ $v(r(self_D)) > 0$ $v(self_D)$ ok by ② ; $v(r(self_D))$ ok by ③ because $C_2 = D$
- $self_C \,.\, r \,.\, v > 0$ ⇝ $v(r(self_C)) > 0$ $v(self_C)$ ok by ② ; $v(r(self_C))$ not ok as $C_2 \neq C$

The Semantics of Visibility

- **Observation**:
  - Whether an expression **does** or **does not** respect visibility is a matter of well-typedness **only**.
  - We only evaluate (= apply I to) **well-typed** expressions.

→ We **need not** adjust the interpretation function I to support visibility.

What is Visibility Good For?



- Visibility is a property of attributes — is it useful to consider it in OCL?
- In other words: given the diagram above, **is it useful** to state the following invariant (even though x is private in D)

context C inv : $n.x > 0$?

It depends. (cf. [OMG, 2006], Sect. 12 and 9.2.2)

- **Constraints and pre/post conditions**:
  - Visibility is **sometimes not** taken into account. To state "global" requirements, it may be adequate to have a "global view", be able to look into all objects.
  - But: visibility supports "narrow interfaces", "information hiding", and similar good design practices. To be more robust against changes, try to state requirements only in the terms which are visible to a class.

  Rule-of-thumb: if attributes are important to state requirements on design models, leave them public or provide get-methods (later).
- **Guards** and **operation bodies**:
  If in doubt, **yes** (= do take visibility into account).
  Any so-called **action language** typically takes visibility into account.

References

[Oestereich, 2006] Oestereich, B. (2006). *Analyse und Design mit UML 2.1, 8. Auflage*. Oldenbourg, 8. edition.

[OMG, 2006] OMG (2006). Object Constraint Language, version 2.0. Technical Report formal/06-05-01.

[OMG, 2007a] OMG (2007a). Unified modeling language: Infrastructure, version 2.1.2. Technical Report formal/07-11-04.

[OMG, 2007b] OMG (2007b). Unified modeling language: Superstructure, version 2.1.2. Technical Report formal/07-11-02.