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The Design Phase

- “Programming in the large”
- **GOAL:** transform results of analysis (requirements specification, product model) into a *software architecture*
- decomposition into components
- SW architecture \( \hat{=} \) components and connectors
- component
  - designated computational unit with specified interface
  - Examples: client, server, filter, layer, database
- connector
  - interaction point between components
  - Examples: procedure call, event broadcast, pipe
Architectural Styles — Overview

Dataflow systems
   Batch sequential, Pipes and filters

Call-and-return systems
   Main program and subroutine, OO systems, Hierarchical layers

Independent components
   Communicating processes, Event systems

Virtual machines
   Interpreters, Rule-based systems

Data-centered systems (repositories)
   Databases, Hypertext systems, Blackboards

(according to Shaw and Garlan, Software Architecture, Prentice Hall)
Classification of an Architectural Style

- design vocabulary—types of components and connectors
- allowable structural patterns
- underlying computational model (semantic model)
- essential invariants
- common examples of use
- advantages/disadvantages
- common specializations
Architecture: Batch Sequential

- separate passes
- each runs to completion before the next starts
- Example: traditional compiler architecture
Pipes and Filters

- each component (filter) transforms input streams to output streams incrementally
- buffered channels (pipes) connect inputs to outputs
- filters are independent entities
- common specializations: pipeline (linear sequence of filters), bounded pipes, typed pipes
Properties of Pipes and Filters

+ global understanding supported
+ reuse supported
+ easy to maintain and enhance
+ specialized analysis supported
+ potential for concurrent execution
  - interactive applications
  - correspondences between streams
  - common format for data transmission
Object-Oriented Organization

- components: objects, connectors: method invocation
- each object is responsible for its integrity
- each object’s representation is hidden
Properties of OO Organization

+ implementation can be changed without affecting clients
+ bundling of operations with data
  - objects must know their interaction partners (contrast with filters!)
Event-based, Implicit Invocation

- also called *reactive integration* or *selective broadcast*
- each component may
  - announce events
  - register an interest in certain events, associated with a callback
- when event occurs, the system invokes all registered callbacks
⇒ announcer of event does not know which components are registered
- order of callback invocation cannot be assumed
- applications: integration of tools, maintaining consistency constraints, incremental checking
Properties of Implicit Invocation

- strongly supports reuse
- eases system evolution
  - lack of control
  - data passed through shared repository
  - correctness?
Layered Systems

- hierarchy of system components, grouped in layers
- inside of layer: arbitrary access between components
- between layers
  - access restricted to lower layers: linear, strict, treeshaped
  - small interfaces
- **advantages:** clarity, reusability, maintainability, testability
- **disadvantages:** not always appropriate, loss of efficiency, no restrictions inside layers
- examples: communication protocols (OSI), database systems, operating systems
Typical Setup

- **I/O layer**
  - dialogue layer
  - application specific
  - application general
- **logical data access**
- **physical data access**

**user interface**

**application**

**data management**
Example: Three-Tier Architecture

- Three kinds of subsystems
  - user interface
  - control
  - database

- Enables consistent look-and-feel
- Useful with single data repository
- Web architecture: Browser, Webserver, Applicationserver
Repositories

- central data structure (current state)
- independent components acting on it
- Example: architecture of modern compiler
Interpreters

- virtual machine in software
- pseudoprogram + interpretation engine
- Example: a programming language
Further Architectural Styles

- Distributed processes
  - topological features
  - interprocess protocols
  - client-server organization
- Main program/subroutine: mirroring the programming language
- Domain specific SW architectures
  - tailored to family of applications
  - Examples: avionics, vehicle management, . . .
- State transition systems
- Combinations of architectural styles
  - hierarchically
  - mixture of connectors
Developing a Software Architecture

- The choice of a software architecture is a far reaching decision that can influence the effort required to change the system later on.
- Criteria for decomposition
- A case study (Parnas)
Criteria for decomposition

- Major processing activity: business rules, user interface, database access, system dependencies
- Consistent abstraction
- Information hiding: encapsulate a design decision or hide complexity e.g., input format, data layout, choice of algorithm, computed data vs. stored data, ...
- Anticipate change
- Maximize cohesion: all elements of a component should contribute to the performance of a single function
- Minimize coupling: component only receives data essential for performing its function
Cohesion

- qualitative measure of dependency of items within a single component
- kinds of cohesion
  - Coincidental Cohesion: (Worst) Component performs multiple unrelated actions
  - Logical Cohesion: Elements perform similar activities as selected from outside component
  - Temporal Cohesion: Elements are related in time (e.g. initialization() or FatalErrorShutdown())
  - Procedural Cohesion: Elements involved in different but sequential activities
  - Communicational Cohesion: Elements involved in different activities based on same input info
  - Sequential Cohesion: Output from one function is input to next (pipeline)
  - Informational Cohesion: Independent actions on same data structure
  - Functional Cohesion: All elements contribute to a single, well-defined task
Coupling

- qualitative measure of interdependence of a collection of components
- kinds of coupling
  - Content Coupling: (worst) component directly references data in another
  - Control Coupling: 2 components communicating with a control flag
  - Common Coupling: 2 components communicating via global data
  - Stamp Coupling: Communicating via a data structure passed as a parameter. The data structure holds more information than the recipient needs.
  - Data Coupling: (best) Communicating via parameter passing. The parameters passed are only those that the recipient needs.
  - No coupling: independent components.
The KWIC index system accepts an ordered set of lines, each line is an ordered set of words, and each word is an ordered set of characters. Any line may be “circularly shifted” by repeatedly removing the first word and appending it at the end of the line. The KWIC index system outputs a listing of all circular shifts of all lines in alphabetical order.

David L. Parnas.
On the criteria to be used in decomposing systems into modules. 
Communications of the ACM, 15(12):1053-1058, December 1972

- Classical problem with practical applications
- Here: four different designs
- Assessment
Guidelines for Assessment

Is the architecture amenable to . . .

- Changes in processing algorithm
  Example: line shifting
- Changes in data representation
- Enhancement to system function
  Example: noise words, interactive
- Reuse
- Good performance
Solution 1: Main program/subroutine with shared data

- Four basic functions: input, shift, alphabetize, and output
- Subroutines coordinated by main program
- Shared storage with unconstrained access
  (why does this work?)
Solution 1: Assessment

+ efficient data representation
+ distinct computational aspects are isolated in different modules

but serious drawbacks in terms of its ability to handle changes
− change in data storage format will affect almost all of the modules
− similarly: changes in algorithm and enhancements to system function
− reuse is not well-supported because each module of the system is tied tightly to this particular application
Solution 2: Abstract data types

- decomposition into five modules
- data no longer shared
- access through procedural interfaces
Solution 2: Assessment

Same processing modules as the first solution, but better amenable to change.

+ algorithms and data representations can be changed in individual modules without affecting others
+ reuse is better supported because modules make fewer assumptions about the others with which they interact

– not well suited to enhancements: to add new functionality
  ▶ modify the existing modules—compromising their simplicity and integrity—or
  ▶ add new modules that lead to performance penalties.
Solution 3: Implicit Invocation

- component integration based on shared data
- but abstract access to data
- operations invoked implicitly as data is modified

```
Input
Circular shift
Alphabetizer
Output
```

```
\begin{itemize}
\item Input medium
\item Lines insert delete \(i\)th
\item Master control
\item Implicit invocation
\item Subprogram call
\item System I/O
\end{itemize}
```

```
Output medium
```

```
Input

\begin{itemize}
\item Input medium
\item Lines insert delete \(i\)th
\end{itemize}
```

```
Circular shift

\begin{itemize}
\item insert
\item delete
\item \(i\)th
\end{itemize}
```

```
Alphabetizer

\begin{itemize}
\item insert
\item delete
\item \(i\)th
\end{itemize}
```

```
Output

\begin{itemize}
\item Output medium
\end{itemize}
```
Solution 3: Assessment

+ functional enhancements easy: register additional modules
+ computations insulated from changes in data representation
+ supports reuse since modules only rely on externally triggered events
  - processing order difficult to control
  - requires more space than previous decompositions
Solution 4: Pipes and Filters

- four filters: input, shift, alphabetize, output
- distributed control
- data sharing limited to pipes

![Diagram of pipes and filters]
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Solution 4: Assessment

+ intuitive flow of processing
+ supports reuse: each filter usable in isolation
+ supports enhancements: new filters are easily incorporated
+ amenable to modification: each filter is independent of the others
  - impossible to support an interactive system
  - inefficient use of space
  - overhead for parsing and unparsing data
## Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Change in Algorithm</th>
<th>Shared Data</th>
<th>Abstract Data Type</th>
<th>Implicit Invocation</th>
<th>Pipe and Filter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>−</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in Data Rep</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>−</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in Function</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>−</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reuse</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>