An Aspect-Oriented Approach to implement JML Features

Henrique Rebêlo Informatics Center Federal University of Pernambuco





Summary

- jmlc problems
 - bigger code, slower code, no support for Java ME, and bad error messages
- Approach
 - aspect-oriented programming
- Contributions
 - smaller code, faster code, Java ME support, and better error messages

Java Modeling Language—JML

- Formal specification language for Java
 - behavioral specification of Java modules
 - Sequential Java
- Adopts design by contract based on Hoare-style with assertions
 - pre-, postconditions and invariants



■ Main goal → Improve functional software correctness of Java programs

Specification Inheritance







Join of Specifications



means

Specification inheritance





means

Specification cases





Separate compilation in jmlc







Annotated Java Source File



Before understanding our approach with AOP...

we will look at the problem

that motivated its use

The failure of JML (user perspective)

- The generated instrumented code is not complaint with Java ME
- The overhead in bytecode size is significant in relation to constrained environments
- Bad performance due to many reflective calls
- Dependence of the reflection API
- Wrong line numbers in error messages

More failures of JML... (implementor perspective)

- Many parts of the compiler code present too many clones
- Generation code is invaded by changes because the generated code is tangled (to the contract enforcement concern) and scattered
- Contract enforcement cannot be understood in isolation
 - reasoning about core class code and contract concern is difficult



Was detected approximately 40960 clone pairs in the jmlrac implementation

Source: CCFinder, 2003. <u>http://www.ccfinder.net</u>

Aspect-oriented programming...

is the solution

to the discussed problems of JML



(Filman, Elrad, Clarke, and Aksit 2005)

AOP is...

Quantification + Non invasiveness

Problems with OO implementation

Tangled code

(tangling)

public class Banco {

private CadastroContas contas;

private Banco() { contas = new CadastroConta (new RepositorioContasAccess());

public void Cadastrar(Conta conta) { Persistence.DBHandler.StartTransaction():

contas.Cadastrar(conta); Persistence.DBHandler.CommitTransaction(); } catch (System.Exception ex){ Persistence.DBHandler.RollBackTransaction(); throw ex;

public void Transferir(string numeroDe, string n

contas.Transferir(numeroDe, numeroPara, valor); Persistence.DBHandler.CommitTransaction(); } catch (System.Exception ex){

umeroPara, double valor) {
 Persistence.DBHandler.StartTransaction();

public class CadastroContas {

private RepositorioContas contas;

public void Debitar(string numero, double valor) {
 Conta c = contas.Procurar(numero);
 c.Debitar(valor);
 contas.Atualizar(c);

public void Transferi(string numeroDe, string n umeroPara, double valor) { Conta de = contas.Procurar(numeroDe); Conta para = contas.Procurar(numeroPara); de.Debiar(valor); para.Creditar(valor); contas.Atualizar(de); contas.Atualizar(para);

public double Saldo(s) ing numero) { Conta c = contas.Proc rar(numero); return c.Saldo; public class DBHandler { private static OleDbConnection connection; public static OleDbConnection Connection { get {

if (connection == null) { string strConexao = "Provider= Microsoft.Jet.OLEDB.4.0; " + "Data Source" + dataSource; connection = new OleDbConnection(strConexae

return connection;

public static OleDbConnection GetOpenConnection() {
 Connection.Open();
 return Connection;

public static void StartTransaction() {
 Connection.Open();
 transaction = Connection.BeginTransaction()

Scattered code (scattering)

The failure of OOP

- Part of the assertion checking code is tangled (to the business concern) and scattered, cannot be reused
- Business code cannot be reused to work with other assertion checking APIs
- Business code is invaded by changes to assertion checking APIs
- Assertion checking policy cannot be understood in isolation

Tangling and scattering of...

Concerns

- Persistence
- Concurrency control
- Logging
- Business rules
- Performance

- Distribution
- Use cases

Assertion checking



Source: AspectJ Programming Guide

Advice in AspectJ provides extra behavior at join points

- Define additional code that should be executed...
 - before
 - after
 - -after returning
 - -after throwing
 - or around

join points

Around-execution example



It is useful when you want to surround the method with extra behaviors Besides *dynamic crosscutting* with *advice*...

- AspectJ also supports *Static* crosscutting
 - change the relation of subtypes
 - add members into classes



The success of AOP

- Assertion checking code is localized, can be understood in isolation, part of it can be reused
- Business code can be reused to work with other assertion checking APIs
- Business code is not invaded by changes to assertion checking APIs
- Less code, more code units

Weaving is used to ...

 Compose the base system with aspects



In relation to our approach...

We use AOP/AspectJ to ...

- Translate JML features into aspects
- Generate bytecode compliant with both Java SE/ME
- Check if the program respects the JML features during runtime

ajmlc: implementation Strategy

Annotated Java Source File



ajmlc: more code units generated...







Add before-execution as precondition



Add after-return-execution as normal postcondition

Add before and afterexecution as invariants

```
class T {
                                  aspect T {
                         class T
                                    before(T obj) :
  int x = 10;
                           int x
                                       exec(!static * T.*) &&
//@ invariant x >= 10;
                         //@ invari
                      _
                                      this(obj){
                                       if(!obj.x >=10){
  void m() {
                           void m
                                         throw new Error();
    body
                             body
                                     after(T obj) returning :
                                       exec(!static * T.*) &&
                                       this(obj){
                                       if(!obj.x >=10){
                                         throw new Error();
```

Research questions

- Does AOP represent the JML features?
- What is the order and relationship between the generated aspects?
- How to check Java ME apps using ajmlc (with aspects)?

The analogy between JML and Aspects

- AspectJ An AOP extension for Java
 - dynamic crosscutting (e.g., before advice)
 - static crosscutting ITD (e.g., new fields)
 - quantification
 - property-based crosscuting wildcarding (*)

execution (* T.*(..))

Identifies executions to any method, with any return and parameters type, defined on type T.

The invariants analogy

(\rightarrow) JML feature as an aspect (\leftarrow) An aspect feature as JML spec

Both JML spec and aspect quantify the same points on type T

Behavioral subtyping analogy

Both JML spec and aspect quantify the same points on type T and its subtypes

Other analogies

- Not limited to:
 - constraint specifications
 - refinement
 - model-programs
 - •

Other quantification points in JML that can be implemented using AspectJ

Before advices to check invariants

- Before advice to check preconditions
- After or around advices to check postconditions
- After advices to check invariants

ajmlc and Java ME applications

To verify Java ME applications, our compiler only generates aspects that avoid AspectJ constructs that are not supported by Java ME

- Avoids AspectJ constructs such as...
 - cflow pointcut
 - cflow below pointcut
 - thisJoinPoint, ...

ajmlc optimizations

- Compiling empty classes
 - ajmlc generates no code
 - jmlc
 - -generates 11.0 KB (source code instrumentation)
 - -generates 5.93 KB (bytecode instrumentation)

jmlc VS ajmlc

JML clauses	jmlc generates	ajmlc generates
requires	yes 🗸	no
ensures	yes 🗸	10
signals	yes 🗸	no
invariant	yes	no

ajmlc provides better error messages

Study

- 3 Java SE applications
 - annotated with JML
 - extracted from JML literature
- We have compiled these programs
 - using ajmlc with two different weavers

 –ajc
 –abc
 - using jmlc (classical JML compiler)

Considered metric

- Code size
 - instrumented source code size
 - instrumented bytecode size
 - Jar size (bytecode size + JML lib)

Results

		ajmlc	
	\mathbf{jmlc}	(ajc)	(abc)
	(KB)	(KB)	(KB)
Animal	28.8	4.8	4.8
Person	27.4	0.5	0.5
Patient	26.2	9.6	9.6
IntMathOps	18.2	2.0	2.0
StackAsArray	55.7	9.2	9.2

ajmlc \mathbf{jmlc} (ajc) (abc) (KB) (KB)(KB)13.317.05.5Animal Person 11.7 2.30.7 25.312.77.4Patient IntMathOps 2.39.395.4StackAsArray 21.723.26.2

Source code

		ajmlc	
	jmlc	(ajc)	(abc)
	(KB)	(KB)	(KB)
hierarchy classes	33.6	18.7	10.7
IntMathOps	20.6	7.5	4.7
StackAsArray	25.2	11.7	6.6

Jar size

Bytecode instrumentation

Conclusion

Benefits to use AOP to instrument JML

- suitability (implementors perspective)
- flexibility (user perspective)
- evidence to be less complex (implementor perspective)
- better error messages (user perspective)
- Answers to research questions
- ajmlc optimizations

Our current Work

 Extendind the ajmlc compiler to treat other JML features (e.g., model programs)

 Supporting assertion checking in a concurrent environment

An Aspect-Oriented Approach to implement JML Features

Henrique Rebêlo Informatics Center Federal University of Pernambuco

