

But the Language
Supports it

Good morning everyone and thank you for being here.

aakash
dharmadhikari



aakashd

I do my open source here



@aakashd

Albeit intermittently I tweet here

niranjan paranjape

This is Niranjan



achamian

you can find his open source contribution here



@niranjan_p

he tweets here



42 Engineering

<http://github.com/c42>

GOTO :context

design discussion

criticising
discuss design or architecture
trivial part of the system or whole codebase

If there is one common thing that we all love, it's criticising code. We discuss the design or if you excuse me "the architecture" of the system we are working on. It may be a trivial part of the system or it might impact the whole codebase. The fact is we like to talk.

debate

Some time these discussions lead to a debate

rational arguments

To begin with rational arguments are presented by everyone involved to justify why certain thing should or should not be done. Points are put forward, counter-points are offered and merits and demerits of various approaches are taken into consideration. This often leads to a conclusion and everyone gets back to coding. But unfortunately sometimes this doesn't happen.

defensive arguments

Despite of all the odds, someone decides to stick with his solution and starts offering defensive arguments. It's fine, we can agree to disagree.

But then there comes a time when the unspeakable is spoken.

but the language
supports it

The language designers weren't stupid, why can't I use this feature when the language supports it

really?

```

1 class GodClass
2   def self.create_the_universe(*args)
3     no_of_stars, no_of_planets, *type_of_species = args
4     stars, planets = [], []
5     random_seed = rand
6     case
7     when no_of_stars < 1000000000
8       p "building a small sized universe"
9       physics_rule_set = GodClass.physics_rules_for_small_system(random_seed)
10      if physics_rule_set.instance_variable_get(:@stability_coefficient)
11        return "Creation failed due to instability" # return point 1
12      end
13
14      stars.each(&:ignite)
15    else
16      raise "Unsupported number of stars"
17    end
18
19    for species in type_of_species
20      systems_with_life = stars.select_random_10_percent
21      # Let's create life
22
23      planets_with_life_forms.each do |planet|
24        planet.disperse_evolution_artifacts_for_atheists
25      end
26    end
27    return "universe created" # return point 42
28  end
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
560
561
562
563
564
565
566
567
568
569
570
571
572
573
574
575
576
577
578
579
580
581
582
583
584
585
586
587
588
589
590
591
592
593
594
595
596
597
598
599
600
601
602
603
604
605
606
607
608
609
610
611
612
613
614
615
616
617
618
619
620
621
622
623
624
625
626
627
628
629
630
631
632
633
634
635
636
637
638
639
640
641
642
643
644
645
646
647
648
649
650
651
652
653
654
655
656
657
658
659
660
661
662
663
664
665
666
667
668
669
670
671
672
673
674
675
676
677
678
679
680
681
682
683
684
685
686
687
688
689
690
691
692
693
694
695
696
697
698
699
700
701
702
703
704
705
706
707
708
709
710
711
712
713
714
715
716
717
718
719
720
721
722
723
724
725
726
727
728
729
730
731
732
733
734
735
736
737
738
739
740
741
742
743
744
745
746
747
748
749
750
751
752
753
754
755
756
757
758
759
760
761
762
763
764
765
766
767
768
769
770
771
772
773
774
775
776
777
778
779
780
781
782
783
784
785
786
787
788
789
790
791
792
793
794
795
796
797
798
799
800
801
802
803
804
805
806
807
808
809
810
811
812
813
814
815
816
817
818
819
820
821
822
823
824
825
826
827
828
829
830
831
832
833
834
835
836
837
838
839
840
841
842
843
844
845
846
847
848
849
850
851
852
853
854
855
856
857
858
859
860
861
862
863
864
865
866
867
868
869
870
871
872
873
874
875
876
877
878
879
880
881
882
883
884
885
886
887
888
889
890
891
892
893
894
895
896
897
898
899
900
901
902
903
904
905
906
907
908
909
910
911
912
913
914
915
916
917
918
919
920
921
922
923
924
925
926
927
928
929
930
931
932
933
934
935
936
937
938
939
940
941
942
943
944
945
946
947
948
949
950
951
952
953
954
955
956
957
958
959
960
961
962
963
964
965
966
967
968
969
970
971
972
973
974
975
976
977
978
979
980
981
982
983
984
985
986
987
988
989
990
991
992
993
994
995
996
997
998
999
1000

```

Yes indeed, the language does support it. Language also supports writing 900 odd lines long class with 150 lines long method. Which has a switch case, for loop, 42 return statements, a few raise conditions and opening up a class like Array to add domain logic.

All these things and many more are supported by Ruby. There are places where you'll use these features. But you shouldn't treat everything as nail just because you are holding a hammer.

OO/Ruby

In next 30 minutes we will talk about various things which Ruby supports, few are specific to Ruby, while other are more generic in nature. We will talk about why you need to pay attention whenever you use any of these features.

In this talk we will cover various features provided by Ruby that, while awesome, should be used with caution. Few of these features are specific to Ruby, few are language agnostic.

library vs. domain

Most of these constructs might seem like a norm and necessary if you have been writing lot of library code to provide a generic feature set, but while writing domain specific (production) code they can be avoided to achieve better object oriented design

mechanic

One thing I'd like to point out is, most of this is a mechanic to achieve a better code.

maturity of the team

[Handoff]

Depending on the maturity of team, you may use few of these construct without adding 'Magic' for the fellow programmer, while you may stay away from others by instinct.

When I say fellow developers, I am not talking about your current team but also the developers who are going to inherit your code.

GOTO :begin

raise “it should have jumped to the next topic”

[achamian]

I guess that's enough of context let's skip through rest of the context and jump directly to the crux of the talk

```
class Species
  attr_accessor :type
  HUMAN = "human"
  # some code
  def is_human?
    self.type == Species::HUMAN
  end
end
```

Jumping straight into the code example.

What's wrong with this method:

anyone?

It's as short as a method can get.

Name expresses the intent.

It returns a boolean, appropriately indicated by "?" at the end as per the Ruby convention

Looks perfect and it is. But it indicates a smell. Every time I write a method like this, I ask why anyone needs to know what state my object is in. The very existence of this method indicates that there's an "if" or worse "switch" somewhere else in my code. May be something like this

```
class GodClass
  def environment_to_support(species)
    case
    when species.is_human?
      {:feeds_on => ["Plants", "Meat"],
       :required_elements_in_atmosphere => ["Oxygen", "Nitrogen"]}
    when species.is_babel_fish?
      {:feeds_on => "Brain wave",
       :required_elements_in_atmosphere => []}
    # so on
    end
  end
end
```

Sweet, we have a switch case.

Nice readable code, is it testable? Who cares?

i love switch

Now that's a problem our small, beautiful method created for us.

tell don't ask

We are violating one of the basic principles of OO "tell don't ask". How to fix it, maybe it's time to create a different classes for Human and BabelFish. May be something like

```
class BabelFish < Species
  def environmental_necessities
    {:feeds_on => "Brain wave",
     :required_elements_in_atmosphere => []}
  end
end
```

```
class GodClass
  def environment_to_support(species)
    species.environmental_necessities
  end
end
```

are “?” methods evil?

Not always. There are places where you have to make a choice between either breaking “tell don’t ask” or pushing code to an objects where it doesn’t belong. In such cases you might be forced to expose internal state of the object to outside world. For example:

```
class User
  def is_admin?
    self.role == :admin
  end
end
```

```
class ApplicationController < ActionController::Base
  def require_admin_privilege
    unless current_user.is_admin?
      head :unauthorized
    end
  end
end
```

Yes, this can be pushed into user by passing a lambda etc. but at least it is acceptable as you don't want to push controller's responsibility to a model

Back to switch

should 'switch' be banned?

While most of the places switch can be replaced with a better modelling, there are scenarios where it's difficult to avoid switch. The only example I can think of is parsing an input from a command line

so can I replace it with

if elsif elsif elsif ...



<http://www.flickr.com/photos/santiagogprg/5023648200/>

Hmm.

<http://www.flickr.com/photos/santiagogprg/5023648200/>

how about this?

```
class Species
  @@environmental_necessities = {
    "babel_fish" => { :feeds_on => "Brain wave" },
    "human" => {} # so on
  }

  def environmental_necessities
    @@environmental_necessities[self.type]
  end
end
```

[Handoff]

No switch, no if, no exposing the type.

The branching still exists.

While all that is true I'd rather leave my code with an if or a switch and make the branching explicit so as to refactor it later instead of hiding the branching behind a Hash.

This is strictly a personal preference.

Raise

[aakashd]

What I want to talk about raising & rescuing exceptions is based on an assumption that we all know about two possible program flows; the regular flow & exceptional flow. That one should not throw an exception in regular flow & should use it carefully even in exceptional flow.

```
class Aircraft
  def start_engine
    # try to start the engine
    raise "Unable to start engine" unless @engine.started?
  end
end
```

```
class Aircraft
  def deploy_landing_gear
    # try to deploy the landing gear
    return @landing_gear.deployed?
  end
end
```

```
class Aircraft
  def deploy_landing_gear
    # try to deploy the landing gear

    # landing gear is stuck halfway through
    raise "Prepare for crash landing" if @landing_gear.stuck?

    return @landing_gear.deployed?
  end
end
```

But what happens when landing gear is stuck.

rules to raise

One should raise an exception when the purpose of the method cannot be completed and because of that the application is left in an unknown and possible inconsistent state.

In languages like Java, exceptions are way to force user to handle a possible outcome of method invocation, which I believe is very much useful because hardly any of the developers take pain to read the documentation.

And last but not the least is the teams or community's conventions about using exceptions. If nothing please stick to that.

```
begin
  # some calculations
  # some network io
  # some file io
  # some magic
rescue => e
  logger.error('Run! Run! we have an error!')
end
```

A classic example of wrong exception handling is unqualified rescue

If you are expecting a piece of code to raise an exception, it is always better to catch that particular exception instead of catching a generic exception.

If you are forced to write an unqualified rescue because the code block you are rescuing raises a lot of exceptions, then probably that problem should be solved first.

```
begin
  # some calculations
  # some network io
  # some file io
  # some magic
rescue => e
  logger.error "Just logging! don't look at me like that."
  raise
end
```

One of the scenarios where unqualified rescue makes sense is that we just want to log the exception & propagate it further.

```
begin
  # some calculations
  # some network io
  # some file io
  # some magic
rescue ZeroDivisionError
  # handle the zero division exception
rescue SomeCrazyException
  # handle the crazy exception
rescue => e
  logger.error "No idea what's heppening. I'm just going
to retry in a while. #{e.message}"
end
```

Another scenario where I will have an unqualified raise is when I don't want an unexpected exception to kill the daemon process.

I would handle all the known exceptions if I can, and in the end just suppress the exception after logging it.

Blind rescue missions

(Gregory Brown aka @seacreature)

There are just too many anti-patterns for rescue..

Another `clever` use of rescue is to assign default values in case of exceptions. What Gregory Brown calls as Blind Rescue Mission in his book Ruby Best Practices. The example in his book is so apt, that I have shamelessly copied the same thing.

```
name = @user.first_name ? @user.first_name.capitalize : "Anonymous"
```

The writers intention here is to return a string “Anonymous” when user does not have first_name. This line of code is slightly complicated because of the ternary operator.

```
name = @user.first_name.capitalize rescue "Anonymous"
```

Few people prefer it's concise & questionably though but cleaner version.

certainly looks a lot more cleaner but what happens when the user itself is nil. The line still succeeds & tells me that the current user is Anonymous.

random facts

rescue => e

doesn't rescue Exception
it only rescues StandardError

*args/hash

[achamian]

Ruby supports accepting variable number of arguments or hash as a last argument of the method call. While writing a library code this comes in handy.

```
def accepts_var_args(*args)
  planet = args[0]
  no_of_moons = args[1]
  moons = args[2..(no_of_moons + 1)]
  continents = [(no_of_moons + 2)..-1]
end
```

But when you are dealing with non-generic code it is better not to accept the var args. Explicitly calling out list of arguments to the method might increase the method signature but it is much more readable.

large number of parameters

If method is accepting a huge list of parameters, say 5 or more, because of which you want to shift to switch to `*args`, that itself is a smell.

It might be necessary for a factory or an object builder, but other places you might want to look at that list and see if those arguments can be clubbed into one or more objects. I am not talking about DTOs here. These related parameters almost always represent some job which method under consideration is doing which can be pushed to that object itself.

hash as the last argument

Same can be said for the hash as a last argument of the method. If the hash represents a long list of options which user may or may not pass, I can understand accepting a hash as it makes it easier to invoke method.

Typical example of such options hash is any of the Rails view helper methods.

```
class Person
  def teach(arguments)
    arguments[:student].accept_skill(skill(arguments[:skill]))
  end
end
```

```
# 1.8.x
```

```
yoda.teach(:student => luke, :skill => "lightsaber")
```

```
# 1.9.2
```

```
yoda.teach(student:luke, skill:"lightsaber")
```

```
# VS
```

```
yoda.teach(luke, "lightsaber")
```

Here the first approach looks tempting as the invocation is lot more readable than the second case. But I'd rather wait for Matz to support such method invocations over using hashes.

Better state the number of arguments method accepts in the method signature rather than the rdoc

while we are talking
about the options hash

do not

modify options hash

or even worse

and expect invoker to
fetch data out of it post
call

it leads to the dark side

Path to the dark side it leads to

```
def activate_skynet(options)
  options[:instructions] = "Eliminate John Conner"
  uri = "https://sky.net/activate".to_uri
  uri.post(options[:auth_headers])
end

options = {"Authentication" => "Basic: XXXXXXXXXXXX"}
activation_status = activate_skynet(options)
next_step = options[:instructions]
```

please don't

private methods

Before I put forward my opinions about private methods let's see what the proponents of private methods say about it. The top reasons why people choose private methods are:

readability

encapsulation

cleaner API

```
class BabelFish
  def translate(some_sound, to_language)
    # code for
    # detecting the language
    # of the text
    # code for
    # converting the input sound
    # into text
    # code for
    # generating text
    # in target language
    # code for
    # convertin text
    # to speach in to_language
  end
end
```

I have twisted the implementation of BabelFish to make it more understandable for people who are not familiar with Hitchhikers Guide. So please pardon me for this stupid code.

As I said earlier, this big method is not readable & to any new developer the implementation is not very clear. So let's split this into multiple methods.

```

class BabelFish
  def translate(sound, to_lang)
    from_lang = detect_language(sound)
    from_text = convert_to_text(from_lang, sound)
    to_text = translate_text(from_lang, to_lang, from_text)
    return text_to_speech(to_text, to_lang)
  end

  private

  def detect_language(sound)
    # some code
  end

  def convert_to_text(language, sound)
    # some code
  end

  def translate_text(from, to, text)
    # some code
  end

  def text_to_speech(text, language)
    # some code
  end
end

```

As expected the translate method has become concise & readable. The extracted methods are obviously private, as no one should be able to call detect_language or text_to_speech on BabelFish, it's just bad API & I couldn't agree more.

So now we have a clean API, with great encapsulation & all the methods are perfectly readable.

If using private methods allows me to achieve all these important qualities of a good API, why do I smell something fishy here?

then why not?

I still feel I shouldn't have done this!

probably they don't
belong here

Our BabelFish is too big & doing too many things. Any implementation change, bug fixes, new functionalities will touch this one file. Not a good thing to do.

what's the alternative?

There may not always be an alternative to private methods, but in my experience if I look hard I have generally found another hidden entity, who can take this responsibility and make the original class smaller & neater.

I always look at private methods as first step towards better design, the key is to observe the data private methods are manipulating. If you see a data that is being manipulated purely by private methods, you have just found the entity that is waiting to be extracted.

Generally private methods can be replaced by composition or delegation.

```
class BabelFish
  def translate(sound_data, to_language)
    Sound.new(sound_data).to_text.translate
    (to_language).to_sound
  end
end
```

```
class Sound #:nodoc:
  # code
end
```

```
class Language #:nodoc:
  # code
end
```

```
class Script #:nodoc:
  #code
end
```

Broken encapsulation
ways to communicate not to use internals
still I prefer it

I have probably broken library level encapsulation & exposed classes with public interfaces that I don't want my users to use. But I would any day prefer this design over a well encapsulated BabelFish.

There are ways to communicate to user that these classes should not be used. Most simple but not very effective way would be to annotate the class or module as nodoc, so that the respective class or module won't be documented.

Class#new as factory

new is just a method

can work as a factory

few things to keep in
mind

return the same type

don't return nil

don't raise an
exception

<http://blog.sidu.in/2007/12/rubys-new-as-factory.html>

class methods

where is my object?

From OO design perspective I have same set of arguments against static methods that I have against private methods. In some cases static methods are worse than private methods, because they encourage procedural programming.

I will repeat myself, that if you look hard you can certainly find the objects to whom you can delegate this responsibility.

general belief static methods are BAD

Next few slides are my personal opinions & I am still figuring out things. They will be very controversial, and I won't be surprised if everyone of you disagrees with me.

In my more than 4 years of experience with Java, class methods or static methods have become a taboo. I have heard similar nightmarish stories of statically typed languages where bunch of static methods live in their own global context & cause limitless problems right from bad design, hard to test code, threading issues to erratic behavior of static members due to multiple custom class loaders.

Let's see what arguments I would have presented against static methods before I started working with Ruby.

can't inherit

can't be abstract

can't be polymorphic

hard to test

threading issues

It suffice to say that as a rule of thumb, just stay away from static in Java world.

does the rule of thumb
apply to Ruby?

But apart from the OO thingy, none of the problems stated previously hold true with Ruby.

ruby class methods are not static

The ruby class methods are unfairly compared with Java static methods, when the Ruby class methods need not be static.

Ruby class methods are
way more elegant &
powerful

```
class Foo
  def self.say
    p "#{self.name} says hi"
  end
end
```

```
class Bar < Foo
end
```

```
Foo.say #=> "Foo says hi"
Bar.say #=> "Bar says hi"
```

The ruby class methods can be inherited, making them part of the class definition hierarchy if not object hierarchy.

The method is no more a non-extensible block of static code & if coded well it can deliver a lot of value.

```
class Foo
  def self.say
    p "#{self.name} says hi"
  end
end
```

```
class Bar < Foo
  def self.say
    super
    p "and welcomes you to ruby conf"
  end
end
```

```
Foo.say #=> "Foo says hi"
```

```
Bar.say #=> "Bar says hi" \n "and welcomes you to ruby conf"
```

The behavior of class methods can be extended or completely overridden, making it more reusable. If there is a logic at blueprint level but not applicable at instance level, you can effectively use class methods to DRY the code.

easy to test

The ruby class methods are as easy to test as instance methods, making the maintenance a non issue.

ActiveRecord::Base.find

ActiveRecords find method is one my most favorite example of a good class method. There will be a lot of people here who hate the kind of baggage extending activerecord pushes on simple models. But it really changed the way I used to look at class level methods, coming from Java world.

With ruby's class methods, I am more comfortable having this as class method on my models, rather than adding boilerplate code of DAO's.

methods on instance of a class Class

What I am about to say sounds slightly convoluted, but I will speak slowly. Ruby class methods are not static they are methods on an instance of a class Class

```
def self.# not so bad
```

as long as it belongs

```
class Company
  def sort_employees(all_employees)
    all_employees.sort_by(&:salary)
  end
end
```

Having a class method which does not use its state is as stupid as having an instance of Company

metaprogramming

[achamian]

random facts

`alias_method`

creates a deep clone of a
method it's not equivalent to
`delegate`

conclusion

try new things

be nice to people
who'll inherit your
code

write tests

42

Aakash Dharmadhikari

Niranjana Paranjape

<http://twitter.com/aakashd>

http://twitter.com/niranjana_p

<https://github.com/aakashd>

<https://github.com/achamian>