

# Design by Contract with JML

Gary T. Leavens

Yoonsik Cheon

Dept. of Computer Science  
Iowa State University  
Ames, IA 50010  
leavens@cs.iastate.edu

Dept. of Computer Science  
University of Texas at El Paso  
El Paso, TX 79968  
cheon@cs.utep.edu

September 28, 2006

## Abstract

This document gives a tutorial introduction to the Java Modeling Language (JML), and explains how JML can be used as a powerful design by contract (DBC) tool for Java. JML is a formal behavioral interface specification language for Java that contains the essential notations used in DBC as a subset. The basic concepts of DBC are explained with a particular emphasis on how to use JML notations to specify Java classes and interfaces. JML tools such as JML compiler (`jmlc`) are also introduced, with examples of their use.

## 1 Motivation

### 1.1 Design by Contract

*Design by contract* (DBC) is a method for developing software [11]. The principal idea behind DBC is that a class and its clients have a “contract” with each other. The client must guarantee certain conditions before calling a method defined by the class, and in return the class guarantees certain properties that will hold after the call. The use of such pre- and postconditions to specify software dates back to Hoare’s 1969 paper on formal verification [7]. What is novel about DBC is that it makes these contracts executable. The contracts are defined by program code in the programming language itself, and are translated into executable code by the compiler. Thus, any violation of the contract that occurs while the program is running can be detected immediately.

A contract in software specifies both obligations and rights of clients and implementors. For example, a contract for a method, `sqrt` that takes a number and returns its square root may be specified as in Fig-

```
//@ requires x >= 0.0;  
/*@ ensures JMLDouble  
@      .approximatelyEqualTo  
@      (x, \result * \result, eps);  
@*/  
public static double sqrt(double x) {  
    /*...*/  
}
```

Figure 1: Pre- and postconditions in JML (lines 1-4) for the method `sqrt`

ure 1. (The static method `approximatelyEqualTo` of the class `JMLDouble` tests whether the relative difference of the first two double arguments is within the given epsilon, the third argument.)

JML specifications are written in special *annotation comments*, which start with an at-sign (`@`). At-signs at the beginnings of lines in annotation comments of the form `/*@ ... @*/` are ignored. Note that the at-sign, `@`, must be right next to the start of comment characters. A comment starting `// @` will be ignored by JML, whereas `//@` starts an annotation properly. Similarly, `/* @` will not start an annotation, instead one must use `/*@`. (JML tools do not currently warn about comments that might use such mistaken annotation markers.)

JML uses a `requires` clause to specify the client’s obligation and an `ensures` clause to specify the implementor’s obligation. The obligation of the client in this case is to pass a positive number as an argument (`x`). On the other hand, the client has the right to get a square root approximation as the result (`\result`). Similarly, the implementor can assume that the argument is a positive number, but has an obligation to compute and return a square root approximation.

As in the previous example, a contract is typically written by specifying a method's pre and postconditions. A method's *precondition* says what must be true to call it. The precondition of our square root method may be specified as follows. (JML uses the keyword `requires` to introduce a precondition.)

```
//@ requires x >= 0.0;
```

A method's *postcondition* says what must be true when it terminates. In a language like Java that supports exceptions, we further distinguish normal and exceptional postconditions. A method's *normal postcondition* says what must be true when it returns normally, i.e., without throwing an exception. For example, the normal postcondition of our square root method may be specified as follows. (JML uses the keyword `ensures` to introduce a normal postcondition.)

```
/*@ ensures JMLDouble
   @     .approximatelyEqualTo
   @     (x, \result * \result, eps);
   @*/
```

(JML allows the specification of what exceptions a method may throw as well. This can be done using JML's `signals_only` clause. However, the default for the `signals_only` clause is to only allow exceptions named in the method header's `throws` clause. Since in Figure 1 no `throws` clause appears in the method header, the method has a default `signals_only` clause that prohibits exceptions from being thrown, when the precondition holds. Thus, beginning JML users can usually ignore the `signals_only` clause, and the `signals` clause, which allows one to specify more details about the program state when exceptions are thrown. Instead, when learning JML, one should concentrate on specifying preconditions that are strong enough to rule out exceptional behaviors.)

In JML specifications are typically written just before the header of the method they specify. An example is given in Figure 2. The `sqrt` method given in this figure is intended for trusted users. It assumes that the argument is positive, and in this case returns the necessary approximation. If the argument is negative, and if the code has been compiled with the JML runtime assertion checking compiler, then the call will result in a runtime error, due to the violation of the specified precondition.

In summary, DBC is a way of recording details of method responsibilities. It can be used for internally called methods to avoid constantly rechecking the validity of arguments. It can also be used to specify the

effect of calling a method, and thus for recording details in a design. Some of these aspects will be further explained in the following subsections as we explain more about JML.

## 1.2 Documentation

Using DBC provides good documentation for program modules such as Java classes and interfaces. For each method of a class or interface, the contract says what it requires, if anything, from the client and what it ensures to the client, as in the examples above and in Figure 2.

DBC is better for documentation than just code; and is even better than using informal documentation, such as program comments or Javadoc comments. A DBC contract specification is more abstract than code; in part this is because it doesn't have to give an algorithm in detail, but can concentrate on what is assumed and what must be achieved. Unlike comments, a formal specification in JML is (usually) machine checkable, and so can help with debugging. That is, checking the specification can help isolate errors before they propagate too far. In addition, because a JML specification is checked mechanically, it has a much greater chance of being kept up-to-date with respect to the code than informal documentation.

How is constructing a square root different than the specification of the `sqrt` method in Figure 2? The main difference is that the contract given in the specification can be satisfied in many different ways. For example, the square root method `sqrt` may be implemented by calling a library routine (as shown), calling another method written by the user, or directly by using linear search, binary search, Newton's method, etc. These will have varying non-functional properties such as efficiency and memory usage. However, the specification abstracts from all these implementation details. This means that the implementation can be changed later without invalidating the client code as long as the new implementation still satisfies the contract. For example, in `sqrt`, the call to `Math.sqrt` could be replaced with another algorithm to compute square roots, and clients would not be affected. In summary, a contract is an abstraction of a method's behavior. While in many cases the contract is about the same length as the code (as shown in Figure 2), in some cases it can be considerably shorter (for example, if the code for computing square roots by Newton's method were written in the body of `sqrt`).

```

package org.jmlspecs.samples.jmltutorial;

import org.jmlspecs.models.JMLDouble;

public class SqrtExample {

    public final static double eps = 0.0001;

    //@ requires x >= 0.0;
    //@ ensures JMLDouble.approximatelyEqualTo(x, \result * \result, eps);
    public static double sqrt(double x) {
        return Math.sqrt(x);
    }
}

```

Figure 2: The file SqrtExample.java

### 1.3 Blame Assignment

Another advantage of DBC is that it can be used to assign blame to a faulty part of a program. For example, who is to be blamed if `sqrt`'s precondition doesn't hold? Clearly this isn't the fault of `sqrt`, which hasn't even started to run yet, so the fault must lie with the caller. Thus, the client code, the code that calls `sqrt` has to be fixed.

Similarly, who is to be blamed if, at the end of processing of a call to `sqrt` in which its precondition held, it turned out that `sqrt`'s postcondition didn't hold? The code of `sqrt` (and the methods it calls) must contain the fault, because the implementor has broken their side of the contract. Thus, the implementing code, in `sqrt` and the methods it calls, has to be fixed.

### 1.4 Efficiency

DBC also allows one to avoid inefficient defensive checks, which can otherwise cripple the efficiency of code. For example, the `sqrt` method in Figure 2 assumes that its argument is non-negative. This trust is validated by checking the preconditions during debugging, but these checks can be turned off for production use of the program.

Another aspect of efficiency is that defensive checks are sometimes not possible to execute efficiently. For example, consider the example below, in which a binary search method requires that its array argument be sorted. Checking that an array is sorted requires time linear in the length of the array, but the binary search routine is supposed to execute a logarithmic time. Therefore the defensive checks would slow down the method unacceptably. In this example, contracts, which are easier to automatically remove

when the program goes into production, are much more efficient.

```

/*@ requires a != null
    @         && (\forallall int i;
    @             0 < i && i < a.length;
    @             a[i-1] <= a[i]);
    @*/
int binarySearch(int[] a, int x) {
    // ...
}

```

In the above, the precondition of `binarySearch` says that the array cannot be null, and that for all integers `i`, if `i` is strictly greater than 0 and strictly less than the length of the array argument `a`, then the element `a[i-1]` is no larger than `a[i]`. Note that this universally quantified expression in JML must have parentheses around it, `(\forallall ...)`. In some sense it is a bit like a `for`-loop in Java, with a declaration (but no initialization), a predicate that describes the range of the declared variable, and a body. However the body is not a statement but a Boolean-valued expression; the body must be true for all of the values of the variable that fall in the described range for the `(\forallall ...)` expression to be true. (The range is optional, but if omitted, such a universally quantified expression may not be executable; it can still be used for documentation purposes, however.)

### 1.5 Modularity of Reasoning

Another important benefit of DBC is that it supports modularity of reasoning. As an example, consider the following typical object-oriented code.

```
...
```

```

source.close();
dest.close();
getFile().setLastModified(
    loc.modTime().getTime());
return modTime();

```

How can we understand this code? There are two ways. We could read either the code for all the methods or the contracts for all the methods. However, if you try to read the code for all the methods the same problem occurs again — how do you understand that code? If the program is small you will run out of code to read, but in code that is from a large program, or that makes heavy use of method calls, and especially one in which there is much use of subtype polymorphism (dynamic binding), it can be very difficult to understand what is going on in a reasonable amount of time. If you have had experience of reading object-oriented source code (especially written by others or by yourself written quite a long time ago), you will have encountered this problem. That is, you will have seen the problem of non-modular reasoning. Reasoning is *non-modular* if to reason about one piece of code, you have to reason about many other pieces of code.

A better way is to read the specifications of the other methods. If the specifications are appropriately abstract, you do not have to keep reading many more specifications to understand what a method call does; the process bottoms out more quickly. In any case, you did not need to read other code, so the process is, by definition, *modular*.

## 1.6 The Cost of Modularity

In return for the benefit of faster understanding, modular reasoning imposes a cost. This cost is that clients are not allowed to conclude anything that is not justified by the contracts of the methods that they call. Another way of looking at this is that, to allow modular reasoning with contract specifications, the client code must work for every implementation that satisfies the contract. Thus reasoning about client code can only use the contracts (not the code!) of methods that are called. In addition, clients are obligated to establish the precondition of each method called. But in return they are saved the trouble of achieving the postcondition themselves. Consider the following example. (In this example, we use two JML assert statements around a piece of Java code.) In this example, we can conclude that the result of the call is approximately 3.0.

```

/*@ assert 9.0 >= 0.0;
double res = SqrtExample.sqrt(9.0);

```

```

/*@ assert JMLDouble
@         .approximatelyEqualTo
@         (9.0, res * res,
@         SqrtExample.eps);
@*/

```

What is not permitted in this example is to look at the code for the `sqrt` method, see that it calls `Math.sqrt`, and conclude from this that the result is accurate to, say, 7 decimal places. The contract only specifies that the result is an approximation that is correct to 4 decimal places (which is the value of `SqrtExample.eps`). But if the method is actually computing the square root with an accuracy of 7 decimal places, what is wrong with using this extra information? The problem is that doing so would tie the client to the actual implementation of the method as opposed to the contract. In other words, the implementation would no longer be free to change the algorithm used to compute square roots. For example, the algorithm could not be changed to be a faster one that only computed square roots to 4 decimal places of accuracy. In summary, client code must only reason about the specifications of the methods it calls, not their code.

## 1.7 Contracts and Intent

There are other good reasons not to use code as contracts. Code makes a poor contract, because by only using code one cannot convey to readers what is intended (i.e., what the essential properties of the method are) and what parts are merely implementation decisions (accidental features). For example, if the code for `sqrt` computes square roots to 7 decimal places, cannot this be changed in the next release? Without some separate description of what is intended, the reader can't tell if that 7 decimal places were intended, or just happened to be computed; perhaps 4 decimal places are all that is necessary for the rest of the program. By contrast, contracts allow implementors to specify their intent and freedom to change inessential details. Thus contracts tell clients what they can count on and what is essential, while leaving implementors the freedom to change inessential details, for example to make code run faster.

Here is a question for you. What kinds of changes might vendors want to make that don't break existing contracts?

## 2 What is JML?

JML stands for “Java Modeling Language”. It is a formal behavioral interface specification language for

Java. As such it allows one to specify both the syntactic interface of Java code and its behavior. The *syntactic interface* of Java code consists of names, visibility and other modifiers, and type checking information. For example, the syntactic interface of a method can be seen in the method's header, which lists its modifiers, name, return type, the types of its formal parameters, and the types of the (checked) exceptions it may throw. The *behavior* of Java code describes what should happen at runtime when the code is used. For example the behavior of a method describes what should happen when the method is called; as we have discussed above, the behavior of a method is often specified using pre- and post conditions. Since JML can document both the syntactic interface and behavior of Java code, it is well-suited to documenting detailed design decisions about Java code [8].

JML combines the practicality of DBC language like Eiffel [12] with the expressiveness and formality of model-oriented specification languages. As in Eiffel, JML uses Java's expression syntax to write the predicates used in *assertions*, such as pre- and postconditions and invariants. The advantage of using Java's notation in assertions is that it is easier for programmers to learn and less intimidating than languages that use special-purpose mathematical notations. However, Java expressions lack some expressiveness that makes more specialized assertion languages convenient for writing behavioral specifications. JML solves this problem by extending Java's expressions with various specification constructs, such as quantifiers.

JML is unique in that it is designed to be used with a wide range of tools [2, 9]. These tools support DBC, runtime assertion checking, discovery of invariants, static checking, specification browsing, and even formal verification using theorem provers. These support tools are freely available from the JML web page <http://www.jmlspecs.org> (see Appendix A for downloading and installing JML tools). For example, JML incorporates many ideas and concepts from model-oriented specification languages, which allows one to write specifications that are suitable for formal verification. The benefit of JML's design is that such features are also useful with other tools, as they help make specifications more abstract and succinct. However, novice users need not fear all of these features; as we show in this document, JML has a small subset that can be used as a DBC language for Java.

## 3 Simple Examples

### 3.1 Informal Specifications

The first step to writing contracts is to organize program comments that describe methods as contracts. That is, one should organize the comments about a method's behavior into preconditions and postconditions. JML supports this without requiring that these comments be formalized by allowing informal descriptions in specifications. An *informal description* looks like the following:

```
(* some text describing a property *)
```

JML treats an informal description as a boolean expression. This allows informal descriptions to be combined with formal statements, and is convenient when the formal statement is not easier to write down or clearer. For example, the following JML specification describes the behavior of the method `sqrt` using informal descriptions.

```
/*@ requires (* x is positive *);
   /*@ ensures (* \result is an
   @           approximation to
   @           the square root of x *)
   @           && \result >= 0;
   @*/
public static double sqrt(double x) {
    return Math.sqrt(x);
}
```

As an exercise, write informal pre and postconditions for the other methods of the class `Person` shown in Figure 3. Are the informal specifications longer than the code sometimes?

Informal specifications are convenient for organizing informal documentation. Informal specifications can also be very useful when there's not enough time to develop a formal description of some aspect of the program. For example, currently JML does not have a formal specification for input and output. Thus, methods that write to and read from files typically have to use informal descriptions to describe parts of their behavior. This kind of escape from formality is very useful, in general, to avoid describing the entire world formally when writing a specification of some method.

However, there are several drawbacks to using informal descriptions. A major drawback is that informal descriptions are often ambiguous or incomplete. Another problem is that informal descriptions cannot be manipulated by tools. For example, JML's runtime assertion checker has no way of evaluating

```

package org.jmlspecs.samples.jmltutorial;

public class Person {
    private String name;
    private int weight;

    /*@ also
       @ ensures \result != null
       @   && (* \result is a displayable
       @     form of this person *);
       @*/
    public String toString() {
        return "Person(\"" + name + "\", "
            + weight + ")";
    }

    public int getWeight() {
        return weight;
    }

    public void addKgs(int kgs) {
        if (kgs >= 0) {
            weight += kgs;
        } else {
            throw new IllegalArgumentException();
        }
    }

    public Person(String n) {
        name = n; weight = 0;
    }
}

```

Figure 3: A class `Person` to be filled with informal specifications. The keyword `also` in the specification of the method `toString` indicates that the method “also” inherits specifications from its supertypes (i.e., the class `Object` in this case).

Table 1: Some of JML’s extension to Java expressions

Syntax	Meaning
<code>\result</code>	result of method call
$a ==> b$	$a$ implies $b$
$a <== b$	$a$ follows from $b$ (i.e., $b$ implies $a$ )
$a <==> b$	$a$ if and only if $b$
$a <!=> b$	not ( $a$ if and only if $b$ )
<code>\old(<math>E</math>)</code>	value of $E$ in pre-state

informal descriptions, so these cannot be checked at runtime. Thus, whenever time permits, one should try to use formal notation instead of informal descriptions.

## 3.2 Formalization

Figure 4 shows the class `Person` of the previous section with all its methods formally specified in JML. Formal specifications in JML are written using an extended form of Java expressions. Specification expressions in JML also have some restrictions, compared to Java.

### 3.2.1 JML Specification Expressions

Some of the extensions JML adds to Java expressions are shown in Table 1. These include a notation for describing the result of a method (`\result`), various kinds of implication<sup>1</sup>, and a way of referring to the pre-state value of an expression (`\old(·)`). We have seen the use of `\result` already, for example in Figure 2. An example of the use of `\old(·)` appears in the specification of the `addKgs` method of the class `Person` in Figure 4. In the normal post-condition, the expression “`weight == \old(weight + kgs)`” is true when the value of `weight` at the end of the method (just before it returns to its caller), is equal to the value the expression “`weight + kgs`” had at the beginning of the method call (just after parameter passing).

The main restriction in JML is that expressions used in JML’s assertions cannot have side effects. Thus Java’s assignment expressions (`=`, `+=`, etc.) and its increment (`++`) and decrement (`--`) operators are not allowed. In addition, only pure methods can be called in assertions. A method is *pure* if it has no side-effects on the program’s state. Some authors call such methods “query” methods, because they can be used

<sup>1</sup>In addition, JML also support various forms of quantifiers (see Section 5.1).

```

package org.jmlspecs.samples.jmltutorial;

/*@ refine "Person.java";

public class Person {
    private /*@ spec_public non_null @*/
        String name;
    private /*@ spec_public @*/
        int weight;

    /*@ public invariant !name.equals("")
        @          && weight >= 0; @*/

    /*@ also
    /*@ ensures \result != null;
    public String toString();

    /*@ also
    /*@ ensures \result == weight;
    public /*@ pure @*/ int getWeight();

    /*@ also
        @ requires kgs >= 0;
        @ requires weight + kgs >= 0;
        @ ensures weight == \old(weight + kgs);
    @*/
    public void addKgs(int kgs);

    /*@ also
        @ requires n != null && !n.equals("");
        @ ensures n.equals(name)
        @          && weight == 0; @*/
    public Person(String n);
}

```

Figure 4: Class `Person` with formal specifications. This specification would appear in a file named `Person.refines-java`.

to ask about the state of an object without changing it. One must tell JML that a method to be pure by using the `pure` modifier in the method’s declaration. For example, the `getWeight` method in Figure 4 is declared to be `pure`. It could thus be called in an assertion; for example a client might specify that the weight of a person `p` be not too high by writing `p.getWeight < 200`. Methods that are not declared to be pure are assumed not to be pure, and cannot be used in specification expressions.

### 3.2.2 Information Hiding in Specifications

JML supports the notion of information hiding by using Java’s privacy levels. In the DBC style of JML usage that we are describing in this document, the privacy of a method or constructor specification is the same as that of the method or constructor it specifies.<sup>2</sup> For example, all the method specifications in Figure 4 have public visibility, because they annotate public methods. The invariant in Figure 4 is also publicly-visible, however its visibility is explicitly specified by using the modifier `public`; without that modifier it would only be visible to clients in the same package.

JML enforces information hiding by ensuring that public specifications can only mention publicly-visible names. That is, JML does not allow private fields to be used in public specifications. Thus, for example, since the method, constructor, and invariant specifications in Figure 4 all have public visibility, they can only mention publicly-visible names. This is the reason for the annotation “`spec_public`” in the declaration of the fields `name` and `weight`. This annotation says that `Person`’s fields `name` and `weight` are to be treated as publicly-visible in JML specifications, even though Java considers them to be private.

### 3.2.3 Non-Null Annotations

The declaration of the instance field `name` shows another JML annotation. The `non_null` annotation is a shorthand way of saying that, in every publicly-visible state, `name` is not null. That is, after a constructor returns, and whenever there is no execution of a method of class `Person` in progress, `name` cannot be null. (This `non_null` annotation is equivalent to the invariant “`name != null`”; see Section 3.3 for details.)

<sup>2</sup> Privacy can be explicitly specified in the heavyweight form of JML method and constructor specifications [8].

### 3.2.4 Underspecification

A method specification doesn't have to be complete. It is often intentionally left incomplete, or *underspecified* in the sense that implementations satisfying the specification may have observably different behaviors. For example, the specification of the method `toString` doesn't exactly specify the return value; all the specification says is that it is a non-null value.

One reason for using underspecification is to allow implementations to have more freedom. In general, this is a good idea, because if you did not care about some details of the behavior of a method, leaving it underspecified can allow faster implementations, or implementations that use less space, or are easier to program. Underspecification also allows room for future enhancements. However, since clients may only rely on the specification as a contract, it is important to include in the contract everything that they need to accomplish their work; that is, everything important about the behavior should be in the contract.

### 3.2.5 Semantics

The meaning of JML method specifications is as follows. A method must be called in a state where the method's precondition is satisfied; otherwise, nothing is guaranteed (the call might loop forever or not return, or make arbitrary state changes). The state where a method is called is referred to as a *pre-state*. If a method is called in a proper *pre-state*, then there are two possible outcomes of the method's execution. The method can return normally or throw an exception.<sup>3</sup> If the method terminates normally without throwing an exception, then that termination state is called a *normal post-state*. If the method terminates by throwing an exception that does not inherit from the class `java.lang.Error`, then that termination state is called an *exceptional post-state*. In a normal post-state, the method's normal postcondition must be satisfied. Similarly, in an exceptional post-state, the exception thrown must be permitted by the specification's (default or explicit) `signals_only` clause, and the exceptional post-state must satisfy the corresponding exceptional postconditions (`signals` clauses).

<sup>3</sup> Other possibilities are that the method may either (3) diverge (i.e., loop forever or otherwise not return to the caller), or (4) the Java Virtual Machine (JVM) may signal an error. JML's `diverges` clause can be used to specify when (3) is allowed. Outcome (4) is outside of the control of the programmer, and therefore is always allowed. See JML's preliminary design document [8] for details.

## 3.3 Invariants

The specification of the class `Person` has the following public invariant clause (see Figure 4).

```
/*@ public invariant !name.equals("")
   @           && weight >= 0;
   @*/
```

An *invariant* is a property that should hold in all client-visible states. It must be true when control is not inside the object's methods. That is, an invariant must hold at the end of each constructor's execution, and at the beginning and end of all methods.<sup>4</sup>

In JML, a public invariant clause allows one to define the acceptable states of an object that are client-visible; such invariants are sometimes called *type invariants*. In JML one can also specify invariants with more restrictive visibility; such invariants, which are not visible to clients, are sometimes called *representation invariants*. Representation invariants can be used to define acceptable internal states of an object; for example, that a linked list is circular, or other similar design decisions. Public invariants about `spec_public`, private fields, such as this one in `Person`, have the flavor of both type and representation invariants.

As an exercise, formally specify the following method assuming that it is declared in the class `Person`. (Hint: when thinking about the precondition, watch out for the invariant!)

```
public void changeName(String newName) {
    name = newName;
}
```

## 4 Basic Tool Usage

In this section we describe some of the tools that work with JML.

### 4.1 Overview of Tools

Several academic researchers and software contributors have collaborated on JML, to provide a range of tools to address the various needs such as reading, writing, and checking JML specifications [2]. The following are the most useful of these for DBC.

<sup>4</sup> However, in JML, constructors and methods declared with the modifier `helper` are exempted from having to satisfy invariants. Such helper methods must be private, and can be used to avoid duplication of code, even code that does not start or end in a state that satisfies a type's invariants.



- The JML compiler (`jmlc`), is an extension to a Java compiler and compiles Java programs annotated with JML specifications into Java bytecode [4, 3]. The compiled bytecode includes runtime assertion checking instructions that check JML specifications such as preconditions, normal and exceptional postconditions, and invariants (see Section 4.2).
- The unit testing tool (`jmlunit` [5]) combines the JML compiler with JUnit, a popular unit testing tool for Java [1]. The tool frees the programmer from writing code that decides test success or failure; instead of writing such test oracles, the tool uses JML specifications, processed by `jmlc`, to decide whether the code being tested works properly.
- The documentation generator (`jmldoc`) produces HTML containing both Javadoc comments and any JML specifications. This makes it possible to browse JML specifications or to post them on the web.
- The extended static checker (`escjava2`), can find possible mistakes in Java code very quickly. It is especially good at finding potential null pointer exceptions and array-out-of-bounds indexing operations. It uses JML annotations to turn off its warnings and propagates and checks JML specifications.
- The type checker (`jml`) is another tool for checking JML specifications, as a faster substitute for `jmlc`, if one does not need to compile the code.

All the above tools are freely available from the JML web page (refer to Appendix A).

## 4.2 JML Compiler

The JML compiler (`jmlc`) behaves like Java compilers, such as `javac`, by producing Java bytecode from source code file. The difference is that it adds assertion checking code to the bytecodes it produces. These check JML assertions such as preconditions, postconditions, and invariants. The execution of such assertion checking code is transparent in that, unless an assertion is violated, and except for performance measures (time and space), the behavior of the original program is unchanged. The transparency of runtime assertion checking is guaranteed, as JML assertions are not allowed to have any side-effects (see Section 3.2).

Using `jmlc` is similar to using `javac`. For example, the following command compiles the file `Person.java`.

```
jmlc Person.java
```

This produces a bytecode file, `Person.class`, in the current working directory.

Sometimes it is convenient to place the output of `jmlc` in a directory that is different than that where normal Java compilers put their output. To do this, one can use the `-d` option. For example, the following command

```
jmlc -d ../bin Person.java
```

puts the output file, `Person.class`, in the directory `../bin`.

By default, `jmlc` names all the files it is processing. This may be reassuring, since `jmlc` is somewhat slow. But if one tires of all this output, one can use the `-Q` option to `jmlc`. For example, the command

```
jmlc -Q *.java
```

quietly compiles all the files in the current working directory whose names end in `.java`.

For more details on the compilation options available, refer to the `jmlc` manual page included in the JML distribution (see Appendix A). Alternatively, there is a graphical user interface for `jmlc`, called `jmlc-gui`, that can be used to run the compiler. It makes keeping track of options and selecting files easier.

How to run bytecode compiled with `jmlc`? It can be treated as regular Java bytecode, except that it needs JML's runtime library classes included in `jmlruntime.jar` to be interpreted by the Java Virtual Machine (i.e., the JVM, which is the `java` command). In particular, the runtime classes must be in the JVM's "boot class path"; this is done automatically if you use the script `jmlrac`. For example, given a main program shown in Figure 5, Figure 6 is a transcript that shows how you can compile and run the `PersonMain` and `Person` classes. (The output is slightly formatted to fit in this paper's columns.) This transcript was done on a Linux machine, using the bash shell, which is reflected in the `$` prompts and the use of the shell variable `$HOME`. The transcript also assumes that the user has installed JML into their home directory, which is named by `$HOME`, so that they have permission to write compiled class files into the directory containing the samples.

If you are using your own Windows machine, you might write the first two lines as follows, for a typical JML install into `c:\JML`.

```
> c:
> cd \
> cd JML\org\jmlspecs\samples\jmltutorial
> set CLASSPATH=c:\JML
```

```

$ cd $HOME/JML/org/jmlspecs/samples/jmltutorial
$ export CLASSPATH="$HOME/JML"
$ jmlc -Q PersonMain.java Person.java
File "Person.java", line 33, character 12
  warning: The informal description is not executable.
$ jmlrac org.jmlspecs.samples.jmltutorial.PersonMain
Exception in thread "main"
  org.jmlspecs.jmlrac.runtime.JMLInternalPreconditionError:
  by method Person.Person regarding specifications at
File "Person.refines-java", line 51, character 20 when
  'n' is null
  at org.jmlspecs.samples.jmltutorial.PersonMain.main(PersonMain.java:253)

```

Figure 6: Compiling and testing `PersonMain` and `Person`.

```

package org.jmlspecs.samples.jmltutorial;

public class PersonMain {
  public static void
  main(String [] argv) {
    System.out.println(new Person(null));
    System.out.println(new Person(""));
  }
}

```

Figure 5: Main program to test the class `Person`

The transcript would then continue as in Figure 6.

Do you see why this transcript results in a precondition violation error? See the specification of the class `Person` in Figure 4. Note that the line number in the backtrace (line 253 of `PersonMain`) does not exist in the source, as one can tell from Figure 5; this line number is an artifact of the compilation process.

It is not necessary to compile all the source files with `jmlc`. For example, the driver class `PersonMain` may be compiled with a plain Java compiler such as `javac`. Only those classes and interfaces that are compiled with `jmlc` will be runtime assertion checked.

## 5 Other Things in JML

This section describes a few more advanced features of JML that are useful in dealing with common problems in specification.

### 5.1 Quantifiers

JML supports several kinds of quantifiers in assertions: a *universal quantifier* (`\forall`), an *existential quantifier* (`\exists`), *generalized quantifiers* (`\sum`,

`\product`, `\min`, and `\max`), and a *numeric quantifier* (`\num_of`). For example, the following predicate uses a universal quantifier to assert that all students found in the set `juniors` have advisors.

```

(\forall Student s;
  juniors.contains(s);
  s.getAdvisor() != null)

```

In a quantifier, such as the above, there is a declaration, such as `Student s`, of a name that is local to the quantifier. This is followed by an optional range predicate, such as `juniors.contains(s)` in the example above; the range predicate restricts the domain to which the quantifier applies. With the range predicate, we quantify over all objects (or values) of the declared type such that the range predicate is satisfied. If the range predicate is omitted, there is no restriction on the objects being quantified over, and so all possible objects apply. Finally, the third predicate, the body of the quantifier, `s.getAdvisor() != null` in the above example, must be true of all the objects that satisfy the range predicate.

An equivalent way to write the above example, without an explicit range predicate, is as follows.

```

(\forall Student s;
  juniors.contains(s)
  ==> s.getAdvisor() != null)

```

The quantifiers `\max`, `\min`, `\product`, and `\sum`, are generalized quantifiers that return respectively the maximum, minimum, product, and sum of the values of their body expression when the quantified variables satisfy the given range expression. The numerical quantifier, `\num_of`, returns the number of values for quantified variables for which the range and the body predicate are true. For example, an expression `(\sum int x; 1 <= x && x <= 5; x)` denotes the sum of values between 1 and 5 inclusive (i.e., 15).

As an exercise, can you write a quantified predicate that asserts that the elements of an array `int[] a` are sorted in ascending order? Hint: use a nested quantification.

## 5.2 Inheritance of specifications

In JML, a subclass inherits specifications such as preconditions, postconditions, and invariants from its superclasses and interfaces that it implements. An interface also inherits specifications of the interfaces that it extends. The semantics of specification inheritance reflects that of code inheritance in Java; e.g., a program variable appearing in assertions is statically resolved, and an instance method call is dynamically dispatched.

An important feature of JML’s specification inheritance is that its semantics supports a behavioral notion of subtyping. The essence of behavioral subtyping is summarized by Liskov and Wing’s *substitution property*, which states that a subtype object can be used in place of a supertype’s object [10]. In essence, preconditions are disjoined, postconditions are conjoined in the form of  $\bigwedge(\text{old}(p_i) \Rightarrow q_j)$  (where  $p_i$  is a precondition and  $q_j$  is the corresponding postcondition), and invariants are conjoined.

## 5.3 Model Fields

The class `Person` in Figure 4 was specified in terms of private, `spec_public` fields `name` and `weight`. For example, the constructor’s postcondition refers to the field `name`. But what if you want to change the implementation, e.g., if you want to use a different data structure? As a simple example, consider you want to change a `spec_public` field’s name from

```
private /*@ spec_public non_null */
    String name;

to
```

```
private /*@ non_null */ String fullName;
```

Ideally, you don’t want to make a change to your public specifications (e.g., the constructor’s postcondition), as such a change may affect the client code because the client relies on the public specification. For specifications, you want to keep the old name public, but for implementation, you don’t want to have two fields taking up space at runtime. In JML, you can solve this dilemma by using a model variable. A *model variable* is a specification-only variable [6]. For example, you can make the old field a model field, introduce a new field, and define a relationship between them, as shown below.




Figure 7: Mapping concrete values into abstract values.

```
/*@ public model non_null String name;
private /*@ non_null */ String fullName;
/*@ private represents name <- fullName;
```

Note that as the new field `fullName` is private, its existence is completely hidden from the client. The representation is not exposed to the client. The `represents` clause, which is also private in this case, defines an *abstraction function* that maps a concrete representation value to an abstract value of the model field (see Figure 7). It says that the value of `name` is the same as that of the given expression, `fullName` in this case.

In sum, a model variable is a specification-only variable. It is like a domain-level construct and its value is given by a `represents` clause. In addition to model variables, JML also support model methods, classes, and interfaces.

Question: how would you modify the specification and implementation to change the representation of a person’s weight from kilograms to pounds?

## 6 Summary

In this paper we have shown the advantages of DBC and how to use JML for DBC.

## A Installing JML Tools

JML documentation and tools are freely available from the JML web site at <http://www.jmlspecs.org>. A release of JML is distributed as a gzipped tar archive file, e.g., `JML.5.1.tar.gz`.

The installation of JML tools is straightforward. You download the distribution file and (unzip and) untar it in an appropriate directory that you want to install JML. Under Microsoft Windows, you can use WinZip or similar programs to extract it to a directory of your choice. On Unix, you can use the

`tar` command to extract it. For example, after saving it to a file `/usr/local/JML.5.1.tar.gz`, do the following commands.

```
% cd /usr/local
% tar -xzvf JML.5.1.tgz
```

JML tools, documents, sample code, and API specifications will be extracted into a subdirectory named `JML`. The subdirectory `bin` contains several OS-dependent shell scripts to run various JML tools, i.e., `*.bat` files for Microsoft Windows, `*-unix` files for Unix, and `*-cygwin` files for Cygwin. You need to copy these files to a directory on your `PATH` and edit them to change the variable `JMLDIR` to the directory where you installed JML.

On Microsoft Windows (e.g., 98, ME, 2000, and XP), copy all `.bat` files from `JML\bin` to a directory on your `PATH`. Then edit the copied `.bat` files by changing `JMLDIR` to the correct value for you (e.g., `c:\JML`).

On Unix including clones like Linux and Cygwin, use the script `bin/Install-JML-Scripts` to install the shell scripts and manual pages. By default, the shell scripts are installed in the directory `/usr/local/bin` and the manual pages in `/usr/local/man`. Look and edit the installation script to install them in other directories and for other options.

For more details on installation, refer to the `README.html` file included in the distribution.

## Acknowledgments

Thanks to students of CS 3331 Advanced Object-Oriented Programming (Fall 2003 and Spring 2004) at UTEP for comments on earlier drafts of this tutorial. Thanks to Francisco Laguna and Faraz Hussain for comments on an earlier draft.

## References

- [1] Kent Beck and Erich Gamma. Test infected: Programmers love writing tests. *Java Report*, 3(7):37–50, 1998.
- [2] Lilian Burdy, Yoonsik Cheon, David R. Cok, Michael D. Ernst, Joeseoph R. Kiniry, Gary T. Leavens, K. Rustan M. Leino, and Erik Poll. An overview of JML tools and applications. *International Journal on Software Tools for Technology Transfer (STTT)*, 7(3):212–232, June 2005.
- [3] Yoonsik Cheon. A runtime assertion checker for the Java Modeling Language. Technical Report 03-09, Department of Computer Science, Iowa State University, Ames, IA, April 2003. The author’s Ph.D. dissertation. Available from [archives.cs.iastate.edu](http://archives.cs.iastate.edu).
- [4] Yoonsik Cheon and Gary T. Leavens. A runtime assertion checker for the Java Modeling Language (JML). In Hamid R. Arabnia and Youngsong Mun, editors, *Proceedings of the International Conference on Software Engineering Research and Practice (SERP '02), Las Vegas, Nevada, USA, June 24–27, 2002*, pages 322–328. CSREA Press, June 2002.
- [5] Yoonsik Cheon and Gary T. Leavens. A simple and practical approach to unit testing: The JML and JUnit way. In Boris Magnusson, editor, *ECOOP 2002 — Object-Oriented Programming, 16th European Conference, Málaga, Spain, Proceedings*, volume 2374 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 231–255, Berlin, June 2002. Springer-Verlag.
- [6] Yoonsik Cheon, Gary T. Leavens, Murali Sitaraman, and Stephen Edwards. Model variables: Cleanly supporting abstraction in design by contract. *Software: Practice and Experience*, 35(6):583–599, May 2005.
- [7] C. A. R. Hoare. An axiomatic basis for computer programming. *Communications of the ACM*, 12(10):576–583, October 1969.
- [8] Gary T. Leavens, Albert L. Baker, and Clyde Ruby. Preliminary design of JML: A behavioral interface specification language for Java. *ACM SIGSOFT Software Engineering Notes*, 31(3):1–38, March 2006. <http://doi.acm.org/10.1145/1127878.1127884>.
- [9] Gary T. Leavens, Yoonsik Cheon, Curtis Clifton, Clyde Ruby, and David R. Cok. How the design of JML accommodates both runtime assertion checking and formal verification. *Science of Computer Programming*, 55(1-3):185–208, March 2005.
- [10] Barbara Liskov and Jeannette Wing. A behavioral notion of subtyping. *ACM Transactions on Programming Languages and Systems*, 16(6):1811–1841, November 1994.
- [11] Bertrand Meyer. Applying “design by contract”. *Computer*, 25(10):40–51, October 1992.

- [12] Bertrand Meyer. *Eiffel: The Language*. Object-Oriented Series. Prentice Hall, New York, NY, 1992.