# Programming Style

- Writing good programs is like writing good prose; the object is to ***communicate***
  - concise, straightforward, no unnecessary parts
- Principles of good programming style are ***language independent***
  - some languages have features that ***encourage*** good style, e.g. structured loops
  - some have features that ***discourage*** good style, e.g. gotos, anemic data types
  - modern block-structured languages are better than older unstructured languages
  - but ***bad*** programs can be written in ***any*** language
- Benefits of good style
  - code that is easy to ***understand***
  - code that is more likely to ***work***
  - code that is easy to ***maintain*** and change
- Method to develop good programming style
  - ***read*** code written by good programmers
  - Ask: Will I understand this program in two years?






# Names

- Pick names that capture the use of the variable or function, e.g. **`addElement`**
  - nouns for variables
  - verbs for functions
  - adjectives for booleans, conditions, and some enumeration constants
- Use ***descriptive*** names for global variables and functions, e.g. **`elementCount`**
- Use ***concise*** names for local variables that reflect ***standard notation***

prefer

```
for (i = 0; i < n; i++)
    a[i] = 0;
```

to

```
for (arrayindex = 0; arrayindex<arraysize;
                     arrayindex++)
    array[arrayindex] = 0;
```

- Use ***case*** judiciously
  - use all capitals for constants
  - don't rely on only case to distinguish names
- Use a consistent style for ***compound*** names
  - **`printword`** **`PrintWord`** **`print_word`**
- Module-level prefixes help distinguish names, e.g. **`Strset_T, Strset_add`**
- Don't use nerdy abbreviations and acronyms

# Layout and Indentation

- Use ***white space*** judiciously
  - separate code into “paragraphs”
  - make expressions more readable
- Use ***indentation*** to emphasize ***structure***
  - use editor “autoindent” facilities and a consistent amount of space
  - watch for extreme indentation — signals ***excessive*** nesting
- Line up parallel structures

```
alpha = angle(p1, p2, p3);
beta = angle(p2, p3, p1);
gamma = angle(p3, p1, p2);
```

```
alpha = angle(p1, p2, p3);
beta  = angle(p2, p3, p1);
gamma = angle(p3, p1, p2)
```

- One statement per line
- Be ***consistent***, but use ***variation*** for emphasis
- Break long lines at logical places, e.g. by precedence; indent continuations
- Use tabular input and output formats






# Clear Expression

- Compare:

```
for(i=1; i<=n; i++)
for(j=1; j<=n; i++)
v[i-1][j-1] = (i/j)*(j/i);
```

vs.

```
/* make v the identity matrix */
for (i = 0; i < n; i++) {
    for (j = 0; j < n; j++)
        v[i][j] = 0.0;
    v[i][i] = 1.0;
}
```

- Rules:
  - be clever, but don’t be ***too clever***
  - say what you mean, simply and directly
  - use parentheses to emphasize precedence and braces to display structure
  - use white space and indentation to clarify structure
  - don’t sacrifice clarity for “efficiency”

# Clear Expression, cont'd

- Compare:

```
if (!(i > 10 || 0 > i)) ...    vs.    if (0 <= i && i <= 10) ...
```

- Compare:

```
for (neg = 0; *s1 == *s2++; )
    if (*s1++ == '\0')
        break;
neg = *s1 - (*--s2);
if (!neg) ...
```

vs.

```
while (*s1 == *s2 && *s1 != '\0') { s1++; s2++; }
if (*s1 == *s2) ...
```

vs.

```
if (strcmp(s1, s2) == 0) ...
```

- Rules:

  avoid double negation

  avoid temporary variables

  use library functions

  let the compiler do the dirty work





# Clear Expression, cont'd

- Compare:

```
if (a > b)
    if (b > c)
        z = c;
    else
        z = b;
else
    if (a > c)
        z = c;
    else
        z = a;
```

vs.

```
if (a < b)
    if (b <= c)
        z = a;
    else
        z = c;
else     /* a >= b *
    if (b <= c)
        z = b
    else
        z = c;
```

better yet:

```
z = min(a, min(b, c));
```

- Rules:

  lay out expressions according to standard conventions

  rearrange logic so it is easy to understand

  follow each decision with a matching action

# Control Structure

- Flow of control should be written for human understanding

```
for (i = 0; i < n; i++) {
     if (strcmp(table[i].word, word))
          continue;
     table[i].count++;
}
```

better:

```
for (i = 0; i < n; i++)
     if (strcmp(table[i].word, word) == 0)
          table[i].count++;
```

- Avoid **`continue;`** **`break`** is OK, but use it sparingly; "breaking" out of functions is OK, if used with care

```
func(a) {
     if (isbad(a))
          return;
     ...
}
```

- Rules:

  use structured control constructs

  don't make the reader jump around or decrypt convoluted flow of control

  avoid long blocks

  avoid complicated, nested blocks

  minimize the use of **`return`** and **`break`**





# Control Structure, cont'd

- "Comb" structures

compare:

```
if (x < v[mid])
     high = mid - 1;
else if (x > v[mid])
     low = mid + 1;
else
     return mid;
```

vs:

```
if (x < v[mid])
     high = mid - 1;
     else if (x > v[mid])
          low = mid + 1;
          else
               return mid;
```

- Ditto for **`switch`**
- Rules:

  implement multiway branches with **`if ... else if ... else`**

  emphasize that only one of the actions is performed

  avoid empty **`then`** and **`else`** actions

  handle default action, even if it "can't happen;" use **`assert(0)`**

  avoid nesting

# Program Structure

- Rules:
  - modularize; use interfaces
  - every function/interface should do ***one*** thing well
  - every function/interface should ***hide*** something
  - replace repetitious code with calls to functions
  - let the data structure the program
  - make sure your code “does nothing” gracefully
  - don’t patch bad code — rewrite it
  - don’t strain to reuse code — reorganize it
  - watch for “off-by-one” errors






# Documentation

- Best program documentation includes
  - clean structure
  - consistent programming
  - good mnemonic identifiers
  - smattering of enlighting comments
- Comments should add new information

```
i = i + 1;   /* add one to i */
```

- Comments and code must ***agree***; if they disagree, odds are they are both wrong
- Don’t comment bad code — rewrite it
- Comment algorithms, not coding idiosyncracies
- Comment procedural interfaces and data structures liberally
- Master the language and its ***idioms***; let the code speak for itself

# Program Organization

- Good, consistent organization makes programs easier to read and modify
- Pick a consistent program layout style for

  functions
  statements
  expressions
  comments

- ***Small*** programs (~ few ***hundred*** lines, maximum) can fit into one file

  opening explanatory comments
  purpose
  author and history (handled better by tools like RCS)
  **`#includes`** (i.e. imports)
  **`#defines`** (i.e. constants)
  type definitions (e.g. **`typedef`**, **`struct`**, etc.)
  global variables
  **`main`**
  functions in alphabetical or logical order

- Maximize “data ink”





# Program Organization, cont’d

- Divide medium-size programs (~ few ***thousand*** lines, maximum) into modules
- Use established interfaces and implementations
- Implementations

  organized around data or function

  organize each implementation as a “small” program

- Interfaces

  use separate headers for separate interfaces, but don’t ***over-modularize***

  permit multiple inclusion

  do ***not*** define variables

- Global variables and functions

  ***declared*** in interfaces, so all clients see the same declaration

  ***defined*** and ***initialized*** in an implementation

- What about ***large*** programs, say, more than 50,000 lines? Another course...

# Efficiency and Style

- If a program doesn't ***work***, it doesn't matter how fast it is!
- Rules:

  make it clear before you make it faster

  make it correct before you make it faster

  see if it's fast enough before you make it faster

  keep it correct while you make it faster

  ill-conceived attempts to increase efficiency usually lead to bad code; gains are usually small or non-existent

- Make performance improvements ***only***

  if they are really needed, and

  if there are objective ***measurements*** that identify the sources of inefficiency

  intuitions are notoriously bad; they aren't "objective measurements"

- Rules:

  keep it simple to make it faster

  let the compiler do the simple optimizations

  don't diddle code to make it faster — find a better algorithm