

2023-02-24

(Draft No. 2 by T P K Healy)

This paper is to propose a new feature for the C++ core language to provide an alternative interface for a class without editing the layout of the object. The combination of keywords:

using new interface

can be used to give an alternative interface to a class that's already been defined. Note that the word 'interface' is not a keyword, and so you can still create types and variables named 'interface'. Sample usage:

```
using new interface lockable_bisem = std::binary_semaphore {
    void lock(void) noexcept(false) { acquire(); }
    void unlock(void) noexcept(false) { release(); }
};
extern std::binary_semaphore g_bisem;
int Func(void)
{
    std::lock_guard<lockable_bisem> myguard(g_bisem);
    // Do more stuff here
}
```

behaves the same as:

```
struct lockable_bisem : std::binary_semaphore {
    void lock(void) noexcept(false) { acquire(); }
    void unlock(void) noexcept(false) { release(); }
};
extern std::binary_semaphore g_bisem;
int Func(void)
{
    std::lock_guard<lockable_bisem> myguard( *(lockable_bisem*)&g_bisem );
    // Do more stuff here
}
```

Strictly speaking, the second code snippet exhibits undefined behaviour – even though it works fine on every C++ compiler. The reasons why it works fine are discussed overleaf.

Downcasting at compile-time from a **Base** class to a **Derived** class works fine when the following two criteria are met:

- 1) The Derived class does not add any additional member objects
- 2) The Derived class does not define or override any virtual functions

When these two criteria are met, it is always safe to downcast at compile-time from **Base** to **Derived**. In these circumstances, the **Derived** class is free to:

a) Define a non-virtual function with a new name that doesn't exist in the Base class

b) Define a non-virtual function to override a non-virtual function of the same name in the Base class

An interface cannot be defined as a template; the following syntax is invalid:

```
template<std::ptrdiff_t n> INVALID SYNTAX
using new interface lockable_bisem = std::counting_semaphore<n> {
    void lock(void) noexcept(false) { acquire(); }
    void unlock(void) noexcept(false) { release(); }
};
```

However an interface can provide an alternative interface for a unspecialised template, the following syntax is valid:

```
using new interface lockable_countsem = std::counting_semaphore { VALID SYNTAX
    void lock(void) noexcept(false) { acquire(); }
    void unlock(void) noexcept(false) { release(); }
};
```

And so then you use 'lockable_countsem' as though it were a template class:

```
int Func(void)
{
    lock_guard< lockable_countsem<1> > myguard(g_countsem);
    // Do more stuff here
}
```

There is an implicit conversion between a class and any of the *interface*'s which are based upon it, including an implicit conversion for references and pointers, for example:

lockable_bisem *p = &g_bisem; Implicit conversion from binary_semaphore* to lockable_bisem*

An interface cannot provide a partial specialisation of a class – instead you must first create a partially-specialised alias, for example:

```
template<class Alloc> using intvector = std::vector<int, Alloc>;
```

And then you can base the interface upon 'intvector' as follows:

```
using new interface popable_intvector = intvector {
    void pop(void) { this->pop_back(); }
```

};

A C++ compiler can perform optimisations when it knows that two or more pointers definitely don't point to the same object (or that two or more references don't refer to the same object). Take the following code snippet shared by Lénárd Szolnoki for example:

```
struct Base {
    int i;
};
struct Derived1 : Base {};
struct Derived2 : Base {};
void foo(Derived1* ptr1, Derived2* ptr2) {
    ptr1->i += ptr2->i;
    ptr1->i += ptr2->i;
    /* compilers currently are allowed to transform this into:
    ptr1->i += 2*ptr2->i;
    */
}
```

When a C++ compiler encounters two pointers where one of the *pointed-to* types is an *interface* to the other *pointed-to* type, the compiler must allow for aliasing, for example:

```
template<class Alloc>
void Func( std::vector<int,Alloc> *p, popable_intvector<Alloc> *q )
{
    // Compiler must allow for aliasing between 'p' and 'q'
}
```

A program is ill-formed if two function overloads are identical other than one type being an *interface* for another, for example:

```
void Func( std::vector<int, std::allocator<int> > *);
void Func( popable_intvector< std::allocator<int> > *);
```

The compiler must terminate compilation and issue a diagnostic to say that an *interface* cannot overload for its base class, nor can it overload for another *interface* which is based upon the same base class.

In the standard header <type_traits>, there shall be a new class: 'is_mutual_interface' as well as 'is_mutual_interface_v' which can be used to query whether any type is an interface for any other type.

More than one interface can be based upon the same class, for example:

```
using new interface popable string = std::string {
    void pop(void) { pop_back(); }
};
using new interface reversible string = std::string {
    void reverse(void)
    {
        for (unsigned i = 0u; i < (size()/2u); ++i)
        {
            using std::swap;
            swap( (*this)[i], (*this)[size()-lu-i]);
        }
    }
};
using new interface one bigger string = std::string {
    size t size(void)
    {
       return this->std::string::size() + 1u;
    }
};
```

The compiler is aware of the relationship between these four types, and it must allow for aliasing between the references in the following snippet:

```
#include <type_traits> // is_mutual_interface
void Func(std::string &a, popable string &b, reversible string &c)
{
   // Compiler must allow for aliasing between a, b and c
   // All of the following assertions must succeed
   static assert( std::is mutual interface v<std::string ,popable string > );
   static assert( std::is mutual_interface_v<popable_string,std::string</pre>
                                                                            > );
   static assert( std::is mutual interface v<std::string , reversible string> );
   static assert( std::is mutual interface v<popable string,reversible string> );
   static assert( false == std::is mutual interface v<int,double> );
   reversible string *p1 = &a; // implicit conversion
   reversible string *p2 = &b; // implicit conversion
   popable string *p3 = &a; // implicit conversion
   popable_string *p4 = &c; // implicit conversion
                    *p5 = &c; // implicit conversion
   std::string
}
```

If an interface is written to add an additional member object, or if it contains a method defined 'virtual', or if it contains a method that overrides the base class's virtual method, the compiler must terminate compilation and issue a diagnostic, as follows:

The keyword 'delete' can be used to deny access to a member object or member function, which can be useful for SFINAE or a 'requires' clause, as follows:

```
using new interface unclearable_string = std::string {
    delete clear;
};
```

Shorthand can be used if the method in the base class has the same signature as the method in the interface, as follows:

```
using new interface lockable_bisem = std::binary_semaphore {
    lock = acquire;
    Unlock = release;
};
```

Please respond to this paper on the C++ Standard Proposals Mailing List:

https://lists.isocpp.org/mailman/listinfo.cgi/std-proposals

You can view the mailing list archive here:

https://lists.isocpp.org/std-proposals/2023/02/date.php

Change Log from Draft to Draft

Draft 2: Replace 'interface' with 'using new interface' because it's such a commonly used identifier. Remove erroneous use of 'public' on Page 2 - you never use this keyword with an interface. Add in shorthand for methods with the same signature. Add in the use of the 'delete' keyword to deny access to a member.