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Chapter

How to Keep the Binary Compatibility of C++ Based Objects

Donguk Yu and Hong Seong Park

Abstract

This chapter proposes the binary compatibility object model for C++ (BiCOMC) to provide the binary compatibility of software components in order to share objects among C++ based executable files such as .exe, .dll, and .so. In addition, the proposed model provides the method overriding and overloading, multiple inheritance, and exception handling. This chapter illustrates how to use the proposed model via a simple example in the Windows and Linux environment. The proposed method is validated by application examples and comparisons with known object models such as C++, COM, and CCC in terms of the call time of a method during execution and the binary compatibility such as reusability due to interface version and the types of compilers. Also this chapter shows that BiCOMC-based components compiled with Microsoft Visual C++ and GCC can call each other and the interface version problems are resolved.
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1. Introduction

Nowadays, lots of software have been developed based on components because of reusability and composability which can make development and maintenance easier. The component-based approach has some advantages that the cost and time required for maintenance and development can be reduced through the combination of components and the property of encapsulation. In particular, the robot software platforms such as OPRoS [1–3], openRTM [4, 5], and OROCOS [6], which are examples of component-based systems, have been using components of dynamic libraries, such as .dll and .so, in order for components to be able to be developed and maintained with ease. Despite these advantages, there are some hurdles in reusing the components. The biggest hurdle is the binary compatibility issue of C++ based components, which is whether or not the components in the binary code compiled by a type of compiler are executing together on the same operating system with other components compiled by its old version compiler or other types of compilers. In practice, the number of components implemented with programming languages such as Java and Python has been increasing because those languages do not cause the binary compatibility problems. However, C++ is an important programming language needed for the control of automation machines/devices such as robots and SW-based PLCs because it provides fast performance [7, 8]. In addition, there have been lots of C++ based components or modules
developed and stably used till now for industrial/office/home automation. Because the components were compiled by different types and/or versions of compilers, it is necessary to reuse them effectively. Therefore, the binary compatibility of C++ components (or objects) should be resolved. Note that examples of the components (or objects) are classes, variables, and methods, where a class can include variables, methods, and zero or more classes.

There are following two types of methods in dynamical sharing of C++ classes: the C-based dynamic library method and the sharing method supported by a compiler. Because the C-based dynamic library method cannot directly share classes, the executable files such as .exe, .dll, and .so refer to the abstract class of the same header files and deliver the address of the instance of the class. The sharing method by compiler can directly share classes. But the method cannot share instances of classes compiled by different types of compilers [9]. In other words, there is a serious problem that the sharing of classes is applicable only to the same compiler, which makes spreading of C++ based components difficult.

For instance, let us consider two types of components in the Windows environment, which are made using Visual C++ from Microsoft (MSVC) and GCC from GNU, respectively. A MSVC-based component and a GCC-based component are not mutually compatible in most cases even though they have been made in the same Windows environment. This situation occurs due to the binary compatibility problem. The binary compatibility problem generally causes the situations where the methods of the object cannot be suitably called or its operation is not properly executed. And then the system can enter into a down (or dead) state. To solve the problem, it is necessary to design an object structure compatible in all types of compilers [10].

There have been some researches to solve the binary compatibility problem of C++ objects, examples of which are COM [11], CCC [12], and ZL [13]. COM solves the binary compatibility problem of C++ objects but has some limitations that it should operate in a Windows environment and be supported only by the MSVC compiler [11]. CCC is a library that the classes are composed of only header files to maintain the binary compatibility and designed to use the C++ 11 features [14] to make binary compatible objects with ease. But CCC has a limitation that it can be used only by compilers that support the C++ 11 standard. In other words, CCC does not share objects compiled by compilers not supporting the C++ 11 standard. In the C++ compatible language ZL [13], the binary compatible classes are supported by customized preprocessors and macros. It does not however support multiple inheritances and provides the binary compatibility only for GCC because the compiler for ZL is made from modified version of GCC. In addition COM and CCC do not support the method overloading, but ZL partially supports it. CCC supports exception handling, COM does it in the restricted manner, but ZL does not support it.

This chapter proposes the binary compatibility object model for C++ (BiCOMC) for reusability of software components which provide binary compatibility for sharing objects between C++ executable files in the Windows or the Linux environment. In addition, the proposed model provides the method overloading and overriding, multiple inheritance, and exception handling. And BiCOMC makes each other share the objects generated by different types of compilers such as MSVC, GCC, and ICC. This chapter provides macros of C++ preprocessor for sharing the binary compatible objects easily and independently of the types and versions of compilers. This chapter illustrates how to use the proposed model via a simple example in the Windows and Linux environment. To validate the proposed method, BiCOMC is compared with COM and CCC in terms of the call time during execution and the binary compatibility among interface versions and the types of compilers. Moreover, it is shown that BiCOMC-based components made using both MSVC and GCC can call the methods of each other and the interface version problems are resolved.
In the next section, a binary compatibility object model for C++ (BiCOMC) is proposed, which has the structures of virtual function tables including multiple inheritance and the casting algorithm for conversion of interfaces. It is shown that method overloading and multiple inheritances are supported. In Section 3, the component based on BiCOMC is defined, and its implementation is shown using examples. Section 4 suggests two examples. One is a simple example to illustrate how to use the proposed method in Windows and Linux environment. The other is an example of a robot application to validate the proposed method, where the application consists of three components compiled by different types of compilers. In Section 5, the binary compatibility and the performance measure of the call time of methods are evaluated. Finally, the conclusions are given in Section 6.

2. Binary compatibility object model for C++ (BiCOMC)

2.1 Object model

A BiCOMC is shown in Figure 1 and has the interface Object as the root of the hierarchy of the class diagrams. Since interfaces are public and can be used by many objects, they do not have any member variables so that binary compatibility is maintained. Note that the interface Object has one pointer variable as shown in Figure 1 for sharing of a virtual function table. The pointer variable is the vftptr pointer for accessing of the table and exists at the topmost of the interface. The structure of the virtual function table is explained later.

Let us consider the case where an executable file A can create an object but a different executable file B can delete the object. In this case, the memory allocated by the file A cannot normally be deleted using the C++ delete operator in the file B because the delete operator of the file B cannot invoke the destructor of the class in

![Class diagram of Object and ErrorDetail interface for BiCOMC.](image-url)
the file A. To solve this problem, the interface Object has a destroy() method so that objects can be deleted by the executable file which created the objects.

Because objects that are shared externally are exposed in the form of an interface, they cannot know the prototype of the object and then cannot be replicated through the C++ copy constructor. The interface Object has a clone() method that is allowed to clone the object.

When interface methods are implemented, the order of the methods in the virtual function table should be the same as the declaration order of the methods in the interface. So the order of the methods in the interface should not be changed once the interface is open in public. Adding a new method to the interface is allowed if its order is not changed. In other words the insertion of a new method is allowed only as the last method of the interface.

All methods can cause exceptions which are related to the interface ErrorDetail in Figure 1. Therefore, only objects implemented in the interface ErrorDetail should be thrown at the occurrence of the exceptions. The interface ErrorDetail has a value() method, a category() method, and a message() method that return an error value, an error category, and a description of the error, respectively.

An interface can inherit only one parent interface, but a class can inherit multiple interfaces. When a class has inherited multiple interfaces, the class has multiple vftptr pointers, which are the addresses of virtual function tables for individually inherited interfaces. The class, which is inherited multiple interfaces, refers to as many virtual function tables as the number of the inherited interfaces, which is shown in Figure 3.

2.2 Structure of a virtual function table

The vftptr pointer of the interface Object points to a virtual function table. A virtual function table contains the address of the overridden method and the interface information for the interface. Figure 2 shows the structure of the virtual function table.

![Figure 2. Structure of a virtual function table.](image-url)
function table. The sizes of depth, version, and next offset are equal to the size of a void pointer (or `void*`), respectively.

A virtual function table contains all the parent interfaces inherited by the interface. The first element, `depth`, of a virtual function table in Figure 2 stores the number of inheritances from the interface Object to the last interface. If the interface directly inherited by the implementation class is the interface Object, the value of `depth` is 0. The second element, `version`, means the version number of BiCOMC for future extension of BiCOMC. The third element, `next offset`, is used for the objects that inherit multiple interfaces and represents the offset between the current `vftptr` and the next `vftptr`, which is explained later. The fourth element `Object FT` refers to the address of the function table of the interface `Object` where the actual addresses of overridden methods and the interface information are stored. The remaining elements `i-th interface FT` points to the function table of the `i-th` interface (`i = 1... N`).

The entry `interface info` in the function table means the interface information. The entry `j-th mth. addr.` (`j = 1... M`) is the address of the `j-th` method. Note that the addresses of the methods are stored in the same order as the order of declaration of the methods.

The interface info includes some elements such as hash, subhash, `mth. count`, `interface name`, and `j-th mth. sig.` (`j = 1... M`). The hash is a 64bit value, and it is calculated with the name of the interface and the names of inherited interfaces. The same hash means that the name of the interface and the names of the inherited interfaces are the same. The subhash is also a 64bit value, and it is calculated with `M` method signatures which contain the name of the method, a return type, and parameters’ types. The same subhash means that the method definitions of two interfaces are the same. The sizes of the hash and the subhash of the interface may not be the same as the size of `void*`. Their sizes are calculated in (1) in bytes. If the hash values of two objects are different, the objects are incompatible. The subhash values are used for the method overloading and backward compatibility. So the method signatures should be checked if the subhash values are not matched. Note that the interface name and the `j-th mth. sig.` (`j = 1...M`) are null-terminated character strings encoded by UTF-8 and `j-th mth. sig.` consists of the method name, the return type, and types of parameters:

\[
size = \left\lceil \frac{16}{\text{sizeof}(\text{void}^*)} \right\rceil \times \text{sizeof}(\text{void}^*)
\]  

(1)

As mentioned above, the method signature can distinguish other methods with the same name because the method’s signature is based on the method name as well as the types of parameters and the return type. So it can be said that BiCOMC supports the method overloading.

2.3 Structure of virtual function tables in multiple inheritance

In BiCOMC, an object that inherits multiple interfaces has as many `vftptr` pointers as the number of inherited interfaces. Note that the basic structure of the virtual function table is described in Section 2.2. Figure 3 shows the structure of the virtual function tables of an object inheriting three interfaces.

In the case where three interfaces have been inherited, three `vftptr` pointers exist as shown in Figure 3. Assume that a 32bit system is used and the next offset of the virtual function Table 1 is 4, which is the difference between the address of `vftptr 2` and the address of `vftptr 1` in the instance of class. And the next offset of the virtual function Table 3 is –8, which is the difference between the address of `vftptr 1` and the address of `vftptr 3`. 
2.4 Interface casting

General casting methods of C++ such as static_cast and dynamic_cast cannot be used among objects created by different types of compilers. Therefore, methods that can cast BiCOMC objects are necessary regardless of a type of compilers used. Figure 4 shows an algorithm for casting BiCOMC objects to other interfaces.

The casting algorithm gets virtual function tables using two parameters of obj and tgtTable. The algorithm compares the tables of obj with the tables of the target interface in order to check whether or not two interfaces are compatible. NULL is returned if two interfaces are not compatible each other. The seventh, tenth, and
forty-second lines in Figure 4 are for processing of multiple inheritance. Lines 21–24 check hash values to test the names of interfaces and inheritance relationships. That is, lines 21–24 compare the hash values and detect whether they are compatible by detecting whether a new interface is added or a different interface name exists. Lines 25–37 compare subhash values, and two interfaces are considered as compatible interfaces if the values are the same. If they are different, it examines method signatures of interface information to check compatibility. An example of interface casting is shown in Figure 6.

3. Definition and implementation of component based on BiCOMC model

In this section the component based on BiCOMC is defined, and its implementation is shown using examples. Figure 5 shows an example of the class Comp_1 based on BiCOMC, where the interface Interface_1 and the interface Interface_2 inherit the interface Object and Interface_3 inherits Interface_2. The definition of the interfaces in Figure 5 is shown in Figure 7. The class Comp_1 is one of the components that provide interfaces Interface_1 and Interface_3. Interface Interface_1 consists of void mth_1(int) and int. mth_2(), and interface Interface_3 inherits interface Interface_2 and consists of void mth_1() and int. mth_2(int).
Figure 6 shows an example of the interface casting algorithm in Figure 4, which shows that Interface_1 is converted to Interface_2 using bicomc_cast based on the algorithm in Figure 4.

The macro BICOMC_INTERFACE defines interfaces as shown in Figure 7, using one or two parameters. The first parameter is the name of the interface, and the second parameter is the name of the parent interface and optional. In the case where the second parameter is empty, the interface Object is inherited. The macro BICOMC_DECL_METHOD in Figure 7 declares the method of the interface. The macro has three parameters as follows: the first parameter is the name of the method, the second parameter is the function type of the method, and the third parameter is the number of parameters of the method. For example, let us consider BICOMC_DECL_METHOD(mth_2, int, (), 0). This macro represents the method int. mth_2() in Figure 8.

The interface definition in Figure 7 is converted into the C++ code of Figure 8 by C++ preprocessor. Note that C++ code for Interface_2 is not represented. The macro BICOMC_INTERFACE in Figure 7 is converted to the C++ code related to the inputted interface name such as Interface_1. As seen in the 1st and 17th lines of Figure 8, the macro BICOMC_INTERFACE (Interface_1) and BICOMC_INTERFACE (Interface_3, Interface_2) create the codes of class Interface_1 public Object and class Interface_3 public Interface_2, respectively. The macro BICOMC_DECL_METHOD is converted to a method which consists of a name, a return type, and parameters. The second, third, and eleventh lines in Figure 7 are converted into the third–seventh lines, ninth–fourteenth lines, and nineteenth to twenty-fourth lines in Figure 8, respectively. From the virtual function table pointed at by the vftptr pointer of the interface Object, the addresses of functions(or methods) are acquired using the inheritance depth of the interface and the order of declarations of the interface methods as shown in the 5th, 11th, and 21st lines in Figure 8, and then the actual overridden methods are called. These methods are converted into the function type as shown in Figure 9 and then stored. Note that ErrorCode is a wrapper class of ErrorDetail in Figure 1.

```c++
1: Interface_1* p1 = new Comp1();
2: Interface_2* p2 = bicomc_cast<Interface_2*>(p1);
```

Figure 6.
An example of interface casting.
In Figure 9, parameter I* is the address of the interface instance, the second parameter R* is the address of the variable receiving the return value of the method, and other parameters (P_1, P_N) are parameters of the method. The method stored in the function type is called with the same function-calling convention. Note that exception information is returned using the interface ErrorDetail. When the exception information has been returned, the C++ code of the method throws the exception on behalf of the method as shown in the 6th, 12th, and 22nd lines in Figure 8.

Figure 10 shows the implementation of the interfaces in Figure 7. The interfaces in Figure 7 are inherited, and the methods are overridden in order to define the class Comp_1. The interfaces and methods for overriding are set using the macros BICOMC_OVERRIDE and BICOMC_OVER_METHOD. Parameters of the macro ErrorDetail* (I*, R*, P_1, P_2, ..., P_N)
BICOMC_OVERRIDE are names of all interfaces that the component inherits. Parameters of the macro BICOMC_OVERRIDE METHOD are the names and signatures of the overridden methods. Figure 11 shows C++ code converted from Figure 10 by C++ preprocessor. The macro BICOMC_OVERRIDE is converted to bool overrideMethod(), and parameters of the macro such as Interface_1 and Interface_3 are used for clear conversion of overridden methods related to the type of the interface. The BICOMC_OVERRIDE METHOD macros on lines 3–7 in Figure 10 are converted to codes on lines 6–11 in Figure 11 and the macro BiCOMC_OVERRIDE_INIT() to holder(overrideMethod()) on the 16th line in Figure 11.

4. Examples of BiCOMC-based application

4.1 A simple example

This section describes in sequence how to make a file copy application, which is a simple example based on BiCOMC. The file copy application is designed to run on Windows and Linux and is built using MSVC and GCC, respectively. The dynamic library providing the file copy function, which named utility, is created, and the executable file using this dynamic library, which named app, is generated as the application. The interface is first defined to share an object that provides a method for
copying files. The interface to provide this functionality is defined in the utility.h file as the ICopy interface. Figure 12 shows that the ICopy interface is defined based on the macro of BiCOMC and is the source code of the dynamic library named utility.cpp.

The BiCOMC macro is defined in object.h, which is added as shown on line 5 in Figure 12 to use it. ICopy has a copy() method that receives two file names of src and dst as the input parameters and copies src to dst, which is shown on the eighth line in Figure 12.

In order to implement the ICopy interface in Figure 12, the Copy class is written made as shown in the utility.cpp of Figure 13. In addition, copy() method of ICopy is overridden in Figure 13. Note that the utility.cpp file is the source code for the utility dynamic library.

The utility.h which defines the ICopy interface is added as one of the header files on the second line in Figure 13, and some header files for the Copy class implementation on lines 4–13 are defined for Windows and Linux. The Copy class inherits the ICopy interface on the 15th line, and the overriding methods are explicitly specified using the BiCOMC macro on lines 16–19, where the specified methods are written on lines 23–37. The create() function on lines 40–46 creates an instance of the Copy class in order to pass its instance outside of the dynamic library called utility. The main() function of app using utility dynamic library is written in the app.cpp file, which is illustrated in Figure 14.

The create() function is called on the 21th line in Figure 14 to get an instance of the Copy class in Figure 13 but casted to ICopy* using bicomc_cast() since create() returns Object*. The copy() method is called to perform file copy on the 24th line. This method is used in try-catch because it generates an exception when copy() fails. The commands shown in Figure 15 are executed to build utility.cpp into utility dynamic library and app.cpp into app executable file, respectively.

4.2 BiCOMC-based component for robot application

This section explains how to implement BiCOMC-based components using a robot applications. The robot application consists of three components in a Windows environment as follows: the ManipulatorComp, the MobileComp, and the AppComp in Figure 16.

The component ManipulatorComp is compiled with GCC 5.2 and controls the manipulator. The component MobileComp is compiled with MSVC 14 and controls the mobile platform. The component AppComp is compiled with MSVC 10 and coordinates the components MobileComp and ManipulatorComp. The component AppComp accesses the components MobileComp and ManipulatorComp through the interfaces IMobile and IManipulator, respectively. Definitions of these interfaces are illustrated in Figure 17. Figure 18 shows the definition of the component MobileComp that inherits the interface IMobile and overrides the methods of the

```
1: // utility.h
2: #ifndef UTILITY_H_
3: #define UTILITY_H_
4: 
5: #include <bicom/object.h>
6: 
7: BICOMC_INTERFACE(ICopy)
8: BICOMC_DECL_METHOD(copy, void(char const* src, char const* dst), 2)
9: BICOMC_INTERFACE_END(ICopy)
10: 
11: #endif // !def UTILITY_H_
```

Figure 12. C++ code of utility.h.
Figure 13. C++ code of utility.h.

```cpp
1: // utility.h
2: #ifndef WIN32
3: # include <Windows.h>
4: # endif
5: # include <dlfcn.h>
6: # ifdef DL_IMPORT
7: # include <sys/sendfile.h>
8: # endif
9: # include <sys/stat.h>
10: # endif
11: # include <iostream>
12: # define DL_IMPORT _attribute__((visibility("default")))
13: #endif
14: #define WIN32
15: #include <windows.h>
16: #endif
17: #include "app.h"
18: #include "app.cpp"
19: 
20: class Copy : public ICopy {
21: #ifdef WIN32
22: BICOMP OVERRIDE(IColor)
23: BICOMP OVERRIDE.INIT()
24: BICOMP OVERRIDE.DESTROY()
25: #endif
26: 
27: public:
28: Copy(): BICOMP OVERRIDE.INIT() {}
29: void destroy() { delete this; }
30: void copy(char const* src, char const* dst) {
31: #ifdef WIN32
32: if (Copy file(src, dst, TRUE) != 0)
33: throw std::runtime error("copy fails");
34: #endif
35: 
36: return new Copy();
37: } catch (...) {
38: return NULL;
39: }
40: }
41: 
42: extern "C" DL IMPORT Object* create() {
43: try {
44: return new Copy();
45: } catch (...) {
46: return NULL;
47: }
48: }
```

Figure 14. C++ code of app.cpp.

```cpp
1: // app.cpp
2: #ifndef WIN32
3: # include <Windows.h>
4: # ifdef
5: # ifdef <dlfcn.h>
6: # endif
7: # include <iostream>
8: # include "utility.h"
9: 
10: int main() {
11: #ifdef WIN32
12: HANDLE handle = LoadLibraryA("utility.dll");
13: void* raw = GetProcAddress(handle, "create");
14: #else
15: void* handle = dlopen("/libutility.so", RTLD_LAZY);
16: void* raw = dlsym(handle, "create");
17: #endif
18: 
19: typedef Object* (func)();
20: func create = reinterpret_cast<func>(raw);
21: ICopy* pCopy = Bicompatible. Cast<ICopy*>(create());
22: if (pCopy) {
23: try {
24: pCopy->copy("src.txt","dst.txt");
25: } catch (std::exception const& e) {
26: std::cerr << e. message () << std::endl;
27: }
28: pCopy->destroy();
29: }
30: #endif
31: freeLibrary(handle);
32: 
33: close(handle);
34: #endif
35: return 0;
36: }
```
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Table 1. Compilation commands of app.cpp and utility.cpp.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MSVC &amp; Windows</th>
<th>GCC &amp; Linux</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>cl /Fe utility utility.cpp /LD</td>
<td>g++ -o libutility.so utility.cpp --shared --fpic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>cl /Fe app app.cpp</td>
<td>g++ -o app app.cpp</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 15. Compilation commands of app.cpp and utility.cpp.

Figure 16. Configuration example of components for a robot application.

Figure 17. Definition of interfaces IMobile and IManipulator.

Figure 18. Definition of component MobileComp.

interface. The component ManipulatorComp and the component AppComp can be defined in the similar manner, which is shown in Figures 19 and 20, respectively. Figure 21 shows the operation results of the robot after three components in Figure 16 are successfully implemented, which are parts captured from a video clip [15]. It can be observed from Figure 21 that the BiCOMC-based components function properly regardless of the types of compilers.
This section evaluates the binary compatibility occurred among different types of compilers and verifies whether backward compatibility can be maintained when the interface version has been changed. There are some binary compatibility checking tools like ABI Compliance Checker [16], shlib-compat [17], libabigail [18], and ABICheck [19], but these tools are used to check API/ABI in C language level or to compare virtual function tables generated by the supported compiler. So they cannot check the binary compatibility of C++ objects created by different types of compilers. In addition these tools cannot detect the compatibility

```
1: class AppComp { 
2:  IMobile* pMobile; 
3:  IManipulator* pManipulator; 
4:  ... 
5:  void main() { 
6:    ... 
7:    pMobile->move(0.5, 0.0); 
8:    ... 
9:    pManipulator->stop(); 
10: } 
11: 
```

Figure 19.
Example of component AppComp.

```
1: class ManipulatorComp : public IManipulator { 
2:  BICOMC_OVERRIDE(1Manipulator) 
3:  BICOMC_OVERRIDE_METHOD(stop, void(int)) 
4:  BICOMC_OVERRIDE_METHOD(move, void(double*,double*,int)) 
5:  ... 
6:  BICOMC_OVERRIDE_END() 
7:  public: 
8:   ManipulatorComp(): BICOMC_OVERRIDE_INIT() { ... } 
9:   void stop(int mode) { ... } 
10:   void move(double* angles, double* times, int n) { ... } 
11:   ... 
12: }; 
```

Figure 20.
Definition of component ManipulatorComp.

Figure 21.
Video capture of robot application running.

5. Evaluation

This section evaluates the binary compatibility occurred among different types of compilers and verifies whether backward compatibility can be maintained when the interface version has been changed. There are some binary compatibility checking tools like ABI Compliance Checker [16], shlib-compat [17], libabigail [18], and ABICheck [19], but these tools are used to check API/ABI in C language level or to compare virtual function tables generated by the supported compiler. So they cannot check the binary compatibility of C++ objects created by different types of compilers. In addition these tools cannot detect the compatibility
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maintained by BiCOMC. For checking of the binary compatibility, this chapter uses the proposed methods explained in Sections 5.1 and 5.2. Finally the call times as performance measures are compared among BiCOMC, COM, and CCC using different types of compilers.

5.1 Evaluation of binary compatibility between compilers

Compilers generally reorder a virtual function table according to each compiler’s ABI, which makes the binary compatibility difficult. The interface CompatibilityChecker is suggested to check whether the methods of objects shared by different binaries (or executable files) created by different types of compilers normally call each other. The interface CompatibilityChecker has the methods check1(), check2(), and check3() arranged in an unordered fashion and is illustrated in Figure 22. The methods simply return the values 1, 2, and 3, respectively. In addition, all methods’ calling convention is controlled as the same.

These methods are called to check whether the normal return value is delivered. The tests are considered successful if the three methods are normally called and are judged to have failed if any of the methods are not normally called or the program has shut down. The experiments using the interface CompatibilityChecker are performed using MSVC 9 and 14, GCC 4.5 and 5.2, and the Intel C++ Compiler 14 and 16 in Windows 10 in order to verify binary compatibility among different types of compilers. Note that the GCC of MinGW-w64 is used. In Tables 1–3, “O” means pass, “X” means failure, and “-” means not testable. ICC is the abbreviation of the Intel C++ Compiler. In other words, “O” means that the three methods are normally called.

It can be seen in Tables 1 and 2 that BiCOMC and CCC guarantee the binary compatibility among MSVC, GCC, and ICC. However, CCC is only available in compilers supporting C++ 11. Table 3 shows that the binary compatibility between MSVC and ICC is guaranteed as stated in [20], but these two compilers are not compatible with GCC. As stated earlier, the different types of compilers reorder the virtual function table, and then the reordered methods are not called normally. So C++ methods are called abnormally by different types of compilers as shown in Table 3, whereas BiCOMC and CCC worked normally because they prevent to reorder a virtual function table.

5.2 Evaluation of backward compatibility of different interface versions

In developing the program, it is necessary to add a new method to the existing interface. That is, the interface version is changed in this case, which is shown in Figure 23.

Figure 23 shows two interfaces of IfaceA and IfaceB, where IfaceB inherits IfaceA. In the version v1, IfaceA has a method, mth_1(). But the interface IfaceA should be upgraded to the new version v2 because a new method of mth_3() is added. Let us consider the following: the v1-related interfaces and the v2-related interfaces are used in the caller and the callee programs, respectively.

```
1: struct CompatibilityChecker {
2:   virtual int check2(int n1, int n2) = 0;
3:   virtual int check1() = 0;
4:   virtual int check3(int n1) = 0;
5: }; 
```

Figure 22. Interface for binary compatibility test.
This test also uses simple methods that return values of 1, 2, and 3, respectively, which are similar to methods used in Section 5.1. The experiments are done using MSVC 14, GCC 5.2, and ICC 16 in Windows 10.

Table 4 shows that BiCOMC can enable the binary compatibility between interfaces of versions v1 and v2, but CCC, COM, and C++ are not compatible between codes with different interface versions. Therefore, BiCOMC supports the backward compatibility of interface versions. MSVC, GCC, and ICC generate a virtual function table in contiguous memory space regardless of inheritance. In this structure of the table, if a new method is added in the parent interface, the offset of child’s methods will be changed. For this reason, C++ does not provide the backward compatibility. COM and CCC also have the same reason. BiCOMC has the structure

![Figure 23. Interface for backward compatibility test per version.](image)

Table 2. Tests of the binary compatibility in CCC.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CCC</th>
<th>Dynamic library (DLL)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MSVC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executable (EXE)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSVC</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GCC</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICC</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. Tests of the binary compatibility in C++.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CCC</th>
<th>Dynamic library (DLL)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MSVC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executable (EXE)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSVC</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GCC</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICC</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How to Keep the Binary Compatibility of C++ Based Objects
DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.5772/intechopen.77383

of Figure 2 so that the parent’s methods and the child’s methods can be stored at independent memory space of each other. Thus BiCOMC supports the backward compatibility of interface versions.

5.3 Call time evaluation

Call times as performance measures are measured in Windows 10 using MSVC 14, GCC 5.2, and ICC 16. The methods of objects are called 10 million times, and the call times are obtained as the average values of all call times. These are shown in Figures 24–26, in which MSVC, GCC, and ICC compilers are used for evaluation, respectively. In these figures, two notations such as XXX and XXX-R are used, where XXX is one of BiCOMC, CCC, CPP (or C++), and COM and -R means that the method used in the test has a return value.

Tables 1–4 show that BiCOMC provides the best binary compatibility among different types of compilers. Figures 24–26 show that C++ has the best call time, but the call time of BiCOMC is similar to those of C++ and COM. CPP is generally faster than others because the method calling accesses an optimized virtual function table which accesses directly addresses of methods. COM is also similar to CPP. Note that GCC does not support COM. CCC is slower as std::function, one of the C++ 11 features [14], is basically used [12]. BiCOMC is slower slightly than CPP and COM because it accesses addresses of methods in the function table pointed by the virtual function table. But the test results show no or little significant difference among BiCOMC and CPP/COM.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method compiler</th>
<th>BiCOMC</th>
<th>CCC</th>
<th>COM</th>
<th>C++</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MSVC 14</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GCC 5.2</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICC 16</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4. Tests of the backward compatibility.

![Figure 24. Call time in MSVC.](image-url)
6. Conclusion

This chapter proposed the binary compatibility object model for C++ (BiCOMC) to provide the binary compatibility of objects necessary for reusability of software components in the Windows and Linux environment in order to share objects among C++ based executable files such as .exe, .dll, and .so. The interfaces for the component, method overloading and overriding, multiple inheritance, and the exception handling were suggested based on BiCOMC model.

The proposed model was validated by application examples and comparisons with commonly known object models such as C++, COM, and CCC in terms of the call time of a method during execution and the binary compatibility such as reusability. The application examples showed that components compiled by GCC and MSVC call each other without any restrictions. From Tables 1–3, it can be seen that the BiCOMC provides better binary compatibility in a Windows environment than object models in C++, COM, and CCC, which are compiled in GCC, MSVC, and ICC. The BiCOMC was compared with C++, COM, and CCC in terms of the call times of methods during run time. The results showed that the call time of
the BiCOMC was similar to C++/COM. In other words, the application examples and the evaluation results verified that the proposed method was provided for the binary compatibility among different types of compilers.

In future we will develop and distribute BiCOMC-based components for various applications such as industrial/medical robot applications and factory/home automation application, which can be used regardless of the types of compilers.
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