

TYPO3.Flow - Feature #31373

Annotation to enforce validation on setter

2011-10-28 10:03 - Christian Müller

Status:	Rejected	Start date:	2011-10-28
Priority:	Could have	Due date:	
Assignee:		% Done:	0%
Category:	Validation	Estimated time:	0.00 hour
Target version:	1.1	Complexity:	
PHP Version:			
Has patch:	No		

Description

Something like @FLOW3\ValidateOnSet which you can annotate to a setter in a model. On each call the generated proxy should check the validation rules for this property before setting and if validation fails throw some error.

Related issues:

Related to TYPO3.Flow - Bug #31500: Argument validation for CLI requests is n... **Under Review 2011-11-02**

Related to TYPO3.Flow - Bug #31502: Validation during persistence got lost in... **Resolved 2011-11-02**

History

#1 - 2011-11-01 12:55 - Jordy de Jong

I've committed a fix to review.typo3.org

With this fix you can add the @FLOW3\ValidateOnSet annotation to your property, the proxy class builder makes sure a setter is created which enforces the validations for the property

Downside of this solution is that you have to add this validation to all your properties in all your models, maybe a generic setting is a better solution to enable this throughout your application?

#2 - 2011-11-01 22:23 - Mr. Hudson

- Status changed from New to Under Review

Patch set 3 of change I21c63047b3adaf3e0f72130b7f1748cbe1103e40 has been pushed to the review server.

It is available at <http://review.typo3.org/6411>

#3 - 2011-11-01 22:24 - Karsten Dambekalns

- Category set to Validation

- Target version set to 1.1

#4 - 2011-11-01 22:35 - Karsten Dambekalns

Two different concepts here. Christian wants to add validation to (existing) setters, Jordy created a change to annotate properties. But: why a new annotation? Why not simply add the existing Validate annotations to the setter methods?

It seems we need a clear concept first...

#5 - 2011-11-01 22:39 - Christian Müller

Karsten Dambekalns wrote:

Two different concepts here. Christian wants to add validation to (existing) setters, Jordy created a change to annotate properties. But: why a new annotation? Why not simply add the existing Validate annotations to the setter methods?

It seems we need a clear concept first...

Yes, lets discuss this further. Actually the additional property was my idea, but I intended it on the set method. Your idea seems nice too but then you have duplicate code (annotations) in a way.

#6 - 2011-11-01 22:47 - Jordy de Jong

I thought adding the annotation to the property would be the more logical place, so it would be next to the defined validations you want to enforce in

the corresponding setter

I agree that my proposed fix isn't the ideal solution.

Personally, I'm wondering why in FLOW3 the validations aren't always enforced, by default. Either in the setter methods or before persistence. Why would you want to persist an object that doesn't match the defined validations?

#7 - 2011-11-02 08:36 - Karsten Dambekalns

Jordy de Jong wrote:

Personally, I'm wondering why in FLOW3 the validations aren't always enforced, by default. Either in the setter methods or before persistence.

See the two related issues [#31500](#) and [#31502](#) - it is not intended like this.

#8 - 2011-11-02 13:22 - Jordy de Jong

Do I understand correctly (from [#31502](#)) that validation during persistence is the intended way?

If so, I agree, because that would also have been my way of solving this.

#9 - 2012-03-14 17:46 - Christian Müller

- Status changed from Under Review to Rejected