

SOLID Object Oriented Design

Justin Schiff

February 13, 2019

SOLID Object Oriented Design

Welcome!

```
int getRandomNumber()  
{  
    return 4; // chosen by fair dice roll.  
              // guaranteed to be random.  
}
```

On Design Thinking

Design is a philosophy and mentality of adapting to change.

- Change is the only constant
- Requirements change
- Technologies change
- Data changes

What is a good methodology to gracefully adapt to these changes?

- Over-engineering
- Under-engineering

Tip

Once well adapted to design thinking code reviews are a great place to apply the methodology.

Different Design Methodologies

There are many philosophies of design.

Functional Programming

- Isolating state upwards
- Making as many **pure** functions as possible without side effects.
- Lisp-based programming languages facilitate this design philosophy.

Procedural Programming

- Basically what we all first do as programmers.
- Write what works, lines execute one after another.

Object Oriented Design.

- Concepts can emerge from our program and express themselves as objects.
- **Polymorphism** removes branching.
- Objects have interfaces that expose their functionality.

Mentality

Programming in these design philosophies is not following a set of rules. It's more a set of questions you ask yourself while you are programming. There is also some understanding of human psychology embedded in these principles.

- Duplication is cheaper than the wrong abstraction. (As opposed to DRY)
- An object in motion remains in motion.
- Make the change easy, then make the easy change.

You see this code in your system:

```
if (record.type == 'student') {  
    return `${record.name} - ${record.grade}`;  
} else if (record.type == 'witch') {  
    return `${record.utf8Glyph} ${record.favoriteSpell}`;  
} else if (record.type == 'teacher') {  
    return `${record.title} ${record.name} (${record.roomNumber})`;  
}  
// The client contacts your PM and says we need to support 'janitor'  
// as well. What are you going to do next?
```

Mentality

Before you know it...

```
if (record.type == 'student') {  
} else if (record.type == 'witch') {  
} else if (record.type == 'janitor') {  
} else if (record.type == 'staff' && record.building == 1) {  
} else if (record.type == 'staff' && record.building == 2) {  
} else if (record.type == 'buildingMaint') {  
} else if (record.type == 'foodServices') {  
} else if (record.type == 'teacher') {  
}  
// etc...
```

SOLID

Ok so we've beaten around the bush a bit. Here they are:

Principles

- Single Responsibility
- Open/Closed Principle
- Liskov Substitution
- Interface Segregation
- Dependency Inversion

Single Responsibility

A class should have only one clear reason for why you would want to change it.

- Easiest way to demonstrate this is to think of the largest object in your system. This is called a **God** object. Most frequently this is **User** and the main domain object in your system.
- Classes that have 1 responsibility are easier to test (see my next talk :))
- Easier to **change**.
- Classes should be cohesive. Meaning code in the class should change together. Common patterns that have low cohesion are code lumped in `utils` files.

Single Responsibility

```
class User extends BaseModel {  
  //...attributes  
  EMAIL_REGEX: /.../  
  beforeCreate() {  
    this.token = GenerateUniqueToken();  
    this.save();  
  }  
  onSave() {  
    if (!EMAIL_REGEX.test(this.email)) {  
      // send validation.  
    }  
  }  
  sendInvitation() {  
    var token = this.token;  
    var message = {  
      subject: '',  
      body: '...token...', // etc.  
    }  
    Mailer({smtp_settings: /*...*/})  
  }  
}
```

Single Responsibility

```
class TokenableModel extends BaseModel {
  onSave() {this.token ||= GenerateUniqueToken();}
  toUnique() {return this.token;}
}

class User extends TokenableModel { // <--
  //...attributes
  EMAIL_REGEX: /regex/
  onSave() {
    if (!EMAIL_REGEX.test(this.email)) {
      // send validation.
    }
  }
  sendInvitation() {
    var token = this.toUnique(); // <--
    var message = {
      subject: '',
      body: '...token...', // etc.
    }
    Mailer({smtp_settings: /*...*/})
  }
}
```

Single Responsibility

```
class TokenableModel extends BaseModel {
  onSave() {this.token ||= GenerateUniqueToken();}
  toUnique() {return this.token;}
}
class Invitation extends TokenableModel {
  user: foreignKey(),
  onCreate() {
    Mailer.sendInvitation(this)
  }
}
class User extends BaseModel { // <--
  //...attributes
  EMAIL_REGEX: /regex/
  onSave() {
    if (!EMAIL_REGEX.test(this.email)) {
      // send validation.
    }
  }
}
```

Single Responsibility

```
class TokenableModel extends BaseModel { /*...*/ }
class Invitation extends TokenableModel { /*...*/ }
class Email {
  constructor(str) { this.str = str; }
  isValid() { return /regex/.test(this.str); }
  // lets you add functionality specifically related to emails here.
  domain() { this.string.split('@').slice(-1).pop(); }
}

class User extends BaseModel {
  //...attributes
  validations: [
    email: {
      validator: Email,
      message: 'You must enter a valid email.'
    }
  ]
}
```

Open/Closed Principles

Code should be open for extension, and closed for modification.

- Able to change behavior without changing the code inside the class.

Tip

Generally achieved with dependency injection and polymorphism.

Open/Closed Principles

```
// Example from before violates OCP
if (record.type == 'student') {
    return `${record.name} - ${record.grade}`;
} else if (record.type == 'witch') {
    return `${record.utf8Glyph} ${record.favoriteSpell}`;

    } else if (record.type == 'teacher') {
    return `${record.title} ${record.name} (${record.roomNumber})`;
}
```

```
// Follows OCP
class Student {
    toDisplayName() {return `${record.name} - ${record.grade}`;}
}
class Teacher { /*etc...*/}

// Now wherever this is just needs to send a message to the class.
displayName = record.toDisplayName();
```

Open/Closed Principles

Another Example...

```
// Violates OCP
class User {
    sendUserPostedEvent(post) {
        NotificationService.sendNotifications(post);
        PostMailer.notifyAllUsers(post);
        post.textSubscribers.each(user => {
            TextService.sendPostUpdateText(user);
        });
    }
}
```

Note

This class is not open for extension. If we want to change any of the functionality we must modify the code in this class.

Open/Closed Principles

```
class PostedEvent {
    constructor(post, observers) {
        this.post = post;
        this.observers = observers;
    }
    notifyObservers() {
        this.observers.forEach(observer => observer.notify(this.post));
    }
}

// Usage.. now you can have as many observers as you want.
// They all respond to a standard interface.
const event = new PostedEvent(post, [
    PostNotificationObserver,
    PostMailerObserver,
    PostTexterObserver
]);
event.notifyObservers(); // somewhere in our code.
class PostMailerObserver { // One of these would look like this.
    constructor(post) { this.post = post; }
    notify() {NodeMailer.sendEmail(/* ... */)}
}
```


Open/Closed Principles

One step further.

```
class CompositeObserver {
    constructor(observers) { this.observers = observers; }
}
// Now our posted event doesn't have to take an array. It can take any
// observer that responds to the `notify` message.
class PostedEvent {
    constructor(post, observer) {
        this.post = post; this.observer = observer;
    }
    notifyObserver() {
        this.observer.notify();
    }
}

const compositeObserver = new CompositeObserver([
    PostNotificationObserver,
    PostMailerObserver,
    PostTexterObserver
])
const event = new PostedEvent(post, compositeObserver);
```

Liskov Substitution

Subclasses should be able to take the place of their parent class.

- This is probably the hardest to implement in common frameworks.
- If you are building a subclass of something make sure to adhere to the contract the superclass.
- Also applies to return values.

Liskov Substitution

Example:

```
class PaymentProcessor {
    charge() { return '/receipt'; }
} // Even without this.
class StripeProcessor extends PaymentProcessor {
    charge() {
        stripe.create_subscriber(/* ... */);
        const receipt_url = '...';
        return receipt_url;
    }
}
class AmazonPaymentProcessor extends PaymentProcessor {
    charge() {
        Amazon.charge_card(/* ... */);
        const receipt_url = '...';
        return receipt_url;
    }
}
class FreeProcessor extends PaymentProcessor {
    charge() {} // we aren't complying to the implicit interface here.
}
```

Liskov Substitution

If you are using typescript you can use an interface.

```
interface IPaymentProcessor {  
  charge() : string;  
}  
  
class FreeProcessor implements IPaymentProcessor {  
  charge() {  
    const {id} = createFreeReceipt();  
    return `/free_receipt/${id}`;  
  }  
}
```

If not this is a subtle thing you should be thinking about. LSP can have subtle violations that can bite you at runtime.

Interface Segregation

Many client-specific interfaces are better than one general-purpose interface.

- Dynamic languages do not really have this problem.
- When using a typed language this is something to consider.
(Typescript)

```
// NO
interface IValidator {
    validate(value: string)
    validateNumber(value: number)
};

// YES
interface IStringValidator {
    validate(value: string)
}

interface INumberValidator {
    validate(value: number)
}
```

Dependency Inversion

Depend on abstractions not concretions.

- Loose Coupling.
- Don't mix high level business logic with low level implementation.
- Using Liskov and Open-Closed will often call upon this pattern.

Dependency Inversion

```
class ImageGetter { // Violates Dependency Inversion.
    getImage() {
        let webcam = new NativeCameraInterface();
        return webcam.requestImage();
    }
}

let getter = new ImageGetter() // calling code would look like...
getter.getImage()

// Obeys Dependency Inversion.
class ImageGetter {
    constructor(imageReader) {
        this.imageReader = imageReader;
    }
    getImage() {
        return imageReader.requestImage();
    }
}

// calling code.
let getter = new ImageGetter(new NativeCameraInterface())
getter.getImage();
```

Dependency Inversion

Notice that now that we have injected the dependency instead of depending on it directly. We can use any object that responds to the `requestImage` message.

```
class NativeCameraInterface() {  
  requestImage() {}  
}  
  
class TestImageInterface() {  
  requestImage() {}  
}  
  
// calling code can now use any implementation it wants  
let getter = new ImageGetter(new NativeCameraInterface())  
getter.getImage();
```


Guidelines

The Code.



Methodology

You will find that these principles are more a method to expand your thinking about code.

- We should use these to inform our code reviews.
- Thinking about objects and where dependencies are is a prime topic for code review and language agnostic.
- Do **NOT** treat them as rules to be applied with hammer. Each principle is solving a problem, do not solve problems that you don't have.
- Most importantly do not frontload these principles. Code what works first and then ask yourself if it could be a nicer api.

Thank You!

<https://gist.github.com/lolzballs/2152bc0f31ee0286b722>