

Item 22: declare data members private.

Why not public data members?

① ⇒ If data members are public, everybody has read write access to it.

We can implement no access, read only access, write read access using get & set functions.

```

class AccessHw {
public:
    int getReadOnly() const { return readOnly; }
    int setReadWrite (int value) { readWrite = value; }
    int getReadWrite() const { return readWrite; }
private:
    int noAccess;
    int readOnly;
    int readWrite;
};

```


③ Encapsulatⁿ.

Suppose we have a class `SpeedDataCollection` where we have a functⁿ `averageSoFar`.

`averageSoFar` can be implemented in 2 ways.

① keeps a running average \rightarrow but this makes `SpeedDataCollectn` object bigger

② `averageSoFar` can be implemented such that it returns / recalculates the value of running average each time \rightarrow this makes it slower.

\Rightarrow On m/c where memory is tight (roadside device) & where averages are needed infrequently, computing average each time is better.

\Rightarrow In application where average are needed frequently & memory is not an issue, keeping running average is preferable.

Now the point is \Rightarrow by accessing the average of these 2 member functⁿ (encapsulating) we can interchange these implementations, client will only need to recompile.

we have the right to change implementation but if done so, how much code client has to change?

In case of public data members, too much client code will be broken also in protected, all the derived classes that uses it which is unknowably large amt of code.

Hence protected are as unencapsulated as public data members.

Item 23 explains \rightarrow something's encapsulated is inversely proportional to amt of code that might be broken

\Rightarrow Hence declare data members private