## Program Language and Design Assignment 3

## Divij Singh

## 17/11/18

The paper addresses a principle in Object Oriented Design, known as the Liskov Substitution Principle.

Put simply, if you have an object in a program, say F, and make an object S that is a subtype of F, then you should be able to swap any instances of F in the program with instances of S without any issues in terms of correctness.

The idea behind the principle is to reduce a program into simple, interchangeable blocks; if you need a feature of one object, you should be able to access it without having to create a unique copy of the object.

While the author uses the example of squares and rectangles, an alternative example could be that of addition and subtraction. (This would also help those unfamiliar with C++ code understand the concept.)

Say we have a function  $F_1$ , which accepts two integers,  $I_1$  and  $I_2$ , and returns their sum. We want the result of 2+3, so we pass the values +2 and +3 to a function  $F_2$ , which performs the same function for positive integers (and is thus a subtype of  $F_1$ ). In return, we will receive a value of +5.

Now, we want the result of 105. This can of course be re-written as +10+(-5), which is an addition calculation. However, upon passing the values to  $F_2$ , we receive an error! After all,  $I_1$  and  $I_2$  must both be positive integers, much as we would like to pretend that +(-5) qualifies as one.

Now, one possible solution could be to only allow the user to give positive integers. However, that would require informing each and every user of this constraint, which is, to be honest, a rather silly constraint. So instead, we realise we must make our  $F_2$  more robust.

So, we change the code to accept any two integers,  $I_1$  and  $I_2$ , and return their sum. This allows us to complete our previous calculation, giving us the answer of 10-5=5. Thus the requirement for the principle is met.

In addition to this signature characteristic,  $F_2$  must also behave in a similar

manner to  $F_1$ .

If we were to pass three values to  $F_2$ , it should throw an error, as  $F_1$  is unable to handle three values as well. This is known as trying to strengthen a precondition.

If we pass two numbers to  $F_2$ , we should only receive one number in return, not more nor less. This is known as trying to weaken a postcondition.

In order to satisfy this principle, any object and its subtypes must meet the above conditions. It is essentially the expected behaviour of the object that is under consideration. If any  $F_1$  is replaced by a subtype  $F_2$ , the replacement must behave in the same manner as  $F_1$  in order for the principle to hold.