



# SOLID PRINCIPLES JAVA INTERVIEWS





This document is strictly for **personal use only** and not for redistribution or commercial purposes.

If you wish to use any part of this document, you must credit the source and creator: @javatechcommunity.com - support@javatechcommunity.com



# class Report { public void GenerateReport() { //Code } public void SendEmail() { //code } }

**Case 1: Wrong** - The Report class is doing two jobs: generating reports and sending emails, which makes it harder to maintain.

Case 2: Right - Separating into ReportGenerator and EmailSender ensures each class handles only one responsibility.

**Use:** This makes the code cleaner, reusable, and easier to debug or modify.





### **Open-Closed Principle**

A class should be open for extension but closed for modification.

```
class PaymentProcessor {
  public void ProcessPayment(string paymentType) {
    if (paymentType == "CreditCard") {
        // Credit card logic
    }
    else if (paymentType == "PayPal") {
        // PayPal logic
    }
}
```

```
interface IPaymentMethod
{
    void ProcessPayment(decimal amount);
}

class CreditCardPayment : IPaymentMethod
{
    public void ProcessPayment(decimal amount)
    {
        // Credit card logic
    }
}

class PayPalPayment : IPaymentMethod
{
    public void ProcessPayment(decimal amount)
    {
        // PayPal logic
    }
}
```

Case 1: Wrong - The PaymentProcessor class checks payment types with if—else, making it hard to add new types without modifying the existing code.

Case 2: Right - By using an IPaymentMethod interface, new payment types can be added by creating new classes without changing the existing code.

**Use:** Makes the code extensible, avoids breaking existing functionality, and simplifies maintenance.



♠ Copyright Notice:



### **Liskov Substitution Principle**

Derived classes must be substitutable for their base classes.

```
class Rectangle {
   public virtual double GetArea()
   {
      return Width * Height;
   }
   public double Width { get; set; }
   public double Height { get; set; }
}

class Square : Rectangle {
   public override double GetArea()
   { return Width * Width; } // Violates LSP
}
```

```
interface IShape {
   double GetArea();
}

class Rectangle : IShape {
   public double Width { get; set; }
   public double Height { get; set; }
   public double GetArea() => Width * Height;
}

class Square : IShape {
   public double Side { get; set; }
   public double GetArea() => Side * Side;
}
```

**Case 1: Wrong** - The Square class inherits from Rectangle, but their behaviors conflict because a square doesn't have separate width and height, violating the substitution principle.

Case 2: Right - Using a common IShape interface separates their behaviors, ensuring each class (e.g., Rectangle, Square) works independently and correctly.

**Use:** Ensures derived classes can replace base classes without breaking functionality or logic.





### Interface Segregation Principle

Clients should not be forced to depend on interfaces they don't use.



```
interface IRegistration
{
  void Register(string username, string password);
}
interface IAuthentication
{
  void Login(string username, string password);
}
interface IPasswordReset
{
  void SendResetPasswordEmail(string email);
}
```

Case 1: Wrong - The IUser interface forces classes to implement methods like SendResetPasswordEmail even if they don't need them, leading to unnecessary dependencies.

Case 2: Right - Splitting into smaller interfaces
(IRegistration, IAuthentication, IPasswordReset)
ensures classes only implement what they actually use.

**Use:** Improves flexibility, reduces redundant code, and ensures interfaces remain focused and modular.



## JAVA TECH COMMUNITY

### **JAVA INTERVIEW PREPARATION - 2025**

### **Dependency Inversion Principle**

High-level modules should depend on abstractions, not on concretions.

```
class ProductService
{
  private readonly ProductRepository repository = new
  ProductRepository();

  public List<Product> GetProducts()
  {
    return repository.GetAllProducts();
  }
}
```

```
interface IProductRepository
{
   List<Product> GetAllProducts();
}

class ProductRepository : IProductRepository
{
   public List<Product> GetAllProducts()
   {
       // code
   }
}

class ProductService
{
   private readonly IProductRepository repository;
   public ProductService(IProductRepository repository)
   {
       this.repository = repository;
   }

   public List<Product> GetProducts()
   {
       return repository.GetAllProducts();
   }
}
```

Case 1: Wrong - ProductService directly depends on ProductRepository, making the code tightly coupled and hard to test or extend.

Case 2: Right - ProductService depends on an abstraction (IProductRepository), allowing flexibility to swap implementations without changing the high-level module.

**Use:** Makes the code scalable, testable, and easier to maintain by reducing dependency on concrete classes.

