

Design Principles

aka Object Oriented Programming

Shaun Luttin

October 1, 2017

Goal

- Become familiar with object-oriented design principles.
- Have a starting point for further research.

Why?

- Modularity
- Allow change of X without changing Y.
- Allow reuse of X without changing Y.

The Principles

- Encapsulate what varies.
- Program to interfaces not to implementations.
- Depend on abstractions not on concrete classes.
- Only talk to your friends.
- A class should have only one reason to change.
- Don't call us, we'll call you.
- Classes should be open to extension and closed to modification.
- Favour composition over inheritance.
- Strive for loosely coupled designs among objects that interact.

Encapsulate what varies.

- Encapsulate ...
 - Restrict outside access to a thing's parts.
 - Bundle operations with the data they use.
- ... what varies.
 - This refers to changes to source code.
 - Source code changes due to changing requirements.
 - E.g. A change in government may cause a change in tax law.
- Restrict outside access to parts of the source code that might change due to changing requirements.
- “what [do] you want to be *able* to change without redesign?” (Gamma et al, 1995)

Encapsulate what varies ...

```
// We have encapsulated the calculation of tax.
class TaxCalculator {

    public calculateTax(product: Product): number {
        // This does then calculation of tax
        return 0;
    }
}

class FarmStand {

    private cart: Array<Product>;

    public CalculateTotalTax(): number {

        const taxCalculator = new TaxCalculator();
        let totalTax = 0;

        for (const product of this.cart) {
            totalTax += taxCalculator.calculateTax(product);
        }

        return totalTax;
    }
}
```

Program to interfaces not to implementations.

- An interface says what requests it will receive.
- An implementation says how it will handle those requests.
- Programming to interfaces adds polymorphism:
 - it lets us change an implementation even at runtime
 - it lets us send the same request to different classes
- A separate, related SOLID principle:
 - Interface Segregation Principle (Martin, 1996)
 - Define lean interfaces that are specific to the client's needs.
 - "Clients should not be forced to depend upon interfaces that they do not use." (Martin, 1996)

Program to interfaces ...

```
function makeOrangeCarrotJuice(): Array<string> {  
  
    const medley = new Array<string>();  
  
    const orange: Juiceable = new Orange();  
    const carrot: Juiceable = new Carrot();  
  
    // The following is programming to Juiceable interfaces  
    for (const juicable of [orange, carrot]) {  
        const juice = juicable.squeeze();  
        medley.push(juice);  
    }  
  
    return medley;  
}  
  
class Orange implements Juiceable {  
    public squeeze = () => "orange juice";  
    public peel = () => { /* peel the orange */ }  
}  
  
class Carrot implements Juiceable {  
    public squeeze = () => "carrot juice";  
    public chop = () => { /* chop the carrot */ }  
}
```


Depend on abstractions not on concrete classes.

- To depend means to make a direct reference.
- Abstractions commit to a interface/type.
- Concrete classes commit to an implementation.
- SOLID: Dependency Inversion Principle (Martin, 1996)
 - Traditionally, high-level modules depend on low-level modules:
 - Higher \rightarrow Middle \rightarrow Lower \rightarrow ...
 - Dependency Inversion inverts that:
 - Higher \rightarrow Abstraction \leftarrow Middle \rightarrow Abstraction \leftarrow Lower ...
- When using dependency inversion,
 - the higher-levels define the abstractions, and
 - the lower-levels implement the abstractions.
- Why? This enables reuse of the higher-level modules.

Depend on abstractions ...

```
// The higher level module defines the abstraction.
export interface Juiceable {
  squeeze(): string;
}

// The higher level module depends on the abstraction.
export function makeJuice(ingredients: Array<Juiceable>) {

  const medley = new Array<string>();

  // The higher level no longer depends on the lower level concrete classes.
  // const orange: Juiceable = new Orange();
  // const carrot: Juiceable = new Carrot();

  for (const juicable of ingredients) {
    const juice = juicable.squeeze();
    medley.push(juice);
  }

  return medley;
}
```

Depend on abstractions ...

```
import { Juiceable, makeJuice } from "./depend-on-abstractions-higher";

// The lower level module depends on the abstraction.
class Orange implements Juiceable {
  public squeeze = () => "orange juice";
}

class Carrot implements Juiceable {
  public squeeze = () => "carrot juice";
}

// That lets it plug in to the higher level module.
makeJuice([
  new Orange(),
  new Orange(),
  new Carrot(),
  new Carrot()]);
```

Only talk to your friends.

- The Law of Demeter (Holland, 1987)
- aka The Principle of Least Knowledge
- Why? Promotes loose coupling via encapsulation.
- “Only talk to your friends”
- “Only use one dot”
 - More than one dot is cause for reflection;
 - it is not necessarily a violation of the LoD.
 - E.g. fluent interfaces use many dots.

Only talk to your friends ...

```
class Farmer {  
  
    private equipment: Array<FarmEquipment>;  
  
    // In the formal definition of the Law of Demeter  
    // a method of an object must only call members of...  
    public digHole(place: Place) {  
  
        // objects created within the method,  
        const shovel = new Shovel();  
        shovel.dig(place);  
  
        // the object itself,  
        this.decreaseEnergyLevel();  
  
        // direct properties/fields of the object, or  
        this.equipment.push(shovel);  
  
        // any argument of the method.  
        let placeName = place.getName();  
  
        // BAD: the Farmer now knows too much about the system.  
        placeName = place.details.locationDetails.name;  
    }  
  
    private decreaseEnergyLevel = () => { };  
}
```

A class should have only one reason to change.

- SOLID: Single Responsibility Principle (Martin, 2003)
- “A class should have only one reason to change”
 - Recall from “encapsulate what varies.”
 - This refers to changes to source code.
 - Source code changes due to changing requirements.
- Why?
 - (Re)use feature X without bringing feature A-Z.
 - Change feature X without breaking/recompiling what depends on feature A-Z.

A class should have only one reason to change ...

```
/*  
 * This is NOT single responsibility.  
 * There are several responsibilities here:  
 *  
 * 1. preparing the raised bed before planting  
 * 2. maintaining it after planting  
 * 3. harvesting  
 *  
 * It's likely that our watering system will change  
 * independently of our harvesting system.  
 */
```

```
class RaisedBed {  
    public addCompost() { }  
  
    public addMulch() { }  
  
    public addSeeds() { }  
  
    public addWater() { }  
  
    public harvestProduce() { }  
  
    public pullWeeds() { }  
}
```

A class should have only one reason to change ...

```
/*
 * This is a better segregation of responsibilities.
 *
 * E.g. A client can now use the harvesting component independcly.
 */

class RaisedBedPreparationService {
    public addCompost() { }

    public addMulch() { }

    public addSeeds() { }
}

class RaisedBedMaintenacenseService {
    public addWater() { }

    public pullWeeds() { }
}

class RaisedBedHarvestService {
    public harvestProduce() { }
}
```


Don't call us, we'll call you.

- "Hollywood Principle" (Sweet, 1983)
- "Inversion of Control" (Johnson and Foote, 1988)
 - Dependency injection is a type of Inversion of Control (TODO: Check this)
 - IoC containers are a type of Dependency Injection
- Dependency Inversion - who owns the abstraction?
- Inversion of Control - when do things happen?
- "coordinating and sequencing application activity"
- "makes a framework different from a library":
 - library: "a set of functions you can call"
 - framework: "insert your behavior into various places"
- How? subclassing, implementing interfaces, binding/events

Don't call us, we'll call you ...

```
abstract class FertilizeGardenProgram {  
    private pourFertilizerOnSoil() {  
        // some implementation  
    }  
  
    // this is a hook  
    protected abstract roughUpTheSoil(): void;  
  
    public run() {  
        // this is WHEN the roughUpTheSoil routine happens  
        this.roughUpTheSoil();  
        this.pourFertilizerOnSoil();  
    }  
}  
  
export class LooseSoilProgram extends FertilizeGardenProgram {  
    protected roughUpTheSoil(): void {  
        // define loose soil routine  
    }  
}  
  
export class RockySoilProgram extends FertilizeGardenProgram {  
    protected roughUpTheSoil(): void {  
        // define rocky soil routine  
    }  
}
```

Don't call us, we'll call you ...

```
import {
    LooseSoilProgram,
    RockySoilProgram,
} from "../inversion-of-control";

const program1 = new LooseSoilProgram();
program1.run();

const program2 = new RockySoilProgram();
program2.run();
```

Classes should be open to extension and closed for modification.

- SOLID: Open-Closed Principle
- Once it is shipped, the source code is sacrosanct.
- Rather than change the source code and risk breaking it,
- extend the source code via inheritance or wrapping.
- E.g. the Decorator Pattern (Gamma et al, 1977)

Open-Closed Principle ...

```
// we have shipped this, clients love it, zero bugs!
class GardenWateringSystem {

    // some operations

    public detectMoistureLevel() { }
}

// version2 without breaking version1

// inheritance
class SolarWateringSystem extends GardenWateringSystem {

    public chargeFromSolarPower() { }
}

// composition / decorating / wrapping
class FilteringWateringSystem implements GardenWateringSystem {

    constructor(private baseSystem: GardenWateringSystem) { }

    public detectMoistureLevel = (): void =>
        this.baseSystem.detectMoistureLevel();

    public filterChemicalsFromWater() { }
}
```

Favour composition over inheritance.

- Composition means a has-a relationship.
 - It is often more semantically natural.
 - It lets us swap implementations at runtime.
 - It is good for code-reuse.
- Inheritance means an is-a relationship.
 - Tall class heirachies are brittle.
 - Changing an implementation is limited to compile time.
 - Is it good for defining taxonomies. (e.g. a String is an Object)
- SOLID: Liskov Substitution (Liskov and Wing, 1994)
 - A consumer that is expecting type A,
 - should have no surprises on receiving a child of type A.
 - Compilers do not help: this is a semantic not syntactic.
 - VegetableBasket should have-a List not be-a List
 - VegetableBasket could be-a Basket not have-a Basket
- <https://www.thoughtworks.com/insights/blog/composition-vs-inheritance-how-choose>

Strive for loosely coupled designs among objects that interact.

- This is the summary statement for all the principles.
- When loosely coupled, we can ...
- ... change X without needing to change Y, and
- ... use X without needing to bring along Y.
- Modular architecture!