

NAME, SURNAME and UČO: \_\_\_\_\_

**Q1.** How would you refactor the following code fragments? [PLEASE answer in ENGLISH, you can also answer in natural language and/or with code/pseudocode]

a.

```
double basePrice = _quantity * _itemPrice;
if (basePrice > 1000)
    return basePrice * 0.95;
else
    return basePrice * 0.98;
```

This example derives from Fowler's (et al.) book [1] - the purpose was to show the Replace Temp with Query refactoring. A revisited solution taking into account some coding standards violations could be the following (the other "magic numbers" could be replaced as well):

```
if (basePrice() > MAX_THRESHOLD){
    return basePrice() * 0.95;
} else{
    return basePrice() * 0.98;
}
...
double basePrice(){
    return quantity * itemPrice;
}
```

[1] M. Fowler, K. Beck, J. Brant, W. Opdyke, and D. Roberts, Refactoring: Improving the Design of Existing Code, 1st edition. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley Professional, 1999.

b.

```
if ( (platform.toUpperCase().indexOf("MAC") > -1) &&
    (browser.toUpperCase().indexOf("IE") > -1) && wasInitialized() &&
    resize > 0 ) {
    //Do something
}
```

This example derives also from Fowler's (et al.) book [1] - the purpose was to show the Introducing Explaining Variable refactoring. A revisited solution taking into account some coding standards violations could be the following:

```
final boolean IS_MACOS = platform.toUpperCase().indexOf("MAC") > -1;
final boolean IS_IEBROWSER = browser.toUpperCase().indexOf("IE") > -1;
final boolean WAS_RESIZED = resize > 0;

if (IS_MACOS && IS_IEBROWSER && wasInitialized() && WAS_RESIZED){
    //Do something
}
```

[1] M. Fowler, K. Beck, J. Brant, W. Opdyke, and D. Roberts, Refactoring: Improving the Design of Existing Code, 1st edition. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley Professional, 1999.

c.

```
String findPerson(String[] people){
    for (int i = 0; i < people.length; i++){
        if (people[i].equals ("Don") ) {
            return "John";
        }
        if (people[i].equals ("John") ) {
            return "Jack";
        }
    }
}
```

Another example from Fowler's (et al.) book [1] - the purpose was to show introduction of a new algorithm with a clearer one (there should be also a generic return to make this compile). A revisited solution could be the following:

```
String findPerson(String [] people){
    final List candidates = Arrays.asList(new String[] {"Don", "John"})
    for (int i = 0; i < people.length; i++){
        if (candidates.contains(people[i]))
            return people[i];
    }
    return "";
}
```

Other comments are that people could be a collection type not an array. Call to people.length might be a performance issue, but it really depends on the compiler optimization (that is might be that the same bytecode is generate as if the assignment of length would happen just once).

[1] M. Fowler, K. Beck, J. Brant, W. Opdyke, and D. Roberts, Refactoring: Improving the Design of Existing Code, 1st edition. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley Professional, 1999.

**Q2.** Show that the following (Java-based) code breaks the Liskov substitutability principle [PLEASE answer in ENGLISH]

```
public class Point {
    private final int x;
    private final int y;
    public Point(int x, int y) {
        this.x = x;
        this.y = y;
    }

    @Override public boolean equals(Object o) {
        if (o == null || o.getClass() != getClass())
            return false;
        Point p = (Point) o;
        return p.x == x && p.y == y;
    }
    ... // Remainder omitted
}
```

This is an example from Joshua Bloch's book [2] - there is a nice section about equals and hashCode implementations for classes. One point is that hashCode should be always overridden when equals is, but apart from this, as in [2] if we subclass from Point to add a global counter functionality we might get the following:

```
public class CounterPoint extends Point {
    private static final AtomicInteger counter = new AtomicInteger();
    public CounterPoint(int x, int y) {
        super(x, y);
        counter.incrementAndGet();
    }
    public int numberCreated() {
        return counter.get();
    }
}
```

Then when used we can get the following:

```
Point p = new Point(16,32);
Point p2 = new Point(16,32);
Point p3 = new CounterPoint(16,32);
System.out.println (p.equals(p2)); // this returns true
System.out.println (p2.equals(p3)); // this returns false
```

Using instance of instead of getClass could avoid to break liskov substitutability principle, but might introduce other problems (see in [1] the discussion about reflexivity, simmetry and transitivity). In such cases, and if possible, the suggestion is to avoid inheritance and use composition (in the example, a class Counter will have a private instance of Point).

[2] J. Bloch, Effective Java, 2 edition. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Addison-Wesley, 2008.