Roulette: Inheritance Case Study

- **Roulette involves a player, a wheel, and bets**
  - Real game has several players, we’ll use one
  - Real game has lots of kinds of bets, we’ll use three but make it simple to add more

- **Instead of brainstorming classes, we’ll take as given:**
  - Wheel
  - Bet
  - Bankroll
  - Roulette (game)
  - What’s missing?
  - What are responsibilities, collaborations?
What are scenarios?

- User/player given choice of bet
  - Bet choice made
  - Wager made
  - Wheel spins
  - Payoff given
  - Play again?

- What happens when player bets?
  - What’s recorded?
  - How is winning determined?
  - What about multiple players, multiple bets?
What is a bet?

- **Difference between wager and bet**
  - Bet contains wager amount
  - Different bets have different payoffs

- **What happens after the wheel rolls and payoff occurs?**

```java
if (myBet == redblack) ...
else if (myBet == oddeven) ...
```

- Problems with this?
- Open closed principle?
- Canonical OO tenet: avoid chains of if/else (when you can)
Roulette Class Diagram

- **Has-a relationship**
  - Bet has a wheel, how/why?
  - BetFactory has bets
    - What bets?
  - Game has a bankroll
    - Does this make sense?

- **Uses-a relationship**
  - Parameters
  - Return values
  - Local variables

- **Has-a relationship**
  - Inheritance, use-as-a
  - Substitutable for-a
Inheritance guidelines in C++

- **Inherit from Abstract Base Classes (ABC)**
  - one pure virtual function needed (=0)
  - must have virtual destructor implemented
  - can have pure virtual destructor implemented, but not normally needed
- **Avoid protected data, but sometimes this isn’t possible**
  - data is private, subclasses have it, can’t access it
  - keep protected data to a minimum
- **Single inheritance, assume most functions are virtual**
  - multiple inheritance ok when using ABC, problem with data in super classes
  - virtual: some overhead, but open/closed principle intact
Designing hyperwag

- **Keep classes small and cohesive**
  - as simple as possible, but no simpler
  - member functions should also be small

- **Design for change**
  - specifications, requirements, design
  - example: other formats for table design?

- **Design first, code second, but revisit design**
- **Know the language, but don’t let the language rule the design**
- **Get the classes right, concentrate on what not how**
One view of hyperwag
Patterns: Abstract Factory

- **Abstract Factory/Factory aka “kit”**
  - system should be independent of how products created
  - system should be configured with one of multiple products (or families of products, e.g., Win95, Motif)
  - you want to provide a class library of products and reveal interfaces but not implementations

- **Consequences**
  - factory encapsulates responsibility and process of creating objects, clients only see abstract interface. “Real names” hidden in factory
  - supporting new products can be difficult depending on the situation (but see Prototype pattern)

- **Often want only one factory accessible in a program**
Patterns: Singleton

● **Singleton**
  ➢ enforce exactly one instance of a class, accessible in a well-defined manner
  ➢ possible to extend via inheritance

● **Consequences**
  ➢ controlled access to single instance, e.g.,
    ```cpp
    Foo * foo = Foo::getInstance();
    ```
  ➢ no global variables
  ➢ no need to rely solely on class/static functions

● **Implementation**
  ➢ private constructor
  ➢ getInstance (or other class/static functions, see hyperwag)
Patterns: Prototype

- **Use a prototypical instance to clone new objects**
  - classes used in a program can be specified/loaded at runtime
  - avoid hierarchy of factories that parallels hierarchy of classes
- **Abstract Prototype class implements clone()**
  - how to copy? deep vs. shallow
  - how to initialize clones in subclasses

- **Managing Prototypes**
  - use a factory or a prototype manager with registered prototypes
  - cloning can be tough (e.g., circular references)