Solution 8: Recursion

ETH Zurich

1 An infectious task

- 1. Correct. However, this version will call *set_flu* twice on all reachable persons except the initial one. On the initial person *set_flu* will be called once in case of a non-circular structure and three times in case of a circular structure.
- 2. Incorrect. This version results in endless recursion if the coworker structure is cyclic. The main cause is that the coworker does not get infected before the recursive call is made, so with a cyclic structure nobody will ever be infected to terminate the recursion.
- 3. Incorrect. This version results in an endless loop if the structure is cyclic. The main problem is with the loop's exit condition that does not include the case when q is already infected.
- 4. Correct. This version works and uses tail recursion. It will always give the flu to p first, and then call *infect* on his/her coworker. The recursion ends when either there is no coworker, or the coworker is already infected. Without the second condition the recursion is endless if the coworker structure is cyclic.

Multiple coworkers

```
class
               PERSON
 create
               make
feature -- Initialization
               make (a_name: STRING)
                                            -- Create a person named 'a_name'.
                           require
                                           a_name_valid: a_name /= Void and then not a_name_valid: a_name
                             do
                                           name := a_name
                                         create {V_ARRAYED_LIST [PERSON]} coworkers
                           ensure
                                           name\_set: name = a\_name
                                           no_coworkers: coworkers.is_empty
                           end
```

feature -- Access

name: STRING -- Name. coworkers: V_LIST [PERSON] -- List of coworkers. has_flu: BOOLEAN -- Does the person have flu? **feature** -- Element change add_coworker (p: PERSON) -- Add 'p' to 'coworkers'. require $p_exists: p /=$ Void $p_{-}different: p /= Current$ not_has_p: not coworkers.has (p) do $coworkers.extend_back(p)$ ensure $coworker_set: coworkers.has(p)$ end set_flu -- Set 'has_flu' to True. do $has_flu :=$ **True** ensure has_flu: has_flu end

invariant

```
name_valid: name /= Void and then not name.is_empty
coworkers_exists: coworkers /= Void
all_coworkers_exist: not coworkers.has (Void)
end
```

The coworkers structure is a directed graph. The master solution traverses this graph using $depth-first\ search.$

2 Short trips

Listing 1: Class SHORT_TRIPS

```
note
  description: "Short trips."
class
  SHORT_TRIPS
inherit
  ZURICH_OBJECTS
feature -- Explore Zurich
  highlight_short_distance (s: STATION)
      -- Highight stations reachable from 's' within 2 minutes.
    require
      station_exists: s \mid = Void
    do
      highlight_reachable (s, 2 * 60)
    end
feature {NONE} -- Implementation
  highlight_reachable (s: STATION; t: REAL_64)
      -- Highight stations reachable from 's' within 't' seconds.
    require
      station_exists: s \mid = Void
    local
      line: LINE
      next: STATION
    do
      if t >= 0.0 then
        Zurich_map.station_view (s).highlight
        across
          s.lines as li
        loop
          line := li.item
          next := line.next\_station (s, line.north\_terminal)
          if next \mid = Void then
            highlight_reachable (next, t - s. position. distance (next. position) / line. speed)
          end
          next := line.next\_station (s, line.south\_terminal)
          if next \neq Void then
            highlight_reachable (next, t - s.position.distance (next.position) / line.speed)
          end
        end
      end
    end
end
```

3 N Queens

Listing 2: Class *PUZZLE*

```
note
  description: "N-queens puzzle."
class
  PUZZLE
feature -- Access
  size: INTEGER
      -- Size of the board.
  solutions: LIST [SOLUTION]
      -- All solutions found by the last call to 'solve'.
feature -- Basic operations
  solve (n: INTEGER)
      -- Solve the puzzle for 'n' queens
      -- and store all solutions in 'solutions'.
    require
      n_positive: n > 0
    do
      size := n
     create {LINKED_LIST [SOLUTION]} solutions.make
      complete (create {SOLUTION}.make_empty)
    ensure
      solutions\_exists: solutions /= Void
      complete_solutions: across solutions as s all s.item.row_count = n end
    end
feature {NONE} -- Implementation
  complete (partial: SOLUTION)
      -- Find all complete solutions that extend the partial solution 'partial'
      -- and add them to 'solutions'.
    require
     partial_exists: partial /= Void
    local
      c: INTEGER
    do
     if partial.row\_count = size then
        solutions.extend (partial)
      else
        from
          c := 1
        until
          c > size
        loop
```

```
if not under_attack (partial, c) then
          complete (partial.extended_with (c))
       end
        c := c + 1
     end
   end
 end
under_attack (partial: SOLUTION; c: INTEGER): BOOLEAN
    -- Is column 'c' of the current row under attack
    -- by any queen already placed in partial solution 'partial'?
 require
   partial\_exists: partial /= Void
    column_positive: c > 0
 local
    current_row, row: INTEGER
 do
    current_row := partial.row_count + 1
   from
     row := 1
    until
     Result or row > partial.row_count
   loop
     Result := attack_each_other (row, partial.column_at (row), current_row, c)
     row := row + 1
   end
 end
attack_each_other (row1, col1, row2, col2: INTEGER): BOOLEAN
    -- Do queens in positions ('row1', 'col1') and ('row2', 'col2') attack each other?
 do
   Result := row1 = row2 or
     col1 = col2 or
     (row1 - row2).abs = (col1 - col2).abs
 end
```

end

4 MOOC: Design by Contract, recursion

The order in which the questions and the answers appear here in the solution may vary because they are randomly shuffled at each attempt.

Design by Contract: preconditions

- In class KNIGHT you have feature set_reputation (rep: INTEGER). What precondition would you write for it? $rep \ge -5$ and $rep \le 5$
- In class KNIGHT you have feature *attack_monster* (mon: MONSTER; wep: WEAPON). What precondition would you write for it? wep /= Void and mon /= Void and then wep.is_ready

- In class MONSTER you have feature *scan_direction* (*dir: DIRECTION*). What precondition would you write for it? No explicit precondition is needed.
- n class WEAPON you have feature *set_ready* (*wep_ready: BOOLEAN*). What precondition would you write for it? No precondition is needed here.
- Suppose that in class MONSTER, feature attack, you want to add the expression *is_knight_close* to the existing precondition *is_angry*. The true sentence is: The compound precondition *is_angry* and *is_knight_close* is a stronger precondition than *is_angry*.
- Suppose you know that a knight can only fight in battle if his or her hit points are greater than 10. Which is a reasonable precondition for BOOLEAN feature *is_fit_for_battle* in class KNIGHT? No precondition is needed here.

Design by Contract: postconditions

- In class KNIGHT you have feature *set_reputation* (*rep: INTEGER*). What postcondition would you write for it? *reputation* = *rep*
- In class KNIGHT you have feature *attack_monster* (mon: MONSTER; wep: WEAPON). What postcondition would you write for it? **old** mon.hit_points >= mon.hit_points **and not** wep.is_ready
- In class MONSTER you have feature *scan_direction (dir: DIRECTION)*. What postcondition would you write for it? *is_knight_found* or *is_scanning_complete*.
- In class WEAPON you have feature *set_ready* (*wep_ready: BOOLEAN*). What postcondition would you write for it? *is_ready = wep_ready*.
- Suppose that in class KNIGHT, feature attack, you want to add to the existing postcondition *old_mon.hit_points* >= *mon.hit_points* and not *wep_is_ready* the new clause: *reputation* = **old** *reputation* + 1 **or** *reputation* = 5. The true sentence is: The compound postcondition: *old_mon.hit_points* >= *mon.hit_points* and not *wep_is_ready* and (*reputation* = **old** *reputation* + 1 **or** *reputation* = 5) is a stronger postcondition than the pre-existing postcondition.
- Suppose you know that a knight can only fight in battle if his or her hit points are greater than 10. Which is a reasonable postcondition for BOOLEAN feature *is_fit_for_battle* in class KNIGHT? **Result** = (*hit_points* > 10).

Design by Contract: class invariants

- Given what you know about class KNIGHT, what invariant would you write? reputation ≥ -5 and reputation ≤ -5 and hit_points ≥ 0
- Given what you know about class MONSTER, what invariant would you write? *hit_points* >= 0
- Given what you know about class WEAPON, what invariant would you write? *is_magic* implies *is_ready* and *damage* >= 1.
- Given what you know about class DIRECTION, what invariant would you write? internal_direction = 1 or internal_direction = 2 or internal_direction = 3 or internal_direction = 4.

Design by Contract: contracts and inheritance

- Given what you know about class KNIGHT_MAGE, which precondition clause would you write for feature *attack_monster* (mon: MONSTER; wep: WEAPON)? require else mana > 0
- Given what you know about class KNIGHT_MAGE, which postcondition clause would you write for feature *attack_monster* (mon: MONSTER; wep: WEAPON)? ensure then mana <= old mana
- Given what you know about class KNIGHT_MAGE, which class invariant would you write for it? $mana \ge 0$.
- Given what you know about class GOBLIN, which precondition would you write for feature attack_with_weapon (kni: KNIGHT; wep: WEAPON)? require last_knight_found = kni and is_angry and wep.is_ready.
- Given what you know about class GOBLIN, which postcondition would you write for feature attack_with_weapon (kni: KNIGHT; wep: WEAPON)? ensure is_angry.
- Given what you know about class GOBLIN, which class invariant would you write for it? No invariant clause is needed.

Design by Contract: putting it all together

- Assume a class FILTER receiving input data from a class INPUT_HANDLER that in turn is used to validate user input. The following statements are true: To check for user input correctness, you should not be using preconditions in class INPUT_HANDLER, but use if statements instead; To check for user input correctness, you should be using preconditions in class FILTER instead of if statements.
- Assume that the correct precondition for a feature f(s: STRING) is: pre: $s \neq Void$ and then s = "test" Consider now the following precondition: pre2: $s \neq Void$ and then not s.is_empty The following statements are true: pre2 is an over-approximation of pre; pre2 is complete and unsound.
- Assume that the correct precondition for a feature f(s: STRING) is: pre: $s \neq Void$ and then not s.is_empty Consider now the following precondition: pre2: $s \neq Void$ and then s = "test" The following statements are true: pre2 is an under-approximation of pre; pre2 is incomplete and sound.
- Assume that the correct postcondition for a feature f is: *post:* $s \neq Void$ and then not *s.is_empty* Where *s: STRING* is an attribute. Consider now the following postcondition: *post2:* $s \neq Void$ and then s = "test". The following statements are true: post2 is an under-approximation of pre; post2 is too strong; post2 is sound but incomplete.
- Assume that the correct postcondition for a feature f is: *post:* $s \neq Void$ and then s = "test" Where s: STRING is an attribute. Consider now the following postcondition: *post2*: $s \neq Void$ and then not *s.is_empty* The following statements are true: post2 is an over-approximation of post; post2 is complete and unsound; post2 is too weak.

Recursion

• The correct way to complete the code of the routine *countdown* is the following:

```
countdown (n: INTEGER) 

-- Count down from n to 0. 

do

if <math>n \ge 0 then

print (n.out)

countdown (n-1)

else

--nothing here

end

end
```

• The following routine, when called with n having value 4, keeps printing consecutive numbers starting from 4, and goes into an infinite loop:

```
\begin{array}{c} \textit{countdown} \ (n: \ \textit{INTEGER}) \\ \textbf{do} \\ & \textbf{if} \ n > 0 \ \textbf{then} \\ & print \ (n.out) \\ & countdown \ (n+1) \\ & \textbf{else} \\ & print \ (\texttt{"Done"}) \\ & \textbf{end} \\ & \textbf{end} \end{array}
```

• The following routine, when called with n having value 4, prints "4321Done":

```
\begin{array}{c} countdown \ (n: \ INTEGER) \\ \textbf{do} \\ & \textbf{if} \ n > 0 \ \textbf{then} \\ & print \ (n.out) \\ & countdown \ (n-1) \\ & \textbf{else} \\ & print \ (\textbf{"Done"}) \\ & \textbf{end} \\ & \textbf{end} \end{array}
```

• If a routine r calls another routine s, which calls another routine t, which finally calls routine s, then routine s is recursive (indirect recursion) and routine t is recursive (indirect recursion).

Programming exercise: recursive algorithm for gcd

Listing 3: Class RECURSIVE_GCD

```
note
```

description: "Encapsulates a recursive algorithm for computing the gcd of two
 positive integers."
author: "mp"
date: "\$Date\$"
revision: "\$Revision\$"

```
class
RECURSIVE_GCD
```

```
feature -- Basic operations
```

```
gcd (a, b: INTEGER): INTEGER
      -- Greater common divisor between a and b.
    require
      a_positive: a > 0
      b_{-}positive: b > 0
    do
      -- This solution is from Dijkstra.
      -- It is based on the observation that if a > b,
      -- then gcd (a,b) = gcd (a-b,b)
       if a = b then
                Result := a
            else if a > b then
                  Result := gcd (a-b, b)
                 \mathbf{else}
                    Result := gcd(a, b-a)
                 \mathbf{end}
            end
    ensure
      result_positive: Result > 0
    end
end
```