Springboard Recursion « Back to Homepage

→ a() hello

> | → b() world

coding

Using recursion:

count();

→ count(n=1)

→ count(n=2)

| → count(n=3)

| → count(n=1)

| | → count(n=2)

| | 3

Using recursion:

count();

function count(n=1) {

console.log(n); count(n + 1);

function count(n=1) {

count(n + 1);

console.log(n);

**if** (n <= 3) {

if (n > 3) return;

← undefined from count(n=1)

function count(n=1) { if (n > 3) return;

console.log(n);

count(n + 1);

Springboard

```
Recursion
```

Download Demo Code Having a function call itself

Also: a very powerful programming technique Also: a popular interview question topic

**The Tiniest Review** 

**Functions Calling Functions** function a() { console.log("hello");

b(); console.log("coding"); function b() {

console.log("world"); c(); console.log("love"); function c() { console.log("i");

→ "hello world i love coding"

Remember, when you call a function, you "freeze" where you are until that function returns, and then continue where you left off.

So  $\boldsymbol{a}$  prints  $|\boldsymbol{b}|$  hello, calls  $\boldsymbol{b}$  which prints  $|\boldsymbol{c}|$  which prints  $|\boldsymbol{c}|$  and returns back to  $\boldsymbol{b}$  which then prints love which then returns back to **a** which prints coding.

**Loops and Recursion** 

**Loops versus Recursion** Any loop can be written instead with recursion

Any recursion can be written instead with a loop ... but often, one way is easier for a problem

Count to 3 Using a while loop:

function count() { **let** n = 1; **while** (n <= 3) {

console.log(n); n += 1;

count(); **Call Frames / Stack** function count(n=1) {

if (n > 3) return;

console.log(n);

count(n + 1);

count();

**More Counting** function count(n=1) {

if (n > 3) return;

console.log(n);

console.log(n);

count(n + 1);

count();

**Loops versus Recursion** 

Using a while loop:

**let** n = 1;

n += 1;

function count() {

**while** (n <= 3) {

console.log(n);

Which do you prefer? Requirements

**Base Case** 

function count(n=1) { if (n > 3) return;

count();

console.log(n); count(n + 1); • Every recursive function needs a base case • How do we know when we're done? Often a base case is a "degenerate case".

• "1" + "2" + concat([3]) → • "1" + "2" + "3" + concat([]) ← degenerate: empty array **Note: Degenerate Cases** A "degenerate case" is one that is so reduced that it's fundamentally different from the others and would need to be treated differently.

concat([1, 2, 3]) →

• "1" + concat([2, 3]) →

Consider counting up to 3 recursively: function count(n=1) { if (n > 3) return; console.log(n);

Here, our base case is "when we hit 3, don't keep recursing". This is a base case, but it's not "degenerate" we could keep counting up after 3; there's nothing preventing us from doing so besides our goal to stop. Compare this with finding the length of a list recursively:

count(n + 1);

function lenlist(nums) {

if (nums[0] === undefined) return 0 return 1 + lenlist(nums.slice(1)); Here, our base case is "the length of an empty list is 0, so return that and don't recurse". This base is "degenerate" — there's no possible way for us to find the length of a list with -1 items in it! It wouldn't even be

possible for us to keep recursing; this base case is a hard limit on what's possible. Not all recursive problems have a degenerate base case, but thinking about if one is possible is often helpful in figuring what your base case is and how the recursion should work. **No Base Case** 

console.log(n); count(n + 1); count(); **Stack Overflow!** 

function count(n=1) {

**Explicit vs. Hidden Base Cases** function count(n=1) { if (n > 3) return; console.log(n); count(n + 1);

Which do you prefer? **Progress** function count(n=1) { if (n > 3) return;

**Returning Data Finding Sum of List** 

console.log(n); count(n + 1);

"Return sum of list using recursion"

• An empty list has sum = 0!

"For every number in array, print the value, doubled"

data = [ 1, [2, 3], 4 ] // => 2 4 6 8

for (let o of n) console.log(o \* 2);

data = [ 1, 2, 3 ] // => 2 4 6

function doubler(nums) { for (let n of nums) {

function doubler(nums) { for (let n of nums) {

} else {

if Array.isArray(n) {

console.log(n \* 2);

if Array.isArray(n) {

} else {

function doubler(nums) {

} else {

It works, but it's pretty hairy!

stack = nums.reverse();

while (stack.length > 0) { let n = stack.pop(); if Array.isArray(n) {

// If array, add it to stack, reversed

Is Item a List?

Print

For Item in List

Is Item a List?

2

Is Item a List?

Print

→ doubler(nums=[1, [2, [3], 4], 5])

← undefined from doubler(nums=[3])

→ doubler(nums=[2, [3], 4])

| → doubler(nums=[3])

Print

For Item in List

Is Item a List? ...

for (let inner of n.reverse() {

stack.append(inner);

console.log(n \* 2);

For Item in List

data = [ 1, [2, [3], 4], 5 ]

if Array.isArray(n) {

console.log(n \* 2);

function doubler(nums) {

doubler(n);

} else {

for (let n of nums) {

For Item in List

recurse

}

} else {

}

for (let o of nums) {

if Array.isArray(o) {

console.log(o);

console.log(n \* 2);

for (let p of o) console.log(p \* 2);

console.log(n \* 2);

What's our base case?

function sum(nums) { if (nums.length === 0) return 0; return nums[0] + sum(nums.slice(1)); sum([1, 2, 4, 5]);

**List Doubler** 

**The Problem** 

**The Challenge** • Some items can be lists themselves • We want to "flatten" them and still print doubled

Some of *those* items can be lists! data = [ 1, [2, [3], 4], 5 ] // => 2 4 6 8 10 function doubler(nums) { for (let n of nums) {

}

Oh No!

**Arbitrary Depth with Loop** data = [ 1, [2, [3], 4], 5 ] // => 2 4 6 8 10

}

This solution uses a data structure called a "stack", adding new work to the end and popping them off the end. This code may be worth study, even though this problem is more easily solved with recursion. **Non-Recursively** Function() Recursively

Function()

}

**Recognizing Recursion Filesystems** 

index.html

<body> <h1>Body</h1> 0ne Two <**ul>** Two A Two B </**ul>** </**ul>** </body>

</html>

**Runtime** 

What's the runtime?

**Parsing** 

**Nested Data** 

<head>

</head>

<html>

 $1 \times (2 + 3 \times (4 + 5 \times 6) + 7)$ 

<title>Title</title>

This is a particularly good, hard exercise to give yourself.

Now runtime and runspace are **O(n) Accumulating Output** Given array of numbers, return even numbers function evens(nums, i=0) { if (nums.length === i) return [];

function sum(nums, i=0) {

if (i === nums.length) return 0;

return nums[i] + sum(nums, i + 1);

if (nums[i] % 2 === 0) { return [nums[i], ...evens(nums, i +1)]; return evens(nums, i + 1); Back to **O(n ^ 2)** — making all those lists! Can solve with "helper recursion":

function evens(nums) {

**let** out = [];

\_evens(nums, 0); return out; Back to O(n) **Accumulators** 

function \_evens(nums, i) {

\_evens(nums, i + 1);

if (nums.length === i) return;

if (nums[i] % 2 === 0) out.push(nums[i]);

return evens(nums, out, i + 1); Back to O(n)

test.py **Fractals** 

> function sum(nums) { if (nums.length === 0) return 0; return nums[0] + sum(nums.slice(1)); O(n ^ 2) — we keep making new lists! It also has *O(n ^ 2)* runspace — keeping all lists in memory! **Improving Runtime** Often, you can keep track of position in array, rather than slice:

Often, can also solve with "accumulator": function evens(nums, out=[], i=0) { if (nums.length === i) return out;

**How Recursion Works** Advanced: Tail Call Optimization

if (nums[i] % 2 === 0) out.push(nums[i]); In some browsers, this can be "tail-call optimized" Resources