

Exercises 6.4

2. Write an algorithm to determine the average of a linked list of real numbers with first node pointed to by `first`.

Solution:

```
template <class T>
double List<T>::getAverage() {
    double total = 0.0;
    int count = 0;

    Node * ptr = _first;

    while (ptr != NULL) {
        ++count;
        total += ptr->data;
        ptr = ptr->next;
    }

    if (count==0) {
        return 0;
    } else {
        return (total/count);
    }
}
```

4. Write an algorithm to determine whether the data items in a linked list with first node pointed to by **first** are in ascending order.

Solution:

```
template <class T>
bool List<T>::isAscendingOrder() {
    Node * ptr = _first;

    if (_first==NULL || _first->next==NULL) {
        return true;
    }

    while (ptr->next != null) {
        if (ptr->data>ptr->next->data) {
            return false;
        }
        ptr = ptr->next;
    }

    return true;
}
```

9. The *shuffle-merge* of two lists x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n and y_1, y_2, \dots, y_m is the list

$$z = \begin{cases} x_1, y_1, x_2, y_2, \dots, x_n, y_n, y_{n+1}, y_{n+2}, \dots, y_m & n < m \\ x_1, y_1, x_2, y_2, \dots, x_m, y_m, x_{m+1}, x_{m+2}, \dots, x_n & n > m \\ x_1, y_1, x_2, y_2, \dots, x_n, y_n & n = m \end{cases}$$

Write an algorithm to shuffle-merge two linked lists with first nodes pointed to by **first1** and **first2**, respectively. The items in these two lists should be copied to produce the new list; the original lists should not be destroyed.

Solution:

```
Node * mergeLists(Node * list1, Node * list2) {
    if (list1 == NULL) {
        Node * newList;
        copyList(list2, newList);

        return newList;
    }

    Node * newListFirst = new Node(list1->data);
    Node * newListPtr = newListFirst;;

    Node * ptr1 = list1;
    Node * ptr2 = list2;

    while (ptr1 != NULL && ptr2 != NULL) {
        // create a new node for ptr2 data
        Node * newNode2 = new Node(ptr2->data);

        // create a new node for ptr1 data
        Node * newNode1 = new Node(ptr1->data);

        // add the new nodes to the merged list
        newListPtr->next = ptr2;
        newListPtr = newListPtr->next;
        newListPtr->next = ptr1;
        newListPtr = newListPtr->next;

        // advance the input lists
        ptr1 = ptr1->next;
        ptr2 = ptr2->next;
    }

    while (ptr1 != NULL) {
        // create a new node for ptr1 data
        Node * newNode = new Node(ptr1->data);
        // add the new node to the merged list
        newListPtr->next = newNode;
```

```
        newListPtr = newListPtr->next;t;
    }

    while (ptr2 != NULL) {
        // create a new node for ptr1 data
        Node * newNode = new Node(ptr1->data);
        // add the new node to the merged list
        newListPtr->next = newNode;
        newListPtr = newListPtr->next;
    }

    // free memory
    delete ptr1;
    delete ptr2;
    delete newListPtr;

    return newListFirst;
}
```

10. Proceed as in Exercise 9, but do not copy the items. Just change links in the two lists (thus destroying the original lists) to produce the merged list.

Solution:

```
Node * mergeLists(Node * list1, Node * list2) {
    if (list1 == NULL) {
        return list2;
    }

    // the start of this list points to the first element of list1
    Node * newListFirst = list1;
    Node * newListPtr = newListFirst;

    // to walk over each list
    Node * ptr1 = list1->next;
    Node * ptr2 = list2;

    // shuffle-merge the two lists
    while (ptr2 != NULL && ptr1 != NULL) {
        // add the element from list 2
        newListPtr->next = ptr2;
        newListPtr = newListPtr->next;

        // advance the list2 pointer
        ptr2 = ptr2->next;

        // add the element from list 1
        newListPtr->next = ptr1;
        newListPtr = newListPtr->next;

        // advance the list1 pointer
        ptr1 = ptr1->next;
    }

    // add remaining element from list 2
    if (ptr1 == NULL && ptr2 != NULL) {
        newListPtr->next = ptr2;
    }

    // free memory
    delete ptr1;
    delete ptr2;
    delete newListPtr;

    return newListFirst;
}
```

Exercises 6.6

1. An ordered linked list of characters has been constructed using the array-based implementation described in this section. The following diagram shows the current contents of the array that stores the elements of the linked list and storage pool:

Node	Data	Next
[0]	J	3
[1]	Z	6
[2]	C	0
[3]	P	-1
[4]	B	2
[5]	M	1
[6]	K	7
[7]	Q	8
[8]	?	9
[9]	?	-1

`first = 4 free = 5`

- (a) List the elements of this list.

Solution:

B, C, J, P

- (b) List the nodes in the storage pool in the order in which they are linked together.

Solution:

M, Z, K, Q, ?, ?

2. Assuming the contents of the array node pictured in Exercise 1, show the contents of node and the values of `first` and `free` after the letter F is inserted into the list so that the resulting list is in alphabetical order.

Solution:

`first = 4 free = 1`

Node	Data	Next
[0]	J	3
[1]	Z	6
[2]	C	5
[3]	P	-1
[4]	B	2
[5]	F	0
[6]	K	7
[7]	Q	8
[8]	?	9
[9]	?	-1

3. Proceed as in Exercise 2, but for the operation Delete J.

Solution:

`first = 4 free = 0`

Node	Data	Next
[0]	J	5
[1]	Z	6
[2]	C	3
[3]	P	-1
[4]	B	2
[5]	M	1
[6]	K	7
[7]	Q	8
[8]	?	9
[9]	?	-1

4. Proceed as in Exercise 2, but for the following sequence of operations: Delete J, Delete P, Delete C, Delete B

Solution:

`first = -1 free = 4`

Node	Data	Next
[0]	J	5
[1]	Z	6
[2]	C	3
[3]	P	0
[4]	B	2
[5]	M	1
[6]	K	7
[7]	Q	8
[8]	?	9
[9]	?	-1

5. Proceed as in Exercise 2, but for the following sequence of operations: Insert A, Delete P, Insert K, Delete C

Solution: first = 5 free = 2

Node	Data	Next
[0]	J	3
[1]	Z	7
[2]	C	1
[3]	K	-1
[4]	B	0
[5]	A	4
[6]	K	8
[7]	Q	9
[8]	?	10
[9]	?	0

6. Assuming the array-based implementation as described in this section, write a function to count the nodes in a linked list.

Solution:

```
template <class T>
int List<T>::nodeCount() {
    int count = 0;
    int ptr = _first;

    while (ptr != NULL) {
        ++count;
        ptr = _items[ptr].next;
    }

    return count;
}
```


7. Assuming the array-based implementation as described in this section, write a boolean-valued function that determines whether the data items in the list are arranged in ascending order.

Solution:

```
template <class T>
bool List<T>::isAscendingOrder() {
    if (getSize() <= 1) {
        return true;
    }

    int prevPtr = _first;
    int currPtr = node[_first].next;

    while (currPtr != NULL) {
        if (_items[prevPtr].data > _items[currPtr].data) {
            return false;
        }

        prevPtr = currPtr;
        currPtr = _items[currPtr].next;
    }

    return true;
}
```

8. Assuming the array-based implementation as described in this section, write a function that returns a pointer to the last node in a linked list.

Solution:

```
template <class T>
int List<T>::getLastNode() {
    int currentPointer = _first;
    int lastPointer = _first;

    while (currentPointer != NULL) {
        lastPointer = currentPointer;
        currentPointer = _items[currentPointer].next;
    }

    return lastPointer;
}
```

9. Assuming the array-based implementation as described in this section, write a function to reverse a linked list in the manner described in Exercise 12 of Section 6.4.

Solution:

```
template <class T>
void List<T>::reverseList() {
    int currentPointer = _first;
    int previousPointer = NULL;
    int nextPointer = NULL;

    while (currentPointer != NULL) {
        nextPointer = _items[currentPointer].next;
        _items[currentPointer].next = previousPointer;
        previousPointer = currentPointer;
        currentPointer = nextPointer;
    }

    _first = previousPointer;
}
```

Worksheet Questions

1. Give asymptotic bounds on the worst-case time complexity of your algorithms for Exercises 6.4 questions 2., 4., 9. and 10 and for Exercises 6.6 questions 7., 8., and 9. *Justify your answer.*

Solution:

Each of the functions must walk over the linked list one time. If the linked list has n items, then this takes $O(n)$ time.

In the shuffle-merge algorithms (questions 9 & 10), we must walk over two different linked lists in the worst-case. These lists may have different lengths and we do not know which is longer. Therefore the worst-case time is $O(n + m)$ where n is the length of the first list and m is the length of the second list.