```
part1
a)
local SumListS SumList Out1 Out2 in
       fun {SumList L}
                             // Declarative recursive
       case L
       of nil then 0
       [] '|'(1:H 2:T) then (H + {SumList T})
       end
       end
       fun {SumListS L}
                            // Stateful iterative
       local Helper C Out in
       newCell 0 C
       fun {Helper L C}
              case L
              of nil then @C
              [] '|'(1:H 2:T) then
              C := (@C+H)
             {Helper T C}
              end
       end
       Out = {Helper L C}
       Out
       end
       end
       Out1 = {SumList [1 2 3 4]}
       Out2 = {SumListS [1 2 3 4]}
```

```
skip Browse Out2
end
local FoldLS FoldL Out1 Out2 in
       fun {FoldL F Z L} // Declarative recursive
       case L
       of nil then Z
       [] '|'(1:H 2:T) then {FoldL F {F Z H} T}
       end
       end
       fun {FoldLS F Z L}
                          // Stateful iterative
       local Helper C Out in
       newCell Z C
       fun{Helper F C L}
              case L
              of nil then @C
              [] '|'(1:H 2:T) then
              C := \{F @C H\}
            {Helper F C T}
         end
       end
       Out = {Helper F C L}
       Out
       end
```

skip Browse Out1

```
end
       Out1 = \{FoldL fun \{ X Y \} (X+Y) end 3 [1 2 3 4] \}
       Out2 = {FoldLS fun {$ X Y} (X+Y) end 3 [1 2 3 4]}
       skip Browse Out1
       skip Browse Out2
end
b)
I see in the declarative version, function SumList and FoldL were called mutiple times
before get the output, and these functions changed
everytime they were called.
For the stateful version, function SumListS and FoldLS were called only once before get the
output, and these funtions stay the same
everytime they were called.
part2
fun {Generate}
       local C Gen in
       newCell 0 C
       Gen = fun \{\$\}
       @C
       end
       C:=(@C+1)
       Gen
       end
```

end

```
part3
a)
fun {NewQueue S}
       local Front Back Size Pu Po IsE Av in
       newCell 0 Size
       newCell nil Front
       newCell nil Back
       Pu = proc \{ N \}
       if (@Size == 0) then
              Front := (N|@Front)
              Back := (N|@Back)
              Size := (@Size + 1)
       else
              if {LT @Size S} then
            Back := (N|@Back)
            Size := (@Size + 1)
              else
            (H|T) = @Front
            (H1|T1) = @Back in
            Front := (H1|T)
            Back := (N|T1)
              end
       end
       end
       Po = fun {\$}
       if {GT @Size 1} then
```

```
(H|T) = @Front
   (H1|T1) = @Back in
       Front := (H1|T)
       Back := T1
       Size := (@Size - 1)
       Н
else
       if (@Size == 1) then
     (H|T) = @Front in
     Size := (@Size -1)
     Front := nil
     Back := nil
       Н
       end
end
end
IsE = fun \{\$\}
(@Size == 0)
end
Av = fun \{\$\}
(S-@Size)
end
ops(push:Pu pop:Po isEmpty:IsE avail:Av)
end
```

end

```
test
```

```
S = {NewQueue 2}

ops (push:Pu pop:Po isEmpty:IsE avail:Av) = S

B1 = {IsE}

A1 = {Av}

{Pu 1}

{Pu 2}

A2 = {Av}

{Pu 3}

B2 = {IsE}

V1 = {Po}

V2 = {Po}

V3 = {Po}

Out = [V1 V2 V3 B1 B2 A1 A2]

skip Browse Out // Out: [2 3 Unbound true() false() 2 0]
```

It is secure because all variables inside the data structure are declared locally, and not returned in the output.

also, the client only can see the operators of the data structure, not the codes. So, they only can operate the data structure

but not change the code of the data structure.

c)

Compare both declarative ADT on page 431 and the secure ADT relating to memory usage, declarative ADT uses

 $(0.02 \ \text{secs},\ 14,745,480 \ \text{bytes})$  while secure ADT is using  $(0.02 \ \text{secs},\ 16,393,656 \ \text{bytes})$ . Therefore, secure ADT

takes more memory usage then the declarative ADT does.