

# The Practice of Programming

Brian W.Kernighan

Rob Pike

June 29, 2015



# Contents

<b>Preface</b>	<b>v</b>
<b>1 Style</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1 Names . . . . .	2
1.2 Expression and Statements . . . . .	5
1.3 Consistency and Idioms (习惯用法) . . . . .	8
1.4 Function Macros . . . . .	13
1.5 Magic Numbers . . . . .	15
1.6 Comments . . . . .	17
1.7 Why Bother? . . . . .	21
<b>2 Algorithms and Data Structures</b>	<b>23</b>
2.1 Searching . . . . .	23
<b>3 Design and Implementation</b>	<b>25</b>
<b>4 Interfaces</b>	<b>27</b>
<b>5 Debugging</b>	<b>29</b>
5.1 Debuggers . . . . .	30
5.2 Good Clues, Easy Bugs . . . . .	31
5.3 No Clues, Hard Bugs . . . . .	34
<b>6 Testing</b>	<b>37</b>
<b>7 Performance</b>	<b>39</b>
<b>8 Portability</b>	<b>41</b>
<b>9 Notation</b>	<b>43</b>



# Preface

The presentation is organized into nine chapters, each focusing on one major aspect of programming practice.

Chapter 1 discusses programming style. Good style is so important to good programming that we have chosen to cover it first. Well-written programs are better than badly-written ones, they have fewer errors and are easier to debug and to modify, so it is important to think about style from the beginning. This chapter also introduces an important theme in good programming, the use of idioms (惯用语法) appropriate to the language being used.

Algorithms and data structures, the topics of Chapter 2, are the core of the computer science curriculum (课程) and a major part of programming courses. Since most readers will already be familiar with this material, our treatment is intended as a brief review of the handful of algorithms and data structures that show up in almost every program. More complex algorithms and data structures usually evolve from these building blocks, so one should master the basics.

Chapter 3 describes the design and implementation of a small program that illustrates algorithm and data structure issues in a realistic setting. The program is implemented in five languages; comparing the versions shows how the same data structures are handled in each, and how expressiveness (表现力) and performance vary across a spectrum (系列) of languages.

Interfaces between users, programs, and parts of programs are fundamental in programming and much of the success of software is determined by how well interfaces are designed and implemented. Chapter 4 shows the evolution of a small library for parsing a widely used data format. Even though the example is small, it illustrates many of the concerns of interface design: abstraction, information hiding, resource management and error handling.

Much as we try to write a program correctly the first time, bugs, and therefore debugging are inevitable. Chapter 5 gives strategies and tactics (策略) for systematic and effective debugging. Among the topics are the signatures of common bugs and the importance of "numerology" (命理学), where patterns in debugging often indicate where a problem lies.

Testing is an attempt to develop a reasonable assurance that a program is working correctly and that it stays correct as it evolves. The emphasis in Chapter 6 is on systematic testing by hand and machine. Boundary condition tests probe at potential weak spots. Mechanization (机械化) and test scaffolds (脚手架) make it easy to do extensive testing with modest effort. Stress tests provide a different kind of testing than typical users do and ferret out (揪出) a different class of bugs.

Computers are so fast and compilers are so good that many programs are fast enough the day they are written. But others are too slow, or they use too much memory, or both. Chapter 7 presents an orderly way to approach the task of making a program use resources efficiently, so that the program remains correct and sound as it is made more efficient.

Chapter 8 covers portability. Successful programs live long enough that their environment changes, or they must be moved to a new system or new hardware or new countries. The goal of portability is to reduce the maintenance of a program by minimizing the amount of change necessary to adapt it to a new environment.

Computing is rich in languages, not just the general-purpose ones that we use for the bulk of programming, but also many specialized languages that focus on narrow domains. Chapter 9 presents several examples of the importance of notation in computing, and shows how we can use it to simplify programs, to guide implementations, and even to help us write programs that write programs.

# Chapter 1

## Style

*It is an old observation that the best writers sometimes disregard the rules of rhetoric (修辞学). When they do so, however, the reader will usually find in the sentence some compensating (补偿) merit (优点), attained at the cost of the violation (违反). Unless he is certain of doing as well, he will probably do best to follow the rules.*

William Strunk and E. B. White, *The Elements of Style*

This fragment of code comes from a large program written many years ago:

```
if ((country == SING) || (country == BRNI) ||
    (country == POL) || (country == ITALY))
{
    /*
     * If the country is Singapore, Brunei or Poland
     * then the current time is the answer time
     * rather than the off hook time.
     * Reset answer time and set day of week.
     */
    ...
}
```

It's carefully written, formatted, and commented, and the program it comes from works extremely well; the programmers who create these system are rightly proud of what they built. But this except is puzzling to the casual reader. What relationship links Singapore, Brunei, Poland and Italy? Why isn't Italy mentioned in the comment? Since the comment and the code differ, one of them must be wrong. Maybe both are. The code is what gets executed and tested, so it's more likely to be right; probably the comment didn't get updated when the code did. The comment doesn't say enough about the relationship among the three countries it does mention; if you had to maintain this code, you would need to know more.

The few lines above are typical of much real code: mostly well done, but with some things could be improved.

This book is about the practice of programming -- how to write programs for real. Our purpose is to help you to write software that works at least as well as the program this example was taken from, while avoiding trouble spots and weakness. We will talk about writing better code from the beginning and improving it as it evolves.

We are going to start in an unusual place, however, by discussing programming style. The purpose of style is to make the code easy to read for yourself and others, and good style is crucial to good programming. We want to talk about it first so you will be sensitive to it as you read the code in the rest of the book.

There is more to writing a program than getting the syntax right, fixing the bugs, and making it run fast enough. Programs are read not only by computers but also by programmers. A well-written program is easier

to understand and to modify than a poorly-written one. The discipline of writing well leads to code that is more like to be correct. Fortunately, this discipline is not hard.

The principles of programming style are based on common sense guided experience, not on arbitrary rules and prescriptions (命令). Code should be clear and simple -- straightforward logic, natural expression, conventional language use, meaningful names, neat formatting, helpful comments -- and it should avoid clever tricks and unusual constructions. Consistency is important because others will find it easier to read your code, and you theirs, if you all stick to the same style. Detail may be imposed by local conventions, management edict (法令), or a program, but even if not, it is best to obey a set of widely shared conventions. We follow the style used in the book *The C Programming Language*, with minor adjustments for C++ and Java.

We will often illustrate rules of style by small example of bad and good programming, since the contrast between two ways of saying the same thing is instructive. These examples are not artificial. The "bad" ones are all adapted from real code, written by ordinary programmers (occasionally yourselves) working under the common pressures of too much work and too little time. Some will be distilled (提取) for brevity (简短), but they will not be misrepresented (错误的叙述). Then we will rewrite the bad excerpts (摘录) to show how they could be improved. Since they are real code, however, they may exhibit (展现) multiple problems. Addressing every shortcoming would take us too far off topics, so some of the good examples will still harbor (隐藏) other, unremarked flaws (缺点).

To distinguish bad examples from good, throughout the book we will place question marks in the questionable code, as in this real excerpt (摘录):

```
? #define ONE 1
? #define TEN 10
? #define TWENTY 20
```

Why are these `#defines` questionable? Consider the modification that will be necessary if an array of TWENTY elements must be made larger. At the very least (至少), each name should be replaced by one that indicates the role of the specific value in the program:

```
#define INPUT_MODE 1
#define INPUT_BUFSIZE 10
#define OUTPUT_BUFSIZE 20
```

## 1.1 Names

What's in a name? A variable or function name labels an object and conveys information about its purpose. A name should be informative, concise, memorable, and pronounceable if possible. Much information comes from context and scope; the broader the scope of a variable, the more information should be conveyed by its name.

*Use descriptive names for globals, short names for locals.* Global variables, by definition, can crop up (突然出现) anywhere in a program, so they need names long enough and descriptive enough to remind the reader of their meaning. It's also helpful to include a brief comment with the declaration of each global:

```
int npending = 0;    // current length of input queue
```

Global functions, classes and structures should also have descriptive names that suggest their role in a program.

By contrast, shorter names suffice (足够) for local variables; within a function, `n` may be sufficient, `npoints` is fine, and `numberOfPoints` is overkill.

Local variables used in conventional way can have very short names. The use of `i` and `j` for loop indices, `p` and `q` for pointers, and `s` and `t` for strings is so frequent that there is little profit and perhaps some loss in longer names. Compare



```
?   for (theElementIndex = 0; theElementIndex < numberOfElements;
?       theElementIndex++)
?       elementArray[theElementIndex] = theElementIndex;
```

to

```
    for (i = 0; i < nelems; i++)
        elem[i] = i;
```

Programmers are often encouraged to use long variable names regardless of context. That is a mistake: clarity is often achieved through brevity.

There are many naming conventions and local customs. Common ones include using names that begin or end with `p`, such as `nodep`, for pointer; initial capital letters for Globals; and all capital for CONSTANTS. Some programming shops use more sweeping (彻底的) rules, such as notation to encode type and usage information in the variable, perhaps `pch` to mean a pointer to a character and `strTo` and `strFrom` to mean strings that will be written to and read from. As for the spelling of the names themselves, whether to use `npending` or `numPending` or `num_pending` is a matter of taste; specific rules are much less important than consistent adherence (坚持) to a sensible convention.

Naming conventions make it easier to understand your own code, as well as code written by others. They also make it easier to invent new names as the code is being written. The longer the program, the more important is the choice of good, descriptive, systematic names.

Namespaces in C++ and packages in Java provide ways to manage the scope of names and help to keep meanings clear without unduly (过度的) long names.

*Be consistent.* Give related things related names that show their relationship and highlight their difference.

Besides being much too long, the member names in this Java class are wildly (鲁莽地) inconsistent:

```
?   class UserQueue {
?       int noOfItemsInQ, frontOfTheQueue, queueCapacity;
?       public int noOfUserInQueue() { ... }
?   }
```

The word "queue" appears as `Q`, `Queue` and `queue`. But since queues can only be accessed from a variable of type `UserQueue`, member names do not need to mention "queue" at all; context suffices, so

```
?   queue.queueCapacity
```

is redundant. This version is better:

```
    class UserQueue {
        int nitems, front, capacity;
        public int nusers() { ... }
    }
```

since it leads to statements like

```
    queue.capacity++;
    n = queue.nusers();
```

No clarity is lost. This example still needs work, however, "items" and "users" are the same thing, so only one term should be used for a single concept.

*Use active names for functions.* Function names should be based on active verbs, perhaps followed by nouns:

```
    now = data.getTime();
    putchar('\n');
```

Functions that return boolean(true or false) value should be named so that return value is unambiguous. Thus

```
? if (checkoctal(c)) ...
```

does not indicate which value is true and which is false, while

```
if (isoctal(c)) ...
```

makes it clear that the function return true if argument is octal and false if not.

*Be accurate.* A name not only labels, it conveys information to the reader. A misleading names can result in mystifying (模糊的) bugs.

One of us wrote and distributed for years a macro called `isoctal` with this incorrect implementation:

```
? #define isoctal(c) ((c) >= '0' && (c) <= '8')
```

instead of the proper

```
#define isoctal(c) ((c) >= '0' && (c) <= '7')
```

In this case, the name conveyed the correct intent but the implementation was wrong; it's easy for a sensible name to disguise a broken implementation.

Here is an example in which the name and the code are in complete contradiction (矛盾):

```
? public boolean inTable(Object obj) {
?     int j = this.getIndex(obj);
?     return(j == nTable);
? }
```

The function `getIndex` returns a value between zero and `nTable-1` if it finds the object, and returns `nTable` if not. The boolean value returned by `inTable` is thus the oppsite of what the name implies. At the time code is written, this might not cause trouble, but if the program is modified later, perhaps by a different programmer, the name is sure to confuse.

**Exercise1-1 .** Comment on the choice of names and values in the following code.

```
? #define TRUE      0
? #define FALSE    1
?
? if ((ch = getchar()) == EOF)
?     not_eof = FALSE;
```

□

**Exercise1-2 .** Improve this function:

```
? int smaller(char *s, char *t) {
?     if (strcmp(s, t) < 1)
?         return 1;
?     else
?         return 0;
? }
```

□

**Exercise1-3 .** Read this code aloud:

```
? if ((falloc(SMRHSHSCRTCH, S_IFEXT|0644, MAXRODDHSH)) < 0)
?     ...
```

□

## 1.2 Expression and Statements

By analogy (类比) with choosing names to aid the reader's understanding, write expressions and statements in a way that makes their meaning as transparent as possible. Write the clearest code that does the job. Use spaces around operators to suggest grouping; more generally, format to help readability. This is trivial (琐细的) but valuable, like keeping a neat desk so you can find things. Unlike your desk, your programs are likely to be examined by others.

*Indent to show structure.* A consistent indentation style is the lowest-energy way to make a program's structure self-evident (不言自明的). This example is badly formatted:

```
?   for(n++;n<100;field[n++]='\0');
?   *i = '\0'; return('\n');
```

Reformatting improves it somewhat:

```
?   for (n++; n < 100; field[n++] = '\0')
?       ;
?   *i = '\0';
?   return('\n');
```

Even better is to put the assignment in the body and separate the increment, so the loop takes a more conventional form and is thus easier to grasp (抓取):

```
    for (n++; n < 100; n++)
        field[n] = '\0';
    *i = '\0';
    return '\n';
```

*Use the natural form for expressions.* Write expressions as you might speak them aloud. Conditional expressions that include negations are always hard to understand:

```
?   if (!(block-id < actblks) || !(block-id >= unblocks))
?       ...
```

Each test is stated negatively, though there is no need for either to be. Turning the relations around lets us state the tests positively:

```
    if ((block-id >= actblks) || (block - id < unblocks))
        ...
```

Note the code reads naturally. *Parenthesize to resolve ambiguity.* Parentheses specify grouping and can be used to make the intent clear even when they are not required. The inner parentheses in the previous example are not necessary, but they don't hurt, either. Seasoned (经验丰富的) programmers might omit them, because the relational operators(< <= == != >= >) have higher precedence than the logical operators(&& and ||).

When mixing unrelated operators, though, it's a good idea to parenthesize. C and its friends present pernicious (恶劣的) precedence problems, and it's easy to make a mistake. Because the logical operators bind tighter than assignment, parentheses are mandatory for most expressions that combine them:

```
    while ((c = getchar()) != EOF)
        ...
```

The bitwise operators & and | have lower precedence than relational operators like ==, so despite its appearance,

```
?   if (x&MASK == BITS)
?       ...
```

actually means

```
?   if (x & (MASK==BITS))
?       ...
```

which is certainly not the programmer's intent. Because it combines bitwise and relational operators, the expression need parentheses:

```
if ((x&MASK) == BITS)
    ...
```

Even if parentheses aren't necessary, they can help if the grouping is hard to grasp at first glance. This code doesn't need parentheses:

```
?   leap_year = y % 4 == 0 && y % 100 != 0 || y % 400 == 0;
```

but they make it easier to understand:

```
leap_year = ((y%4 == 0) && (y%100 != 0)) || (y%400 == 0);
```

We also removed some of the blanks: grouping the operands of higher-precedence operators helps the readers to see the structure more quickly.

*Break up complex expressions.* C, C++ and Java have rich expression syntax and operators, and it's easy to get carried away by cramming (塞满) everything into one construction. An expression like the following is compact (紧凑的) but it packs too many operations into a single statement:

```
?   *x += (*xp=(2*k < (n-m) ? c[k+1] : d[k--]));
```

It's easier to grasp when broken into several pieces:

```
if (2*k < n-m)
    *xp = c[k+1];
else
    *xp = d[k--];
*x += *xp;
```

*Be clear.* Programmers' endless creative energy is sometimes used to write the most concise code possible, or to find clever ways to achieve a result. Sometimes these skills are misapplied, though, since the goal is to write clear code, not clever code.

What does this intricate (复杂的) calculation do?

```
?   subkey = subkey >> (bitoff - ((bitoff >> 3) << 3));
```

The innermost expression shifts `bitoff` three bits to the right. The result is shifted left again, thus replacing the three shifted bits by zeros. This result in turn is subtracted from the original value, yielding the bottom three bits of `bitoff`. These three bits are used to shift `subkey` to the right.

Thus the original expression is equivalent to

```
subkey = subkey >> (bitoff & 0x7);
```

It takes a while to puzzle out what the first version is doing; the second is shorter and clearer. Experienced programmers make it ever shorter by using assignment operator:

```
subkey >>= bitoff & 0x7;
```

Some constructs seem to invite abuse. The `? :` operator can lead to mysterious code:

```
?   child=(!LC&&!RC)?0:(!LC?RC:LC);
```

It's almost impossible to figure out what this code without following all the possible paths through the expression. This form is longer, but much easier to follow because it makes the paths explicit:

```

if (LC == 0 && RC == 0)
    child = 0;
else if (LC == 0)
    child = RC;
else
    child = LC;

```

The `?:` operator is fine for short expressions where it can replace four lines of if-else with one, as in

```
max = (a > b) ? a : b;
```

or perhaps

```
printf("The list has %d item%s\n", n, n==1 ? "" : "s");
```

but it is not a general replacement for conditional statements.

*Be careful with side effect.* Operators like `++` have side effects: besides returning a value, they also modify an underlying variable. Side effects can be extremely convenient, but they can also cause trouble because the actions of retrieving the value and updating the variable might not happen at the same time. In C and C++, the order of execution of side effects is undefined, so this multiple assignment is likely to produce the wrong answer:

```
? str[i++] = str[i++] = ' ';
```

The intent is to store blanks at the next two position in `str`. But depending on when `i` is updated, a position in `str` could be skipped and `i` might end up increased only by 1. Break it into two statements:

```

str[i++] = ' ';
str[i++] = ' ';

```

Even though it contains only one increment, this assignment can also give varying results:

```
? array[i++] = i;
```

If `i` is initially 3, the array element might be set to 3 or 4.

It's not just increment and decrement that have side effects; I/O is another source of behind-the-scenes (幕后的) action. This example is an attempt to read two related numbers from standard input:

```
? scanf("%d %d", &yr, &profit[yr]);
```

It is broken because part of the expression modifies `yr` and another part uses it. The value of `profit[yr]` can never be right unless the new value of `yr` is the same as the old one. You might think that the answer depends on the order in which the arguments are evaluated, but the real issue is that all the arguments to `scanf` are evaluated before the routine is called, so `&profit[yr]` will always be evaluated using the old value of `yr`. This sort of problem can occur in almost any language. The fix is, as usual, to break up the expression:

```

scanf("%d", &yr);
scanf("%d", &profit[yr]);

```

Exercises caution in any expression with side effects.

**Exercise1-4.** Improves each of these fragments:

```

? if (!(c == 'y' || c == 'Y'))
?     return;
? length = (length < BUFSIZE) ? length : BUFSIZE;
? flag = flag ? 0 : 1;
? quote = (*line == '"') ? 1 : 0;
? if (val & 1)
?     bit = 1;
? else
?     bit = 0;

```

□

**Exercise1-5.** What is wrong with this excerpt (摘录)?

```
? int read(int *ip) {
?     scanf("%d", ip);
?     return *ip;
? }
? ...
? insert(&graph[vert], read(&val), read(&ch));
```

□

**Exercise1-6.** List all the different output this could produce with various orders of evaluation:

```
? n = 1;
? printf("%d %d\n", n++, n++);
```

Try it on as many compilers as you can, to see what happens in practice.

□

### 1.3 Consistency and Idioms (习惯用法)

Consistency leads to better programs. If formatting varies unpredictably, or loop over an array runs uphill this time and downhill the next, or strings are copied with `strcpy` and a `for` loop there, the variations make it harder to see what's really going on. But if the same computation is done the same way every time it appears, any variation suggests a genuine (真正的) difference, one worth nothing.

*Use a consistent indentation and brace style.* Indentation show structure, but which indentation style is best? Should the opening brace go on the same line as the `if` for on the next? Programmers have always argued about the layout of program, but the specific style is much less important than its consistent application. Pick one style, preferably (更合意地) ours, use it consistently, and don't waste time arguing.

Should you include braces even when they are not needed? Like parentheses, braces can resolve ambiguity and occasionally make the code clearer. For consistency, many experienced programmers always put braces around loop or `if` bodies. But if the body is a single statement they are unnecessary, so we tend to omit them. If you also choose to leave them out, make sure you don't drop them when they are needed to resolve the "dangling (悬挂的) else" ambiguity exemplified (示例) by this excerpt (摘录):

```
? if (month == FEB) {
?     if (year%4 == 0)
?         if (day > 29)
?             legal = FALSE;
?     else
?         if (day > 28)
?             legal = FALSE;
? }
```

The indentation is misleading, since the `else` is actually attached to the line

```
? if (day > 29)
```

and the code is wrong. When one `if` immediately follows another, always use braces:

```
? if (month == FEB) {
?     if (year%4 == 0) {
?         if (day > 29)
?             legal = FALSE;
?     } else {
?         if (day > 28)
?             legal = FALSE;
?     }
? }
```

Syntax-driven tools make this sort of mistake less likely.

Even with the bug fixed, though, the code is hard to follow. The computation is easier to grasp if we use a variable to hold the number of days in February:

```
?  if (month == FEB) {
?      int nday;
?
?      nday = 28;
?      if (year%4 == 0)
?          nday == 29;
?      if (day > nday)
?          legal = FALSE;
?  }
```

The code still wrong -- 2000 is a leap year, while 1900 and 2100 are not -- but this structure is much easier to adapt to make it absolutely right.

By the way, if you work on a program you didn't write, preserve the style you find there. When you make a change, don't use your own style even though you prefer it. The program's consistency is more important than your own, because it makes life easier for those who follow.

*Use idioms for consistency.* Like natural language, programming languages have idioms, conventional ways that experienced programmers write common pieces of code. A central part of learning any language is developing a familiarity with its idioms.

One of the most common idioms is the form of a loop. Consider the C, C++, or Java code for stepping through the  $n$  elements of an array, for example to initialize them. Someone might write the loop like this:

```
?  i = 0;
?  while (i <= n-1)
?      array[i++] = 1.0;
```

or perhaps like this:

```
?  for (i = 0; i < n; )
?      array[i++] = 1.0;
```

or even:

```
?  for (i = 0; --i >= 0; )
?      array[i] = 1.0;
```

All of these are correct, but the idiomatic form is like this:

```
for (i = 0; i < n; i++)
    array[i] = 1.0;
```

This is not an arbitrary choice. It visits each member of an  $n$ -element array indexed from 0 to  $n-1$ . It places all the loop control in the `for` itself, runs in increasing order, and uses the very idiomatic `++` operator to update the loop variable. It leaves the index variable at a known value just beyond the last array element. Native speakers recognize it which study and write it correctly without a moment's thought.

In C++ or Java, a common variant includes the declaration of the loop variable:

```
for (int i = 0; i < n; i++)
    array[i] = 1.0;
```

Here is the standard loop for walking along a list in C:

```
for (p = list; p != NULL; p = p->next)
    ...
```

Again, all the loop control is in the `for`.

For an infinite loop, we prefer

```
for (;;)
    ...
```

but

```
while (1)
    ...
```

is also popular. Don't use anything other than these forms.

Indentation should be idiomatic, too. This unusual vertical layout detracts (贬低) from readability; it looks like three statements, not a loop:

```
?   for (
?       ap = arr;
?       ap < arr + 128;
?       *ap++ = 0
?       )
?   {
?       ;
?   }
```

A standard loop is much easier to read:

```
for (ap = arr; ap < arr+128; ap++)
    *ap = 0;
```

Sprawling (蔓延的) layout also force code onto multiple screens or pages, and thus detract from readability.

Another common idiom is to nest an assignment inside a loop condition, as in

```
while ((c = getchar()) != EOF)
    putchar(c);
```

The `do-while` statement is used much less often than `for` and `while`, because it always executes at least once, testing at the bottom of the loop instead of the top. In many cases, that behavior is a bug waiting to bite, as in this rewrite of the `getchar` loop:

```
?   do {
?       c = getchar();
?       putchar(c);
?   } while (c != EOF);
```

It write a spurious (假的) output character because the test occurs after the call to `putchar`. The `do-while` loop is the right one only when the body of the loop must always be executed at least once; we'll see some examples later.

One advantage of the consistent use of idioms is that it draws attentions to non-standard loops, a frequent sign of trouble:

```
int i, *iArray, nmemb;

iArray = malloc(nmemb * sizeof(int));
for (i = 0; i <= nmemb; i++)
    iArray[i] = i;
```

Space is allocated for `nmemb` items, `iArray[0]` through `iArray[nmemb-1]`, but since the loop test is `<=` the loop walks off the end of array and overwrites whatever is stored next in memory. Unfortunately, error like this are often not detected until long after the damage has been done.

C and C++ also have idioms for allocating space for strings and then manipulating it, and code that doesn't use them often harbors (隐藏) a bug:



```
? char *p, buf[256];
?
? gets(buf);
? p = malloc(strlen(buf));
? strcpy(p, buf);
```

One should never use `gets`, since there is no way to limit the amount of input it will read. This leads to security problems that we'll return to in Chapter 6, where we will show that `fgets` is always a better choice. But there is another problem as well: `strlen` does not count the `'\0'` that terminates a string, while `strcpy` copies it. So not enough space is allocated, and `strcpy` writes past the end of allocated space. The idiom is

```
p = malloc(strlen(buf) + 1);
strcpy(p, buf);
```

or

```
p = new char[strlen(buf) + 1];
strcpy(p, buf);
```

in C++. If you don't see the `+1`, beware.

Java doesn't suffer from this specific problem, since strings are not represented as null-terminated arrays. Array subscripts are checked as well, so it is not possible to access outside the bounds of an array in Java.

Most C and C++ environments provide a library function, `strdup`, that creates a copy of a string using `malloc` and `strcpy`, making it easy to avoid this bug. Unfortunately, `strdup` is not part of the ANSI C standard.

By the way, neither the original code nor the corrected version check the value returned by `malloc`. We omitted this improvement to focus on the main point, but in a real program the return value from `malloc`, `realloc`, `strdup`, or any other allocation routine should always be checked.

*Use else-ifs for multi-way decisions.* Multi-way decisions are idiomatically expressed as a chain of `if .. else if .. else`, like this:

```
if (condition1)
    statement1
else if (condition2)
    statement2
...
else if (conditioni)
    statementi
else
    default-statement
```

The *conditions* read from top to bottom; at the first *condition* that is satisfied, the *statement* that follows is executed, and then rest of the construct is skipped. The *statement* part may be a single statement or group of statements enclosed in braces. The last `else` handles the "default" situation, where none of the other alternatives was chosen. This trailing (拖尾的) `else` part may be omitted if there is no action for the default, although leaving it with an error message may help to catch conditions that "can't happen".

Align all of the `else` clauses (子句) vertically rather than lining up (排列) each `else` with the corresponding `if`. Vertical alignment emphasizes that tests are done in sequence and keep them from marching off (步进, 越来越远) the right side of the page.

A sequence of nested `if` statements is often a warning of awkward (笨拙的) code, if not outright (显示) errors:

```
? if (argc == 3)
?     if ((find == fopen(argv[1], "r")) != NULL)
?         if ((fout = fopen(argv[2], "w")) != NULL) {
?             while ((c =getc(find)) != EOF)
```

```

?        putc(c, fout);
?         fclose(fin); fclose(fout);
?     } else
?         printf("Can't open output file %s\n", argv[1]);
?     else
?         printf("Can't open input file %s\n", argv[1]);
?     else
?         printf("Usage: cp inputfile outputfile\n");

```

The sequence of ifs requires us to maintain a mental (心理的) pushdown (推进) stack of what tests were made, so that at the appropriate point we can pop them until we determine the corresponding action (if we can still remember). Since at most one action will be performed, we really want an `else if`. Changing the order in which the decisions are made leads to a clearer version, in which we have also corrected the resource leak (泄漏) in the original:

```

if (argc != 3)
    printf("Usage: cp inputfile outputfile\n");
else if ((fin = fopen(argv[1], "r")) == NULL)
    printf("Can't open input file %s\n", argv[1]);
else if ((fout = fopen(argv[2], "w")) == NULL) {
    printf("Can't open output file %s\n", argv[2]);
    fclose(fin);
} else {
    while ((c = getc(fin)) != EOF)
        putc(c, fout);
    fclose(fin);
    fclose(fout);
}

```

We read down the tests until the first one that is true, do the corresponding action, and continue after the last `else`. The rule is to follow each decision as closely as possible by its associated action. Or, to put it another way, each time you make a test, do something.

Attempts to re-use pieces of code often lead to tightly knotted (纠缠的) programs.

```

?     switch (c) {
?     case '-': sign = -1;
?     case '+': c = getchar();
?     case '.': break;
?     default: if (!isdigit(c))
?                 return 0;
?     }

```

This uses a tricky sequence of fall-throughs in the `switch` statement to avoid duplicating one line of code. It's also not idiomatic; cases should almost always end with a `break`, with the rare exceptions commented. A more traditional layout and structure is easier to read, though longer:

```

?     switch (c) {
?     case '-':
?         sign = -1;
?         /* fall through */
?     case '+':
?         c = getchar();
?         break;
?     case '.':
?         break;
?     default:
?         if (!isdigit(c))
?             return 0;
?         break;
?     }

```

The increase in size is more than offset by the increase in clarity. However, for such an unusual structure, a sequence of `else-if` is even clearer:

```

    if (c == '-') {
        sign = -1;
        c = getchar();
    } else if (c == '+') {
        c = getchar();
    } else if (c != '.' && !isdigit(c)) {
        return 0;
    }

```

The braces around the one-line blocks highlight the parallel structure.

An acceptable use of a fall-through occurs when several cases have identical code; the conventional layout is like this:

```

    case '0':
    case '1':
    case '2':
        ...
        break;

```

and no comment is required.

**Exercise1-7.** Rewrite these C/C++ excerpts more clearly:

```

?      if (istty(stdin)) ;
?      else if (istty(stdout)) ;
?          else if (istty(stderr)) ;
?          else return(0);

?      if (retval != SUCCESS)
?          return(retval);
?      /* All went well */
?      return SUCCESS;

?      for (k = 0; k++ < 5; x += dx)
?          scanf("%lf", &dx);

```

□

**Exercise1-8.** Identify the errors in this Java fragment and repair it by rewriting with an idiomatic loop:

```

?      int count = 0;
?      while (count < total) {
?          count++;
?          if (this.getName(count) == nametable.userName()) {
?              return (true);
?          }
?      }

```

□

## 1.4 Function Macros

There is a tendency among older C programmers to write macros instead of function for very short computations that will be executed frequently; I/O operations such as `getchar` and character test like `isdigit` are officially sanctioned (认可的) examples. The reason is performance: a macro avoids the overhead of a function call. This argument was weak even when C was first defined, a time of slow machines and expensive

function calls; today it is irrelevant. With modern machines and compilers, the drawbacks of function macros outweigh (超过) their benefits.

*Avoid function macros.* In C++, `inline` functions render (补偿) function macros unnecessary; in Java, there are no macros. In C, they cause more problems than they solve.

One of the most serious problem with function macros is that a *parameter* that appears more than once in the definition might be evaluated more than once; if the argument in the call includes an expression with side effect, the result is a subtle (微妙的) bug. This code attempts to implement one of the character tests from `<ctype.h>`:

```
? #define isupper(c) ((c) >= 'A' && (c) <= 'Z')
```

Note that the parameter `c` occurs twice in the body of the macro. If `isupper` is called in a context like this,

```
? while (isupper(c = getchar()))
?     ...
```

then each time an input character is greater than or equal to A, it will be discarded and another character read to be tested against Z. The C standard is carefully written to permit `isupper` and analogous functions to be macros, but only if they guarantee to evaluate the argument only once, so this implementation is broken.

It's always better to use the `ctype` function than to implement them yourself, and it's safer not to nest routine like `getchar` that have side effects. Rewriting the test to use two expressions rather one makes it clearer and also gives an opportunity to catch end-of-file explicitly:

```
while ((c = getchar()) != EOF && isupper(c))
    ...
```

Sometimes multiple evaluation causes a performance problem rather than an outright error. Consider this example:

```
? #define ROUND_TO_INT(x) ((int) ((x) + ((x) > 0 ? 0.5 : -0.5)))
?     ...
? size = ROUND_TO_INT(sqrt(dx*dx + dy*dy));
```

This will perform the square root computation twice as often as necessary. Even given simple arguments, a complex expression like the body of `ROUND_TO_INT` translates into many instructions, which should be housed (收藏) in a single function to be called when needed. Instantiating a macro at every occurrence makes the compiled program larger. (C++ `inline` functions have this drawback, too.)

*Parenthesize the macro body and arguments.* If you insist on using function macros, be careful. Macros work by textual substitution: the parameters in the definition are replaced by the arguments of the call and the result replaces the original call, as text. This is a troublesome difference from function. This expression

```
1 / square(x)
```

works fine if `square` is a function, but if it's a macro like this,

```
? #define square(x) (x) * (x)
```

the expression will be expanded to the erroneous

```
? 1 / (x) * (x)
```

The macro should be rewritten as

```
#define square(x) ((x) * (x))
```

All those parentheses are necessary. Even parenthesizing the macro properly does not address the multiple evaluation problem. If an operation is expensive or common enough to be wrapped up, use a function.

In C++, `inline` functions avoid the syntactic trouble while offering whatever performance advantage macros might provide. They are appropriate for short functions that set or retrieve a single value.

**Exercise1-9.** Identify the problems with this macro definition:

```
?      #define ISDIGIT(c) ((c >= '0') && (c <= '9')) 1 : 0
```

□

## 1.5 Magic Numbers

*Magic numbers* are the constants, array sizes, character positions, conversion factors, and other literal numeric values that appear in programs.

*Give names to magic numbers.* As a guideline, any number other than 0 or 1 is likely to be magic and should have a name of its own. A raw number in program source gives no indication of its importance or derivation (来历), making the program harder to understand and modify. This excerpt from a program to print a histogram of letter frequencies on a 24 by 80 cursor-addressed terminal is needlessly opaque (不透明的) because of a host of magic numbers:

```
? fac = lim / 20;          /* set scale factor */
? if (fac < 1)
?     fac = 1;
?
?                          /* generate histogram */
? for (i = 0, col = 0; i < 27; i++, j++) {
?     col += 3;
?     k = 21 - (let[i] / fac);
?     star = (let[i] == 0) ? ' ' : '*';
?     for (j = k; j < 22; j++)
?         draw(j, col, star);
? }
? draw(23, 2, ' '); /* label x axis */
? for (i = 'A'; i <= 'Z'; i++)
?     printf("%c ", i);
```

The code includes, among others, the number 20, 21, 22, 23. They're clearly related... or are they? In fact, there are only three numbers critical to this program: 24, the number of rows on the screen; 80, the number of column; and 26, the number of letters in the alphabet. But none of these appears in the code, which makes the numbers that do even more magical.

By giving names to the principal (主要的) numbers in the calculation, we can make the code easier to follow. We discover, for instance, that the number 3 comes from  $(80-1)/26$  and that `let` should have 26 entries, not 27 (an off-by-one error perhaps caused by 1-indexed screen coordinates). Making a couple of other simplifications, this is the result:

```
enum {
    MINROW    = 1,                /* top edge */
    MINCOL    = 1,                /* left edge */
    MAXROW    = 24,               /* bottom edge (<=) */
    MAXCOL    = 80,               /* right edge (<=) */
    LABELROW  = 1,                /* position of labels */
    NLET      = 26,               /* size of alphabet */
    HEIGHT    = MAXROW - 4,       /* height of bars */
    WIDTH     = (MAXCOL-1)/NLET,  /* width of bars */
};

...
fac = (lim + HEIGHT - 1) / HEIGHT; /* set scale factor */
if (fac < 1)
    fac = 1;
for (i = 0; i < NLET; i++) { /* generate histogram */
```

```

    if (let[i] == 0)
        continue;
    for (j = HEIGHT - let[i]/fac; j < HEIGHT; j++)
        draw(j+1+LABELROW, (i+1)*WIDTH, '*');
}
draw(MAXROW-1, MINCOL+1, ' '); /* label x axis */
for (i = 'A'; i <= 'Z'; i++)
    printf("%c ", i);

```

Now it's clearer what the main loop does: it's an idiomatic loop from 0 to NLET, indicating that the loop is over the elements of the data. Also the calls to `draw` are easier to understand because words like `MAXROW` and `MINCOL` remind us of the order of arguments. Most important, it's now feasible to adapt the program to another size of display or different data. The numbers are demystified (易懂的) and so is the code.

*Define numbers as constants, not macros.* C programmers have traditionally used `#define` to manage magic number values. The C preprocessor is a powerful but blunt (愚蠢的) tool, however, and macros are a dangerous way to program because they change the lexical structure of the program underfoot (碍事的). Let the language proper do the work. In C and C++, integer constants can be defined with an `enum` statement, as we say in the previous example. Constants of any type can be declared with `const` in C++:

```
const int MAXROW = 24, MAXCOL = 80;
```

or final in Java:

```
static final int MAXROW = 24, MAXCOL = 80;
```

C also has `const` values but they cannot be used as array bounds, so the `enum` statement remains the method of choice in C.

*Use character constants, not integers.* The functions in `<ctype.h>` or their equivalent should be used to test the properties of character. A test like this:

```
?   if (c >= 65 && c <= 90)
?       ...
```

depends completely on a particular character representation. It's better to use

```
?   if (c >= 'A' && c <= 'Z')
?       ...
```

but that may not have the desired effect if the letters are not contiguous in the character set encoding or if the alphabet include other letters. Best is to use the library:

```
if (isupper(c))
    ...
```

in C or C++, or

```
if (Character.isUpperCase(c))
    ...
```

in Java.

A related issue is that the number 0 appears often in programs, in many contexts. The compiler will convert the number into the appropriate type, but it helps the reader to understand the role of each 0 if the type is explicit. For example, use `(void *)0` or `NULL` to represent a zero pointer in C, and `'\0'` instead of 0 to represent the null byte at the end of a string. In other words, don't write

```
?   str = 0;
?   name[i] = 0;
?   x = 0;
```

but rather:

```
str = NULL;
name[i] = '\0';
x = 0.0;
```

We prefer to use different explicit constants, reserving 0 for a literal integer zero, because they indicate the use of the value and thus provide a bit of documentation. In C++, however, 0 rather than NULL is the acceptable notation for a null pointer. Java solves the problem best by defining the keyword `null` for an object reference that doesn't refer to anything.

*Use the language to calculate the size of an object.* Don't use an explicit size for any data type; use `sizeof(int)` instead of 2 or 4, for instance. For similar reasons, `sizeof(array[0])` may be better than `sizeof(int)` because it's one less thing to change if the type of the array changes.

The `sizeof` operator is sometimes a convenient way to avoid inventing names for the numbers that determine array size. For example, if we write

```
char    buf[1024];
fgets(buf, sizeof(buf), stdin);
```

the buffer size is still a magic number, but it occurs only once, in the declaration. It may not be worth inventing a name for the size of a local array, but it is definitely worth writing code that does not have to change if the size or type changes.

Java arrays have `length` that gives the numbers of elements:

```
char buf[] = new char[1024];
for (int i = 0; i < buf.length; i++)
    ...
```

There is no equivalent of `.length` in C and c++, but for an array (not a pointer) whose declaration is visible, this macro computes the number of elements in the array:

```
#define NELEMS(array) (sizeof(array) / sizeof(array[0]))

double dbuf[100];
for (i = 0; i < NELEMS(dbuf); i++)
    ...
```

The array size is set in only one place; the rest of the code not change if the size does. There is no problem with multiple evaluation of the macro argument here, since there can be no side effects, and in fact the computation is done as the program is being compiled. This is an appropriate use for a macro because it does something that a function cannot: compute the size of an array from its declaration.

**Exercise1-10** . How would you rewrite these definitions to minimize potential errors?

```
?      #define FTZMETER    0.3048
?      #define METERZFT    328084
?      #define MIZFT      5280.0
?      #define MIZKM      1.609344
?      #define SQMIZSQKM  2.589988
```

□

## 1.6 Comments

Comments are meant to help the reader of a program. They do not help by saying things the code already plainly (清楚地) says, or by contradicting (矛盾) the code, or by distracting (分心) the reader with elaborate

(详细说明) typographical (印刷的) displays. The best comments aid the understanding of a program by briefly pointing out salient (突出的) details or by providing a larger-scale view of the proceedings (进程, 进行).

*Don't belabor (痛打) the obvious.* Comments shouldn't report self-evident information, such as the fact that `i++` increments `i`. Here are some of our favorite worthless comments:

```
?  /*
?   * default
?   */
?  default:
?      break;

?  /* return SUCCESS */
?  return SUCCESS;

?  zerocount++;    /* increment zero entry counter */

?  /* initialize "total" to "number_received" */
?  node->total = node->number_received;
```

All of these comments should be deleted; they're just clutter (杂物).

Comments should add something that is not immediately evident from the code, or collect into one place information that is spread through the source. When something subtle (微妙的) is happening, a comment may clarify, but if the actions are obvious already, restating them in words is pointless:

```
?  while ((c = getchar()) != EOF && isspace(c))
?      ;    /* skip white space */
?  if (c == EOF)    /* end of file */
?      type = endoffile;
?  else if (c == '(') /* left parenthes */
?      type = leftparen;
?  else if (c == ';') /* semicolon */
?      type = semicolon;
?  else if (isdigit(c)) /* number */
?      ...
```

These comments should also be deleted, since the well-chosen names already convey the information.

*Comment functions and global data.* Comments can be useful, of course. We comment functions, global variables, constant definitions, fields in structures and classes, and anything else where a brief summary can aid understanding.

Global variables have a tendency to crop up (突然出现) intermittently (间歇地) throughout a program; a comment serves as a reminder to be referred to as needed. Here's an example from a program in Chapter 3 of this book:

```
struct State { /* prefix + suffix list */
    char    *pref[NPREF]; /* prefix words */
    Suffix  *suf;          /* list of suffixes */
    State   *next;         /* next in hash table */
};
```

A comment that introduces each function sets the stage for reading the code itself. If the code isn't too long or technical, a single line is enough:

```
// random: retrn an integer in the range [0, r-1].
int random(int r)
{
    return (int) (Math.floor(Math.random() * r));
}
```



Sometimes code is genuinely (真正地) difficult, perhaps because the algorithm is complicated or the data structure are intricate (复杂的). In that case, a comment that points to a source of understanding can aid the reader. It may also be valuable to suggest why particular decisions were made. This comment introduces an extremely efficient implementation of an inverse (反转) discrete (离散) cosine transform (DCT) used in JPEG image decoder:

```
/*
 * idct: Scaled integer implementation of
 * inverse two dimensional 8*8 Discrete Cosine Transform,
 * Chen-Wang algorithm (IEEE ASSP-32, pp 803-816, Aug 1984)
 *
 * 32-bit integer arithmetic (8-bit coefficients)
 * 11 multiplies, 29 adds per DCT
 *
 * coefficients extended to 12 bits for IEEE 1180-1990 compliance.
 */
static void idct(int b[8*8])
{
    ...
}
```

This helpful comment cites the reference, briefly describes the data used, indicates the performance of the algorithm, and tells how and why the original algorithm has been modified.

*Don't comment bad code, rewrite it.* Comment anything unusual or potentially confusing, but when the comment outweighs the code, the code probably needs fixing. This example uses a long, muddled (胡乱对付的) comment and a conditional-compiled debugging print statement to explain a single statement:

```
? /* if "result" is 0, a match was found, so return true.
?  * otherwise, "result" is non-zero, so return false
?  */
? #ifdef DEBUG
? printf("*** isword returns !result = %d\n", !result);
? fflush(stdout);
? #endif
?
? return(!result);
```

Negation is hard to understand and should be avoided. Part of the problem is the uninformative (无法提供信息的) variable name, `result`. A more descriptive name, `matchfound`, makes the comment unnecessary and cleans up the print statement, too.

```
#ifdef DEBUG
printf("*** isword returns matchfound = %d\n", matchfound);
fflush(stdout);
#endif

return(matchfound);
```

*Don't contradict the code.* Most comments agree with code when they are written, but as bugs are fixed and the program evolves, the comments are often left in their original form, resulting in disagreement with the code. This is the likely explanation for the inconsistency in the example that opens this chapter.

Whatever the source of the disagreement, a comment that contradicts the code is confusing, and many a debugging session has been needlessly protracted (拖延) because a mistaken comment was taken as truth. When you change the code, make sure the comments are still accurate.

Comments should not only agree with code, they should support it. The comment in this example is correct -- it explains the purpose of the next two lines -- but it appears to contradict the code; the comment talks about newline and the code talks about blanks:

```
?  time(&now);
?  strcpy(date, ctime(&now));
?  /* get rid of trailing newline character copied from ctime */
?  i = 0;
?  while (date[i] != ' ') i++;
?  date[i] = 0;
```

One improvement is to rewrite the code more idiomatically:

```
?  time(&now);
?  strcpy(date, ctime(&now));
?  /* get rid of trailing newline character copied from ctime */
?  i = 0;
?  while (date[i] != '\n') i++;
?  date[i] = '\0';
```

Code and comment now agree, but both can be improved by being made more direct. The problem is to delete the newline that `ctime` puts on the end of the string it returns. The comment should say so, and the code should do so:

```
time(&now);
strcpy(date, ctime(&now));
/* ctime() puts newline at end of string, delete it */
date[strlen(data) - 1] = '\0';
```

This last expression is the C idiom for removing the last character from a string. The code is now short, idiomatic and clear, and the comment support it by explaining why it needs to be there.

*Clarify, don't confuse.* Comments are supposed to help readers over the hard parts, not create more obstacles. This example follows our guidelines of commenting the function and explaining unusual properties; on other hand, the function is `strcmp` and the unusual properties are peripheral(无关紧要的) to the job at hand, which is the implementation of a standard and familiar interface:

```
?  int strcmp(char *s1, char *s2)
?  /* string comparison routine returns -1 if s1 is
?   * above s2 in an ascending order list, 0 if equal,
?   * 1 if s1 below s2
?   */
?  {
?      while (*s1 == *s2) {
?          if (*s1 == '\0') return(0);
?          s1++;
?          s2++;
?      }
?      if (*s1 > *s2) return(1);
?      return(-1);
?  }
```

When it takes more than a few words to explain what's happening, it's often an indication that the code should be rewriting. Here, the code could perhaps be improved but the real problem is the comment, which is nearly as long as the implementation and confusing. too (which way is "above"?). We're stretching (伸展) the point to say this routine is hard to understand, but since it implements a standard function, its comment can help by summarizing the behavior and telling us where the definition originates; that's all that's needed:

```
/*
 * strcmp: return <0 if s1 < s2, > 0 if s1 > s2, 0 if equal.
 * ANSI C, section 4.11.4.2
 */
int strcmp(const char *s1, const char *s2)
{
    ...
}
```

Students are taught that it's important to comment everything. Professional programmers are often required to comment all their code. But the purpose of commenting can be lost in blindly following rules. Comments are meant to help a reader understand parts (全景) of the program that are not readily understood from the code itself. As much as possible, write code that is easy to understand; the better you do this, the fewer comments you need. Good code needs fewer comments than bad code.

**Exercise 1-11**. Comment on these comments.

```
?      void dict::insert(string& w)
?      // returns 1 if w in dictionary, otherwise returns 0.

?      if (n > MAX || n % 2 > 0) // test for even number

?      // write a message
?      // Add to line counter for each line written
?      void write_message()
?      {
?          // increment line counter
?          line_number = line_number + 1;
?          fprintf(fout, "%d %s\n%d %s\n%d %s\n",
?              line_number, HEADER,
?              line_number + 1, BODY,
?              line_number + 2, TRAILER);
?          // increment line counter
?          line_number = line_number + 2;
?      }
```

□

## 1.7 Why Bother?

In this chapter, we've talked about the main concerns of programming style: descriptive names, clarity in expressions, straightforward control flow, readability of code and comments, and the importance of consistent use of conventions and idioms in achieving all of these. It's hard to argue that these are bad things.

But why worry about style? Who cares what a program looks like if it works? Doesn't it take too much time to make it look pretty? Aren't the rules arbitrary anyway?

The answer is that well-written code is easier to read and to understand, almost surely has fewer errors, and is likely to be smaller than code that has been carelessly tossed (摇摆) and never polished. In the rush to get programs out the door to meet some deadline, it's easy to push style aside, to worry about it later. This can be a costly decision. Some of the examples in this chapter show what can go wrong if there isn't enough attention to good style. Sloppy (粗心的) code is bad code -- not just awkward and hard to read, but often broken.

The key observation is that good style should be a matter of habit. If you think about style as you write the code originally, and if you take the time to revise and improve it, you will develop good habits. Once they become automatic, your subconscious will take care of many of the details for you, and even the code you produce under pressure will be better.

## Supplementary (补充的) Reading

As we said at the beginning of the chapter, writing good code has much in common with writing good English. Strunk and White's *The Elements of Style* (Allyn & Bacon) is still the best short book on how to write English well.

This chapter draw on the approach of *The Elements of Programming Style* by Brian Kernighan and P. J. Plauger (McGraw-Hill, 1978). Steve Maguire's *Writing Solid Code* (Microsoft Press, 1993) is an excellent source of programming advise. There are also helpful descussions of style in Steve McConnell's *Code Complete* (Microsoft Press, 1993) and Peter van der Linder's *Expert C Programming: Deep C Secrets* (Prentice Hall, 1994).

## Chapter 2

# Algorithms and Data Structures

*In the end, only familiarity with the tools and techniques of the field will provide right solution for a particular problem, and only a certain amount of experience will provide consistently professional result.*

Raymond Fielding. *The Technique of Special Effects Cinematography*

The study of algorithms and data structures is one of the foundations of computer science, a rich field elegant techniques and sophisticated mathematical analyses. And it's more than just fun and games for the theoretically inclined: a good algorithm or data structure might make it possible to solve a problem in seconds that could otherwise take years.

In specialized areas like graphics, databases, parsing, numerical analysis, and simulation, the ability to solve problems depends critically on state-of-the-art algorithms and data structures. If you are developing your programs in a field that's new to you, you *must* find out what is already known, lest (免得) you waste your time doing poorly what others have already done well.

Every program depends on algorithms and data structures, but few programs depend on the invention of brand new ones. Even within an intricate (错综复杂的) program like a compiler or a web browser, most of the data structures are arrays, lists, trees and hash tables. When a program needs something more elaborate (详细), it will likely be based on these simpler ones. Accordingly, for most programmers, the task is to know what appropriate algorithms and data structures are available and to understand how to choose among alternatives.

Here is the story in a nutshell. There are only a handful of basic algorithms that show up in almost every program -- primarily searching and sorting -- and even those are often included in libraries. Similarly, almost every data structure is derived from a few fundamental ones. Thus the material covered in this chapter will be familiar to almost all programmers. We have written working versions to make the discussion concrete, and you can lift code verbatim (逐字的) if necessary, but do so only after you have investigated what the programming language and its libraries have to offer.

### 2.1 Searching



## **Chapter 3**

# **Design and Implementation**





## **Chapter 4**

# **Interfaces**



## Chapter 5

# Debugging

*Bug, a defect or fault in a machine, plan, or the like. orig. U.S. 1889 Pall Mall Gaz. 11 Mar: 1/1 Mr. Edison, I was informed, has been up the two previous nights discovering 'a bug' in his phonograph -- an expression for solving a difficulty, implying that some imaginary insect has secreted itself inside and is causing all the trouble.*

*Oxford English Dictionary. 2nd Edition*

We have presented a lot of code in the past four chapters, and we've pretended that it all pretty much worked the first time. Naturally this wasn't true; there were plenty of bugs. The word "bug" didn't originate with programmers, but it is certainly one of the most common terms in computing. Why should software be so hard?

One reason is that the complexity of a program is related to the number of ways that its components can interact, and software is full of components and interactions. Many techniques attempt to reduce the connections between components so there are fewer pieces to interact; examples include information hiding, abstraction and interfaces, and the language features that support them. There are also techniques for ensuring the integrity of a software design -- program proofs, modeling, requirements analysis, formal verification -- but none of these has yet changed the way software is built; they have been successful only on small problems. The reality is that there will always be errors that we find by testing and eliminate by debugging.

Good programmers know that they spend as much time debugging as writing so they try to learn from their mistakes. Every bug you find can teach you how to prevent a similar bug from happening again or to recognize it if it does.

Debugging is hard and can take long and unpredictable amount of time, so the goal is to avoid having to do much of it. Techniques that help reduce debugging time include good design, good style, boundary condition tests, assertions (断言) and sanity (完整性) checks in the code, defensive (防御性) programming, well-designed interfaces, limited global data, and checking tools. An ounce (盎司) of prevention really is worth a pound (磅) of cure.

What is the role of language? A major force in the evolution of programming language has been the attempt to prevent bugs through language features. Some features make classes of errors less likely: range checking on subscript, restricted pointers or no pointers at all, garbage collection, string data types, typed UO, and strong type-checking. On the opposite side of the coin, some features are prone (倾向的) error, like `goto` statements, global variables, unrestricted pointers, and automatic type conversions. Programmers should know the potentially risky bits of their languages and take extra care when using them. They should also enable all compiler checks and heed (注意) warnings.

Each language feature that prevents some problem has a cost of its own. If a higher-level language makes the simple bugs disappear automatically, the price is that it makes it easier to create higher-level bugs. No

language prevents you from making mistakes.

Even though we wish it were otherwise, a majority of programming time is spent testing and debugging. In this chapter, we'll discuss how to make your debugging time as short and productive as possible; we'll come back to testing in Chapter 6.

## 5.1 Debuggers

Compiler for major languages usually come with sophisticated (复杂的) debuggers, often packaged as part of a development environment that integrates creation and edition of source code, compilation, execution, and debugging, all in a single system. Debuggers include graphical interfaces for stepping through a program one statement or function at a time, stopping at particular lines or when a specific condition occurs. They also provide facilities for formatting and displaying the values of variables.

A debugger can be invoked directly when a problem is known to exist. Some debuggers take over automatically when something unexpectedly goes wrong during program execution. It's usually easy to find out where the program was executing when it died, examining the sequence of functions that were active (the stack trace), and display the values of local and global variables. That much information may be sufficient to identify a bug. If not, breakpoints and stepping make it possible to re-run a failing program one step at a time to find the first place where something goes wrong.

In the right environment and in the hands of an experienced user, a good debugger can make debugging effective and efficient, if not exactly painless. With such powerful tools at one's disposal, why would anyone ever debug without them? Why do we need a whole chapter on debugging?

There are several good reasons, some objective and some based on personal experience. Some languages outside the mainstream have no debugger or provide only rudimentary (基本的) debugging facilities. Debuggers are system-dependent, so you may not have access to the familiar debugger from one system when you work on another. Some programs are not handled well by debuggers: multi-process or multi-thread programs, operating systems, and distributed systems must often be debugged by lower-level approaches. In such situations, you're on your own, without much help besides print statements and your own experience and ability to reason about code.

As a personal choice, we tend not to use debuggers beyond getting a stack trace or the value of a variable or two. One reason is that it is easy to get lost in details of complicated data structures and control flow; we find stepping through a program less productive than thinking harder and adding out statements and self-checking code at critical places. Clicking over statements takes longer than scanning the output of judiciously-placed (精心放置的) displays. It takes less time to decide where to put print statements than to single-step to the critical section of code, even assuming we know where that is. More important, debugging statements stay with the program; debugger sessions are transient.

Blind probing with a debugger is not likely to be productive. It is more helpful to use the debugger to discover the state of the program when it fails, then think about how the failure could have happened. Debuggers can be arcane (晦涩难解的) and difficult programs, and especially for beginners may provide more confusion than help. If you ask the wrong question, they will probably give you an answer, but you may not know it's misleading.

A debugger can be of enormous (庞大的) value, however, and you should certainly include one in your debugging toolkit; it is likely to be the first thing you turn to. But if you don't have a debugger, or if you're stuck on an especially hard problem, the techniques in this chapter will help you to debug effectively and efficiently anyway. They should make your use of your debugger more productive as well, since they are largely concerned with how to reason about errors and probable causes.

## 5.2 Good Clues, Easy Bugs

Oops! Something is badly wrong. My program crashed, or printed nonsense, or seems to be running forever. Now what?

Beginners have a tendency to blame the compiler, the library, or anything other than their own code. Experienced programmers would love to do the same, but they know that, realistically, most problems are their own fault.

Fortunately, most bugs are simple and can be found with simple techniques. Examine the evidence in the erroneous output and try to infer (推论) how it could have been produced. Look at any debugging output before the crash; if possible get a stack trace from a debugger. Now you know something of what happened, and where. Pause to reflect. How could that happen? Reason back from the state of the crashed program to determine what could have caused this.

Debugging involves backwards reasoning, like solving murder mysteries. Something impossible occurred, and the only solid information is that it really did occur. So we must think backwards from the result to discover the reasons. Once we have a full explanation, we'll know what to fix and, along the way, likely discover a few other things we hadn't expected.

*Look for familiar patterns.* Ask yourself whether this is familiar pattern. "I've seen that before" is often the beginning of understanding, or even the whole answer. Common bugs have distinctive signatures. For instance, novice (新手) C programmers often write:

```
?  int n;
?  scanf("%d", n);
```

instead of

```
int n;
scanf("%d", &n);
```

and this typically causes an attempt to access out-of-bounds memory when a line of input is read. People who teach C recognize the symptom instantly.

Mismatched types and conversion in `printf` and `scanf` are an endless source of easy bugs:

```
?  int n = 1;
?  double d = PI;
?  printf("%d %f\n", d, n);
```

The signature of this error is sometimes the appearance of preposterous (反常的) values: huge integers or improbably large or small floating-point values. On a Sun SPARC, the output from this program is a huge number and an astronomical (天文的) one<sup>1</sup> (folded to fit):

```
107434034 26815 ... 30144.000000
```

Another common error is using `%f` instead of `%lf` to read a double with `scanf`. Some compilers catch such mistakes by verifying that the type of `scanf` and `printf` arguments match their format string; if all warnings are enabled, for the `printf` above, the GNU compiler `gcc` reports that

```
x.c:9: warning: int format, double arg (arg 2)
x.c:9: warning: double format, different type arg (arg 3)
```

Failing to initialize a local variable give rise to another distinctive error. The result often an extremely large value, the garbage left over from whatever previous value was stored in the same memory location. Some compilers will warn you, though you may have enable the compile-time check, and they can never catch all

<sup>1</sup>It's hard to type a long number, so I omit most of digits.

cases. Memory returned by allocators like `malloc`, `realloc`, and `new` is likely to be garbage too; be sure to initialize it.

*Examine the most recent change.* What was the last change? If you're changing only one at a time as a program evolves, the bug most likely is either in the new code or has been exposed by it. Looking carefully at recent changes helps to localize the problem. If the bug appears in the new version and not in the old, the new code is part of the problem. This means that you should preserve at least the previous version of the program, which you believe to be correct, so that you can compare behaviors. It also means that you should keep records of the changes made and bugs fixed, so you don't have to rediscover this vital information while you're trying to fix a bug. Source code control systems and other history mechanisms are helpful here.

*Don't make the same mistake twice.* After you fix a bug, ask whether you might have made the same mistake somewhere else. This happened to one of us just days before beginning to write this chapter. The program was a quick prototype for a colleague, and included some boilerplate (样板) for optional arguments:

```
?   for (i = 1; i < argc; i++) {
?       if (argv[i][0] != '-') /* options finished */
?           break;
?       switch (argv[i][1]) {
?           case 'o': /* output filename */
?               outname = argv[i];
?               break;
?           case 'f':
?               from = atoi(argv[i]);
?               break;
?           case 't':
?               to = atoi(argv[i]);
?               break;
?           ...
?       }
```

Shortly after our colleague tried it, he reported that the output file name always had the prefix `-o` attached to it. This was embarrassing but easy to repair; the code should have read

```
outname = &argv[i][2];
```

So that was fixed up and shipped off, and back came another report that the program failed to handle an argument like `-f123` properly: the converted numeric value was always zero. This is the same error; the next case in the `switch` should have read

```
from = atoi(&argv[i][2]);
```

Because the author was still in a hurry, he failed to notice that the same blunder (错误) occurred twice more and it took another round before all of the fundamentally identical errors were fixed.

Easy code can have bugs if its familiarity causes us to let down our guard. Even when code is so simple you could write it in your sleep, don't fall asleep while writing it.

*Debug it now, not later.* Being in too much of a hurry can hurt in other situations as well. Don't ignore a crash when it happens; track it down right away, since it may not happen again until it's too late. A famous example occurred on the Mars Pathfinder mission. After the flawless (完美的) landing in July 1997 the spacecraft's computers tended to reset once a day or so, and the engineers were baffled (困惑). Once they tracked down the problem, they realized that they had seen that problem before. During pre-launch tests the resets had occurred, but had been ignored because the engineers were working on unrelated problems. So they were forced to deal with the problem later when the machine was tens of millions of miles away and much harder to fix.

*Get a stack trace.* Although debuggers can probe running programs, one of their most common uses is to examine the state of a program after death. The source line number of the failure, often part of a stack trace, is the most useful single piece of debugging information; improbable (不太可能的) values of arguments are

also a big clue (zero pointers, integers that are huge when they should be small, or negative when they should be positive, character strings that aren't alphabetic).

Here is a typical example, based on the discussion of sorting in Chapter 2. To sort an array of integers, we should call `qsort` with the integer comparison function `icmp`:

```
int arr[N];
qsort(arr, N, sizeof(arr[0]), icmp);
```

but suppose it is inadvertently (粗心地) passed the name of the string comparison function `strcmp` instead:

```
? int arr[N];
? qsort(arr, n, sizeof(arr[0]), strcmp);
```

A compiler can't detect the mismatch of types here, so disasters awaits. When we run the program, it crashes by attempting to access an illegal memory location. Running the `dbx` debugger produces a stack trace like this, edited to fit<sup>2</sup>:

```
0 strcmp(0x1a2, 0x1c2) ["strcmp.s":31]
1 strcmp(p1 = 0x10001048, p2 = 0x1000105c) ["badqs.c":31]
2 qst(0x10001048, 0x10001074, 0x400b20, 0x4) ["qsort.c":147]
3 qsort(0x10001048, 0x1c2, 0x4, 0x400b20) ["qsort.c", 63]
4 main() ["badqs.c":45]
5 __istart() ["crtltinit.s":13]
```

This says that the program died in `strcmp`; by inspection, the two pointers passed to `strcmp` are much too small, a clear sign of trouble. The stack trace gives a trail (痕迹) of line numbers where each function was called. Line 13 in our test file `badqs.c` is the call

```
return strcmp(v1, v2);
```

which identifies the failing call and points towards the error.

A debugger can also be used to display values of local or global variables that will give additional information about what went wrong.

*Read before typing.* One effective but under-appreciated debugging technique is to read the code very carefully and think about it for a while without making changes. There's a powerful urge to get to the keyboard and start modifying the program to see if the bug goes away. But chances are that you don't know what's really broken and will change the wrong thing, perhaps breaking something something else. A listing of the critical part of program on paper can give a different perspective than what you see on the screen, and encourages you to take more time for reflection. Don't make listings as a matter of routine, though. Printing a complete program wastes trees since it's hard to see the structure when it's spread across many pages and the listing will be obsolete (荒废的) the moment you start editing again.

Take a break for while; sometimes what you see in the source code is what you meant rather than what you wrote, and an interval away from it can soften your misconception (误解) and help the code speak for itself when you return.

Resist the urge to start typing; thinking is a worthwhile alternative.

*Explain your code to someone else.* Another effective technique is to explain your code to someone else. This will often cause you to explain the bug to yourself. Sometimes it takes no more than a few sentences, followed by an embarrassed "Never mind, I see what's wrong. Sorry to bother you." This works remarkably well; you can even use non-programmer as listeners. One university computer center kept a teddy bear near the help desk. Students with mysterious bugs were required to explain to the bear before they could speak to a human counselor (顾问).

<sup>2</sup>The source pdf is blurry (模糊的), so the stack trace may contain some typing errors

## 5.3 No Clues, Hard Bugs

"I haven't got a clue. What on earth is going on?" If you really haven't any idea what could be wrong, life gets tougher.

*Make the bug reproducible.* The first step is to make sure you can make the bug appear on demand. It's frustrating to chase down a bug that doesn't happen every time. Spend some time constructing input and parameter settings that reliably cause the problem, then wrap up the recipe (处方) so it can be run with a button push or a few keystrokes. If it's a hard bug, you'll be making it happen over and over as you track down the problem, so you'll save yourself time by making it easy to reproduce.

If the bug can't be made to happen every time, try to understand why not. Does some set of conditions make it happen more often than others? Even if you can't make it happen every time, if you can decrease the time spent waiting for it, you'll find it faster.

If a program provides debugging output, enable it. Simulation programs like the Markov chain program in Chapter 3 should include an option that produces debugging information such as the seed of the random number generator so that output can be reproduced; another option should allow for setting the seed. Many programs include such options and it is a good idea to include similar facilities in your own programs.

*Divide and conquer* (分而治之). Can the input that causes the program to fail be made smaller or more focused? Narrow down the possibilities by creating the smallest input where the bug still shows up. What changes make the error go away? Try to find crucial (决定性的) test cases that focus on the error. Each test case should aim at a definitive outcome that confirms or denies hypothesis (假说) about what is wrong.

Proceed by binary search. Throw away half the input and see if the output is still wrong; if not, go back to the previous state and discard the other half of the input. The same binary search process can be used on the program text itself: eliminate some part of the program that should have no relationship to the bug and see if the bug is still there. An editor with undo is helpful in reducing big test cases and big programs without losing the bug.

*Study the numerology* (命理) *of failures.* Sometimes a pattern in the numerology of failing examples gives a clue that focuses the search. We found some spelling mistakes in a newly written section of this book, where occasional letters had simply disappeared. This was mystifying (迷惑的). The text had been created by cutting and pasting from another file, so it seemed possible that something was wrong with the cut or paste commands in the text editor. But where to start looking for the problem? For clues we looked at the data, and noticed that the missing characters seemed uniformly (均匀地) distributed through the text. We measured the intervals and found that the distance between dropped characters was always 1023 bytes, a suspiciously non-random value. A search through the editor source code for numbers near 1024 found a couple of candidates. One of those was in new code, so we examined that first, and the bug was easy to spot, a classic off-by-one error where a null byte overwrote the last character in a 1024-byte buffer.

Studying the patterns of numbers related to the failure pointed us right at the bug. Elapsed time? A couple of minutes of mystification, five minutes of looking at the data to discover the pattern of missing characters, a minute to search for likely places to fix, and another minute to identify and eliminate the bug. This one would have been hopeless to find with a debugger, since it involved two multiprocess programs, driven by mouse clicks, communicating through a file system.

*Display output to localize your search.* If you don't understand what the program is doing, adding statements to display more information can be the easiest, most cost-effective way to find out. Put them in to verify your understanding or refine your ideas of what's wrong. For example, display "can't get here" if you think it's not possible to reach a certain point in the code; then if you see that message, move the output statements back towards the start to figure out where things first begin to go wrong. Or show "got here" messages going forward, to find the last place where things seem to be working. Each message should be distinct so you can tell which



one you're looking at.

Display messages in a compact fixed format so they are easy to scan by eye or with programs like the pattern-matching tool `grep`. (A `grep`-like program is invaluable (无价的) for searching text. Chapter 9 includes a simple implementation.) If you're displaying the value of a variable, format it the same way each time. In C and C++, show pointers as hexadecimal numbers with `%x` or `%p`; this will help you to see whether two pointers have the same value or are related. Learn to read pointer values and recognize likely and unlikely ones, like zero, negative numbers, odd numbers, and small numbers. Familiarity with the form of address will pay off (获益) when you're using a debugger, too.

If output is potentially voluminous (长篇的), it might be sufficient to print single-letter outputs like A, B, . . . , as a compact display of where the program went.

*Write self-checking code.* If more information is needed, you can write your own check function to test a condition, dump relevant variables, and abort the programs:

```
/* check: test condition, print and dir */
void check(char *s)
{
    if (var1 > var2) {
        printf("%s, var1 %d var2 %d\n", s, var1, var2);
        fflush(stdout); /* make sure all output is out */
        abort();        /* signal abnormal termination */
    }
}
```

We wrote `check` to call `abort`, a standard C library function that causes program execution to be terminated abnormally for analysis with a debugger. In a different application, you might want `check` to carry on after printing.

Next, add calls to `check` wherever they might be useful in your code:

```
check("before suspect");
/* ... suspect code ... */
check("after suspect");
```

After a bug is fixed, don't throw `check` away. Leave it in the source, commented out or controlled by a debugging option, so that it can be turned on again when the next difficult problem appears.

For harder problems, `check` might evolve to do verification and display of data structures. This approach can be generalized to routine that perform ongoing (进行中) consistency checks of data structures and other information. In a program with intricate (复杂的) data structures, it's good idea to write these checks *before* problems happen, as components of the program proper (适当的), so they can be turned on when trouble starts. Don't use them only when debugging; leave them installed during all stages of program development. If they're not expensive, it might be wise to leave them always enables. Large programs like telephone switching systems often devote a significant amount of code to "audit" (审计) subsystems that monitor information and equipment, and report or even fix problems if they occur.

*Write a log file.* Another tactic (策略) is to write a *log file* containing a fixed-format stream of debugging output. When a crash occurs, the log records what happened just before the crash. Web servers and other network programs maintain extensive logs of traffic so they can monitor themselves and their clients; this fragment (edited to fit) comes from a local system:

```
[Sun Dec 27 16:19:24 1998]
HTTPd: access to /usr/local/httpd/cgi-bin/test.html
failed for m1.cs.bell-labs.com,
reason: client denied by server (CGI non-executable)
from http://m2.cs.bell-labs.com/cgi-bin/test.pl
```

Be sure to flush I/O buffers so the final log records appear in the log file. Output functions like `printf` normally buffer their output to print it efficiently; abnormal termination may discard this buffered output. In C, a call to `fflush` guarantees that all output is written before the program dies; there are analogous `flush` function for output streams in C++ and Java. Or, if you can afford the overhead, you can avoid the flushing problem altogether by using unbuffered I/O for log files. The standard functions `setbuf` and `setvbuf` control buffering; `setbuf(fp, NULL)` turns off buffering on the stream `fp`. The standard error streams (`stderr`, `cerr`, `System.err`) are normally unbuffered by default.

*Draw a picture.* Sometimes pictures are more effective than text for testing and debugging. Pictures are especially helpful for understanding data structures, as we say in Chapter 2, and of course when writing graphics software, but they can be used for all kinds of programs. Scatter (散点) plots display misplaced values more effectively than columns of numbers. A histogram of data reveals anomalies in exam grades, random numbers, bucket sizes in allocators and hash tables, and the like.

If you don't understand what's happening inside your program, try annotating the data structures with statistics and plotting the result. The following graphs plot<sup>3</sup>, for the `C markov` program in Chapter 3, hash chain lengths on the  $x$  axis and the number of elements in chains of that length on the  $y$  axis. The input data is our standard test, *The Book of Psalms* (42685 words, 22482 prefixes). The first two graphs are for the good hash multipliers of 31 and 37 and the third is for the awful multiplier of 128. In the first two cases, no chain is longer than 15 or 16 elements and most elements are in chains of length 5 or 6. In the third, the distribution is broader, the longest chain has 187 elements, and there are thousands of elements in chains longer than 20.

---

<sup>3</sup>Lack of graphs, because the graph is too blurry and ugly to represent.

## **Chapter 6**

# **Testing**



## **Chapter 7**

# **Performance**



## **Chapter 8**

# **Portability**





## **Chapter 9**

## **Notation**

