

## Question 1

I ran the occurs check for the set of files okc\*.txt. The time finding for each such case is as follows

okc1.txt

```
time ./CS561A2.exe okcheck-samples/okc1.txt /CS561A2.exe okcheck-samples
Failure
```

LHS:  $\langle(10, y)$

RHS:  $\langle(x, +(b, y))$

Substitution: NO SUBSTITUTION POSSIBLE

```
real    0m0.005s
user    0m0.000s
sys     0m0.000s
```

```
time ./CS561A2.exe okcheck-samples/okc1.txt -no0ccurCheck
```

LHS:  $\langle(10, y)$

RHS:  $\langle(x, +(b, y))$

Substitution:  $\{x/10, y/+(b, y)\}$

```
real    0m0.004s
user    0m0.000s
sys     0m0.000s
```

okc2.txt

```
time ./CS561A2.exe okcheck-samples/okc2.txt
Failure
```

LHS:  $[a, x]$

RHS:  $x$

Substitution: NO SUBSTITUTION POSSIBLE

```
real    0m0.004s
user    0m0.000s
sys     0m0.000s
```

```
time ./CS561A2.exe okcheck-samples/okc2.txt -no0ccurCheck
```

LHS:  $[a, x]$

RHS:  $x$

Substitution:  $\{x/L(a, x)\}$

```
real    0m0.004s
user    0m0.000s
sys     0m0.000s
```

okc3.txt

```
time ./CS561A2.exe okcheck-samples/okc3.txt -no0ccurCheck
```

LHS:  $+(x, a)$

RHS:  $+(\langle(y, [x, y, a, 10, b])\rangle)$

Substitution:  $\{x/\langle(y, [x, y, a, 10, b])\rangle\}$

```
real    0m0.004s
user    0m0.000s
sys     0m0.000s
```

```
time ./CS561A2.exe okcheck-samples/okc3.txt
```

Failure

LHS:  $+(x, a)$

RHS:  $+(\langle(y, [x, y, a, 10, b])\rangle)$

Substitution: NO SUBSTITUTION POSSIBLE

```
real    0m0.004s
user    0m0.000s
sys     0m0.000s
```

okc4.txt

```
time ./CS561A2.exe okcheck-samples/okc4.txt
```

Failure

```
LHS: favorite([+(1, b), [f, 6, h], i, 9, k])
RHS: favorite([+(a, max(3, e, b))], avg([5, 6, 7], 8, j, 0), [A, B, C])
Substitution: NO SUBSTITUTION POSSIBLE
real    0m0.004s
user    0m0.000s
sys     0m0.000s
```

```
time ./CS561A2.exe okcheck-samples/okc4.txt -noOccurCheck
LHS: favorite([+(1, b), [f, 6, h], i, 9, k])
RHS: favorite([+(a, max(3, e, b))], avg([5, 6, 7], 8, j, 0), [A, B, C])
Substitution: {a/1, b/max(3, e, b)}

real    0m0.004s
user    0m0.000s
sys     0m0.000s
```

```
okc5.txt
-----
time ./CS561A2.exe okcheck-samples/okc5.txt -noOccurCheck
LHS: favorite([[[[6, x]]]])
RHS: favorite([x])
Substitution: {x/L2([[[[6, x]]]])}
```

```
real    0m0.009s
user    0m0.000s
sys     0m0.000s
```

```
time ./CS561A2.exe okcheck-samples/okc5.txt
Failure
LHS: favorite([[[[6, x]]]])
RHS: favorite([x])
Substitution: NO SUBSTITUTION POSSIBLE
```

```
real    0m0.004s
user    0m0.000s
sys     0m0.000s
```

```
okc6.txt
-----
time ./CS561A2.exe okcheck-samples/okc6.txt
Failure
LHS: favorite([[[[6, x]]]])
RHS: favorite([x])
Substitution: NO SUBSTITUTION POSSIBLE
```

```
real    0m0.005s
user    0m0.000s
sys     0m0.000s
```

```
time ./CS561A2.exe okcheck-samples/okc6.txt -noOccurCheck
LHS: favorite([[[[6, x]]]])
RHS: favorite([x])
Substitution: {x/L2([[[[6, x]]]])}
```

```
real    0m0.004s
user    0m0.000s
sys     0m0.004s
```

```
okc7.txt
-----
time ./CS561A2.exe okcheck-samples/okc7.txt -noOccurCheck
LHS: [[1], [2], [(x)]]
RHS: [[z], [y], [x]]
Substitution: {x/L6((x)), y/2, z/1}
```

```
real    0m0.004s
user    0m0.000s
sys     0m0.000s
```

```
time ./CS561A2.exe okcheck-samples/okc7.txt
Failure
```

```
LHS: [[[1], [2], [[+(x)]]]]
RHS: [[[z], [y], [x]]]
Substitution: NO SUBSTITUTION POSSIBLE
```

```
real    0m0.004s
user    0m0.000s
sys     0m0.000s
```

okc8.txt

-----

```
time ./CS561A2.exe okcheck-samples/okc8.txt
```

Failure

```
LHS: [[[1], [2], [[1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, a, b, c, d, e, f, g, h, i, j, k, l, m, n, o, p, q, r, s,
t, u, v, w, x, y, z]]]]
RHS: [[[z], [y], [x]]]
Substitution: NO SUBSTITUTION POSSIBLE
```

```
real    0m0.004s
user    0m0.000s
sys     0m0.000s
```

```
time ./CS561A2.exe okcheck-samples/okc8.txt -noOccurCheck
```

```
LHS: [[[1], [2], [[1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, a, b, c, d, e, f, g, h, i, j, k, l, m, n, o, p, q, r, s,
t, u, v, w, x, y, z]]]]
RHS: [[[z], [y], [x]]]
Substitution: {x/L6(1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, a, b, c, d, e, f, g, h, i, j, k, l, m, n, o, p, q, r,
s, t, u, v, w, x, y, z), y/2, z/1}
```

```
real    0m0.004s
user    0m0.000s
sys     0m0.000s
```

okc9.txt

-----

```
time ./CS561A2.exe okcheck-samples/okc9.txt -noOccurCheck
```

LHS: +(x, y)

RHS: x

Substitution: {x/+(x, y)}

```
real    0m0.003s
user    0m0.000s
sys     0m0.000s
```

```
time ./CS561A2.exe okcheck-samples/okc9.txt
```

Failure

LHS: +(x, y)

RHS: x

Substitution: NO SUBSTITUTION POSSIBLE

```
real    0m0.003s
user    0m0.000s
sys     0m0.000s
```

okc10.txt

-----

```
time ./CS561A2.exe okcheck-samples/okc10.txt
```

Failure

LHS: +(a, +(y, +(b, [c, x])))

RHS: x

Substitution: NO SUBSTITUTION POSSIBLE

```
real    0m0.004s
user    0m0.000s
sys     0m0.000s
```

```
time ./CS561A2.exe okcheck-samples/okc10.txt -noOccurCheck
```

LHS: +(a, +(y, +(b, [c, x])))

RHS: x

Substitution: {x/+(a, +(y, +(b, [c, x])))}

```
real    0m0.004s
user    0m0.000s
```

```

sys      0m0.000s

okc11.txt
-----
time ./CS561A2.exe okcheck-samples/okc11.txt -noOccurCheck
LHS: +(a, -(1, 2))
RHS: +(-(a, b), y)
Substitution: {a/-(a, b), y/-(1, 2)}

real    0m0.004s
user    0m0.000s
sys     0m0.000s

```

```

time ./CS561A2.exe okcheck-samples/okc11.txt
Failure
LHS: +(a, -(1, 2))
RHS: +(-(a, b), y)
Substitution: NO SUBSTITUTION POSSIBLE

real    0m0.004s
user    0m0.000s
sys     0m0.000s

```

Occurs in general they say is an expensive operation. This is because for every term we check in the expression of the term is contained in that expression. For every deeply nested expressions this can be expensive. although slightly expensive from my experiments i found out that on an average even with the occur check on the running time is pretty fast.

With really complicated expression the lag due to occurs check comes into play.

#### Question 2(a)

-----  
An algorithm for the unifier can work like this:

```

unifier(expression1 , expression2):
    expression_list1 = partition expression1 into sub expressions consisting of constants , variables ,
    lists and compound statements
    expression_list2 = partition expression2 into sub expressions consisting of constants , variables ,
    lists and compound statements

    if length(expression_list1) == length(expression_list2):
        discard every constant expression in expression_list2 and expression_list1 that occur at the same
        index

        add every variable expression in expression_list2 and expression_list1 that occur at the same index
        to the variable map. add these variables to the equivalence map also. discard these variables then
        from the
        expression lists

        for every variable expression in expression_list2 or expression_list1 that maps to a constant
        expression
        and occurs at the same index, add the variable , constant mapping to the value map
        for every value added , refer the variables that are equal to the variable in the equivalence map
        and assign values for
        those variables also.
        discard all such variables and the constant from the expression list

        for every list expression in the expression lists that occurs at the same index, create new
        expressions 1 and 2 consisting
        of children in the list , discard these two list and then unify these 2 new expression using the
        unify method

        for every compound expression in the expression lists that occurs at the same index, create new
        expressions 1 and 2 consisting
        of children in the compound , discard these two compound expressions and then unify these 2 new
        expression
        using the unify method

```

a unification algorithm like this keeps decreasing the elements to be evaluated and always terminates.

#### Question 2(b)

-----

Why, in general, is a more general unifier preferred over a less general one?

A more general unifier is always preferred as every other unification algorithm can be obtained by altering the most general unification algorithm. This is because for every pair of unifiable expressions there is always a single most general unifier.

A MGU always returns if not all possibilities a proper set of mappings for each variable

#### Question 3

-----

For testing the code, I built the code step by step. Starting with the scanner code to make sure tokenization works properly. Once the tokenization worked I created classes for lists, variables, constants. I tested them. Then I added support for compound statements. I then created a tree chain with all these children and checked its consistency. I then implemented the unify and unify var algorithm. I checked with many test cases starting with the most simple one to many complex types. As and when if something failed I ran it again and tested all cases till I got the expected output.