Questions

Bookmark this page

Not

1/1 point (graded)

Alyssa and Ben are studying the recursive datatype for Boolean formulas.

Ben suggests changing the `Not` variant from `Not(formula:Formula)` to `Not(var:Variable)`. Which of these formulas should Alyssa offer as a counterexamples?

- [ ] $(P \vee Q) \wedge (\neg P \vee R)$
- [ ] $(P \vee Q) \wedge (P \vee \neg R)$
- [ ] $(P \vee Q) \wedge (\neg P \vee \neg R)$
- [x] $(P \vee Q) \wedge \neg (P \vee R)$
- [x] $\neg ((P \vee Q) \wedge (P \vee R))$

✔

Explanation
With this change, Ben can only represent negated variables, not negated (sub-)formulas.

Submit | Show Answer

Answers are displayed within the problem

Pair

1/1 point (graded)

When we write `Environment = ImList<Variable x Boolean>`, we mean that an `Environment` is implemented as an `ImList` of two-element tuples (a.k.a. pairs) where the first element is a `Variable` and the second is a `Boolean`.

Then we wrote statements like:

```
lookup(Cons((var, val), rest), x) = if var = x then val else lookup(rest, x)
```

which says: when we look up *x* in an `Environment` whose first pair is *(var, val)*, if *var* is *x*, return *val*, otherwise keep looking for *x* in the `rest` of the `Environment` (which is just an `ImList` of these pairs).

Unlike Python, Java does not have tuples. What could we do instead to store these tuples?

- [ ] Environment = ImList< List< Variable, Boolean>>
- [ ] Environment = ImList< List< String, Boolean>>
- [x] Environment = ImList< List< Object>>
- [ ] Environment = ImList< Variable[]>
- [ ] Environment = ImList< Boolean[]>

- [ ] Environment = ImList< String[]>
- [x] Environment = ImList< Object[]>

✔

Explanation
The first two options are not valid Java: `List`s have only one type of thing in them. And we need to store two different types, so the `Object` list and array are the only options that work.

Submit

Show Answer

Answers are displayed within the problem

Pair problems

0/1 point (graded)

The solutions for storing pairs in the previous question are pretty bad. What do they *not* provide?

- [x] static checking of the types of objects in the pair
- [x] dynamic checking of the types of objects in the pair
- [x] static checking of the number of objects in the pair
- [x] dynamic checking of the number of objects in the pair
- [x] static checking that we only access valid indices in the pair
- [ ] dynamic checking that we only access valid indices in the pair

Explanation
Lists and arrays provide dynamic out-of-bounds checking, but that's it.
Storing these pairs as sequences of `Object`s is not a good design.

Submit

Show Answer

Pair progress

4/4 points (graded)

Let's define an abstract datatype `Pair<T, U>` to store pairs of values. This is another generic type: the first element of the pair is of some unknown type we'll call `T`, and the second is of unknown type `U`. For Boolean formula environments, we will use `Pair<Variable, Boolean>`.

This ADT will be characterized by two operations: `first`, to retrieve the first element in the pair, and `second`, to retrieve the second element.

To work on the concrete implementation, we'll write a datatype definition:

```
Pair<T, U> = Pair(first:T, second:U)
```

Pair has only one concrete variant.

Fill in the blanks to define operations:

```
first : FIRST_INPUTS -> FIRST_OUTPUTS
second : SECOND_INPUTS -> SECOND_OUTPUTS
```

FIRST_INPUTS

- (•) Pair< T, U>
- ( ) T
- ( ) U
- ( ) first
- ( ) t

- ◯ u

✔

FIRST_OUTPUTS

- ◯ Pair< T, U>
- ◉ T
- ◯ U
- ◯ first
- ◯ t
- ◯ u

✔

SECOND_INPUTS

- ◉ Pair< T, U>
- ◯ T
- ◯ U
- ◯ second
- ◯ t
- ◯ u

✔

SECOND_OUTPUTS

- ◯ Pair< T, U>
- ◯ T
- ◉ U
- ◯ second
- ◯ t
- ◯ u

✔

Explanation
These function definitions are in terms of types, so names like `first`, `t`, etc. are out. The input is a `Pair` (probably these will be instance methods, and it will be `this`), and the output is the first or second element, which are of arbitrary, unknown types `T` and `U`.

Submit

Show Answer

Answers are displayed within the problem

Previous Next