

parent

• Application creates a new environment

Stateful Definition Evaluation Rule

A definition creates a new place with the definition's name in the frame associated with the evaluation environment. The value in the place is value of the definition's expression.

If there is already a place with the name in the current frame, the definition replaces the old place with a new place and value.

Stateful Name Evaluation Rule

To evaluate a name expression, search the evaluation environment's frame for a place with a name that matches the name in the expression.

If such a place exists, the value of the name expression is the value in that place.

Otherwise, the value of the name expression is the result of **evaluating the name expression in the parent environment.** If the evaluation environment has no parent, the name is not defined and the name expression evaluates to an error.





- Hard to program without Scheme interpreter

18

- Too much emphasis on runtime analysis

y:3

Think about this, we'll discuss in Monday's class...

Question 10: count-unique

Define a procedure, *count-unique*, that takes as input a list of numbers. It produces as output a number that indicates the number of unique numbers in the input list. So,

(count-unique (list 1 1 2 0)) should evaluate to 3.
(count-unique (list 2 2 2)) should evaluate to 1.
(count-unique (list 1 2 1 2 1)) should evaluate to 2.
For full credit, your procedure must work correctly for all possible inputs that are Lists of numbers.

count-unique: hard and slow way

(lambda (el) (not (= el (car p))))

Running time is in $\theta(N^2)$ where N is number of elements in p.

From Chapter 5:

(define (list-filter test p)

(if (null? p) null (if (test (car p)) (cons (car p) (list-filter test (cdr p))) (list-filter test (cdr p)))))

20

count-unique: easier, faster way

 Observe: if elements are sorted, don't need to search entire list to find duplicates

(define (count-unique p)
 (- (length p) (count-repeats (sort p <))))</pre>

Running time is in $\theta(N \log N)$.

Body of *count-unique* applies sort (to a list of length N), count-repeats (to a list of length N), and length (to a list of length <= N):

 $\theta(N \log N) + \theta(N) + \theta(N) = \theta(N \log N)$ Assumes: all values in p below some fixed constant C (needed for < to be constant time).

count-unique: "fastest" way

There are *N* recursive calls, each calls *list-filter* which has running time in $\theta(N)$. Assumes = is constant time: only true if elements of *p* are bounded (always

Assumes: all values in p below some fixed constant C (needed for < to be constant time).

(define C 100)

(define (count-unique p)

(+1 (count-unique

(list-filter

(cdr p))))))

(if (null? p) 0

Worst case: no duplicates.

below some max value)

(define (count-unique p) (length (list-filter (lambda (n) (list-contains? p n)) (intsto C))))

C executions of list-contains? which has running time in $\theta(N)$. Running time is in $\theta(N)$.

Is this really the fastest?

Do you trust your classmates to follow the honor expectations in this class?

Yes, I trust them completely
 I worry that there may be a few transgressions, but I believe the vast majority of the class is honorable and it is fair and beneficial to rely on this.
 I think this class places too high a burden on students' honor, and there are enough dishonorable students that it is unfair on the honorable students.
 I have direct knowledge of other students violating the honor policy on problem sets.
 I have direct knowledge of other students violating the honor policy on this exam.

Honor Expectations



19

