CSE 303, Autumn 2006, Final Examination 12 December 2006

Please do not turn the page until everyone is ready.

Rules:

- The exam is closed-book, closed-note, except for one two-sided 8.5"x11" piece of paper.
- Please stop promptly at 4:20.
- You can rip apart the pages, but please write your name on each page.
- There are **79 points** total, distributed **unevenly** among 6 questions (many of which have multiple parts).
- When writing code, style matters, but don't worry about indentation.

Question	Max	Grade
1	11	
2	16	
3	10	
4	13	
5	9	
6	20	
Total	79	

Advice:

- Read questions carefully. Understand a question before you start writing.
- Write down thoughts and intermediate steps so you can get partial credit.
- The questions are not necessarily in order of difficulty. **Skip around.**
- If you have questions, ask.
- Relax. You are here to learn.

Name:			

1. (11 Points) Consider the following three header/source files:

```
--- bar.h ------
struct Bar {
 int baz;
 int quux;
};
--- foo.h ------
#include "bar.h"
int foo(struct Bar *bar);
--- foo.c ------
#include <stdlib.h>
#include "foo.h"
#include "bar.h"
int main(int argc, char**argv) {
 struct Bar b = {atoi(argv[1]), atoi(argv[2])};
 return foo(&b);
int foo(struct Bar *bar) {
 return (bar->baz == bar->quux) ? 1 : 0;
```

(a) (2 pts) What error will you get when you compile with gcc -Wall -o foo foo.c?

(b) (2 pts) How can you change foo. h so that compilation will succeed? Be specific.

Name:

Problem 1, continued

(c) (2 pts) How can you change bar.h so that compilation will succeed? Be specific.

(d) (2 pts) Is it best to fix this problem by changing foo.h, bar.h, or both? Why?

- (e) (3 pts) What will happen when you run this program in the following ways? Give the code that is returned and/or describe any errors that occur.
 - ./foo 1 1
 - ./foo 1 One
 - ./foo 1

Name:			

Name:

2. (16 Points) Consider the following Class definitions. (Feel free to rip out this page.)

```
class A {
  char *str;
public:
  A(char *s) : str(s) {}
  ~A() {}
 char *getStr() { return str; }
class B {
  char *str;
public:
  B(char *s) {
    str = (char *)malloc(strlen(s) + 1);
    strcpy(str,s);
  ~B() { free(str); }
  char *getStr() {
    char *newStr = (char *)malloc(strlen(str) + 1);
    strcpy(newStr,str);
    return newStr;
};
```

Name:			

Name:

Problem 2, continued

(a) (2 pts) These two classes have the same data members and the same interface. Why is class B more robust?

(b) (2 pts) What information should be included in a minimum specification for B::B(char *s)?

(c) (2 pts) What information should be included in a minimum specification for B::getStr()?

(d) (2 pts) Write a line of code that you could add to the top of B::B(char *s) to make it more robust.

Name:

Problem 2, continued

For each of the following code sequences, say what compile time or run time problems it causes, if any.

```
(e) (2 pts)

void f1() {
    A a("A");
    B b("B");
    b = (B)a;
}
```

```
(f) (2 pts)

void f2() {
   A *a = (A*)new B("B");
   delete a;
}
```

```
(g) (2 pts)

void f3() {
    A *a = dynamic_cast<A*>(new B("B"));
    delete a;
}
```

```
(h) (2 pts)

void f4() {
    B b1("B1"), b2("B2");
    b2 = b1;
}
```

Name:		

Continue to the next page

3. (10 Points) Consider the following code:

```
#include <iostream>
using namespace std;
class C1 {
  int _i1;
public:
  C1(int i1) : _i1(i1) {}
  virtual void PrintA(ostream &out) {
    out << _i1 << endl;
  void PrintB(ostream &out) {
    out << _i1 << endl;
};
class C2 : public C1 {
  int _i2;
public:
  C2(int i1, int i2) : C1(i1), _i2(i2) {}
  void PrintA(ostream &out) {
    out << _i2 << endl;
  virtual void PrintB(ostream &out) {
    out << _i2 << endl;
};
class C3 : public C2 {
  int _i3;
public:
  C3(int i1, int i2, int i3) : C2(i1,i2), _i3(i3) {}
  void PrintA(ostream &out) {
    out << _i3 << endl;
 void PrintB(ostream &out) {
   out << _i3 << endl;
};
```

Name: _____

Problem 4 (continued)

For each commented line below, indicate what is printed on cout.

```
int main() {
 C1 c1(1);
 C2 c2(1,2);
 C3 c3(1,2,3);
 C1 *p1 = &c1;
 C1 *p2 = dynamic cast < C1 *> (&c2);
 C1 *p3 = dynamic_cast < C1 *> (&c3);
 p1->PrintA(cout); // Output is _____
 p1->PrintB(cout); // Output is _____
 p2->PrintA(cout); // Output is _____
 p2->PrintB(cout); // Output is _____
 p3->PrintA(cout); // Output is _____
 p3->PrintB(cout); // Output is _____
 C1 c1_2 = c2;
 C1 c1_3 = c3;
 c1_2.PrintA(cout); // Output is _____
 c1_2.PrintB(cout); // Output is _____
 c1_3.PrintA(cout); // Output is _____
 c1_3.PrintB(cout); // Output is _____
}
```

Name: _____

4. (13 Points) The following is a list of files and the include statements found in each:

```
-- Pilot.h ------
#include <iostream>
-- Pilot.cpp ------
#include "Pilot.h"
-- Viper.h ------
#include <iostream>
-- Viper.cpp -----
#include <cassert>
#include "Viper.h"
#include "Battlestar.h"
#include "Pilot.h"
-- Battlestar.h -----
#include <iostream>
#include <string>
#include <vector>
-- Battlestar.cpp -----
#include <cassert>
#include "Battlestar.h"
#include "Viper.h"
-- main.cpp -----
#include <iostream>
#include <iostream>
#include "Battlestar.h"
#include "Viper.h"
Suppose we also have a Makefile that begins with the following lines.
-- Makefile -----
GXX = g++
CFLAGS = -Wall -g
```

N.T.			
Name:			
rame.			

Instead of using static libraries, we want this Makefile to compile main.cpp, Battlestar.cpp, Viper.cpp, and Pilot.cpp and link them to create a program called bsgsim. Indicate whether or not the following lines of the Makefile are correct. If they are incorrect, write the corrected version.

```
(a) (3pts)
Battlestar.o: Battlestar.cpp Battlestar.h Viper.h
     g++ -Wall -g -c -o $@ $<</pre>
```

```
(b) (3pts)
Pilot.cpp: Pilot.h
    g++ -Wall -g -c -o Pilot.o $<</pre>
```

```
(c) (3pts)
bsgsim: main.o Viper.o Battlestar.o
$(GXX) $(CFLAGS) -o $@ $<</pre>
```

For each statement below, indicate whether it is true or false.

(d) (1 pt) In order for the whole project to compile when we type "make", the line that builds "bsgsim" should go at the bottom of the Makefile.

True False

(e) (1 pt) In order to run bsgsim in gdb, we would have to add a special flag to each Makefile command above.

True False

(f) (1 pt) In order to profile bsgsim with gprof, we would have to add a special flag to each Makefile command above.

True False

(g) (1 pt) Suppose Battlestar.o, Viper.o, and Pilot.o were each placed in static libraries (libB.a, libV.a, and libP.a). If we link them to bsgsim with the flags -1P -1B -1V -1B -1V, (in that order) we are guaranteed success.

True False

5.	(9 Points) The project in the previous problem has been imported into a Subversion
	repository. Bob and Kate both have working copies of this project. All files in the
	repository and in both of their working copies are at revision 1. Both Bob and Kate begin
	to edit the file Pilot.cpp. After each command executed by Bob or Kate below,
	indicate the revision of Pilot.cpp that appears in the repository, Bob's working copy,
	and Kate's working copy. If the revision has no number, write the letter "e" (for "edited")
	in the blank. You may assume that no other commands are executed.

		Repository	Bob's	Kate's
(a)	(2 pts) Bob makes edits and executes this command svn commit Pilot.cpp -m "Bob"	l: ———		
(b)	(2 pts) Kate makes edits and executes this command svn revert Pilot.cpp	d: 		
(c)	(2 pts) Kate makes edits and executes this command svn commit Pilot.cpp -m "Kate"	d: 		
(d)	(2 pts) Kate executes this command: svn update Pilot.cpp			

(e) (1 pt) Assuming Kate makes no edits to other files in the project, what is the revision of these other files after the above commands are executed?

3 T		
Name:		
rame.		

6. (20 Points) Consider the following code snippets contained in the files indicated. (Feel free to rip out this page.)

```
-- Viper.h ------
class Viper {
  Battlestar *base;
  int id;
public:
 Viper(int i, Battlestar *b=NULL);
 void Land(Battlestar &b);
 void Launch();
 const Battlestar * GetBattlestar() const;
};
-- Battlestar.h -----
class Battlestar {
  string name;
  vector<Viper*> inside;
public:
 Battlestar(string n, int nVipers=10);
 Viper *GrantLaunchClearance(Viper *v);
 void GrantLandingClearance(Viper *v);
 bool ViperInside(Viper *v) const;
 const string &GetName() const;
};
-- Battlestar.cpp -----
// Lands the Viper v on this Battlestar.
// Precondition: v Cannot be in this Battlestar's list
// Precondition: v's Battlestar must be NULL
void Battlestar::GrantLandingClearance(Viper *v) {
 assert(!ViperInside(v) && v->GetBattlestar() == NULL);
 v->Land(*this);
  inside.push_back(v);
}
// Returns true if the Viper is inside this Battlestar.
// Otherwise, returns false.
bool Battlestar::ViperInside(Viper *v) {
  for (unsigned int i=0; i<inside.size(); i++) {</pre>
     if (inside[i] == v)
     return true;
 return false;
```

Name:			

Continue to the next page.

Name:	

Problem 6, continued:

(a) (6 pts) Given the code above and the code sequence below, indicate whether or not the commented lines below would produce errors when compiled. You may assume that all the necessary headers have been included. (Indicate your choice by writing "Yes" or "No" after each "// Error?" comment.)

- (b) (3 pts) Which of the following make good "black box" tests for the method Battlestar::GrantLandingClearance? Circle all that apply.
 - 1. A code sequence that checks the effects of the method against the specification.
 - 2. A code sequence that exercises every function call inside the method.
 - 3. A code sequence that violates the method's preconditions.

Name:	

(c)	(5 pts) Suppose that you compile and run the project bsgsim with no arguments,
	after which you discover that Battlestar::GrantLandingClearance is
	failing an assertion. How would you use gdb to determine which precondition was
	violated and which caller violated it? You must give either specific commands or
	clear descriptions of each step.

(d) (3 pts) After getting bsgsim to work, you start to think that it is running too slowly. You start to profile it using gprof. You suspect that the method Battlestar::ViperInside is too slow and that you need to implement a faster algorithm. You profile it, check the flat profile, and notice that this method is called 100 times more than any other. Does this give you a clear sense of whether or not you should rewrite this method? Explain your answer.

(e) (3 pts) Continuing your investigation of Battlestar::ViperInside, you notice that whenever you run the program, about 80% of the time is spent in this method, and it is called only from Battlestar::GrantLandingClearance. Does this give you a clear sense of whether or not you should rewrite the method? Explain your answer.