# Section 6: HW6 and Midterm 

Slides by Vinod Rathnam, and Geoffrey Liu (with material from Alex Mariakakis, Kellen Donohue, David Mailhot, and Hal Perkins)

## Breadth-First Search (BFS)

Often used for discovering connectivity
Calculates the shortest path if and only if all edges have same positive or no weight
Depth-first search (DFS) is commonly mentioned with BFS
BFS looks "wide", DFS looks "deep"
Can also be used for discovery, but not the shortest path

## BFS Pseudocode

```
public boolean find(Node start, Node end) {
    put start node in a queue
    while (queue is not empty) {
        pop node N off queue
        if (N == end)
            return true;
        else {
            for each node O that is child of N
                        push O onto queue
        }
    }
    return false;
}
```


## Breadth-First Search

START:
$\mathrm{Q}:<A>$
Pop: $\mathrm{A}, \mathrm{Q}:<>$
$\mathrm{Q}:<\mathrm{B}, \mathrm{C}>$
Pop: $\mathrm{B}, \mathrm{Q}:<\mathrm{C}>$
$\mathrm{Q}:<\mathrm{C}$
Pop: C, $\mathrm{Q}:<\mathrm{C}>$
$\mathrm{Q}:<>$
DONE

Starting at A
Goal: Fully explore


## Breadth-First Search with Cycle

START:<br>Q: <A><br>Pop: A, Q: <><br>Q: <B><br>Pop: B, Q: <><br>Q: <C><br>Pop: C, Q: <><br>Q: <A><br>NEVER DONE

Starting at A
Goal: Fully Explore


## BFS Pseudocode

```
public boolean find(Node start, Node end) {
    put start node in a queue
    while (queue is not empty) {
        pop node N off queue
        mark node N as visited
        if (N is goal)
            return true;
        else {
            for each node O that is child of N
                        if O is not marked visited
                                    push O onto queue
        }
    }
    return false;

\section*{Breadth-First Search}

Q: <>


\section*{Breadth-First Search}
\(\mathrm{Q}:<>\)
\(\mathrm{Q}:<\mathrm{A}>\)


\section*{Breadth-First Search}
\[
\begin{aligned}
& \mathrm{Q}:<> \\
& \mathrm{Q}:<\mathrm{A}> \\
& \mathrm{Q}:<>
\end{aligned}
\]


\section*{Breadth-First Search}
\[
\begin{aligned}
& \mathrm{Q}:<> \\
& \mathrm{Q}:<\mathrm{A}> \\
& \mathrm{Q}:<> \\
& \mathrm{Q}:<\mathrm{C>}
\end{aligned}
\]


\section*{Breadth-First Search}
\(\mathrm{Q}:<>\)
\(\mathrm{Q}:<A>\)
\(\mathrm{Q}:<>\)
\(\mathrm{Q}:<C>\)
\(\mathrm{Q}:<C, \mathrm{D}>\)


\section*{Breadth-First Search}
\[
\begin{aligned}
& \mathrm{Q}:<> \\
& \mathrm{Q}:<\mathrm{A}> \\
& \mathrm{Q}:<> \\
& \mathrm{Q}:<\mathrm{C}> \\
& \mathrm{Q}:<\mathrm{C}, \mathrm{D}> \\
& \mathrm{Q}:<\mathrm{D}>
\end{aligned}
\]


\section*{Breadth-First Search}


\section*{Breadth-First Search}
\[
\begin{aligned}
& \mathrm{Q}:<> \\
& \mathrm{Q}:<\mathrm{A}> \\
& \mathrm{Q}:<> \\
& \mathrm{Q}:<\mathrm{C}> \\
& \mathrm{Q}:<\mathrm{C}, \mathrm{D}> \\
& \mathrm{Q}:<\mathrm{D}> \\
& \mathrm{Q}:<\mathrm{D}, \mathrm{E}> \\
& \mathrm{Q}:<\mathrm{E}>
\end{aligned}
\]


\section*{Breadth-First Search}


\section*{Shortest Paths with BFS}


\section*{Shortest Paths with BFS}


\section*{Shortest Paths with Weights}


\section*{Shortest Paths with Weights}


Midterm review

\section*{Midterm topics}

Reasoning about code
Specification vs. Implementation

Identity \& equality
Testing

Abstract Data Types (ADTs)

\section*{Reasoning about code 1}

Using backwards reasoning, find the weakest precondition for each sequence of statements and postcondition below. Insert appropriate assertions in each blank line. You should simplify your answers if possible.

\(z=x+y ;\)

\(y=z-3 ;\)
\(\{x>y\}\)

\section*{Reasoning about code 1}

Using backwards reasoning, find the weakest precondition for each sequence of statements and postcondition below. Insert appropriate assertions in each blank line. You should simplify your answers if possible.

\(z=x+y ;\)
\(\{x>z-3\}\)
\(y=z-3 ;\)
\(\{x>y\}\)

\section*{Reasoning about code 1}

Using backwards reasoning, find the weakest precondition for each sequence of statements and postcondition below. Insert appropriate assertions in each blank line. You should simplify your answers if possible.
\[
\begin{aligned}
& \{x>x+y-3=>y<3\} \\
& z=x+y ; \\
& \{x>z-3\} \\
& y=z-3 ; \\
& \{x>y\}
\end{aligned}
\]

\section*{Reasoning about code 1}

Using backwards reasoning, find the weakest precondition for each sequence of statements and postcondition below. Insert appropriate assertions in each blank line. You should simplify your answers if possible.

\(p=a+b ;\)

\(q=a-b ;\)
\(\{p+q=42\}\)

\section*{Reasoning about code 1}

Using backwards reasoning, find the weakest precondition for each sequence of statements and postcondition below. Insert appropriate assertions in each blank line. You should simplify your answers if possible.

\(p=a+b ;\)
\(\{p+a-b=42\}\)
\(q=a-b ;\)
\(\{p+q=42\}\)

\section*{Reasoning about code 1}

Using backwards reasoning, find the weakest precondition for each sequence of statements and postcondition below. Insert appropriate assertions in each blank line. You should simplify your answers if possible.
\[
\begin{aligned}
& \{a+b+a-b=42 \Rightarrow a=21\} \\
& p=a+b ; \\
& \{p+a-b=42\} \\
& q=a-b ; \\
& \{p+q=42\}
\end{aligned}
\]

\section*{Specification vs. Implementation}

Suppose we have a BankAccount class with instance variable balance. Consider the following specifications:
A. @effects decreases balance by amount
B. @requires amount >= 0 and amount <= balance @effects decreases balance by amount
C. @throws InsufficientFundsException
if balance < amount
@effects decreases balance by amount

Which specifications does this implementation meet?
I. void withdraw(int amount) \{ balance -= amount; \}

Another way to ask the question:
If the client does not know the implementation, will the method do what the client expects it to do based on the specification?

\section*{Specification vs. Implementation}

Suppose we have a BankAccount class with instance variable balance. Consider the following specifications:
A. @effects decreases balance by amount \(\checkmark\) does exactly what the spec says
B. @requires amount >= 0 and amount <= balance @effects decreases balance by amount
C. @throws InsufficientFundsException if balance < amount @effects decreases balance by amount

Which specifications does this implementation meet?
I. void withdraw(int amount) \{ balance -= amount; \}

\section*{Specification vs. Implementation}

Suppose we have a BankAccount class with instance variable balance. Consider the following specifications:
A. @effects decreases balance by amount \(\sqrt{ }\) does exactly what the spec says
B. @requires amount >= 0 and amount <= balance \(\sqrt{ }\) If the client follows the @requires @effects decreases balance by amount
C. @throws InsufficientFundsException if balance < amount @effects decreases balance by amount

Which specifications does this implementation meet?
I. void withdraw(int amount) \{ balance -= amount; \}

\section*{Specification vs. Implementation}

Suppose we have a BankAccount class with instance variable balance. Consider the following specifications:
A. @effects decreases balance by amount \(\sqrt{ }\) does exactly what the spec says
B. @requires amount >= 0 and amount <= balance \(\sqrt{ }\) If the client follows the @requires @effects decreases balance by amount
C. @throws InsufficientFundsException
if balance < amount
@effects decreases balance by amount

Which specifications does this implementation meet?
I. void withdraw(int amount) \{ balance -= amount; \}

\section*{Specification vs. Implementation}

Suppose we have a BankAccount class with instance variable balance. Consider the following specifications:
A. @effects decreases balance by amount
B. @requires amount >= 0 and amount <= balance @effects decreases balance by amount
C. @throws InsufficientFundsException
if balance < amount @effects decreases balance by amount

Which specifications does this implementation meet?
```

II. void withdraw(int amount) {
if (balance >= amount) balance -= amount;
}

```

\section*{Specification vs. Implementation}

Suppose we have a BankAccount class with instance variable balance. Consider the following specifications:
A. @effects decreases balance by amount \(X\) balance does not always decrease
B. @requires amount >= 0 and amount <= balance @effects decreases balance by amount
C. @throws InsufficientFundsException
if balance < amount @effects decreases balance by amount

Which specifications does this implementation meet?
```

II. void withdraw(int amount) {
if (balance >= amount) balance -= amount;
}

```

\section*{Specification vs. Implementation}

Suppose we have a BankAccount class with instance variable balance. Consider the following specifications:
A. @effects decreases balance by amount \(X\) balance does not always decrease
B. @requires amount \(>=0\) and amount <= balance \(\sqrt{ }\) If the client follows the @requires @effects decreases balance by amount
C. @throws InsufficientFundsException
if balance < amount @effects decreases balance by amount

Which specifications does this implementation meet?
II. void withdraw(int amount) \{
if (balance >= amount) balance -= amount; \}

\section*{Specification vs. Implementation}

Suppose we have a BankAccount class with instance variable balance. Consider the following specifications:
A. @effects decreases balance by amount \(X\) balance does not always decrease
B. @requires amount >= 0 and amount <= balance \(\sqrt{ }\) If the client follows the @requires @effects decreases balance by amount
C. @throws InsufficientFundsException
if balance < amount
@effects decreases balance by amount \(X\) Method never throws an exception

Which specifications does this implementation meet?
II. void withdraw(int amount) \{
if (balance >= amount) balance -= amount; \}

\section*{Specification vs. Implementation}

Suppose we have a BankAccount class with instance variable balance. Consider the following specifications:
A. @effects decreases balance by amount
B. @requires amount >= 0 and amount <= balance @effects decreases balance by amount
C. @throws InsufficientFundsException
if balance < amount @effects decreases balance by amount

Which specifications does this implementation meet?
```

III.void withdraw(int amount) {
if (amount < 0) throw new IllegalArgumentException();
balance -= amount;
}

```

\section*{Specification vs. Implementation}

Suppose we have a BankAccount class with instance variable balance. Consider the following specifications:
A. @effects decreases balance by amount \(X\) balance does not always decrease
B. @requires amount >= 0 and amount <= balance @effects decreases balance by amount
C. @throws InsufficientFundsException
if balance < amount @effects decreases balance by amount

Which specifications does this implementation meet?
```

III.void withdraw(int amount) {
if (amount < 0) throw new IllegalArgumentException();
balance -= amount;
}

```

\section*{Specification vs. Implementation}

Suppose we have a BankAccount class with instance variable balance. Consider the following specifications:
A. @effects decreases balance by amount \(X\) balance does not always decrease
B. @requires amount >= 0 and amount <= balance \(\sqrt{ }\) If the client follows the @requires @effects decreases balance by amount
C. @throws InsufficientFundsException
if balance < amount @effects decreases balance by amount

Which specifications does this implementation meet?
```

III.void withdraw(int amount) {
if (amount < 0) throw new IllegalArgumentException();
balance -= amount;
}

```

\section*{Specification vs. Implementation}

Suppose we have a BankAccount class with instance variable balance. Consider the following specifications:
A. @effects decreases balance by amount \(X\) balance does not always decrease
B. @requires amount >= 0 and amount <= balance \(\sqrt{ }\) If the client follows the @requires @effects decreases balance by amount
C. @throws InsufficientFundsException
if balance < amount
@effects decreases balance by amount
\(\mathbf{X}\) Method throws wrong exception for wrong reason

Which specifications does this implementation meet?
```

III.void withdraw(int amount) {
if (amount < 0) throw new IllegalArgumentException();
balance -= amount;
}

```

\section*{Specification vs. Implementation}

Suppose we have a BankAccount class with instance variable balance. Consider the following specifications:
A. @effects decreases balance by amount
B. @requires amount >= 0 and amount <= balance @effects decreases balance by amount
C. @throws InsufficientFundsException
if balance < amount
@effects decreases balance by amount

Which specifications does this implementation meet?
```

IV. void withdraw(int amount) throws InsufficientFundsException {
if (balance < amount) throw new InsufficientFundsException();
balance -= amount;
}

```

\section*{Specification vs. Implementation}

Suppose we have a BankAccount class with instance variable balance. Consider the following specifications:
A. @effects decreases balance by amount \(X\) balance does not always decrease
B. @requires amount >= 0 and amount <= balance @effects decreases balance by amount
C. @throws InsufficientFundsException
if balance < amount
@effects decreases balance by amount

Which specifications does this implementation meet?
```

IV. void withdraw(int amount) throws InsufficientFundsException {
if (balance < amount) throw new InsufficientFundsException();
balance -= amount;
}

```

\section*{Specification vs. Implementation}

Suppose we have a BankAccount class with instance variable balance. Consider the following specifications:
A. @effects decreases balance by amount \(X\) balance does not always decrease
B. @requires amount >= 0 and amount <= balance \(\sqrt{ }\) If the client follows the @requires @effects decreases balance by amount
C. @throws InsufficientFundsException
if balance < amount
@effects decreases balance by amount

Which specifications does this implementation meet?
```

IV. void withdraw(int amount) throws InsufficientFundsException {
if (balance < amount) throw new InsufficientFundsException();
balance -= amount;
}

```

\section*{Specification vs. Implementation}

Suppose we have a BankAccount class with instance variable balance. Consider the following specifications:
A. @effects decreases balance by amount \(X\) balance does not always decrease
B. @requires amount \(>=0\) and amount <= balance \(\sqrt{ }\) If the client follows the @requires @effects decreases balance by amount
C. @throws InsufficientFundsException
if balance < amount
@effects decreases balance by amount \(\sqrt{ }\) Method does what the spec says

Which specifications does this implementation meet?
```

IV. void withdraw(int amount) throws InsufficientFundsException {
if (balance < amount) throw new InsufficientFundsException();
balance -= amount;
}

```

\section*{Writing Code Given Invariant}

Given two strings \(a\) and \(b\) where a.length \(>0\) and \(b\).length \(>0\) that are only comprised of alphabetic characters \(a-z\), fill in the implementation on the following slides for the method arePermutations which returns true if \(a\) and \(b\) are permutations of each other and false otherwise.

In general we ask that you do not use additional loops in your answer, but specifically for the following two implementations, you may use additional loops.

Examples:
```

arePermutations("abcd", "dbca") -> true
arePermutations("efgh", "efgi") -> false
arePermutations(``>, "abcd") -> false

```

\section*{Writing Code Given Invariant 1}
public boolean arePermutations(String a, String b) \{
\{inv: sortedA \(=\operatorname{sorted}(\mathrm{a}[0] \ldots \mathrm{a}[\mathrm{k}-1]) \& \& \operatorname{sortedB}=\operatorname{sorted}(\mathrm{b}[0] \ldots \mathrm{b}[\mathrm{k}-1]) \& \& \mathrm{a}\). length \(==\mathrm{b} . \mathrm{length}\}\) while ( ) \{
\}
\}

\section*{Writing Code Given Invariant 1}
public boolean arePermutations(String a, String b) \{
if (a.length() != b.length()) return false;
String sortedA = "‘";
String sortedB = "s";
int k = 0;
\(\{\) inv: sortedA \(=\operatorname{sorted}(a[0] \ldots a[k-1]) \& \& \operatorname{sortedB}=\operatorname{sorted}(b[0] \ldots b[k-1]) \& \& a . l e n g t h==b . l e n g t h\}\) while ( ) \{
\}
return sortedA.equals(sortedB);

\section*{Writing Code Given Invariant 1}
```

public boolean arePermutations(String a, String b) {
if (a.length() != b.length()) return false;
String sortedA = `">;
String sortedB = 'r>;
int k = 0;
{inv: sortedA = sorted(a[0] ... a[k-1]) \&\& sortedB = sorted(b[0] ... b[k-1]) \&\& a.length == b.length}
while ( ) {
char letterA = a[k];
char letterB = b[k];
int i = 0;
while (i != sortedA.length() \&\& sortedA[i] < letterA) {
i++;
}
sortedA = sortedA.substring(0, i) + letterA + sortedA.substring(i, sortedA.length());

```
    \}
    return sortedA.equals(sortedB);
\}

\section*{Writing Code Given Invariant 1}
```

public boolean arePermutations(String a, String b) {
if (a.length() != b.length()) return false;
String sortedA = "'>;
String sortedB = "`>;
int k = 0;
{inv: sortedA = sorted(a[0] ... a[k-1]) \&\& sortedB = sorted(b[0] ... b[k-1]) \&\& a.length == b.length}
while ( ) {
char letterA = a[k];
char letterB = b[k];
int i = 0;
while (i != sortedA.length() \&\& sortedA[i] < letterA) {
i++;
}
sortedA = sortedA.substring(0, i) + letterA + sortedA.substring(i, sortedA.length());
i = 0;
while (i != sortedB.length() \&\& sortedB[i] < letterB) {
i++;
}
sortedB = sortedB.substring(0, i) + letterB + sortedB.substring(i, sortedB.length());
}
return sortedA.equals(sortedB);
}

```

\section*{Writing Code Given Invariant 1}
```

public boolean arePermutations(String a, String b) {
if (a.length() != b.length()) return false;
String sortedA = "'>;
String sortedB = "`>;
int k = 0;
{inv: sortedA = sorted(a[0] ... a[k-1]) \&\& sortedB = sorted(b[0] ... b[k-1]) \&\& a.length == b.length}
while (k != a.length()) {
char letterA = a[k];
char letterB = b[k];
int i = 0;
while (i != sortedA.length() \&\& sortedA[i] < letterA) {
i++;
}
sortedA = sortedA.substring(0, i) + letterA + sortedA.substring(i, sortedA.length());
i = 0;
while (i != sortedB.length() \&\& sortedB[i] < letterB) {
i++;
}
sortedB = sortedB.substring(0, i) + letterB + sortedB.substring(i, sortedB.length());
k++;
}
return sortedA.equals(sortedB);
}

```

\section*{Writing Code Given Invariant 2}
public boolean arePermutations(String a, String b) \{
```

{inv: counts[0] = \# of a’s in a[0], ..., a[i-1], ..., counts[25] = \# of z's in a[0], ..., a[i-1]
\&\& a.length == b.length}
while ( ) {
}
{inv: counts[0] >= 0, ... , counts[25] >= 0 \&\& a.length == b.length}
while ( ) {
}

```
\}

\section*{Writing Code Given Invariant 2}
```

public boolean arePermutations(String a, String b) {
if (a.length() != b.length()) return false;
int[] counts = new int[26];
int i = 0;
{inv: counts[0] = \# of a's in a[0], ..., a[i-1], ..., counts[25] = \# of z's in a[0], ..., a[i-1]
\&\& a.length == b.length}
while ( ) {
}
{inv: counts[0] >= 0, ... , counts[25] >= 0 \&\& a.length == b.length}
while ( ) {

```
    \}
\}

\section*{Writing Code Given Invariant 2}
```

public boolean arePermutations(String a, String b) {
if (a.length() != b.length()) return false;
int[] counts = new int[26];
int i = 0;
{inv: counts[0] = \# of a's in a[0], ..., a[i-1], ..., counts[25] = \# of z's in a[0], ..., a[i-1]
\&\& a.length == b.length}
while (i != a.length()) {
char letter = a.charAt(i);
counts[letter - 'a']++;
i++;
}
{inv: counts[0] >= 0, ... , counts[25] >= 0 \&\& a.length == b.length}
while ( ) {

```
\}
\}

\section*{Writing Code Given Invariant 2}
```

public boolean arePermutations(String a, String b) {
if (a.length() != b.length()) return false;
int[] counts = new int[26];
int i = 0;
{inv: counts[0] = \# of a's in a[0], ..., a[i-1], ..., counts[25] = \# of z's in a[0], ..., a[i-1]
\&\& a.length == b.length}
while (i != a.length()) {
char letter = a.charAt(i);
counts[letter - 'a']++;
i++;
}
i = 0;
{inv: counts[0] >= 0, ... , counts[25] >= 0 \&\& a.length == b.length}
while (i != a.length()) {
char letter = b.charAt(i);
counts[letter - 'a']--;
if (counts[letter - 'a`] < 0) return false;
i++;
}
return true;
}

```

\section*{Testing arePermutations Implementation}

For the previous implementations of arePermutations, write two test cases where the inputs result in expected/actual behavior that is fundamentally different from each other. Write a brief explanation convincing someone else why your test cases test different behavior. You can define behavior in terms of expected (black box) or actual (clear box) execution equivalence.

\section*{Test Cases 1}

Input: \(a=\) "abcd" and \(b=" a b c "\)
Returns: false
This test case tests the behavior where two Strings that are not of equal length cannot be permutations of each other by definition. In terms of the specific implementation of arePermutations, this tests the case where the loop is never entered because the Strings do not have the same length to begin with.

\section*{Test Cases 2}

Input: \(\mathrm{a}=\) "abcabc" and \(\mathrm{b}=\) "baccba"
Returns: true
This test case tests the behavior where two Strings are permutations of each other but contain repeated characters that appear in different orders in each String. In terms of the specific implementation of arePermutations, this tests the case where the frequency of letters from String \(a\), when compared against String \(b\), never becomes negative despite the letters not appearing in the same order relative to one another (assuming implementation 2).

\section*{Specifications 2}
```

/**
* An IntPoly is an immutable, integer-valued polynomial
* with integer coefficients. A typical IntPoly value
* is a_0 + a_1*x + a_2*x^2 + ... + a_n*x_n. An IntPoly
* with degree n has coefficent a_n != 0, except that the
* zero polynomial is represented as a polynomial of
* degree 0 and a_0 = 0 in that case.
*/
public class IntPoly {
int a[];
// AF(this) = a has n+1 entries, and for each entry,
// a[i] = coefficient a_i of the polynomial.
}

```

\section*{Specifications 2}
```

/**
* Return a new IntPoly that is the sum of this and other
* @requires
* @modifies
* @effects
* @return
* @throws
*/
public IntPoly add(IntPoly other)

```

\section*{Specifications 2}
```

/**
* Return a new IntPoly that is the sum of this and other
* @requires other != null
* @modifies none
* @effects none
* @return a new IntPoly representing the sum of this and other
* @throws none
*/
public IntPoly add(IntPoly other)

```

\section*{Representation invariants}

One of your colleagues is worried that this creates a potential representation exposure problem. Another colleague says there's no problem since an IntPoly is immutable. Is there a problem? Give a brief justification for your answer.
```

public class IntPoly {
int a[];
// AF(this) = a has n+1 entries, and for each entry,
// a[i] = coefficient a_i of the polynomial.
// Return the coefficients of this IntPoly
public int[] getCoeffs() {
return a;
}
}

```

\section*{Representation invariants}

One of your colleagues is worried that this creates a potential representation exposure problem. Another colleague says there's no problem since an IntPoly is immutable. Is there a problem? Give a brief justification for your answer.
```

public class IntPoly {
int a[];
// AF(this) = a has n+1 entries, and for each entry,
// a[i] = coefficient a_i of the polynomial.
// Return the coefficients of this IntPoly
public int[] getCoeffs() {
return a; The return value is a reference to the same coefficient
}
}
array stored in the IntPoly and the client code could
alter those coefficients.

```

\section*{Representation invariants}

If there is a representation exposure problem, give a new or repaired implementation of getCoeffs that fixes the problem but still returns the coefficients of the IntPoly to the client. If it saves time you can give a precise description of the changes needed instead of writing the detailed Java code.
```

public class IntPoly {
int a[];
// AF(this) = a has n+1 entries, and for each entry,
// a[i] = coefficient a_i of the polynomial.
// Return the coefficients of this IntPoly
public int[] getCoeffs() {
return a;
}
}

```

\section*{Representation invariants}

If there is a representation exposure problem, give a new or repaired implementation of getCoeffs that fixes the problem but still returns the coefficients of the IntPoly to the client. If it saves time you can give a precise description of the changes needed instead of writing the detailed Java code.
```

public int[] getCoeffs() {
int[] copyA = new int[a.length];
for (int i = 0; i < copyA.length; i++) {
copyA[i] = a[i]
}
return copyA
}

```

\section*{Representation invariants}

If there is a representation exposure problem, give a new or repaired implementation of getCoeffs that fixes the problem but still returns the coefficients of the IntPoly to the client. If it saves time you can give a precise description of the changes needed instead of writing the detailed Java code.
```

public int[] getCoeffs() {
int[] copyA = new int[a.length];
for (int i = 0; i < copyA.length; i++) {
copyA[i] = a[i]
}
return copyA 1. Make a copy
}
2. Return the copy

```

\section*{Representation invariants}

If there is a representation exposure problem, give a new or repaired implementation of getCoeffs that fixes the problem but still returns the coefficients of the IntPoly to the client. If it saves time you can give a precise description of the changes needed instead of writing the detailed Java code.
```

public int[] getCoeffs() {
int[] copyA = new int[a.length];
for (int i = 0; i < copyA.length; i++) {
copyA[i] = a[i]
}
return copyA
1. Make a copy
2. Return the copy

```

Alternatively, we can just use...

\section*{Reasoning about code 2}

We would like to add a method to this class that evaluates the IntPoly at a particular value \(x\). In other words, given a value \(x\), the method valueAt \((x)\) should return \(a_{0}+a_{1} x+a_{2} x^{2}+\ldots+a_{n} x^{n}\), where \(a_{0}\) through an are the coefficients of this IntPoly.

For this problem, develop an implementation of this method and prove that your implementation is correct.
(see starter code on next slide)

\section*{Reasoning about code 2}
```

/** Return the value of this IntPoly at point x */
public int valueAt(int x) {
int val = a[0];
int xk = 1;
int k = 0;
int n = a.length-1; // degree of this, n >=0
{___}
while (k != n) {
x\mp@code{m x <k * x;}
{___}
val = val + a[k+1]*xk;
{___}
k = k + 1;
{___}
}
{____}
return val;
}

```

\section*{Reasoning about code 2}
```

/** Return the value of this IntPoly at point x */
public int valueAt(int x) {
int val = a[0];
int xk = 1;
int k = 0;
int n = a.length-1; // degree of this, n >=0
{inv: xk = x^k \&\& val = a[0] + a[1]*x + ... + a[k]*x^k}
while (k != n) {
{___}
xk = xk * x;
{___}
val = val + a[k+1]*xk;
{___}
k = k + 1;
{___}
}
{____}
return val;
}

```

\section*{Reasoning about code 2}
```

/** Return the value of this IntPoly at point x */
public int valueAt(int x) {
int val = a[0];
int xk = 1;
int k = 0;
int n = a.length-1; // degree of this, n >=0
{inv: xk = x^k \&\& val = a[0] + a[1]*x + ... + a[k]*x^k}
while (k != n) {
{inv \&\& k != n}
xk = xk * x;
{
val = val + a[k+1]*xk;
{____}
k = k + 1;
{___}
}
{____}
return val;
}

```

\section*{Reasoning about code 2}
```

/** Return the value of this IntPoly at point x */
public int valueAt(int x) {
int val = a[0];
int xk = 1;
int k = 0;
int n = a.length-1; // degree of this, n >=0
{inv: xk = x^k \&\& val = a[0] + a[1]*x + ... + a[k]*x^k}
while (k != n) {
{inv \&\& k != n}
xk = xk * x;
{xk = x^(k+1) \&\& val = a[0] + a[1]*x + ... + a[k]* (^^k}
val = val + a[k+1]*xk;
{____}
k = k + 1;
{___}
}
{____}
return val;
}

```

\section*{Reasoning about code 2}
```

/** Return the value of this IntPoly at point x */
public int valueAt(int x) {
int val = a[0];
int xk = 1;
int k = 0;
int n = a.length-1; // degree of this, n >=0
{inv: xk = x^k \&\& val = a[0] + a[1]*x + ... + a[k]*x^k}
while (k != n) {
{inv \&\& k != n}
xk = xk * x;
{xk = x^(k+1) \&\& val = a[0] + a[1]*x + ... + a[k]* (^^k}
val = val + a[k+1]*xk;
{xk = x^(k+1) \&\& val = a[0] + a[1]*x + ... + a[k+1]* (^^(k+1)}
k = k + 1;
{___}
}
{____}
return val;
}

```

\section*{Reasoning about code 2}
```

/** Return the value of this IntPoly at point x */
public int valueAt(int x) {
int val = a[0];
int xk = 1;
int k = 0;
int n = a.length-1; // degree of this, n >=0
{inv: xk = x^k \&\& val = a[0] + a[1]*x + ... + a[k]*x^k}
while (k != n) {
{inv \&\& k != n}
xk = xk * x;
{xk = x^(k+1) \&\& val = a[0] + a[1]*x + ... + a[k]*x^k}
val = val + a[k+1]*xk;
{xk = x^(k+1) \&\& val = a[0] + a[1]*x + ... + a[k+1]*x^(k+1)}
k = k + 1;
{inv}
}
{____}
return val;
}

```

\section*{Reasoning about code 2}
```

/** Return the value of this IntPoly at point x */
public int valueAt(int x) {
int val = a[0];
int xk = 1;
int k = 0;
int n = a.length-1; // degree of this, n >=0
{inv: xk = x^k \&\& val = a[0] + a[1]*x + ... + a[k]*x^k}
while (k != n) {
{inv \&\& k != n}
xk = xk * x;
{xk = x^(k+1) \&\& val = a[0] + a[1]*x + ... + a[k]*x^k}
val = val + a[k+1]*xk;
{xk = x^(k+1) \&\& val = a[0] + a[1]*x + ... + a[k+1]* (^^(k+1)}
k = k + 1;
{inv}
}
{inv \&\& k = n = val = a[0] + a[1]*x + ... + a[n]*x^n}
return val;
}

```

\section*{Equality}

Suppose we are defining a class StockItem to represent items stocked by an online grocery store. Here is the start of the class definition, including the class name and instance variables:
```

public class StockItem {
String name;
String size;
String description;
int quantity;
/* Construct a new StockItem */
public StockItem(...);
}

```

\section*{Equality}

A summer intern was asked to implement an equals function for this class that treats two StockItem objects as equal if their name and size fields match. Here's the result:
```

/** return true if the name and size fields match */
public boolean equals(StockItem other) {
return name.equals(other.name) \&\& size.equals(other.size);
}

```

This equals method seems to work sometimes but not always. Give an example showing a situation when it fails.

\section*{Equality}

A summer intern was asked to implement an equals function for this class that treats two StockItem objects as equal if their name and size fields match. Here's the result:
```

/** return true if the name and size fields match */
public boolean equals(StockItem other) {
return name.equals(other.name) \&\& size.equals(other.size);
}

```

This equals method seems to work sometimes but not always. Give an example showing a situation when it fails.
```

Object s1 = new StockItem("thing", 1, "stuff", 1);
Object s2 = new StockItem("thing", 1, "stuff", 1);
System.out.println(s1.equals(s2));

```

\section*{Equality}

A summer intern was asked to implement an equals function for this class that treats two StockItem objects as equal if their name and size fields match. Here's the result:
```

/** return true if the name and size fields match */
public boolean equals(StockItem other) { // equals is overloaded, not overridden
return name.equals(other.name) \&\& size.equals(other.size);
}

```

This equals method seems to work sometimes but not always. Give an example showing a situation when it fails.
```

Object s1 = new StockItem("thing", 1, "stuff", 1);
Object s2 = new StockItem("thing", 1, "stuff", 1);
System.out.println(s1.equals(s2));

```

\section*{Equality}

Show how you would fix the equals method so it works properly (StockItems are equal if their names and sizes are equal)
/** return true if the name and size fields match */

\section*{Equality}

Show how you would fix the equals method so it works properly (StockItems are equal if their names and sizes are equal)
/** return true if the name and size fields match */
@Override
public boolean equals(Object o) \{
if (!(o instanceof StockItem)) \{ return false;
\}
StockItem other = (StockItem) o; return name.equals(other.name) \&\& size.equals(other.size);

\section*{hashCode}

Which of the following implementations of hashCode( ) for the StockItem class are legal:
1. return name.hashCode();
2. return name.hashCode() * \(17+\) size.hashCode();
3. return name.hashCode() * 17 + quantity;
4. return quantity;

\section*{hashCode}

Which of the following implementations of hashCode( ) for the StockItem class are legal:
1. return name.hashCode(); \(\sqrt{ }\) legal
2. return name.hashCode() * \(17+\) size.hashCode();
3. return name.hashCode() * 17 + quantity;
4. return quantity;

\section*{hashCode}

Which of the following implementations of hashCode( ) for the StockItem class are legal:
1. return name.hashCode(); \(\checkmark\) legal
2. return name.hashCode() * 17 + size.hashCode(); \(\sqrt{ }\) legal
3. return name.hashCode() * 17 + quantity;
4. return quantity;

\section*{hashCode}

Which of the following implementations of hashCode( ) for the StockItem class are legal:
1. return name.hashCode(); \(\sqrt{ }\) legal
2. return name.hashCode() * \(17+\) size.hashCode(); \(\sqrt{ }\) legal
3. return name.hashCode() * 17 + quantity; Xillegal!
4. return quantity;

\section*{hashCode}

Which of the following implementations of hashCode( ) for the StockItem class are legal:
1. return name.hashCode(); \(\sqrt{ }\) legal
2. return name.hashCode() * \(17+\) size.hashCode(); \(\sqrt{ }\) legal
3. return name.hashCode() * \(17+\) quantity; \(X\) illegal!
4. return quantity; Xillegal!

\section*{hashCode}

Which of the following implementations of hashCode( ) for the StockItem class are legal:
1. return name.hashCode(); \(\checkmark\) legal
2. return name.hashCode() * 17 + size.hashCode(); \(\sqrt{ }\) legal
3. return name.hashCode() * 17 + quantity; Xillegal!
4. return quantity; Xillegal!

The equals method does
not care about quantity

\section*{hashCode}

Which implementation do you prefer?
public int hashCode() \{ return name.hashCode();
\}
public int hashCode() \{ return name.hashCode()*17 + size.hashCode();
\}

\section*{hashCode}

Which implementation do you prefer?
public int hashCode() \{ return name.hashCode(); \}
public int hashCode() \{ return name.hashCode()*17 + size.hashCode();
\}```

