## Exam I <br> Sample Solutions

## Problem 1.

(a) $X$ is the correct answer -- the number of choices of $0\{110\} 1$ corresponds to the number of times around the outer-loop of diagram $A$; for each $0\{110\} 1$ choice, the number of choices of 110 corresponds to the number of times around the inner-loop on that pass of the outer loop. For instance, W is wrong because it does not include 0101 while A does.
(b) $Z$ is the correct answer -- $\square$ agrees with $B$ by the "straight through" path, $0\{1\} 0 Z$ agrees for the 1 -subloop possibly followed by another outer-loop iteration, and OZOZ agrees for the B-recursion for the first $Z$ and another possible outer-loop iteration for the second. For instance, $Y$ is wrong because it allows 0100 while $B$ does not.

## Problem 2.

Function application has higher precedence than list construction (:) so both the typing and derivation structure should indicate that $f$ is applied only to $x$, and the result of the expression is a list with first element $\mathrm{f} x$ and tail xs . Note that the "types" referred to are either concrete (Int, Bool, etc.) or polymorphic (a, b, etc.) types.
(a) $f x$ is function application and since there are no pre-defined types involved, $f$ is polymorphic with $f:: \mathrm{a}->\mathrm{b}, \mathrm{x}:: \mathrm{a}$, and $\mathrm{f} x:: \mathrm{b}$. From its use with ':', xs is a list whose element type is undetermined, so xs :: [c]. For $\mathrm{f} x: \mathrm{xs}$ to be type correct, it must be that $\mathrm{c}=\mathrm{b}$. Hence the types are $\mathrm{f}:: \mathrm{a}->\mathrm{b}, \mathrm{x}:: \mathrm{a}$, and $\mathrm{xs}::[\mathrm{b}]$.
(b) The lower precedence operation ':' will appear earlier (i.e., above) function application in the derivation tree. To introduce the ':' operation, we must derive qop ${ }^{(r, 5)}$, and this in turn requires deriving rexp ${ }^{5}$, so this guides the first steps. Specifically,


## Problem 3

This problem requires nested repetitions -- at the outer level, to cycle through each list item, and then for each one to search for a repetition. For this problem, we present two solutions. First, a recursive approach. Recursion is used for the outer repetition, and the nested cycle is accomplished iteratively using pre-defined functions filter and elem. Note that neither the amount nor depth of recursion exceed the length of the argument list.

```
> extractRepeats
> extractRepeats (x:xs)
> | elem x xs = x:extractRepeats rest -- add x, repeat with later x removed
> | otherwise = extractRepeats xs -- x not duplicated, drop x and repeat
> where rest = filter (/=x) xs
```

A solution without recursion can also be constructed. The outer repetition is accomplished using list comprehension with a generator for the list indices, followed by two filters for the nested repetitions using elem, take, and drop pre-defined functions; the first filter checks that an item xs!!k is duplicated later in the list, and the second makes sure items repeated multiple times appear in the result only once.

```
> extractRepeats2 xs
    = [xs!!k | k<-[0..length xs -1], -- generate each index
    elem (xs!!k) (drop (k+1) xs), -- test item reappearing later in xs
    not (elem (xs!!k) (take k xs))] -- but not earlier
```

