

Name: \_\_\_\_\_

**CSE 303, Spring 2005, Final Examination**  
**7 June 2005**

**Please do not turn the page until everyone is ready.**

Rules:

- The exam is closed-book, closed-note, except for one side of one 8.5x11in 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 **90** total points, distributed **unevenly** among 8 questions (which all have multiple parts).
- When writing code, style matters, but don't worry about indentation.

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. Consider this C program, which compiles without warning, but crashes when run:

```
int factorial(int x) {
    if(x==1)
        return 1;
    return x * factorial(x-1);
}
int main(int argc, char**argv) {
    factorial(0);
}
```

- (a) **3pts** Looking at the source code, why does the program crash?
- (b) **6pts** What would happen if you used `gdb` to run this program? Without looking at the source code, what `gdb` commands would you use? What would you be able to conclude?

Name: \_\_\_\_\_

2. Suppose a C program includes this code, which includes a loop that is *useless*. Assume that `x` and `y` are valid pointers to legal strings (that end in `'\0'`).

```
int f(char *x, char* y) {
    int i=0;
    for(; i < 10000000; ++i)
        strcmp(x,y);
    return 7;
}
```

In the 3 separate problems below, suppose you use `gprof` to profile this program. *You must give a different answer for each problem.*

- (a) **5pts** The time samples from `gprof` show that the program spends most of its time in `strcmp`, but removing the loop from `f` has no noticeable effect on performance. What is the most likely explanation?
- (b) **5pts** The call counts from `gprof` show that `strcmp` is called much more than any other function and 60% of the calls to `strcmp` come from `f`, but removing the loop from `f` has no noticeable effect on performance. What is the most likely explanation?
- (c) **3pts** The time samples from `gprof` show that the program spends most of its time in `strcmp` and the call counts from `gprof` show that `strcmp` is called much more than any other function and 60% of the calls to `strcmp` come from `f`, but removing the loop from `f` *still* has no noticeable effect on performance. What is the most likely explanation?

Name: \_\_\_\_\_

3. Consider this type definition for *trees of integers* in C and 3 functions that allegedly deallocate the space for a tree:

```
#include <stdlib.h>
struct Tree {
    int val;
    struct Tree * left;
    struct Tree * right;
};
void free_tree_1(struct Tree * t) {
    if(t == NULL)
        return;
    free(t);
}
void free_tree_2(struct Tree * t) {
    if(t == NULL)
        return;
    free(t);
    free_tree_2(t->left);
    free_tree_2(t->right);
}
void free_tree_3(struct Tree * t) {
    if(t == NULL)
        return;
    free_tree_3(t->left);
    free_tree_3(t->right);
    free(t);
}
```

- (a) **8pts** Explain which of the three functions is the best. Explain why the other two are not well-written.
- (b) **4pts** Explain what assumption(s) the best function is implicitly making and how the function is wrong if the assumption(s) are violated.

Name: \_\_\_\_\_

4. Here are the contents of three files that together form a program:

- a.c:

```
void f(int* x, int* y) { *y = *x; }
```

- a.h:

```
#ifndef A_H  
#define A_H  
void f(int*);  
#endif
```

- b.c:

```
#include <a.h>  
int main(int argc, char**argv) {  
    int x;  
    f(&x);  
    return 0;  
}
```

- (a) **2pts** Why is this program incorrect?
- (b) **4pts** Will `gcc -c a.c; gcc -c b.c; gcc a.o b.o` create an executable `a.out` or will there be compiler errors? Explain.
- (c) **4pts** To catch this program's error, would it help to have `a.c` include `a.h`? Explain.
- (d) **4pts** To catch this program's error, would it help to use a Makefile that recompiles `a.c` and `b.c` whenever `a.h` changes? Explain.

Name: \_\_\_\_\_

5. Here are the contents of 4 files:

- a.java: `class A { static boolean f() { return true; } }`

- b.java:

```
class B { public static void main(String[] args) {  
    if(args.length < 3)  
        A.f();  
    } }
```

- a.c: `int f() { return 1; }`

- b.c:

```
int f(); // declaration of function defined in another file  
int main(int argc, char **argv) {  
    if(argc < 3)  
        f();  
    return 0;  
}
```

For each of the following command sequences, explain whether the last command would succeed or cause some sort of error. **3pts each**

(a) `javac a.java`  
`javac b.java`  
`rm A.class`  
`java B 1 2 3 4`

(b) `javac a.java`  
`javac b.java`  
`rm A.class`  
`java B 1`

(c) `gcc -c a.c`  
`gcc -c b.c`  
`gcc -o prog a.o b.o`  
`rm a.o`  
`./prog 1 2 3 4`

(d) `gcc -c a.c`  
`gcc -c b.c`  
`gcc -o prog a.o b.o`  
`rm a.o`  
`./prog 1`

Name: \_\_\_\_\_

6. Consider this Java code, assuming that `assert` evaluates its argument and raises an exception if the result is false (i.e., “the assertion fails”). (Assume there is only one thread and assertions are “enabled”.)

```
class List {
    Object head;
    List tail;
    List(Object h, List t) { head = h; tail = t; }
}
final class BackupList { // final means no subclasses, so that is not an issue
    private List lst = null;
    private List backup = null;
    public List get() { return lst; }
    public void add(Object obj) {
        assert(lst.tail == backup); // (1)
        backup = lst;
        lst = new List(obj,lst);
        assert(lst.tail == backup); // (2)
    }
}
```

- (a) **3pts** A bad thing will happen when you call the `add` method on a `BackupList`. What is the bad thing and how would you change the line marked (1) to avoid it? (Your result should still check what (1) is attempting to check.)
- (b) **3pts** Would you make an analogous change to line (2). Why or why not?
- (c) **3pts** Given your change to (1), can the assertion at line (1) fail? If so, how? If not, why not?
- (d) **3pts** Can the assertion at line (2) fail? If so, how? If not, why not?

Name: \_\_\_\_\_

7. This problem asks you to design a Makefile and version-control scheme for automatically generating documentation for Java code.

**Scenario:**

- Assume `a.java` defines one class `A`, and `b.java` defines one class `B`.
  - The `javadoc` program takes a Java file (e.g., `a.java`) that defines a class and makes an HTML file that describes the class (e.g., `a.html`).
  - You need to add a license agreement to the top of every HTML file that `javadoc` produces. The contents of the license are in a file `license`. You have written a shell-script `add-license` that takes an HTML file and changes it so it includes the contents of `license`.
- (a) **8pts** Write a `Makefile` with targets for making `a.html` and `b.html`. The generated files should include the license. They should be remade whenever and only whenever a file that could affect their contents has changed.
- (b) **4pts** Which of the files mentioned in this problem would you put in a version-control system? Briefly justify your inclusion or exclusion of each file.



Name: \_\_\_\_\_

8. Consider this Java code. Do *not* assume there is only one thread.

```
final class A { // final means no subclasses, so that is not an issue
    private int i = 0;
    private Object lk;
    public void f() { synchronized (lk) { ++i; ++i; } }
    public boolean g() { synchronized (lk) { return (i % 2)==0; } }
}
```

- (a) **2pts** Can a call to `g` ever return `false`? Why or why not?
- (b) **2pts** If we change the body of `f` to just `{++i; ++i;}`, can a call to `g` ever return `false`? Why or why not?
- (c) **2pts** If we change the body of `g` to just `{ return (i % 2)==0; }`, can a call to `g` ever return `false`? Why or why not?