These questions are intended for self-study, to help review and deepen your understanding of the lecture. Sample answers are available. There is nothing to hand in.

1. (a) The schematic machine code for while loops shown on slide 19 is slightly inefficient because it executes two branch instructions (one conditional and one unconditional) on each iteration of the loop body. Write down a better schematic machine code sequence that executes just one branch per iteration of the body. (Hint: Your sequence can start with an unconditional branch that is executed just once, no matter how many times the loop iterates.)

(b) Slide 19 shows how a repeat statement can be translated into a while statement, but the translation duplicates the code for the loop body s. Write down a schematic machine code sequence for repeat that does not have this duplication.

2. Consider compiling the following case statement, where e is an integer-valued expression and the si are arbitrary statements.

```plaintext
case e of
  4 : s4
  17 : s17
  13 : s13
  99 : s99
  2 : s2
  88 : s88
  12 : s12
  default: sd
end
```

Slide 16 showed how this can be compiled into a linear chain of if-then-else statements. For n case labels, evaluating this code requires in the worst case \( O(n) \) equality comparisons—seven in this example.

Suppose instead that we want to compile the case statement into code that does a binary search on the possible values to dispatch to the correct sub-statement. This should be possible using only \( O(\log n) \) comparisons. Assume that the target language of our compiler has (only) a three-way comparison primitive that compares a value against zero and branches to one of three sub-statements based on whether the result is negative, zero, or positive:

```plaintext
ifsign v
  <: s1 // execute this if v is negative
  =: s2 // execute this if v is zero
  >: s3 // execute this if v is positive
```

For example, the following code prints “is positive”.

```plaintext
x = 10+20
```
ifsign x
  <: print "is negative"
  =: print "is zero"
  >: print "is positive"

(The IBM 704, an early processor that was the original compilation target for FORTRAN, had such an instruction; this led to FORTRAN's having a similar operator called the "arithmetic IF." More modern processors don't have a three-way comparison instruction like this, but it is easily synthesized from a pair of ordinary binary comparisons without affecting the asymptotic complexity of the code. We use it here to make the exponential improvement given by binary search more obvious.)

Show pseudo-code (in the style of the slide) for the result of compiling this example into a decision tree of nested ifsign statements. Executing your code should require evaluating only three ifsign tests in the worst case. Note that multiple leaves of your tree will need to execute the statement sd; an ideal solution will avoid duplicating that statement (which could in general be a large block), but this is not the crucial point here.

3. Recall that in Scala, we can write a loop that iterates over consecutive numbers n, n+1, n+2, ..., m as for (i <- n to m). As suggested in Lecture 2a Slide 23, we can also write for (i <- c) to iterate over any collection c that has an iterator method. In fact, the first of these is just a special case of the second: the Scala class Range is just a particular kind of collection that represents a set of consecutive integers. This is a neat economy in the Scala language design.

Assume that a Range value carries these two pieces of data (this is a slight simplification of the real definition in Scala):

```scala
val start: Int // initial value of sequence
val end: Int // final value of sequence
```

Sketch how to implement an iterator object for a Range that can be used as shown at the bottom of slide 23. Describe the data fields of the iterator, how it is constructed given a particular Range r, and the implementation of the hasNext() and next() methods. Don’t worry about using legal Scala syntax; pseudo-code is fine. (Note: In real Scala, the hasNext method is defined as a parameterless method, so it must be called without parentheses; see https://www.artima.com/pins1ed/composition-and-inheritance.html#10.3. So if you do want to try writing real Scala code here, remember to omit the parentheses on this call when testing, or you’ll get a syntax error.)