

1 Default

Suppose we have a `MyStack` interface that we want to implement. We want to add two default methods to the interface: `insertAtBottom` and `flip`. Fill in these methods in the code below.

```
public interface MyStack<E> {  
    void push(E element); // adds an element to the top of the stack  
    E pop();              // removes and returns the top element of the stack  
    boolean isEmpty();   // returns true if the stack is empty  
    int size();          // returns the number of elements in the stack  
  
    // inserts the item at the bottom of the stack using push, pop, isEmpty, and size  
    private void insertAtBottom(E item) {  
  
    }  
  
    // flips the stack upside down (hint: use insertAtBottom)  
    default void flip() {  
  
    }  
}
```

Solution

```
// inserts the item at the bottom of the stack using push, pop, isEmpty, and size
private void insertAtBottom(E item) {
    if (isEmpty()) {
        push(item);
        return;
    }
    E topElem = pop();
    insertAtBottom(item);
    push(topElem);
}

// flips the stack upside down (hint: use insertAtBottom)
default void flip() {
    // Base case
    if (isEmpty()) {
        return;
    }
    // Pop top
    E topElem = pop();
    // Recursively reverse the remainder
    flip();
    // Insert the popped element at the bottom
    insertAtBottom(topElem);
}
```

2 MetaComparison

Given `IntList x`, an `IntList y`, and a `Comparator<Integer> c`, the `IntListMetaComparator` performs a comparison between `x` and `y`.

Specifically, the `IntListMetaComparator` performs a pairwise comparison of all the items in `x` and `y`. If the lists are of different lengths, the extra items in the longer list are ignored. Let α be the number of items in `x` that are less than the corresponding item in `y` according to `c`. Let β be the number of items in `x` that are greater than the corresponding item in `y` according to `c`. If $\alpha > \beta$, then `x` is considered less than `y`. If $\alpha = \beta$, then `x` is considered equal to `y`. If $\alpha < \beta$, then `x` is considered greater than `y`. For example:

```
Comparator<Integer> c = new FiveCountComparator(); //compares # of fives
IntList x = [ 55, 70, 90, 115, 5];                //e.g. 55 has 2 fives
IntList y = [150, 35, 215, 25];
IntListMetaComparator ilmc = new IntListMetaComparator(c);
ilmc.compare(x, y); // returns negative number
```

For the example above, according to the `FiveCountComparator`, we have that $55 > 150$, $70 < 35$, $90 < 215$, and $115 = 25$. This yields $\alpha = 2$ and $\beta = 1$, and thus `ilmc.compare` will return a negative number. Fill in the code below:

```
public class IntListMetaComparator implements Comparator<IntList> {
    -----

    public IntListMetaComparator(Comparator<Integer> givenC) {
        -----
    }

    /* Returns negative number if more items in x are less,
       Returns positive number if more items in x are greater.
       If one list is longer than the other, extra items are ignored. */
    public int compare(IntList x, IntList y) {
        if ((-----) || (-----)) {
            -----
        }
        -----

        if (-----) {

            return -----;

        } else if (-----) {

            return -----;

        } else {

            return -----;

        }
    }
}
```

```
import java.util.Comparator;

public class IntListMetaComparator implements Comparator<IntList> {
    private Comparator<Integer> givenC;

    public IntListMetaComparator(Comparator<Integer> givenC) {
        this.givenC = givenC;
    }

    /**
     * Returns a negative number if more items in x are less.
     * Returns a positive number if more items in x are greater.
     * If one list is longer than the other, extra items are ignored.
     */
    @Override
    public int compare(IntList x, IntList y) {
        if (x == null || y == null) {
            return 0;
        }

        int compValue = givenC.compare(x.first, y.first);

        if (compValue > 0) {
            return compare(x.rest, y.rest) + 1;
        } else if (compValue < 0) {
            return compare(x.rest, y.rest) - 1;
        } else {
            return compare(x.rest, y.rest);
        }
    }
}
```

3 Inheritance Syntax

Suppose we have the classes below:

```
public class ComparatorTester {
    public static void main(String[] args) {
        String[] strings = new String[] {"horse", "cat", "dogs"};
        System.out.println(Maximizer.max(strings, new LengthComparator()));
    }
}

public class LengthComparator implements Comparator<String> {
    @Override
    public int compare(String a, String b) {
        return a.length() - b.length();
    }
}

public class Maximizer {
    /**
     * Returns the maximum element in items, according to the given Comparator.
     */
    public static <T> T max(T[] items, Comparator<T> c) {
        ...
        int cmp = c.compare(items[i], items[maxDex]);
        ...
    }
}
```

(a) Suppose we omit the `compare` method from `LengthComparator`. Which of the following will fail to compile?

- `ComparatorTester.java`
- `LengthComparator.java`
- `Maximizer.java`
- `Comparator.java`

`LengthComparator`, because it is claiming to be a `Comparator`, but it is missing a `compare` method.

(b) Suppose we omit `implements Comparator<String>` in `LengthComparator`. Which file will fail to compile?

- `ComparatorTester.java`
- `LengthComparator.java`
- `Maximizer.java`
- `Comparator.java`

`ComparatorTester`, because we are trying to provide a `LengthComparator` (which isn't a `Comparator`) to the method `max`, which expects a `Comparator`.

`LengthComparator`, because `compare` is no longer overriding anything, thus causing the `@Override` to trigger a compiler error.

- (c) Suppose we removed `@Override`. What are the implications?

The code will work fine, but it's best practice to say "Override" to prevent typos and make our code more clear.

- (d) Suppose we changed where the type parameter appears so that the code in `Maximizer` looks like:

```
public class Maximizer<T> {
    public T max(T[] items, Comparator<T> c) {
        ...
    }
}
```

What would change about the way we use `Maximizer`?

We'd have to instantiate a `Maximizer` object to use it, e.g. `Maximizer<String> m = new Maximizer<>();` This isn't as nice.

- (e) Suppose we changed the method signature for `max` to read `public static String max(String[] items, Comparator<String> c)`. Would the code shown still work?

Yes, it would still work, it just wouldn't generalize to types other than `String`.