Subject: test2.scm
Posted by padietl on Thu, 20 Oct 2016 16:45:35 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

For number 6, the script tests treeflatten, instead of treedepth.

Subject: Re: test2.scm
Posted by lusth on Thu, 20 Oct 2016 21:18:21 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

I just retrieved it and it tests both. Am I missing something?

Oh, and the RHPS remake is on tonight!

Subject: Re: test2.scm
Posted by crjosey on Wed, 26 Oct 2016 15:13:59 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

For number 6, the test script shows the following for treeflatten:

(inspect (treeflatten (treeNode 1 nil nil)))
(println "    [it should be (((0 1))])")

Should the return value instead be ((0 . 1))?

Subject: Re: test2.scm
Posted by jarobinson3 on Thu, 27 Oct 2016 18:50:09 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

It should return (0.1) but it didn't but I will test for a pair and not a list.

Subject: Re: test2.scm
Posted by brvowell on Fri, 28 Oct 2016 22:26:56 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

So if there is only one leaf in the tree, then the treeflatten function should return just a list instead of a list of lists like it will in other cases?
It should return a list of pairs. If there is one leaf then the list will contain a single pair.

When I call my treeFlatten function in the run function, the output is correct but when it's called in the test script it says it's undefined? What's the problem?

Capitalization matters. You should know that by now!

I'm used to camelCase and didn't notice that small change, sorry for the stupid question.

jrmelton wrote on Sat, 29 October 2016 10:10
I'm used to camelCase and didn't notice that small change, sorry for the stupid question.

No, I'm sorry. I wasn't consistent in naming that function, as I usually use camelCase as well.