Review: Varieties of Recursive Processes

- We can characterize (potentially) recursive functions according to the patterns in which data flows through them.
- The simplest case is a non-recursive function call, which does something (call it \( h \)) to its input data and returns the result:
  ```python
def func0(x):
    return h(x)
```

- "Operations" include any processing that does not cause further recursion.
- This is a leaf call.

Iterative (Tail-Recursive) Processes

- Tail-recursive processes do no further processing after a recursive call.
  ```python
def func1(x):
    if P(x):
      return h1(x)
    else:
      return func1(h2(x))
```

- Once we make a recursive call, can forget about the caller.
- Constant space needed for administrative overhead (in principle).
- Time required (number of operations) proportional to call depth.

Linear Recursions

- Linear recursions do one recursive call and then additional processing.
  ```python
def func2(x):
    if P(x):
      return h1(x)
    else:
      y = func2(h2(x))
      if P2(x):
        return h3(x, y)
      z = func2(h4(x, y))
      return h5(x, y, z)
```

- Must keep track of pending calls, because there is more to do for each.
- Space proportional to depth of calls needed for administrative overhead.
- Time required proportional to call depth.

Tree (General) Recursion

- Tree recursions do more than one recursive call in each function execution.
  ```python
def func3(x):
    if P1(x):
      return h1(x)
    else:
      y = func3(h2(x))
      if P2(x):
        return h3(x, y)
      z = func3(h4(x, y))
      return h5(x, y, z)
```

- Again, must keep track of pending calls (one per level).
- So, space proportional to depth of calls.
- But time required may be exponential in call depth.

Avoiding Redundant Computation

- Consider again the classic Fibonacci recursion:
  ```python
def fib(n):
    if n <= 1:
      return n
    else:
      return fib(n-1) + fib(n-2)
```

- This is tree recursion with a serious speed problem.
- Computation of, say \( \text{fib}(5) \) computes \( \text{fib}(2) \) several times, because both \( \text{fib}(4) \) and \( \text{fib}(2) \) compute it, and both \( \text{fib}(5) \) and \( \text{fib}(4) \) compute \( \text{fib}(3) \). Computing time grows exponentially.

- The iterative version does not have this problem because it saves the results of the recursive calls (in effect) and reuses them.
  ```python
def fib(n):
    if n <= 1: return n
    a, b = 0, 1
    for k in range(2, n+1):
      a, b = b, a+b
    return b
```
**Change Counting**

- Here’s another version of change-counting, which you did in homework:

```python
def count_change(amount, coins = (50, 25, 10, 5, 1)):
    """Return the number of ways to make change for AMOUNT, where
    the coin denominations are given by COINS."
    if amount == 0:
        return 1
    elif len(coins) == 0 or amount < 0:
        return 0
    else:
        return count_change(amount-coins[0], coins) + 
        count_change(amount, coins[1:])
```

- Here, we often revisit the same subproblem:
  - E.g., Consider making change for 87 cents.
  - When choose to use one half-dollar piece, we have the same subproblem as when we choose to use no half-dollars and two quarters.

**Memoizing**

- Extending the iterative Fibonacci idea, let’s keep around a table (“memo table”) of previously computed values.
- Example: count_change:

```python
def count_change(amount, coins = (50, 25, 10, 5, 1)):  # memo_table = {}  # how often called?
    def count_change(amount, coins):
        if (amount, coins) not in memo_table:
            memo_table[amount,coins] = full_count_change(amount, coins)
        return memo_table[amount,coins]

    def full_count_change(amount, coins):
        # How often called?
        ... # (calls count_change for recursive results)
        memo_table = [ [-1] * (len(coins)+1) for i in range(amount+1) ]
        memo_table[0] = [ i for i in range(amount+1) ]
        memo_table[amount] = [ -1: ]
        for a in range(0, amount+1):
            memo_table[a][0] = full_count_change(a, coins)
        return memo_table[amount,coins]
```

- Question: how could we test for infinite recursion?

**Optimizing Memoization**

- Used a dictionary to memoize `count_change`, which is highly general, but can be relatively slow.
- More often, we use arrays indexed by integers (lists in Python), but the idea is the same.
- For example, in the `count_change` program, we can index by amount and by the starting index of the original value of `coins` that we use.

```python
def count_change(amount, coins = (50, 25, 10, 5, 1)):
    memo_table = [ [-1] * (len(coins)+1) for i in range(amount+1) ]
    def count_change(amount, coins):
        if amount < 0: return 0
        else: return memo_table[amount][len(coins)]
    def full_count_change(amount, coins):
        # How often called?
        ... # (calls count_change for recursive results)
        memo_table = [ [-1] * (len(coins)+1) for i in range(amount+1) ]
        memo_table = [ [-1] * (len(coins)+1) for i in range(amount+1) ]
        memo_table[0] = [ i for i in range(amount+1) ]
        memo_table[amount] = [ -1: ]
        for a in range(0, amount+1):
            memo_table[a][0] = full_count_change(a, coins)
        return memo_table[amount,coins]
```

- For same coins, need smaller amounts first.
- Full_count_change(57, (50, 25, 10, 5, 1)) -> 62

**Result of Tracing**

- Consider `count_change(57)` (returns only):

  ```python
  full_count_change(57, (1)) -> 0  Need shorter 'coins' arguments
  full_count_change(56, (1)) -> 0  first.
  full_count_change(1, (1)) -> 0  For same coins, need smaller
  full_count_change(0, (1,)) -> 1  amounts first.
  full_count_change(1, (1,)) -> 1
  full_count_change(57, (1,)) -> 1
  full_count_change(2, (5, 1)) -> 1
  full_count_change(7, (5, 1)) -> 2
  ... full_count_change(57, (5, 1)) -> 12
  full_count_change(7, (20, 5, 1)) -> 2
  full_count_change(17, (10, 5, 1)) -> 6
  ... full_count_change(32, (10, 5, 1)) -> 16
  full_count_change(7, (25, 10, 5, 1)) -> 2
  full_count_change(32, (25, 10, 5, 1)) -> 18
  full_count_change(57, (25, 10, 5, 1)) -> 60
  full_count_change(7, (50, 25, 10, 5, 1)) -> 2
  full_count_change(57, (50, 25, 10, 5, 1)) -> 62
  ```

- Now rewrite `count_change` to make the order of calls explicit, so that we needn’t check to see if a value is memoized.
- We start with the base cases (0 coins) and work backwards.

```python
def count_change(amount, coins = (50, 25, 10, 5, 1)):
    memo_table = [ [-1] * (len(coins)+1) for i in range(amount+1) ]
    def count_change(amount, coins):
        if amount < 0: return 0
        else: return memo_table[amount,coins]
    def full_count_change(amount, coins):
        if amount == 0: return 1
        elif len(coins) == 0 or amount < 0: return 0
        else:
            memo_table[amount,coins] = full_count_change(amount, coins)
            return memo_table[amount,coins]
```

- Dynamic Programming

  ```python
  for a in range(0, amount+1):
      memo_table[a][0] = full_count_change(a, ())
  for k in range(1, len(coins) + 1):
      for a in range(1, amount+1):
          memo_table[a][k] = full_count_change(a, coins[k:])
  return count_change(amount, coins)
  ```
Trees As a Class

- Just as linked lists can be repackaged as a class, so can trees.

class Tree:
    def __init__(self, label, children=[]):
        self.label = label
        for branch in children:
            assert isinstance(branch, Tree)
        self.children = list(children)

def __repr__(self):
    if self.children:
        children_str = ', ' + repr(self.children)
    else:
        children_str = ''
    return 'Tree({0}{1})'.format(self.label, children_str)

def is_leaf(self):
    return not self.children

def __len__(self):
    """The number of vertices in me."""
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