COMPUTER SCIENCE TRIPOS Part IA – 2017 – Paper 1

1 Foundations of Computer Science (LCP)

A one-person game (such as Rubik's cube, or peg solitaire) has a finite number of possible *states*, some of which count as *winning*. A *move* is a step from one state to another. From each given state, the player can choose from a set of (zero or more) possible next moves. We call a state *winnable* if a winning state can be reached from it in zero or more moves.

For simplicity, assume that states are coded as integers. Also assume that we are given functions winning(x) returning true or false and next(x) returning the list of states that can be reached in one move from state x.

(a) The following code is an attempt to implement the notion of winnable:

Briefly explain how this code works. Also describe its main limitation: how it can fail to find a winning state that is only a few moves away. Illustrate this point by giving specific definitions of winning and next. [5 marks]

- (b) Modify the code above to yield the function winpath x, which returns the list of states from x to the winning state found or, alternatively, the empty list to indicate that no winning state was found. [4 marks]
- (c) Sometimes we are only interested in a winnable state if it is only a few moves away from the current state. Modify your solution from part (b) to obtain the function bounded_winpath n x, which looks for winning states that are at most n moves away from x.
- (d) Use your solution from part (c) to obtain the function new_winpath x, which has the same objective as winpath x, but without the limitation mentioned in part (a). Briefly explain why the limitation no longer applies and the price that has been paid for this.
- (e) Briefly outline an alternative approach to correcting the limitation mentioned in part (a), using the notion of a queue. What are the advantages and drawbacks of this approach?[3 marks]

For full credit, code should be concise and clear. Exceptions may be useful in this but are not required.