1 Past Papers

• 2016 Paper 3 Question 4
• 2015 Paper 3 Question 4

2 Practical

2.1 Missing Returns
Now that the language has if statements, explain what happens with the following function:

```cpp
func missing_return(x) {
    if (x == 0) {
        return 1;
    }
}
```

The answer can be found in the emitted code. Is this safe? What can be changed to ensure safety? Is it sensible to continue execution? Modify the relevant part of the code generator, possibly adding methods to the runtime, to handle missing returns safely. Is it possible to detect missing returns at compile time?

2.2 While Loops
Similarly to if statements, implement while loops, along with break and continue.

```cpp
func while_loop(x) {
    i <- 1;
    j <- 0;
    while (i != x) {
        i <- i + 1;
        if (i == 3) {
            continue;
        }
        j <- j + i;
    }
    return j;
}
```

Implement labelled breaks, similarly to what Java provides - design the syntax such that the while loop's node includes an optional label. Why are such break statements safer than arbitrary gotos?
2.3 For Loops

Implement for loops, enabling statements of the form:

```plaintext
for (i <- 0; i != 5; i <- i + 1) {
    ...
}
```

`break`, with or without labels, along with `continue`, should work in `for` loops as well.

2.4 Fixing Builtin Types

The type system infers the most general polymorphic type for each function in a module, including the prototypes for builtins, such as `input_int`. This is incorrect: because of the polymorphic type, `input_int` can be forced to return any type. Your task is to fix this problem by allowing builtins to be annotated with explicit types. Introduce the following declarations, replacing functions with optional bodies:

```plaintext
extern input_int(): Int;
```

Notice that a representation for types in the language syntax is necessary - you are not required to add polymorphic types and type variables, only integers, the unit type and function types.