Computer Science Department Indiana University Lindley Hall 101 Bloomington, Indiana 47401

Key Words and Phrases: structured programming, control structures, looping, while statement, until statement, exit statement, flowchart, ease of programming.

CR Categories: 4.4.2, 4.4.9, 5.5.2

TECHNICAL REPORT No. 10

A CASE FOR WHILE-UNTIL DANIEL P. FRIEDMAN STUART C. SHAPIRO

April 5, 1974

A CASE FOR WHILE-UNTIL

Daniel P. Friedman Stuart C. Shapiro Indiana University

Abstract

A new control structure construct, the <u>while-until</u>, is introduced as a syntactic combination of the <u>while</u> and the <u>until</u>. Examples are shown indicating that use of the <u>while-until</u> can lead to structured programs that are conceptually more manageable than those attainable without it. The <u>while-until</u> statement is then extended to a value returning expression which is shown to be more powerful than either the while or the until.

A major suggestion of structured programming is to employ looping control structures in order to break the program down into conceptually manageable units. The purpose of this paper is to propose an additional looping control structure construct (the <u>while-until</u>) that, in certain instances, yields program loops that are closer to the conceptual organization of the segment than is possible with the existing constructs. The <u>while-until</u> as a statement will be shown to be equivalent to the existing looping control structures. The <u>while-until</u> as a value (Boolean) returning expression will be shown to be a more powerful control structure than the while or until structures discussed by Dijkstra [1].

The existing constructs that we are concerned with are

while β repeat s

and

repeat s until β .

Dijkstra [1] presents these graphically as in Figures 1 and 2.





Fig. 1 while β repeat s

Fig. 2 repeat s until β

The syntactic construct we are proposing is while β_1 repeat s until β_2

which is presented graphically in Figure 3.

-2-



Fig. 3 while β_1 repeat s until β_2

The <u>while-until</u> does not involve nesting, but is some other combination [2] of the features of the <u>while</u> and the <u>until</u> loops. The <u>while-until</u> may be replaced by the <u>until</u> or the <u>while</u> as the only looping structure since

while β_1 repeat s until β_2

is equivalent to

<u>if β_1 then repeat s until if $(\beta_2$ then true else $\neg \beta_1$ </u>)

and also to

 $\underline{if} \beta_1 \underline{then} \underline{begin} s; \underline{while} \underline{if}(\beta_2 \underline{then} \underline{false} \underline{else} \beta_1) \underline{repeat} s \underline{end}$

If <u>escape</u> (or <u>break</u> or <u>exit</u>) were employed, another equivalent form is

A: while β_1 repeat

begin s; if β_2 then escape A end

end A

In those cases where Figure 3 is the desired control structure it appears that the <u>while-until</u> yields clearer, more understandable code than any of the above alternatives. We can paraphrase the semantic content of the <u>while-until</u> as: "while it is possible to try, keep trying until you succeed." The <u>while</u> and the <u>until</u> loops can be defined in terms of the <u>while-until</u> in the following way:

while β repeat s = def while β repeat s until false and

<u>repeat</u> s <u>until</u> $\beta = def$ <u>while</u> <u>true</u> <u>repeat</u> s <u>until</u> β

The while-until is a natural control structure for searching, since every search terminates either by finding the desired element or by determining that it is not present. As an example, we show its use for a binary search: comment Find item A in table T[1:N] ;

low :=0;

high := N + 1;

while low < high - 1 repeat

try := (low + high) / 2;

if T[try] < A then low := try else high := try
until T[try] = A;</pre>

An appropriate application for the <u>while-until</u> occurs whenever a loop includes two operations, one of which requiring a test prior to its execution and the other requiring a test which can only be performed after its execution. An example of this is: copy a file up to and including the end-of-file mark onto an output file, however, nothing may be written on the output file unless there is enough space for a record.

comment Copy file INPUT onto the file OUTPUT;

while Spaceleft(OUTPUT) repeat

Inbuffer(INPUT, b);

Outbuffer(OUTPUT, b)

until Eof(INPUT);

In languages in which statements are expressions having values, for example LISP [3], ALGOL 68 [4] and BLISS [5], the <u>while-until</u> can be assigned a value in an especially useful way. We define the value of the <u>while-</u> <u>until</u> expression to be the value of the last evaluated -5-

Boolean. That is, the value of

while β_1 repeat s until β_2

is <u>false</u> if and only if the loop terminates due to the evaluation of β_1 (see Figure 4). A non-Boolean value could be returned on certain termination conditions (e.g., <u>exit</u> in BLISS or predicates in LISP).



Fig. 4 value returning while-until

There are two ways in which the loop may be terminated: the programmer will want to ascertain which of the two Booleans caused termination. This is precisely the information provided by the value of the <u>while-until</u>.

Using the value of the <u>while-until</u>, we may easily incorporate the above search routine into an insertion.

comment T[1:M] is a table containing N < M active

elements. Insert A in T if it is not already present;

-7-

low := 0;

high := N + 1;

if (while low < high - 1 repeat

try := (low + high) / 2

if T[try] < A then low := try else high := try
until T[try] = A)</pre>

then Insertafter(A,T,low);

The previously presented copy routine can be incorporated into an algorithm that uses up to N output files, depending on the length of the input file:

comment Place one copy of file INPUT onto OUTPUT[1:N]

as needed;

i := 1;

while i < N repeat

Open(OUTPUT[i])

if (while Spaceleft(Output [i]) repeat

Inbuffer(INPUT, b);
Outbuffer(OUTPUT[i], b)

until Eof(INPUT))

then Close(OUTPUT[i]); i := i + 1

until Eof(INPUT);

Earlier, we showed that the <u>while-until</u> statement is definable in terms of just the <u>while</u> or just the <u>until</u>. This is not true, however, for the <u>while-until</u> expression. Peterson, Kasami, and Tokura [6], p. 506, have shown that "There exist flowcharts that cannot be translated into [<u>if</u> and <u>until</u>] programs with single-level exits, even if node splitting is allowed." Their example of such a flowchart is shown in Figure 5.

The following program using value-returning <u>while-until</u> and <u>if expression</u> is a translation of this flowchart.

-8-

s; **if** A then begin a₁;

if (while (while B repeat b)

<u>until</u> - (while - C repeat c₂ until true)) repeat c₁

until - (while (while D repeat d1

until - (while - A repeat a2 until true))

<u>repeat</u> a₁ <u>until true</u>))

then d₂ else b₂

end

else begin a2;

if (while (while D repeat d1

until - (while - A repeat a until true))

repeat a1

until -(while (while B repeat b,

until - (while - B repeat c2 until true))

-9-

repeat c₁ until true))

then by else dy

end



Fig. 5 Flowchart from Peterson, Kasami, and Tokura [6].

Similarly, Ashcroft and Manna [7] have exhibited a flowchart, shown in Figure 6, which cannot be translated into an <u>if</u> and <u>while</u> program. The following <u>while-until</u> program, due to M. Wand and D. Wise, is a translation of this flowchart.

<u>if (while (if (while P repeat h until false) then true</u> else Q)

repeat h

until ¬(while (if (while Q repeat g until false) then true else P)

repeat g until true))

then g else h

We have introduced the <u>while-until</u> as an additional control structure for structured programming. We have demonstrated cases in which use of the <u>while-until</u> results in more readable programs and allows programmers to program closer to the way they think. Although the <u>while-</u> <u>until</u> statement can be defined in terms of the <u>while</u> or the <u>until</u>, we have shown that the <u>while-until</u> expression is a stronger control structure than either. -11-





References

- Dijkstra, E. W., "Notes on structured programming," <u>Structured Programming</u>, Academic Press, London, 1972, pp. 1-82.
- 2. Friedman, D. P., Shapiro, S. C., "String union as an operation for control structure generation," (in progress).
- McCarthy, J., et al., <u>LISP 1.5 Programmers Manual</u>, MIT Press, Cambridge, Mass., 1962.
- 4. van Wijngaarden, A., Mailloux, B. J., Peck, J. F. L., Koster, C. H. A., <u>Report of the Algorithmic Language</u> ALGOL 68, ACM, New York, 1969.
- 5. Wulf, W. A., Russell, D. B., Habermann, A. N., "BLISS: a language for systems programming," CACM 14, 12 (Dec. 1971), pp. 780-790.
- Peterson, W. W., Kasami, T., Tokura, N., "On the capabilities of while, repeat and exit statements," CACM 16,8, (Aug. 1973), pp.503-512.
- 7. Ashcroft, E., Manna, Z., "The translation of 'go to' programs to 'while' programs," <u>Information Processing 71</u>, North-Holland Publishing Co., 1972, pp. 250-255.