We normally publish the post-mortem for an assignment after it has been marked and released. Here is a list of common errors provided by the graders for assignment 8.

General

- Many students who included multiple helper functions inside a `local` were missing separators between their function blocks. Not only are separators necessary for functions defined at the top level, but they are also necessary for locally defined functions, as discussed in the style guide. However, separators are not required between locally defined constants.

- Many students were missing design recipe components for locally defined helper functions. Remember that purposes and contracts are still required for any functions defined inside a `local`. However, purposes and contracts are not needed for locally defined constants.

- Many students emulated built-in functions to pass as arguments when using abstract list functions. This was mostly done by creating a `lambda` functions of the form `(lambda (x) (f x))` or `(lambda (x y) (f x y))`, where `f` is any built-in function. To avoid overcomplicating code in this case by introducing an unnecessary `lambda`, simply pass the built-in function itself as an argument to a higher-order function.

Question 2

- Many students did not correctly account for the fact that the points value of a King, Queen, Jack and Ace were different from their face values. This is a little unfortunate to see, as the idea of converting the face value of `Card` into their points value appeared on both assignment 3 and the midterm.

Question 3

- Many students did not include all the design recipe components for `bt-fold`. As with all other functions we have asked you to write on assignments, it is expected that you include the purpose, contract, examples, and tests, where the examples and tests are direct applications of the function, in addition to the function definition itself. This has been our expectation since assignment 2, and nowhere does it say that `bt-fold` is an exception to this.

- Throughout the question, many students did not include test cases with non-trivial trees. Testing your functions with trees that have three or less nodes is not sufficient.

- Some students used `Node` instead of `BT` in their contracts. However, a `Node` cannot be an empty tree, and this restriction was not enforced for any of the functions in this question.

- Parts (a), (b), (c), and (d) were generally well done.
• Many students did not complete part (e).

• In part (e), some students had issues with handling larger trees in their solution for full?.

Question 4

• Parts (a), (b), and (c) were generally well done.

• In parts (b), (d), and (e), some students repeated the common errors from assignments 4 and 5 in their solutions. Please refer to the post-mortems for assignments 4 and 5 to see the repeated common errors.

• Many students did not complete parts (f) or (g). However, the question was well done overall for the students who completed these sub-questions.