

TEST CASE:

0.1f,0.2f,0.1f

```
CHECKING: 0.1 with 0.2
START: 0.1

0.1
0.2
0.0
TRACK1
K1=nums.length-2
*****WRITTEN END-----: 0.1
This is counter at the moment: 0
It is not possible to trigger hasTransition if counter is 0 since can not see transition in opposite direction
CURRENT START: 0.1
-----Stored start -> end: 0.1->0.2
$CURRENT list: []
CURRENT START: 0.1
WHEN-----
CHECKING: 0.2 with 0.1
START: 0.1
0.1
0.2
0.1
XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX
0.1
0.1
0.3
0.1
HEREEEEEE
COUNTER IS 0-----
$Writing range: 0.2-> 0.1
[0.2->0.1]
```

We can see it has stored the value

I can see that in my code, I had this already planned as an issue, but for some reason including my documentation, I thought logic was too casual.. We know if $k == \text{nums.length}-2$ (this will be absolute last index for k)... So need to evaluate in which circumstances it would be detrimental to write the store...

```
//in descending sequence
if (Math.abs(nums[k] - (nums[k+1] + difference)) < epsilon)
{
```

We know we are currently in descending sequence..... We know there is an ascending chain before And if this is last execution, there can not be any circumstances in which it would be detrimental to write the store in my opinion.... It does not relate list being empty or not!

```
314         if (counter==0 && (k==nums.length-2))
315         {
316             if(! (potentialFurtherAscendingBeyondThisStart=="") && !(potentialFurtherAscendingBeyondThisEnd=="") && !isFirstOccurrenceAscendingChain)
317             {
318                 sm.add(potentialFurtherAscendingBeyondThisStart+"->" + nums[k]);
319                 System.out.println("-----2322USING STORED TO WRITE RANGE");
320                 System.out.println("Writing range: " + potentialFurtherAscendingBeyondThisStart + "-> " + nums[k]);
321                 potentialFurtherAscendingBeyondThisStart="";
322                 potentialFurtherAscendingBeyondThisEnd="";
323             }
324
325             //I feel we also need to trigger using stored value if 3.6, (3.5), 3.6 if the list is empty
326             //this is a bit speculative but it seems quite logical.. otherwise we will run too far ahead without writin anything...
327
328             //If (sm.isEmpty())
329             //If
330             // 5
331             // sm.add(potentialFurtherAscendingBeyondThisStart+"->" + potentialFurtherAscendingBeyondThisEnd);
332             // System.out.println("-----1980USING STORED TO WRITE RANGE");
333             // System.out.println("Writing range: " + potentialFurtherAscendingBeyondThisStart + "-> " + potentialFurtherAscendingBeyondThisEnd);
334             // potentialFurtherAscendingBeyondThisStart="";
335             // potentialFurtherAscendingBeyondThisEnd="";
336             // }
```

I can see this line of code appears when counter!=0

This is clearly not the case when it has reached $\text{nums.length}-2$ otherwise it would have written the store

```
822         }
823         if ((Math.abs(nums[k] - (nums[k-1] + difference)) < epsilon) && (Math.abs(nums[k] - (nums[k+1] - difference)) < epsilon))
824         { System.out.println("Previous number less, next number greater");
825             if (!isFirstOccurrenceAscendingChain)
826             {
827                 start=String.valueOf(nums[k-1]);
828
829                 isFirstOccurrenceAscendingChain=true;
830             }
```

So to be safe, I need to include logic on the code below to perform action when $\text{isFirstOccurrenceAscendingChain}=0$ and perhaps also when $\text{sm.isEmpty}()$

```
if (sm.isEmpty() && !isFirstOccurrenceAscendingChain
&& !(potentialFurtherAscendingBeyondThisStart=="")
&& !(potentialFurtherAscendingBeyondThisEnd==""))
{
    sm.add(potentialFurtherAscendingBeyondThisStart+"->" + nums[k]);
    System.out.println("-----1980USING STORED TO WRITE RANGE");
    System.out.println("Writing range: " + potentialFurtherAscendingBeyondThisStart + "-> " + potentialFurtherAscendingBeyondThisEnd);
    potentialFurtherAscendingBeyondThisStart="";
    potentialFurtherAscendingBeyondThisEnd="";
}
```

[0.1->0.2, 0.2->0.1]

I will need to run through several test cases for peace of mind.

On paper, it just does not seem it will interfere...

```
336
337     start=String.valueOf(nums[k]);
338     end = String.valueOf(nums[k+1]);
339     sm.add(start+"->" + end);
340     System.out.println("5Writing range: " + start + "-> " + end);
341     isFirstOccurenceAscendingChain=false;
342     isFirstOccurenceAscendingChainNoTransition =false;
343     break;
```

We are also breaking shortly after... So it seems totally safe option