This lab gives you practice in working with our implementation of the `dslist` class that mimics the STL `list` class. Create a directory/folder named `lab7` and download these files into that folder:

http://www.cs.rpi.edu/academics/courses/fall16/csci1200/labs/07_list_implementation/dslist.h  
http://www.cs.rpi.edu/academics/courses/fall16/csci1200/labs/07_list_implementation/lab7.cpp

Checkpoint 1

The implementation of the `dslist` class is incomplete. In particular, the class is missing the `destroy_list` private member function that is used by the destructor and the `clear` member function. The provided test case in `lab7.cpp` works “fine”, so what’s the problem?

Before we fix the problem, let’s use Dr. Memory and/or Valgrind to look at the details more carefully. You should use the memory debugging tools both on your local machine and by submitting the files to the homework server (we have set up a practice space for Lab 7). Study the memory debugger output carefully. The output should match your understanding of the problems caused by the missing `destroy_list` implementation. Ask a TA if you have any questions.

Now write and debug the `destroy_list` function and then re-run the memory debugger (both locally and on the submission server) to show that the memory problems have been fixed.

To complete this checkpoint, show a TA the implementation and memory debugger output before and after writing `destroy_list`.

Checkpoint 2

One subtle difference between the STL `list` implementation and our version of the `dslist` class is the behavior of the iterator that represents the end of the list (the value returned by `end()`). In STL you may decrement the end iterator. For example, you can print the contents of a list in reverse order:

```cpp
std::list<int>::iterator itr = my_lst.end();
while (itr != my_lst.begin()) {
  itr--;
  cout << *itr;
}
```

The syntax is admittedly rather awkward, that’s why we might typically prefer to use a reverse iterator to do this task. How does the `dslist` class behave on a corresponding test case? Try it out. How could you fix the implementation so that it more closely matches the behavior of the STL version? There are a couple different options... If you can’t come up with one quickly, please raise your hand and ask a TA. Make the necessary changes to the implementation and test out your solution.

To complete this checkpoint, describe to a TA how you changed the implementation to allow the end iterator to be decremented.