Functional Programming Practicals 02: Program Derivation

Shin-Cheng Mu

FLOLAC 2020

1. Let *descend* be defined by:

descend :: Nat \rightarrow List Nat descend 0 = [] descend ($\mathbf{1}_{+}$ n) = $\mathbf{1}_{+}$ n : descend n .

(a) Let *sumseries* = $sum \cdot descend$, synthesise an inductive definition of *f*.

Solution: It is immediate that sum (descend 0) = 0. For the inductive case we calculate:

 $sum (descend (1_{+} n))$ $= \{ definition of descend \}$ $sum ((1_{+} n) : descend n)$ $= \{ definition of sum \}$ $1_{+} n + sum (descend n))$ $= \{ definition of sum \}$ $1_{+} n + sumseries n .$ Thus we have sumseries 0 = 0 $sumseries (1_{+} n) = 1_{+} n + sumseries n .$

(b) The function *repeatN* :: (Nat, a) \rightarrow List a is defined by

repeatN(n, x) = map(const x)(descend n).

Thus repeat N(n, x) produces n copies of x in a list. E.g. repeat N(3, a') = aaa''. Calculate an inductive definition of repeat N.

Solution: It is immediate that repeatN(0, x) = []. For the inductive case we calculate

```
repeatN (\mathbf{1}_{+} n, x)
= \{ definition of repeatN \}
map (const x) (descend (\mathbf{1}_{+} n))
= \{ definition of descend \}
map (const x) (\mathbf{1}_{+} n : descend n)
= \{ definition of map and const \}
x : map (const x) (descend n)
= \{ definition of repeatN \}
x : repeatN (n, x) .
Thus we have
repeatN (0, x) = []
```

(c) The function *rld* :: List (Nat, *a*) \rightarrow List *a* performs run-length decoding:

 $repeatN(\mathbf{1}_{+}, n, x) = x : repeatN(n, x)$.

```
rld = concat \cdot map repeatN.
```

For example, *rld* [(2, 'a'), (3, 'b'), (1, 'c')] = "aabbbc". Come up with an inductive definition of *rld*.

```
Solution: For the base case:
       rld []
      = { definition of rld }
       concat (map repeatN [])
      = { definitions of map and concat }
       []
For the inductive case:
       rld((n, x) : xs)
      = { definition of rld }
       concat (map repeat N((n, x) : xs))
      = { definitions of map }
       concat (repeatN (n, x) : map repeatN xs)
      = { definitions of concat }
       repeatN (n, x) ++ concat (map repeatN xs)
      = { definition of rld }
       repeatN(n, x) + rld xs.
```

We have thus derived:

rld [] = []rld ((n, x) : xs) = repeatN (n, x) + rld xs .

2. There is another way to define *pos* such that *pos x xs* yields the index of the first occurrence of *x* in *xs*:

pos :: Eq $a \Rightarrow a \rightarrow List a \rightarrow Int$ pos $x = length \cdot takeWhile (x \neq)$

(This *pos* behaves differently from the one in the lecture when *x* does not occur in *xs*.) Construct an inductive definition of *pos*.

Solution: It is immediate that pos x [] = 0. For the inductive case we calculate: pos x (y : xs) $= length (takeWhile (x \neq) (y : xs))$ $= \{ definition of takeWhile \}$ $length (if x \neq y then y : takeWhile (x \neq) xs else [])$ $= \{ function application distributes into if (for total functions) \}$ $if x \neq y then length (y : takeWhile (x \neq) xs) else length []$ $= \{ definition of length \}$ $if x \neq y then 1_{+} length (takeWhile (x \neq) xs) else 0$ $= \{ definition of pos \}$ $if x \neq y then 1_{+} pos x xs else 0 .$ Thus we have constructed: pos x [] = 0 $pos x (y : xs) = if x \neq y then 1_{+} pos x xs else 0 .$

3. Zipping and mapping.

(a) Let second f(x, y) = (x, f y). Prove that zip xs (map f ys) = map (second f) (zip xs ys).

Solution: Recall one of the possible definitions of *zip*:

zip[]ys = [] zip(x : xs)[] = []zip(x : xs)(y : ys) = (x, y) : zip xs ys.

Following the structure, we prove the proposition by induction on *xs* and *ys*. A tip for equational reasoning: it is usually easier to go from the more complex side to the simpler side, from the side with more structure to the side with less structure. Thus we start from the left-hand side.

```
Case xs := [].
```

```
map (second f) (zip [] ys)
     = { definition of zip }
        map (second f) []
     = { definition of map }
        []
     = { definition of zip }
        zip [] (map f ys).
Case xs := x : xs, ys := [].
        map (second f) (zip(x : xs)[])
     = { definition of zip }
        map (second f) []
     = { definition of map }
        []
     = { definition of zip }
        zip(x : xs)[]
     = { definition of map }
        zip (x : xs) (map f []).
Case xs := x : xs, ys := y : ys.
        map (second f) (zip(x : xs)(y : ys))
     = { definition of zip }
        map (second f) ((x, y) : zip xs ys)
     = { definition of map }
        second f(x, y): map (second f) (zip xs ys)
```

= { definition of second }
 (x, f y) : map (second f) (zip xs ys)
= { induction }
 (x, f y) : zip xs (map f ys)
= { definition of zip }
 zip (x : xs) (f y : map f ys)
= { definition of map }
 zip (x : xs) (map f (y : ys)).

(b) Consider the following definition

delete :: List $a \rightarrow$ List (List a) delete [] = [] delete (x : xs) = xs : map (x:) (delete xs) ,

such that

```
delete [1, 2, 3, 4] = [[2, 3, 4], [1, 3, 4], [1, 2, 4], [1, 2, 3]]
```

That is, each element in the input list is deleted in turns. Let *select* :: List $a \rightarrow$ List (*a*, List *a*) be defined by *select* xs = zip xs (*delete* xs). Come up with an inductive definition of *select*. **Hint**: you may find *second* useful.

```
Solution: The base case [] is immediate. For the inductive case:
        select (x : xs)
      = { definition of select }
        zip(x:xs) (delete (x:xs))
      = { definition of delete }
        zip(x:xs)(xs:map(x:)(delete xs))
         { definition of zip }
      =
        (x, xs): zip xs (map (x:) (delete xs))
      = { property proved above }
       (x, xs): map (second (x:)) (zip xs (delete xs))
      = { definition of select }
        (x, xs): map (second (x:)) (select xs).
We thus have
     select []
                    =[]
     select (x : xs) = (x, xs) : map (second (x:)) (select xs).
```

(c) An alternative specification of delete is

```
delete xs = map (del xs) [0.. length xs - 1]
where del xs i = take i xs + drop (1 + i) xs,
```

(here we take advantage of the fact that [0 .. n] returns [] when *n* is negative). From this specification, derive the inductive definition of *delete* given above. **Hint**: you may need the following property:

$$[0..n] = 0: map(\mathbf{1}_{+}) [0..n-1], \text{ if } n \ge 0,$$
(1)

and the map-fusion law (??) given below.

Solution: delete (x : xs)= { definition of *delete* } map (del (x : xs)) [0.. length (x : xs) - 1] = { definition of *length*, arithmetics } map (del (x : xs)) [0 .. length xs]= { *length* $xs \ge 0$, by (**??**) } map (del (x : xs)) (0 : map (1_+) [0 .. length xs - 1]) = { definition of *map* } del (x : xs) = 0 : map (del (x : xs)) (map $(\mathbf{1}_{+}) = 0$... length xs - 1]) $= \{ \text{ map fusion (??)} \}$ del (x : xs) = 0 : map (del $(x : xs) \cdot (\mathbf{1}_{+}) = 0$... length xs - 1] Now we pause for a while to inspect *del* (x:xs). Apparently, *del* (x:xs) 0 = xs. For *del* $(x : xs) \cdot (\mathbf{1}_+)$ we calculate: $(del (x : xs) \cdot (\mathbf{1}_{+})) i$ = { definition of (\cdot) } del (x : xs) (1_{+} i) = { definition of *del* } *take* $(\mathbf{1}_{+} i)$ $(x : xs) + drop (\mathbf{1}_{+} (\mathbf{1}_{+} i))$ (x : xs)= { definitions of *take* and *drop* } x : take i xs + drop (**1**₊ i) xs = { definition of *del* } x : del xs i = { definition of (\cdot) } $((x:) \cdot del xs) i$. We resume the calculation:



4. Prove the following *map-fusion* law:

$$map \ f \cdot map \ g = map \ (f \cdot g) \ .$$

(2)

Solution:
$map \ f \cdot map \ g = map \ (f \cdot g)$ $\equiv \{ \text{ extensional equality } \}$ $(\forall xs :: (map \ f \cdot map \ g) \ xs = map \ (f \cdot g) \ xs)$ $\equiv \{ \text{ definition of } (\cdot) \}$ $(\forall xs :: (map \ f \ (map \ g \ xs) = map \ (f \cdot g) \ xs).$
We prove the proposition by induction on xs.
Case <i>xs</i> := []. Omitted.
Case <i>xs</i> := <i>x</i> : <i>xs</i> .
$map f (map g (x : xs))$ $= \{ definition of map, twice \}$ $f (g x) : map f (map g xs)$ $= \{ induction \}$ $f (g x) : map (f \cdot g) xs$ $= \{ definition of (\cdot) \}$ $(f \cdot g) x : map (f \cdot g) xs$ $= \{ definition of map \}$ $map (f \cdot g) (x : xs).$

5. Assume that multiplication (×) is a constant-time operation. One possible definition for *exp* $m n = m^n$ could be:

 $\begin{array}{ll} exp & :: Nat \rightarrow Nat \rightarrow Nat \\ exp \ m \ 0 & = 1 \\ exp \ m \ (1 + n) & = m \times exp \ m \ n \end{array}$

Therefore, to compute *exp* m n, multiplication is called n times: $m \times m \times ... \times m \times 1$. Can we do better?

Yet another way to represent a natural number is to use the binary representation.

(a) The function *binary* :: $Nat \rightarrow [Bool]$ returns the *reversed* binary representation of a natural number. For example:

binary 0 = [], binary 1 = [*T*], binary 2 = [*F*, *T*], binary 3 = [*T*, *T*], binary 4 = [*F*, *F*, *T*],

where T and F abbreviates True and False. Given the following functions:

even :: *Nat* \rightarrow *Bool*, returning true iff the input is even, odd :: Nat \rightarrow *Bool*, returning true iff the input is odd, and div :: Nat \rightarrow Nat \rightarrow Nat, for integral division,

define *binary*. You may just present the code.

Hint One possible implementation discriminates between 3 cases – the input is 0, the input is odd, and the input is even.

Solution:

(b) Briefly explain in words whether your implementation of *binary* terminates for all input in *Nat*, and why.

Solution: All non-zero natural numbers strictly decreases when being divided by 2, and thus we eventually reaches the base case for 0.

(c) Define a function *decimal* :: List Bool → Nat that takes the reversed binary representation and returns the corresponding natural number. E.g. *decimal* [T, T, F, T] = 11. You may just present the code.

Solution:

(d) Let *roll* $m = exp \ m \cdot decimal$. Assuming we have proved that $exp \ m \ n$ satisfies all arithmetic laws for m^n . Construct (with algebraic calculation) a definition of *roll* that does not make calls to *exp* or *decimal*.

```
Solution: Let's calculate roll m xs = exp m (decimal xs) by distinguishing
between the three cases of n: Case xs := []:
        roll m []
     = exp m (decimal [])
     = { definition of decimal }
        exp m 0
      = { definition of exp }
        1
Case xs = False : xs:
        roll m (False : xs)
     = { definition of roll }
        exp m (decimal (False : xs))
     = { definition of decimal }
        exp m (2 \times decimal xs)
      = { arithmetic: m^{2n} = (m^2)^n }
        exp(m \times m) (decimal xs)
      = { definition of roll }
        roll (m \times m) xs
Case xs = True : xs:
        roll m (True : xs)
```

= { definition of roll } exp m (decimal (True : xs)) = { definition of decimal } exp m (1 + 2 × decimal xs) = { definition of exp } $m \times exp m (2 \times decimal xs)$ = { arithmetic: $m^{2n} = (m^2)^n$ } $m \times exp (m \times m)$ (decimal xs) = { definition of roll } $m \times roll (m \times m) xs$ We have thus constructed: roll m [] = 1 $roll m (False : xs) = roll (m \times m) xs$ $roll m (True : xs) = m \times roll (m \times m) xs$

Remark If the fusion succeeds, we have derived a program computing m^n :

fastexp $m = roll m \cdot binary$.

The algorithm runs in time proportional to the length of the list generated by *binary*, which is $O(\log_2 n)$.

6. Recall the internally labelled binary tree:

data ITree a = Null | Node a (ITree a) (ITree a).

A baobab tree is a kind of tree with very thick trunks. An Itree Int is called a baobab tree if every label in the tree is larger than the sum of the labels in its two subtrees. The following function determines whether a tree is a baobab tree (where sumT :: ITree Int \rightarrow Int computes the sum of labels in a tree):

baobab :: ITree Int \rightarrow Bool baobab Null = True baobab (Node x t u) = baobab t \land baobab u \land x > (sumT t + sumT u).

What is the time complexity of *baobab*? Define a variation of *baobab* that runs in time proportional to the size of the input tree by tupling.

7. Recall the externally labelled binary tree:

```
data Etree a = \text{Tip } a \mid \text{Bin (ETree } a) (ETree a).
```

The function *size* computes the size (number of labels) of a tree, while *repl t xs* tries to relabel the tips of *t* using elements in *xs*. Note the use of *take* and *drop* in *repl*:

 $\begin{array}{ll} size \ ({\rm Tip}\ _) &= 1\\ size \ ({\rm Bin}\ t\ u) &= size\ t + size\ u \ .\\ repl :: {\rm ETree}\ a \to {\rm List}\ b \to {\rm ETree}\ b\\ repl \ ({\rm Tip}\ _) & xs = {\rm Tip}\ (head\ xs)\\ repl \ ({\rm Bin}\ t\ u)\ xs = {\rm Bin}\ (repl\ t\ (take\ n\ xs))\ (repl\ u\ (drop\ n\ xs))\\ {\rm where}\ n = size\ t \ . \end{array}$

The function *repl* runs in time $O(n^2)$ where *n* is the size of the input tree. Can we do better? **Hint**: try calculating the following function:

repTail :: ETree $a \rightarrow \text{List } b \rightarrow (\text{ETree } b \times \text{List } b)$ *repTail* s xs = (repl s (take n xs), drop n xs), **where** n = size s.

You might need properties including:

take m (take (m + n) xs) = take m xs, drop m (take (m + n) xs) = take n (drop m xs), drop (m + n) xs = drop n (drop m xs).

8. The function tags returns all labels of an internally labelled binary tree:

tags :: ITree $a \rightarrow \text{List } a$ tags Null = [] tags (Node x t u) = tags t + [x] + tags u .

Try deriving a faster version of *tags* by Calculating

tagsAcc :: ITree $a \rightarrow \text{List } a \rightarrow \text{List } a$ *tagsAcc* t ys = tags t + ys.

9. Define the following function *expAcc*:

 $expAcc :: Nat \rightarrow Nat \rightarrow Nat \rightarrow Nat$ $expAcc \ b \ n \ x = x \times exp \ b \ n$.

Calculate a definition of *expAcc* that uses only $O(\log n)$ multiplications to compute b^n . You may assume all the usual arithmetic properties about exponentials. **Hint**: consider the cases when *n* is zero, non-zero even, and odd.