

```
nat by wf x_value lt :=
   sum_digits_aux sum x_value base base_gt_1 with inspect (leb x_value 0) := {
    | true eqn:x_value_is_0 => sum
    | false eqn:x_value_n_0 =>
     sum_digits_aux (add sum (modulo x_value base)) (div x_value base) base
      base_gt_1
   }.
 Next Obligation.
  Proof.
  apply div_lt.
   rewrite leb_iff_conv in x_value_n_0.
  easy.
  Qed.
  Definition sum_digits (digits : nat) (base : nat) : nat :=
   match le_lt_dec base 1 with
    | left base le 1 => 0
    | right base_gt_1 =>
      sum_digits_aux 0 digits base base_gt_1
   end.
Note that the definition of sum_digits_aux basically rephrases the algorithm you gave in your
definition for the aux recursive function. There is a trick the inspect pattern to make sure we
have an hypotheses that tells in which branch of the if-then-else construct we are. Hypothesis
x_value_n_0 is important for the proofs that come later.
```

The by wf x_value Peano.lt fragment specifies that the "decrease" notion will be the one of the strict order for natural numbers. This order is known to be well-founded. Note also that my sum_digits_aux takes one more argument when compared to yours: I need

When the Equations command is processed, the system understands the algorithm is still cannot prove that the x_value argument decreases by itself, so it give that as an obligation to be proved. I show here how to prove it, using theorems that are present in Coq libraries.

a proof that base is strictly larger than 1, otherwise, I cannot guarantee the decrease.

 A second solution is to use the basic knowledge handled by the guard checker: rely only on pattern matching and use a fuel argument.

Definition sum_digits' (digits : nat) (base : nat) : nat := let fix aux (sum x_value base fuel : nat) : nat := match fuel with $0 \Rightarrow sum$ S p =>if leb x_value 0 then sum

else aux (add sum (modulo x_value base)) (div x_value base) base p aux 0 digits base digits. I don't like this solution, because the fuel argument is artificial and it is not clear what happens if the base is 1 or the fuel is strictly smaller than x_value, but these cases are not meant to happen. It can be a source of bugs.

Whether you call this function with a base that is larger than 1 or not is up to you. If you call this function with a base that is larger than 1, then fuel is guaranteed to decrease by only 1 at each

recursive call, while x_value is divided by base at each recursive call, so fuel should remain larger than x_value. Ultimately, you should be able to prove in Coq that the two functions defined in this solution sum_digits and sum_digits' behave the same whenever 1 < base. [EDIT]: in a previous version of sum_digits', the value returned when fuel is 0 was 0, this is

wrong and leads to sum_digits' 1 2 being wrongly computed. Share Edit Follow edited 13 hours ago answered 19 hours ago Yves 3,608 • 12 • 12

Questions Help

STACK OVERFLOW

Teams Advertising Collectives Talent

PRODUCTS

About Press Work Here Legal **Privacy Policy** Terms of Service

STACK EXCHANGE NETWORK Technology Culture & recreation Life & arts Science

Professional

Business

API

Data

Site design / logo © 2022 Stack Exchange Inc; user contributions licensed under <u>CC BY-SA</u>. rev 2022.12.19.43125

Add a comment **Answer Your Question**

COMPANY

Contact Us

Cookie Settings

Cookie Policy

Blog Facebook Twitter LinkedIn Instagram