

Name: Wen Chuan Lee
Student ID: 4927941 (leex7095)
Class: CSCI 2041
Title: Homework 5 - Solutions

Question 1: Power function, over natural numbers

We would like to show that:

$$\forall n : \text{power } n \ x = x^n$$

The Principle of Induction for natural numbers is:

$$\forall n, P(n) \text{ if } P(0) \text{ and } P(n-1) \Rightarrow P(n)$$

Our property P is:

$$P(n, x) \text{ is } \text{power } n \ x = x^n$$

Our inductive proof would have 2 cases:

Base case: $P(0, x)$: show that $\text{power } (0, x) = 1$

$$\text{power } 0 \ x = 1.0 \quad \text{(by definition of power)}$$

Step: $P(n, x)$: show that $\text{power } n \ x = x^n$

Our Inductive Hypothesis is where $\text{power } (n-1) \ x = x^{(n-1)} * x^{(n-2)} * x^{(n-3)} * \dots * x^0$ holds.

$$\begin{aligned} \text{power } n \ x &= x * \text{power } (n-1) \ x && \text{(by definition of power)} \\ &= x * x^{(n-1)} * x^{(n-2)} * x^{(n-3)} * \dots * x^0 && \text{(by inductive hypothesis)} \\ &= x^n && \text{(by properties of multiplication)} \end{aligned}$$

Hence we have proven $\forall n : \text{power } n \ x = x^n$

Question 2: Power over structured numbers

We would like to show that:

$$\forall n \in \text{nat}, \text{power } n \ x = x^{\text{to_Int } (n)}$$

The Principle of Induction for type *nat* is:

$$\forall n, P(n) \text{ if } P(\text{Zero}) \text{ and } P(\text{Succ } n) \text{ when } P(n) \text{ holds.}$$

Our property P (for type *nat*) is:

$$P(n, x) \text{ is } \text{power } n \ x = x^{\text{to_Int } (n)}$$

Our inductive proof would have 2 cases:

P(Zero,x): show that $\text{power } \text{Zero} \ x = x^{\text{to_Int } (\text{Zero})}$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{power } \text{Zero} \ x &= 1.0 && \text{(by definition of power)} \\ &= x^0 && \text{(by mathematical definition of power)} \\ &= x^{\text{to_Int } (\text{Zero})} && \text{(by definition of to_Int)} \end{aligned}$$

P(n, x) : show that $\text{power } (\text{Succ } n) \ x = x^{\text{to_Int } (\text{Succ } n)}$

Our inductive hypothesis is $\text{power } n \ x = x^{\text{to_Int } (n)}$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{power } (\text{Succ } n) \ x &= x * . \text{power } n \ x && \text{(by definition of power)} \\ &= x * . x^{\text{to_Int } n} && \text{(by inductive hypothesis)} \\ &= x^{\text{to_Int } n + 1} && \text{(by mathematical power)} \\ &= x^{\text{to_Int } (\text{Succ } n)} && \text{(by definition of to_Int)} \end{aligned}$$

Hence we have proven $\text{power } n \ x = x^{\text{to_Int } (n)}$

Question 3: Length of Lists

The principle of induction for list type is:

$$\forall l, P(l) \text{ if } P([]) \text{ and } P(v :: l), \text{ if } P(l)$$

We need to show the following property P:

$$P(l, r) = \text{length}(l @ r) = \text{length } l + \text{length } r$$

Our base case is: $P([], r) : \text{show that } \text{length}([], r) = \text{length } [] + \text{length } r$

from definition of function, we know that $P[] \Rightarrow 0$

$$\text{length}([], r) = \text{length } r \quad (\text{by the function definition and properties of list:})$$

$$[] @ l = l)$$

$$= 0 + \text{length } r \quad (\text{by the properties of addition})$$

$$= \text{length } [] + \text{length } r \quad (\text{by definition of length})$$

Step: $P(x :: xs, r) : \text{show that } \text{length}(x :: xs @ r) = \text{length}(x :: xs) + \text{length } r$

Our inductive hypothesis is $\text{length}(xs @ r) = \text{length } xs + \text{length } r$

$$\text{length}(x :: xs @ r) = \text{length}(x :: xs @ r) \quad (\text{by properties of lists})$$

$$= 1 + \text{length}(xs @ r) \quad (\text{by definition of sum})$$

$$= 1 + \text{length } xs + \text{length } r \quad (\text{by inductive hypothesis})$$

$$= \text{length}(x :: xs) + \text{length } r \quad (\text{by definition of sum})$$

Hence we have proven that $\text{length}(l @ r) = \text{length } l + \text{length } r$.

Question 4: List length and reverse

The principle of induction for list type is:

$$\forall l, P(l) \text{ if } P([]) \text{ and } P(v :: l), \text{ if } P(l)$$

We need to show the following property P:

$$P(l, r) = \text{length}(\text{reverse } l @ r) = \text{length } l : r$$

Base: $P([], r) : \text{show that } \text{length}(\text{reverse } [] @ r) = \text{length } [] @ r$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{length}(\text{reverse } [] @ r) &= \text{length}(r @ []) && \text{(by definition of reverse)} \\ &= \text{length } r && \text{(by list properties)} \\ &= 0 + \text{length } r && \text{(by mathematical operation)} \\ &= \text{length } [] + \text{length } r && \text{(by proof from Question 3)} \\ &= \text{length } ([] @ r) && \text{(by definition of length)} \end{aligned}$$

Step: $P(x :: xs) : \text{show that } \text{length}(\text{reverse } x :: xs) = \text{length } (x : xs)$

The inductive hypothesis is $\text{length}(\text{reverse } xs) = \text{length } xs$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{length}(\text{reverse } x :: xs) &= \text{length}(\text{reverse } xs @ [x]) && \text{(by definition of reverse)} \\ &= \text{length}(\text{reverse } xs) + \text{length } ([x]) && \text{(by definition of length)} \\ &= \text{length}(\text{reverse } xs) + 1 && \text{(by definition of length)} \\ &= 1 + \text{length } (xs) && \text{(by inductive hypothesis)} \\ &= \text{length } (x : xs) && \text{(by definition of length)} \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we have proven that $\text{length}(\text{reverse } l @ r) = \text{length } l : r$

Question 5: List length and reverse

The principle of induction for list type is:

$$\forall l, P(l) \text{ if } P([]) \text{ and } P(v :: l), \text{ if } P(l)$$

We need to show the following property P:

$$P(l1, l2) = \text{reverse}(l1 @ l2) = \text{reverse } l2 @ \text{reverse } l1$$

Base: $P([], l2) : \text{show that } \text{reverse}([], l2) = \text{reverse } l2 @ \text{reverse } []$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{reverse}([], l2) &= \text{reverse } l2 && \text{(by properties of lists)} \\ &= \text{reverse } l2 @ [] && \text{(by properties of lists)} \\ &= \text{reverse } l2 @ \text{reverse } [] && \text{(by definition of reverse)} \end{aligned}$$

Step: $P(x : xs, r) : \text{show that } \text{reverse}(x : xs @ r) = \text{reverse } r @ \text{reverse}(x : xs)$

By Induction Hypothesis we have $\text{reverse}(xs @ r) = \text{reverse } r @ \text{reverse } xs$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{reverse}(x : xs @ r) &= \text{reverse}(x :: xs @ r) && \text{(by properties of lists)} \\ &= \text{reverse}(x :: (xs @ r)) && \text{(by properties of lists)} \\ &= \text{reverse}(xs @ r) @ [x] && \text{(by definition of reverse)} \\ &= \text{reverse } r @ \text{reverse } xs @ [x] && \text{(by inductive hypothesis)} \\ &= \text{reverse } r @ \text{reverse}(xs @ [x]) && \text{(by properties of lists)} \\ &= \text{reverse } r @ \text{reverse}(x :: xs) && \text{(by definition of reverse)} \\ &= \text{reverse } r @ \text{reverse}(x : xs) \end{aligned}$$

Thus we have proven that $\text{reverse}(l1 @ l2) = \text{reverse } l2 @ \text{reverse } l1$

