
0: Lists without Lisp!

(a) Prove that `concat` is symmetric across `[]`. That is, prove that `concat(L, []) = concat([], L)`

We proceed by the structural induction. Let $P(L)$ be the statement that `concat(L, []) = concat([], L)`

Base Case: $L = []$:

$$\begin{aligned}\text{concat}(L, []) &= \text{concat}([], []) \\ &= [] && \text{[definition of concat]} \\ &= \text{concat}([], []) && \text{[definition of concat]} \\ \text{concat}(L, []) &= \text{concat}([], L)\end{aligned}$$

Induction Hypothesis: For some $L1 \in \text{List}$, suppose $P(L1)$ is true.

Induction Step: We want to show $P(L)$ is true for $L = x :: L1$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}$.

$$\begin{aligned}\text{concat}(L, []) &= \text{concat}(x :: L1, []) \\ &= x :: \text{concat}(L1, []) && \text{[by definition of concat]} \\ &= x :: \text{concat}([], L1) && \text{[by I.H.]} \\ &= x :: L1 && \text{[by definition of concat]} \\ &= \text{concat}([], x :: L1) && \text{[by definition of concat]} \\ &= \text{concat}([], L)\end{aligned}$$

Thus, by structural induction, we have proven our original claim that `concat` is symmetric across `[]`. □

(b) Prove that for all lists A, B, C, **concat** is associative. That is:
 $\text{concat}(\text{concat}(A, B), C) = \text{concat}(A, \text{concat}(B, C))$

We proceed by the structural induction. Let $P(A)$ be the statement that $\text{concat}(\text{concat}(A, B), C) = \text{concat}(A, \text{concat}(B, C))$. Let B and C be arbitrary lists. We induct on A.

Base Case: $A = []$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{concat}(\text{concat}(A, B), C) &= \text{concat}(\text{concat}([], B), C) \\ &= \text{concat}(B, C) && \text{[definition of concat]} \\ &= \text{concat}([], \text{concat}(B, C)) && \text{[definition of concat]} \\ \text{concat}(\text{concat}(A, B), C) &= \text{concat}(A, \text{concat}(B, C)) \end{aligned}$$

Induction Hypothesis: For some $A1 \in \text{List}$, let $P(A1)$ be true.

Induction Step: We want to show $P(A)$ where $A = x :: A1$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}$.

$$\begin{aligned} \text{concat}(\text{concat}(A, B), C) &= \text{concat}(\text{concat}(x :: A1, B), C) \\ &= \text{concat}(x :: \text{concat}(A1, B), C) && \text{[by definition of concat]} \\ &= x :: \text{concat}(\text{concat}(A1, B), C) && \text{[by definition of concat]} \\ &= x :: \text{concat}(A1, \text{concat}(B, C)) && \text{[by I.H.]} \\ &= \text{concat}(x :: A1, \text{concat}(B, C)) && \text{[by definition of concat]} \\ &= \text{concat}(A, \text{concat}(B, C)) \end{aligned}$$

Thus, by structural induction, we have proven our original claim that **concat** is commutative. □

(c) Prove that $\text{rev}(\text{concat}(A, B)) = \text{concat}(\text{rev}(B), \text{rev}(A))$ for all lists A and B.

- Lemma 1 (proved in part a): $\text{concat}(L, []) = \text{concat}([], L)$
- Lemma 2 (proved in part b): $\text{concat}(\text{concat}(A, B), C) = \text{concat}(A, \text{concat}(B, C))$

We proceed by the structural induction. Let $P(A)$ be the statement that $\text{rev}(\text{concat}(A, B)) = \text{concat}(\text{rev}(B), \text{rev}(A))$. Let B be an arbitrary list. We induct on A.

Base Case: $A = []$

$$\begin{aligned}
 \text{rev}(\text{concat}(A, B)) &= \text{rev}(\text{concat}([], B)) \\
 &= \text{rev}(B) && \text{[definition of concat]} \\
 &= \text{concat}([], \text{rev}(B)) && \text{[definition of concat]} \\
 &= \text{concat}(\text{rev}(B), []) && \text{[by Lemma 1]} \\
 &= \text{concat}(\text{rev}(B), \text{rev}([])) && \text{[definition of rev]} \\
 \text{rev}(\text{concat}(A, B)) &= \text{concat}(\text{rev}(B), \text{rev}(A))
 \end{aligned}$$

Induction Hypothesis: For some $A1 \in \text{List}$, let $P(A1)$ be true.

Induction Step: We want to show $P(A)$ where $A = x : A1$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$\begin{aligned}
 \text{rev}(\text{concat}(A, B)) &= \text{rev}(\text{concat}(x : A1, B)) \\
 &= \text{rev}(x : \text{concat}(A1, B)) && \text{[definition of concat]} \\
 &= \text{concat}(\text{rev}(\text{concat}(A1, B)), x : []) && \text{[definition of rev]} \\
 &= \text{concat}(\text{concat}(\text{rev}(B), \text{rev}(A1)), x : []) && \text{[by I.H.]} \\
 &= \text{concat}(\text{rev}(B), \text{concat}(\text{rev}(A1), x : [])) && \text{[by Lemma 2]} \\
 &= \text{concat}(\text{rev}(B), \text{rev}(x : A1)) \\
 \text{rev}(\text{concat}(A, B)) &= \text{concat}(\text{rev}(B), \text{rev}(A))
 \end{aligned}$$

Thus, by structural induction, we have proven our original claim that $\text{rev}(\text{concat}(A, B)) = \text{concat}(\text{rev}(B), \text{rev}(A))$.

□

1: Proving BST Insertion Works!

(a) Prove that for all $b \in \mathbb{Z}, v \in \mathbb{Z}$ and all trees T , if $\text{less}(b, T)$, and $b > v$, then $\text{less}(b, \text{insert}(v, T))$

Let $P(T)$ be the statement that for all $b \in \mathbb{Z}, v \in \mathbb{Z}$, if $\text{less}(b, T)$ and $b > v$, then $\text{less}(b, \text{insert}(v, T))$
i.e. for all $b \in \mathbb{Z}, v \in \mathbb{Z}$, $\text{less}(b, T) \wedge b > v \Rightarrow \text{less}(b, \text{insert}(v, T))$.

We prove $P(T)$ for all $T \in \text{Trees}$ by structural induction on T .

Base Case: $T = \text{Nil}$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{less}(b, T) \wedge b > v &= \text{less}(b, \text{Nil}) \wedge b > v \\ &= \text{true} \wedge b > v && \text{[definition of less]} \\ &\Rightarrow \text{true} \wedge \text{true} \wedge b > v \\ &= \text{less}(v, \text{Nil}) \wedge \text{less}(v, \text{Nil}) \wedge b > v && \text{[definition of less]} \\ &= \text{less}(b, \text{Tree}(v, \text{Nil}, \text{Nil})) && \text{[definition of less]} \\ &= \text{less}(b, \text{insert}(v, \text{Nil})) && \text{[definition of insert]} \\ &= \text{less}(b, \text{insert}(v, T)) \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, $\text{less}(b, T) \wedge b > v \Rightarrow \text{less}(b, \text{insert}(v, T))$ for $T = \text{Nil}$ and our base case holds.

Induction Hypothesis: For some $L, R \in \text{Trees}$, suppose $P(L)$ and $P(R)$ are true.

Induction Step: We want to show $P(T)$ is true for $T = \text{Tree}(x, L, R)$ for all $x \in \mathbb{Z}$. We start by looking at two cases: $v < x$ and $v \geq x$.

Case: $v < x$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{less}(b, T) \wedge b > v &= \text{less}(b, \text{Tree}(x, L, R)) \wedge b > v \\ &= x < b \wedge \text{less}(b, L) \wedge \text{less}(b, R) \wedge b > v && \text{[definition of less]} \\ &\Rightarrow x < b \wedge \text{less}(b, \text{insert}(v, L)) \wedge \text{less}(b, R) && \text{[by } P(L) \text{ in I.H.]} \\ &= \text{less}(b, \text{Tree}(x, \text{insert}(v, L), R)) && \text{[definition of less]} \end{aligned}$$

Case: $v \geq x$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{less}(b, T) \wedge b > v &= \text{less}(b, \text{Tree}(x, L, R)) \wedge b > v \\ &= x < b \wedge \text{less}(b, L) \wedge \text{less}(b, R) \wedge b > v && \text{[definition of less]} \\ &\Rightarrow x < b \wedge \text{less}(b, L) \wedge \text{less}(b, \text{insert}(v, R)) && \text{[by } P(R) \text{ in I.H.]} \\ &= \text{less}(b, \text{Tree}(x, L, \text{insert}(v, R))) && \text{[definition of less]} \end{aligned}$$

We see from our cases that if $v < x$ then $\text{less}(b, T) \wedge b > v \Rightarrow \text{less}(b, \text{Tree}(x, \text{insert}(v, L), R))$ else $\text{less}(b, T) \wedge b > v \Rightarrow \text{less}(b, \text{Tree}(x, L, \text{insert}(v, R)))$.

By the definition of `insert`, we can roll both implications into one and state that $\text{less}(b, T) \wedge b > v \Rightarrow \text{less}(b, \text{insert}(v, \text{Tree}(x, L, R)))$ which is equivalent to $\text{less}(b, T) \wedge b > v \Rightarrow \text{less}(b, \text{insert}(v, T))$

Thus, by structural induction, we have shown that $P(T)$ is true for all $T \in \text{Trees}$. \square

(b) Prove that for all trees T and all $v \in \mathbb{Z}$, if $\text{isBST}(T)$, then $\text{isBST}(\text{insert}(v, T))$.

Let $P(T)$ be the statement that for all $v \in \mathbb{Z}$, if $\text{isBST}(T)$, then $\text{isBST}(\text{insert}(v, T))$ i.e. for all $v \in \mathbb{Z}, \text{isBST}(T) \Rightarrow \text{isBST}(\text{insert}(v, T))$.

We prove $P(T)$ for all $T \in \text{Trees}$ by structural induction on T .

Base Case: $T = \text{Nil}$

$$\begin{aligned}
 \text{isBST}(T) &= \text{isBST}(\text{Nil}) \\
 &= \text{true} && [\text{definition of isBST}] \\
 &\Rightarrow \text{true} \wedge \text{true} \wedge \text{true} \\
 &= \text{less}(v, \text{Nil}) \wedge \text{isBST}(\text{Nil}) \wedge \text{greater}(v, \text{Nil}) \wedge \text{isBST}(\text{Nil}) && [\text{definition of less, isBST, and greater}] \\
 &= \text{isBST}(\text{Tree}(v, \text{Nil}, \text{Nil})) && [\text{definition of isBST}] \\
 &= \text{isBST}(\text{insert}(v, \text{Nil})) && [\text{definition of insert}] \\
 &= \text{isBST}(\text{insert}(v, T))
 \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, $\text{isBST}(T) \Rightarrow \text{isBST}(\text{insert}(v, T))$ for $T = \text{Nil}$ and our base case holds.

Induction Hypothesis: For some $L, R \in \text{Trees}$, suppose $P(L)$ and $P(R)$ are true.

Induction Step: We want to show $P(T)$ is true for $T = \text{Tree}(x, L, R)$ for all $x \in \mathbb{Z}$. We start by looking at two cases: $v < x$ and $v \geq x$.

Case: $v < x$

$$\begin{aligned}
 \text{isBST}(T) &= \text{isBST}(\text{Tree}(x, L, R)) \\
 &= \text{less}(x, L) \wedge \text{isBST}(L) \wedge \text{greater}(x, R) \wedge \text{isBST}(R) && [\text{definition of isBST}] \\
 &\Rightarrow \text{less}(x, L) \wedge x > v \wedge \text{isBST}(L) \wedge \text{greater}(x, R) \wedge \text{isBST}(R) && [\text{by our case}] \\
 &\Rightarrow \text{less}(x, \text{insert}(v, L)) \wedge \text{isBST}(L) \wedge \text{greater}(x, R) \wedge \text{isBST}(R) && [\text{by theorem proven in part a)}] \\
 &\Rightarrow \text{less}(x, \text{insert}(v, L)) \wedge \text{isBST}(\text{insert}(v, L)) \wedge \text{greater}(x, R) \wedge \text{isBST}(R) && [\text{by } P(L) \text{ in I.H.}] \\
 &= \text{isBST}(\text{Tree}(x, \text{insert}(v, L), R)) && [\text{definition of isBST}]
 \end{aligned}$$

Case: $v \geq x$

$$\begin{aligned}
 \text{isBST}(T) &= \text{isBST}(\text{Tree}(x, L, R)) \\
 &= \text{less}(x, L) \wedge \text{isBST}(L) \wedge \text{greater}(x, R) \wedge \text{isBST}(R) && [\text{definition of isBST}] \\
 &\Rightarrow \text{less}(x, L) \wedge \text{isBST}(L) \wedge \text{greater}(x, R) \wedge v \geq x \wedge \text{isBST}(R) && [\text{by our case}] \\
 &\Rightarrow \text{less}(x, L) \wedge \text{isBST}(L) \wedge \text{greater}(x, \text{insert}(v, R)) \wedge \text{isBST}(R) && [\text{symmetric theorem for greater}] \\
 &\Rightarrow \text{less}(x, L) \wedge \text{isBST}(L) \wedge \text{greater}(x, \text{insert}(v, R)) \wedge \text{isBST}(\text{insert}(v, R)) && [\text{by } P(R) \text{ in I.H.}] \\
 &= \text{isBST}(\text{Tree}(x, L, \text{insert}(v, R))) && [\text{definition of isBST}]
 \end{aligned}$$

We see from our cases that if $v < x$ then $\text{isBST}(T) \Rightarrow \text{isBST}(\text{Tree}(x, \text{insert}(v, L), R))$ else $\text{isBST}(T) \Rightarrow \text{isBST}(\text{Tree}(x, L, \text{insert}(v, R)))$.

By the definition of insert , we can roll both implications into one and state that $\text{isBST}(T) \Rightarrow \text{isBST}(\text{insert}(v, \text{Tree}(x, L, R)))$ which is equivalent to $\text{isBST}(T) \Rightarrow \text{isBST}(\text{insert}(v, T))$

Thus, by structural induction, we have shown that $P(T)$ is true for all $T \in \text{Trees}$. \square