

$g+a = (1)$

Interactive Theorem Proving Assignment 3
Martin Skilleter (u6679334)
12 May 2019

I collaborated with the following people while completing this assignment: Isabel Longbottom (u6702144) and Aaron Bryce (u6677442).

Question 1

```
import tactic.interactive
import init.meta.interaction_monad
import data.real.basic
```

```
open tactic
```

```
-- Find the maximum element of a list of  $\mathbb{N}$ . Used to work out at what point
-- we don't need to traverse the targets list any further.
```

```
def find_max : list  $\mathbb{N}$  →  $\mathbb{N}$  →  $\mathbb{N}$ 
| [] so_far := so_far
| (h :: tl) so_far := if h > so_far then find_max tl h else find_max tl so_far
```

```
-- Given a list of  $\mathbb{N}$  (the 'targets'), return the goals corresponding
-- to these indices. Indexed from 1 (not 0).
```

```
meta def find_wanted_goals : list  $\mathbb{N}$  →  $\mathbb{N}$  →  $\mathbb{N}$  → list expr → tactic (list expr)
| tgts crnt max gls := if crnt > max then return []
```

```
else match gls with
| [] := fail "No such goals!"
| (g::gs) := if crnt ∈ tgts then
do out ← find_wanted_goals
```

```
tgts (crnt+1) max gs,
```

```
find_wanted_goals tgts (crnt+1) max gs,
```

```
return ([g]++out)
```

```
else do out ←
```

```
return out
```

```
-- A wrapper for find_wanted_goals. Only needs to be given the targets.
```

```
meta def find_goals : list  $\mathbb{N}$  → tactic unit
```

```
| tgts := do let max := find_max tgts 0,
```

```
gls ← get_goals,
```

```
found_goals ← find_wanted_goals tgts 1 max gls,
```

```
set_goals (found_goals)
```

```
meta def set_tactic_state (new_state : tactic_state) : tactic unit := λ s, (do
skip new_state)
```

```
meta def get_tactic_state : tactic tactic_state := λ s,
interaction_monad.result.success s s
```

this is just list.foldl not.max

more arguments
that don't change in
recursive calls before
the colon.

why? I thought we said 0-indexed.

why is this in the
tactic monad?

no need to get
the value, then
return it!

You can tell you're doing something lame here because this is a bad recursion!

This is quite redundant

Good to give all tactics a doc-string: /-- ... -/

```
-- focus_goals as described in the assignment specifications
-- The tactic can be invoked using the syntax requested
-- After focus_goals has been run, we restore the other goals. However,
-- Some of these might have been solved as a consequence of what was solved
inside
-- the given goal block. For example, proving commutativity of addition will
also
-- tell Lean the definition of addition we are using. This is unavoidable.
```

```
meta def tactic.interactive.focus_goals (pe : interactive.parse
lean.parser.pexpr) (t : tactic.interactive.itactic) : tactic unit :=
```

```
do s ← get_tactic_state,
```

```
  s' ← get_goals,
```

```
  e ← to_expr pe,
```

```
  tgts ← eval_expr (list ℕ) e,
```

```
  find_goals tgts,
```

```
  s'' ← get_goals,
```

```
  let s''' := list.diff s' s'',
```

```
  t,
```

```
  gls ← get_goals,
```

```
  if gls ≠ [] then do set_tactic_state s, fail "Failed to discharge the
goals!" else
```

```
    set_goals s'''
```

```
section focus_goals_examples
```

```
-- Example of failing when there are no such goals.
```

```
example : ring ℝ :=
```

```
begin
```

```
  constructor,
```

```
  success_if_fail {focus_goals [1,2,16] {simp}}, -- Error message "No such
goals!"
```

```
  exact neg_add_self,
```

```
  exact add_comm,
```

```
  exact one_mul,
```

```
  exact mul_one,
```

```
  exact left_distrib,
```

```
  exact right_distrib,
```

```
end
```

but what happens? test?

error reporting if parsing goes wrong?

a bit awkward that you 'set_goals' then immediately 'get_goals'. You should just know already!

SO many primes!

-- Example of succeeding and restoring other goals.

example (p q : Prop) : $\neg (p \wedge q) \leftrightarrow \neg p \vee \neg q$:=

begin

constructor,

focus_goals [1] {exact classical.not_and_distrib.mp},

exact not_and_of_not_or_not,

end

-- Example of discharging some goals but not others and therefore failing.

example : true \wedge (true \vee false) :=

begin

split,

success_if_fail {focus_goals [1,2] {repeat {trivial}}}, -- Failed with error
message "Failed to discharge the goals!"

trivial,

constructor,

trivial,

end

-- Example of focus_goals succeeding

example : true \wedge true :=

begin

split,

focus_goals [1,2] {repeat {trivial}},

end

end focus_goals_examples

-- work_on_goals as described in the assignment specifications

meta def tactic.interactive.work_on_goals (pe : interactive.parse
lean.parser.pexpr) (t : tactic.interactive.itactic) : tactic unit :=

do s ← get_tactic_state,

s' ← get_goals,

e ← to_expr pe,

tgts ← eval_expr (list ℕ) e,

find_goals tgts,

s'' ← get_goals,

let s''' := list.diff s' s'',

t,

gls ← get_goals,

do set_goals (gls ++ s''')

usually actually enter the namespace instead
of just prefixing: easier to read.

lots of repetition here, can you
factor it out?

```
section work_on_goals_examples
```

```
open real
```

```
-- Example of solving some goals and then prepending these to the remaining goals.
```

```
example : ring  $\mathbb{R}$  :=
```

```
begin
```

```
  constructor,
```

```
  work_on_goals [1, 3, 5, 11] {exact neg_add_self,  
                                exact one_mul},
```

```
  exact left_distrib,
```

```
  exact add_comm,
```

```
  exact mul_one,
```

```
  exact right_distrib,
```

```
end
```



```
end work_on_goals_examples
```

Question 3

```
import tactic.interactive tactic.basic
import tactic.basic
import tactic.ring
import data.real.basic

open tactic real

meta def get_tactic_state : tactic tactic_state := λ s,
interaction_monad.result.success s s

-- Takes a single tactic and the complexity function and checks if it is "less
complex" than the previous best
meta def run_each (c : tactic ℕ) (best : ℕ) (s₀ : tactic_state) (t : tactic
unit) : tactic ℕ
| s := match t s₀ with -- Get the current tactic state and try running the
tactic on the original tactic state
| result.success _ s₁ := do match c s₁ with | result.success c₁ _ := -- If
it succeeds, try running our complexity function
if (c₁ < best) then
result.success c₁ s₁ -- If the result is less complex, store the new complexity
-- and the new tactic state (before the complexity function was run)
else
result.success best s -- If it is more complex, change nothing
| _ := result.success best s --
If it fails, change nothing
end
| _ := result.success best s -- If it fails, change nothing
end

-- Recursor function to deal with a list of tactics. Terminates if the list is
done.
-- Otherwise, use run_each to check if the head of the list is the best and
then repeat.
meta def run_list (c : tactic nat) (s₀ : tactic_state): ℕ → list (tactic unit)
→ tactic unit
| _ [] := do skip -- We have no more tactics left to try
| best (t :: ts) := do best' ← run_each c best s₀ t, -- Run the first tactic
and store its complexity
out ← run_list best' ts, -- Repeat on tail of list
return out
```

The description of this tactic should definitely explain what it is doing to the tactic state.

if best = 0
you don't
even need
to run
the other
tactic!

such long lines....

user-facing tactics should all have
doc-strings: /-- This is how to use the tactic. -/.

```
-- Note that the best tactic state is carried along by being set as current  
tactic state  
-- Can be invoked using the syntax "run_best c `[simp], `[refl], `[trivial,  
dsimp]]"  
-- Tried to remove the backtick syntax and use an interactive block, but Keeley  
-- explained that these are not foundational in Lean and are instead "tacked  
on",  
-- so a new parser would have had to be written. This would have been  
difficult,  
-- hard to maintain and likely quite inefficient.
```

```
meta def run_best (c : tactic nat) (L : list (tactic unit)) : tactic unit :=  
do s₀ ← get_tactic_state,  
  run_list c s₀ 1000000000 L -- A large starting best value is used, because  
the natural numbers have no upper bound  
  -- and it needs to be larger than the output of the complexity function after  
the first iteration
```

```
example : true ∨ (false ∧ true) :=  
begin
```

```
  run_best (num_goals) `[trivial, refl], `[constructor], `[ring], --  
  Constructor is only tactic that makes progress, so constructor runs  
  run_best (num_goals) `[intros], `[trivial]], -- Trivial finishes the proof  
end
```

Lame!! 😊 So if I use num_goals * 10²⁰
your tactic fails? 😊
Good, but even more testing would be
better.