
2. Not My Cup of Tree

(a) **Base Case:** $U = \text{empty}$

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \text{values}(\text{makeBst}(\text{nil})) \\
 &= \text{values}(\text{empty}) && \text{Definition of makeBst} \\
 &= \text{nil} && \text{Definition of values}
 \end{aligned}$$

(b) **Inductive Step:** $U = \text{cons}(a, L)$

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \text{values}(\text{makeBst}(\text{cons}(a, L))) \\
 &= \text{values}(\text{node}(b, \text{makeBst}(P), \text{makeBst}(R))) && \text{Def makeBST} \\
 & \quad \text{where } (P, S) = \text{split}(m, \text{cons}(a, L)), m = \lfloor \text{len}(\text{cons}(a, L)) / 2 \rfloor, S = \text{cons}(b, R) \\
 &= \text{concat}(\text{values}(\text{makeBst}(P), \text{cons}(b, \text{values}(\text{makeBst}(R))))) && \text{Definition of value} \\
 &= \text{concat}(P, \text{cons}(b, \text{values}(\text{makeBst}(R)))) && \text{Inductive Hypothesis}^* \\
 &= \text{concat}(P, \text{cons}(b, R)) && \text{Inductive Hypothesis}^* \\
 &= \text{concat}(P, S) && \text{since } S = \text{cons}(b, R) \\
 &= \text{cons}(a, L) && \text{Lemma 1}
 \end{aligned}$$

* Justification that the Inductive Hypothesis applies to the lists P and R: Note that $m = \lfloor \text{len}(\text{cons}(a, L)/2 \rfloor$ (according to the values defined above), and $n = \text{len}(U) = \text{len}(\text{cons}(a, L))$, so $m \leq \text{len}(U)$, so Lemma 1 applies.

$$\begin{aligned}
 \text{len}(P) &= m && \text{Lemma 1} \\
 &= \lfloor \text{len}(\text{cons}(a, L)/2 \rfloor && \text{Substitution for } m \\
 &\leq \text{len}(\text{cons}(a, L)) && \text{Arithmetic}
 \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 \text{len}(R) &= \text{len}(S) - 1 && \text{Def of len (since } S = \text{cons}(b, R)) \\
 &= \text{len}(\text{cons}(a, L)) - m - 1 && \text{Lemma 1)} \\
 &\leq \text{len}(\text{cons}(a, L)) && \text{Arithmetic } (m \geq 0)
 \end{aligned}$$

So since $\text{len}(P) \leq \text{len}(\text{cons}(a, L))$ and $\text{len}(R) \leq \text{len}(\text{cons}(a, L))$, we can apply the inductive hypothesis to both these lists.

(c) Prove $\text{len}(S) \geq 1$

$$\begin{aligned}\text{len}(S) &= \text{len}(L) - m \\ &= \text{len}(L) - \lfloor \text{len}(L)/2 \rfloor \\ &\geq 1 - \lfloor \text{len}(L)/2 \rfloor \\ &\geq 1 - 0 \\ &\geq 1\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}m &\leq \text{len}(L), \text{ Property of split} \\ m &= \lfloor \text{len}(L) / 2 \rfloor \\ \text{len}(L) &\geq 1 \\ \lfloor \text{len}(L)/2 \rfloor &\geq 0 \\ \text{Arithmetic}\end{aligned}$$

4. Many More Fish in the Tree

(a) Claim: Define $P(L)$ to be that $\text{contains}(a, \text{concat}(L, S)) = \text{contains}(a, L) \text{ or } \text{contains}(a, S)$ where a is any integer and S is any List. I will prove the claim by structural induction on L .

Base Case: nil

$$\begin{aligned}\text{contains}(a, \text{concat}(\text{nil}, S)) &= \text{contains}(a, S) && \text{Definition of concat} \\ &= \text{false or contains}(a, S) && \text{Identity} \\ &= \text{contains}(a, \text{nil}) \text{ or } \text{contains}(a, S) && \text{Definition of contains}\end{aligned}$$

Inductive Hypothesis: Suppose that $P(B)$ holds for an arbitrary list B . I.e., suppose that $\text{contains}(a, \text{concat}(B, S)) = \text{contains}(a, B) \text{ or } \text{contains}(a, S)$

Inductive Step: We need to show that $P(\text{cons}(r, B))$ holds for any integer r .

$$\begin{aligned}\text{contains}(a, \text{concat}(\text{cons}(r, B), S)) & \\ &= \text{contains}(a, \text{cons}(r, \text{concat}(B, S))) && \text{Def of concat} \\ &= (a = r) \text{ or } \text{contains}(a, \text{concat}(B, S)) && \text{Def of contains} \\ &= (a = r) \text{ or } \text{contains}(a, B) \text{ or } \text{contains}(a, S) && \text{Inductive Hypothesis} \\ &= \text{contains}(a, \text{cons}(r, B)) \text{ or } \text{contains}(a, S) && \text{Def of contains}\end{aligned}$$

Conclusion: $P(L)$ holds for any list L by structural induction

(b) Claim: Define $P(U)$ to be the claim that $\text{contains}(a, \text{values}(U)) = \text{lookup}(a, U)$ where a is any integer and U is any BST. I will prove the claim by induction.

Base Case: empty

$$\begin{aligned} \text{contains}(a, \text{values}(\text{empty})) &= \text{contains}(a, \text{nil}) && \text{Definition of values} \\ &= \text{false} && \text{Definition of contains} \\ &= \text{lookup}(a, \text{empty}) && \text{Definition of lookup} \end{aligned}$$

Inductive Hypothesis: Suppose that $P(K)$ holds for an arbitrary BST K . I.e., $\text{contains}(a, \text{values}(K)) = \text{lookup}(a, K)$ where a is any integer.

Inductive Step: We need to show $P(\text{node}(b, S, T))$ where b is an arbitrary integer and S and T are arbitrary BSTs.

$$\begin{aligned} &\text{contains}(a, \text{values}(\text{node}(b, S, T))) \\ &= \text{contains}(a, \text{concat}(\text{values}(S), \text{cons}(b, \text{values}(T)))) && \text{Def of values} \\ &= \text{contains}(a, \text{values}(S)) \text{ or } \text{contains}(a, \text{cons}(b, \text{values}(T))) && \text{Part A} \\ &= \text{contains}(a, \text{values}(S)) \text{ or } (a = b) \text{ or } \text{contains}(a, \text{values}(T)) && \text{Def of contains} \end{aligned}$$

a can either be less than, greater than, or equal to b , so there are three cases to check.

Case 1: $a < b$

$$\begin{aligned} &\text{contains}(a, \text{values}(S)) \text{ or } (a = b) \text{ or } \text{contains}(a, \text{values}(T)) && \text{Def of contains} \\ &= \text{contains}(a, \text{values}(S)) \text{ or } \text{False} \text{ or } \text{contains}(a, \text{values}(T)) && \text{Since } a < b, \text{ so } a \neq b \\ &= \text{contains}(a, \text{values}(S)) \text{ or } \text{False} \text{ or } \text{False} && \text{BST Invariant} \\ &= \text{contains}(a, \text{values}(S)) && \text{Identity} \\ &= \text{lookup}(a, S) && \text{Inductive Hypothesis} \\ &= \text{lookup}(a, \text{node}(b, S, T)) && \text{Definition of lookup, since } a < b \end{aligned}$$

Case 2: $a > b$

$$\begin{aligned} &\text{contains}(a, \text{values}(S)) \text{ or } (a = b) \text{ or } \text{contains}(a, \text{values}(T)) && \text{Def of contains} \\ &= \text{contains}(a, \text{values}(S)) \text{ or } \text{False} \text{ or } \text{contains}(a, \text{values}(T)) && \text{Since } a > b, \text{ so } a \neq b \\ &= \text{False} \text{ or } \text{contains}(a, \text{values}(T)) \text{ or } \text{False} && \text{BST Invariant} \\ &= \text{contains}(a, \text{values}(T)) && \text{Identity} \\ &= \text{lookup}(a, T) && \text{Inductive Hypothesis} \\ &= \text{lookup}(a, \text{node}(b, S, T)) && \text{Definition of lookup, since } a > b \end{aligned}$$

Case 3: $a = b$

$\text{contains}(a, \text{values}(S)) \text{ or } (a = b) \text{ or } \text{contains}(a, \text{values}(T))$	Def of contains
$= \text{contains}(a, \text{values}(S)) \text{ or } \text{True} \text{ or } \text{contains}(a, \text{values}(T))$	Since $a = b$
$= \text{True}$	Domination
$= \text{lookup}(a, \text{node}(b, S, T))$	Definition of lookup, since $a = b$

Conclusion: Since these three cases in the inductive step are exhaustive, we have shown that the claim holds for an arbitrary BST $K = \text{node}(b, S, T)$. Therefore, we have also proven that $P(U)$ holds for any BST U by structural induction.

5. Chomping at the Split
