

M.) To Prove that

$$(o ((\text{curry map}) f) ((\text{curry map}) g)) = ((\text{curry map}) (o f g))$$

1.) Base Case - where each function is applied to '()'
 Left hand side of Proof

$$((o ((\text{curry map}) f) ((\text{curry map}) g)) '())$$

$$= \{ \text{apply - compose law} \}$$

$$(((\text{curry map}) f) (((\text{curry map}) g) '()))$$

$$= \{ \text{apply - curried law} \}$$

$$(((\text{curry map}) f) (\text{map } g '()))$$

$$= \{ \text{map - nil law} \}$$

$$(((\text{curry map}) f) '())$$

$$= \{ \text{apply - curried law} \}$$

$$(\text{map } f '())$$

$$= \{ \text{map - nil law} \}$$

$$= '()$$

Right hand side of the Proof

$$(((\text{curry map}) (o f g)) '())$$

$$= \{ \text{apply - curried law} \}$$

$$(\text{map } (o f g) '())$$

$$= \{ \text{map - nil law} \}$$

$$= '()$$

So,

As we use same argument on each side it returns the same thing so the Base case holds on empty list

We apply non-empty list $ys = (\text{cons } x \text{ } xs)$

Left hand side of the proof

$$\begin{aligned}
 & ((\circ ((\text{curry map}) f)) ((\text{curry map}) g)) \text{ } ys \\
 &= \{ \text{substituting } ys \text{ with } (\text{cons } x \text{ } xs) \} \\
 & ((\circ ((\text{curry map}) f)) ((\text{curry map}) g)) (\text{cons } x \text{ } xs) \\
 &= \{ \text{apply - compose law} \} \\
 & (((\text{curry map}) f) ((\text{curry map}) g) (\text{cons } x \text{ } xs)) \\
 &= \{ \text{apply - curried law} \} \\
 & (((\text{curry map}) f) (\text{map } g (\text{cons } x \text{ } xs))) \\
 &= \{ \text{map - cons law} \} \\
 & (((\text{curry map}) f) (\text{cons } (g x) (\text{map } g xs))) \\
 &= \{ \text{apply - curried law} \} \\
 & (\text{map } f (\text{cons } (g x) (\text{map } g xs))) \\
 &= \{ \text{map - cons law} \} \\
 & (\text{cons } (f (g x)) (\text{map } f (\text{map } g xs))) \\
 &= \{ \text{apply - curried law} \} \\
 & (\text{cons } (f (g x)) (\text{map } f (((\text{curry map}) g) xs))) \\
 &= \{ \text{apply - curried law} \} \\
 & (\text{cons } (f (g x)) (((\text{curry map}) f) (((\text{curry map}) g) xs))) \\
 &= \{ \text{apply - compose law} \} \\
 & (\text{cons } (f (g x)) ((\circ ((\text{curry map}) f)) ((\text{curry map}) g) xs)) \\
 & \quad \&
 \end{aligned}$$

= { By induction hypothesis }

$$(\text{cons } (f (g x)) ((\text{curry map}) (o f g)) ns))$$

= { apply - compose law }

$$(\text{cons } ((o f g) x) ((\text{curry map}) (o f g)) ns))$$

= { apply - curried law }

$$(\text{cons } ((o f g) x) (\text{map } (o f g) xs))$$

= { map - cons law }

$$(\text{map } (o f g) (\text{cons } x ns))$$

= { replace $(\text{cons } x ns)$ with ys }

$$(\text{map } (o f g) ys)$$

= { ~~applied~~ - curried law }

$$(((\text{curry map}) (o f g)) ys)$$

As we notice

$$((o ((\text{curry map}) f) ((\text{curry map}) g)) ys) = (((\text{curry map}) (o f g)) ys)$$

for any ys we can say that it is true for any list.