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1. Perform the typing inference algorithm for the expression:

**Step 1**: Rename bound variables:

**Step2**: Assign type variables for every sub expression:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Expression | Variable |
|  | T0 |
|  | T1 |
|  | T2 |
|  | T3 |
|  | T> |
|  | Tx |
|  | Ty |
|  | T#t |
|  | T#f |
|  | Tnum8 |
|  | Tnum3 |

**Step 3:** The equations for the sub-expressions are:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Expression | Equation |
|  | T1=[Tnum8 \*Tnum3-> T0] |
|  | T1=[Tx -> T2] |
|  | T2= T#t |
|  | T#t= T#f |
|  | T> =[Tx \* Ty -> T3] |
|  | T>= [Number \* Number-> Boolean] |
|  | T#t= Boolean |
|  | T#f= Boolean |
|  | Tnum8= Number |
|  | Tnum3= Number |

**Step 4:** Then Solve the equations

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Equation | Substitution |
| T1=[Tnum8 \*Tnum3-> T0] |  |
| T1=[Tx -> T2] |  |
| T2= T#t |  |
| T#t= T#f |  |
| T> =[Tx \* Ty -> T3] |  |
| T>= [Number \* Number-> Boolean] |  |
| T#t= Boolean |  |
| T#f= Boolean |  |
| Tnum8= Number |  |
| Tnum3= Number |  |

After a few step we get:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Equation | Substitution |
|  | T1=[Number \* Number -> Boolean] |
|  | T2= Boolean |
|  | T#t= Boolean |
|  | T#f= Boolean |
|  | T> =[ Number \* Number -> Boolean] |
|  | Tnum8= Number |
|  | Tnum3= Number |
|  | Tx= Number |
|  | Ty= Number |
|  | T0= Boolean |

**And we will return the answer T0= Boolean.**

1. a. assuming that this is the typing statement: {f:[T1->T2], x: T1} |- (f x): T2 (there seemed to be a typo of this sort (f x)}: T2 ) then under the environment that x is of T1, and f receives a T1 and returns T2, then f(x) is of type T2, so the statement is True.  
   If this was not a typo, then the statement is false since there is no expression.

b. again, assuming that there is a typo and the correct typing statement is:   
{f:[T1->T2],g: [T2->T3], x: T2}|- (f g x): T3, then g(x) receives x of type T2 and outputs T3, but f receives T1, so it cannot receive g as an input, so the typing statement is False.

c. {f:[T2->T1],g: [T1->T2], x: T1}|- (f (g x)): T1, this statement is True,  
 because it goes , g can receive T1 as input and f receives T2 as input so everything is legal. So the final type is T1, makes the statement true.  
  
d. {f:[T2->Number],, x: Number}|- (f x x): Number , this statement is false. Because we do not know anything about T2, but we activate f on (number\*number) and we cannot confirm T2 is of this type. We also cannot confirm T2 is of type number, so this statement is False.

1. The type of cons in scheme is: , since it receives two arguments of T1 and T2, and returns a list of these arguments, so it also returns a vector type of T1\*T2 but in the form of a list which we consider T3. The list type is generic because it depends on T1 and T2.  
     
   The type of car in scheme is: T1 -> T2, when T1 is a list of type (T3\*T4\*T5\*…Tn) and T2 is the first element of the list so T2=T3.  
     
   The type of cdr in scheme is: T1 -> T2, when T1 is a list of type (T3\*T4\*T5\*…Tn) and T2 is a list of type (T4\*T5\*…Tn).
2. The type of the following function:
3. a. the MGU here is T1=T2  
     
   b. any MGU here will work , because there is no generic property here the statement Number=Number will always be true.  
     
   c. [T1\*[T1->T2]->Number] , [[T3->Number]\*[T4->Number]->Number]  
   the MGU here is the following:  
   T1 = [T3 -> Number] because of the left side argument of the main function

T4 = T1 - because of the right side argument of the main function and nested the left side argument of that function. So now we can deduce that:

T4 = [T3 -> Number]

T2 = Number

Substituting we got the following type statement:

[[T3->Number]\*[ [T3->Number]->Number]->Number] ,   
[[T3->Number]\*[ [T3 -> Number]->Number]->Number]

d. [T1->T1] , [T1->[Number->Number]] has the following MGU:

T1 = T1,

T1 = [Number->Number]

Substituting we get:

[[Number->Number] -> [Number->Number]],

[[Number->Number]-> [Number->Number]]

**Part 2 q.3**

**Part 4 q.b**

The advantages of the Promise object versus the callbacks are:

* Easier to understand.
* Working with synchronous operations that need to notify only once (usually completion or error).
* Coordinating or managing multiple asynchronous operations at the same time.
* Handling errors from nested or deeply nested asynchronous operations at the highest level without going into the nested operations
* Chaining asynchronous operations (such as do these two async operations, examine the result) without the need of complex syntax and code.
* Managing a mix of asynchronous and synchronous operations