

Homework 7

Fletcher Gornick

March 12, 2021

Problem 1 (30 points)

```
type 'a tree = Leaf | Branch of 'a tree * 'a * 'a tree

let rec flip_tree =
  fun t ->
  match t with
  | Leaf -> Leaf
  | Branch (left, root, right) ->
    Branch (flip_tree right, root, flip_tree left)
```

Theorem 1. For any type `a` and any value `t` of type `a tree`, we have

$$\text{flip_tree } (\text{flip_tree } t) = t$$

Domain All values of type `a tree`.

Property $P(t)$: `flip_tree (flip_tree t) = t`.

Inductive order $R(t_1, t_2)$: `t1` is a proper subtree of `t2`.

1. `t = Leaf`.

Left-hand side: `flip_tree (flip_tree Leaf) = flip_tree Leaf = Leaf`.

Right-hand side: `Leaf`.

Both sides agree.

2. `t = Branch (left, root, right)`.

Left-hand side:

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{flip_tree } (\text{flip_tree } (\text{Branch } (\text{left}, \text{root}, \text{right}))) \\ &= \text{flip_tree } (\text{Branch } ((\text{flip_tree } \text{right}), \text{root}, (\text{flip_tree } \text{left}))) \\ &= \text{Branch } (\text{flip_tree } (\text{flip_tree } \text{left}), \text{root}, \text{flip_tree } (\text{flip_tree } \text{right})) \end{aligned}$$

Right-hand side:

$$\text{Branch } (\text{left}, \text{root}, \text{right})$$

It is thus sufficient to show that

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{flip_tree } (\text{flip_tree } \text{left}) = \text{left} \\ & \text{flip_tree } (\text{flip_tree } \text{right}) = \text{right} \end{aligned}$$

Which is exactly $P(\text{left})$ and $P(\text{right})$. $P(\text{left})$ and $P(\text{right})$ are implied by the inductive hypothesis because both `left` and `right` are proper subtrees of `t`. That is, $R(\text{left}, t)$ and $R(\text{right}, t)$.

Problem 2 (30 points)

```
let rec sum_tree =  
  fun t ->  
    match t with  
    | Leaf -> 0  
    | Branch (left, root, right) ->  
      sum_tree left + root + sum_tree right
```

Theorem 2. For any value t of type `int tree`, we have

$$\text{sum_tree (flip_tree } t) = \text{sum_tree } t$$

Domain All values of type `a tree`.

Property $P(t)$: $\text{sum_tree (flip_tree } t) = \text{sum_tree } t$.

Inductive order $R(t_1, t_2)$: t_1 is a proper subtree of t_2 .

1. $t = \text{Leaf}$.

Left-hand side: $\text{sum_tree (flip_tree Leaf)} = \text{sum_tree Leaf} = 0$.

Right-hand side: $\text{sum_tree Leaf} = 0$.

Both sides agree.

2. $t = \text{Branch (left, root, right)}$.

Left-hand side:

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{sum_tree (flip_tree (Branch (left, root, right)))} \\ &= \text{sum_tree (Branch ((flip_tree right), root, (flip_tree left)))} \\ &= \text{sum_tree (flip_tree right)} + \text{root} + \text{sum_tree (flip_tree left)} \\ &= \text{sum_tree (flip_tree left)} + \text{root} + \text{sum_tree (flip_tree right)} \end{aligned}$$

Right-hand side:

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{sum_tree (Branch (left, root, right))} \\ &= \text{sum_tree left} + \text{root} + \text{sum_tree right} \end{aligned}$$

It is thus sufficient to show that

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{sum_tree (flip_tree left)} = \text{sum_tree left} \\ & \text{sum_tree (flip_tree right)} = \text{sum_tree right} \end{aligned}$$

Which is exactly $P(\text{left})$ and $P(\text{right})$. $P(\text{left})$ and $P(\text{right})$ are implied by the inductive hypothesis because both `left` and `right` are proper subtrees of `t`. That is, $R(\text{left}, t)$ and $R(\text{right}, t)$.

Bonus Problem (10 points)

```
let rec length l =
  match l with
  | [] -> 0
  | h :: t -> 1 + length t

let rec size_tree =
  fun t ->
  match t with
  | Leaf -> 0
  | Branch (left, _, right) ->
    size_tree left + 1 + size_tree right

let rec list_of_tree_helper =
  fun t l ->
  match t with
  | Leaf -> l
  | Branch (left, root, right) ->
    list_of_tree_helper left (root :: list_of_tree_helper right l)

let list_of_tree t = list_of_tree_helper t []
```

Lemma 3. For any type `a`, any value `t` of type `a tree`, and any value `l` of type `a list`, we have

$$\text{length (list_of_tree_helper } t \text{ } l) = \text{size_tree } t + \text{length } l$$

Domain All values of type `a tree` and `a list`.

Property $P(t)$: $\text{length (list_of_tree_helper } t \text{ } l) = \text{size_tree } t + \text{length } l$.

Inductive order $R(t_1, t_2)$: t_1 is a proper subtree of t_2 .

1. $t = \text{Leaf}$.

Left-hand side: $\text{length (list_of_tree_helper Leaf } l) = \text{length } l$.

Right-hand side: $\text{size_tree Leaf} + \text{length } l = 0 + \text{length } l = \text{length } l$.

Both sides agree.

2. $t = \text{Branch (left, root, right)}$.

Left-hand side:

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{length (list_of_tree_helper (Branch (left, root, right)) } l) \\ &= \text{length (list_of_tree_helper left (root :: list_of_tree_helper right } l)) \\ &= \text{size_tree left} + \text{length (root :: (list_of_tree_helper right } l)) \\ &= \text{size_tree left} + 1 + \text{length (list_of_tree_helper right } l) \\ &= \text{size_tree left} + 1 + \text{size_tree right} + \text{length } l \end{aligned}$$

Since the trees `left` and `right` are proper subtrees of `t`, that is, $R(\text{left}, t)$ and $R(\text{right}, t)$, $P(\text{left})$ and $P(\text{right})$ are implied by the inductive hypothesis. This means

$$\begin{aligned} \text{length (list_of_tree_helper left)} &= \text{size_tree left} + \text{length } l \\ \text{length (list_of_tree_helper right)} &= \text{size_tree right} + \text{length } l \end{aligned}$$

Which is why these equalities are made above in *Left-hand side*.

Right-hand side:

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{size_tree } t + \text{length } l \\ &= \text{size_tree left} + 1 + \text{size_tree right} + \text{length } l \end{aligned}$$

Again, both sides agree.

Therefore, by the principle of mathematical induction, the claim $\text{length } (\text{list_of_tree_helper } t \ l) = \text{size_tree } t + \text{length } l$ must hold for all values t and l of type `a tree` and `a list` respectively.

Theorem 4. *For any type `a` and any value `t` of type `a tree`, we have*

$$\text{length } (\text{list_of_tree } t) = \text{size_tree } t$$

The function $\text{length } (\text{list_of_tree } t)$ can be rewritten as $\text{length } (\text{list_of_tree_helper } t \ [])$. As proven in *Lemma 3*, $\text{length } (\text{list_of_tree_helper } t \ l) = \text{size_tree } t + \text{length } l$, so we can apply this to our new case, giving us $\text{length } (\text{list_of_tree_helper } t \ []) = \text{size_tree } t + \text{length } []$. Finally, since $\text{length } [] = 0$, we have $\text{length } (\text{list_of_tree_helper } t \ []) = \text{size_tree } t + 0 = \text{size_tree } t$.

Again, since $\text{length } (\text{list_of_tree_helper } t \ [])$ can be rewritten as $\text{length } (\text{list_of_tree } t)$, we can conclude that $\text{length } (\text{list_of_tree } t) = \text{size_tree } t$.