Quiz (Week 6)

Functors

Question 1

Which of the following type definitions admit law-abiding instances of Functor ?

```
    Maybe
    X String
    (->) a for any a
    (,) a for any a
    Io
    []
    Gen
    Tree where:
```

data Tree a = Leaf | Branch a (Tree a) (Tree a)

```
Every one of these is a functor except for String, which is not a type constructor and therefore cannot be a Functor. IO is an abstract type that implements
```

Functor, as is Gen. The others have the following implementations:

```
instance Functor Maybe where
  fmap :: (a -> b) -> Maybe a -> Maybe b
  fmap f (Just x) = Just (f x)
  fmap f Nothing = Nothing

instance Functor ((->) x) where
  fmap :: (a -> b) -> (x -> a) -> (x -> b)
  fmap ab xa x = ab (xa x)

instance Functor ((,) x) where
  fmap :: (a -> b) -> (x, a) -> (x, b)
  fmap f (x, a) = (x, f x)

instance Functor [] where
  fmap :: (a -> b) -> [a] -> [b]
```

```
instance Functor Tree where
fmap :: (a -> b) -> Tree a -> Tree b
fmap f Leaf = Leaf
fmap f (Branch x l r) = Branch (f x) (fmap f l) (fmap f r)
```

Question 2

Here is a data type definition for a non-empty list in Haskell.

```
data NonEmptyList a = One a | Cons a (NonEmptyList a)
```

Which of the following are law-abiding | Functor | instances for | NonEmptyList |?

1.

```
instance Functor NonEmptyList where
fmap f (One x) = One (f x)
fmap f (Cons x xs) = Cons (f x) (fmap f xs)
```

2. X

```
instance Functor NonEmptyList where
fmap f (One x) = One (f x)
fmap f (Cons x xs) = One (f x)
```

3. X

```
instance Functor NonEmptyList where
fmap f (One x) = One (f x)
fmap f (Cons x xs) = Cons (f x) (Cons (f x) (fmap f xs))
```

4. X

```
instance Functor NonEmptyList where
fmap f (One x) = One (f x)
fmap f (Cons x xs) = Cons (f (f x)) (fmap f xs)
```

Option 1 obeys the functor laws. Proof by induction of the first law (fmap id xs = xs): Base case, when xs = 0ne x:

Inductive case, assuming $xs = Cons \times xs'$, with the inductive hypothesis that fmap id xs' = xs':

The composition law (fmap f (fmap g xs) = fmap (f . g) xs) follows from parametricity.

Options 2 and 3 do not obey the first law, as fmap id (Cons 3 (One 1)) does not equal Cons 3 (One 1), and option 4 is not type correct as f :: a -> b, not a -> a.

Applicatives

Question 3

Which of the following type definitions are examples of Applicative?

- ✓ Maybe
- 2. X String
- 3. **✓** (->) a for any a
- 4. **X** (,) a for any a
- 5. **✓** I0
- 6. **✓** []
- 7. **✓** Gen

Once again, String is not a type constructor, so cannot be an Applicative.

Furthermore (,) a does not admit a law-abiding applicative instance either, as we cannot implement pure:

```
instance Applicative ((,) x) where
pure :: a -> (x, a)
pure a = (???? , a)
```

Of the other options, Gen and IO are both applicatives, as are Maybe, (->) a and [] as follows:

Question 4

Here is a data type definition for a non-empty list in Haskell.

```
data NonEmptyList a = One a | Cons a (NonEmptyList a)
```

Which of the following are law-abiding Applicative instances for NonEmptyList?

1. 🗸

```
instance Applicative NonEmptyList where
  pure x = Cons x (pure x)
  (One f) <*> (One x) = One (f x)
  (One f) <*> (Cons x _) = One (f x)
  (Cons f _) <*> (One x) = One (f x)
  (Cons f fs) <*> (Cons x xs) = Cons (f x) (fs <*> xs)
```

2. X

```
instance Applicative NonEmptyList where
pure x = One x
(One f) <*> (One x) = One (f x)
(One f) <*> (Cons x _) = One (f x)
(Cons f _) <*> (One x) = One (f x)
(Cons f fs) <*> (Cons x xs) = Cons (f x) (fs <*> xs)
```

```
instance Applicative NonEmptyList where
  pure x = One x
  One f <*> xs = fmap f xs
  (Cons f fs) <*> xs = fmap f xs `append` (fs <*> xs)
    where
    append (One x) ys = Cons x ys
    append (Cons x xs) ys = Cons x (xs `append` ys)
```

4. X

```
instance Applicative NonEmptyList where
pure x = Cons x (pure x)
One f <*> xs = fmap f xs
(Cons f fs) <*> xs = fmap f xs `append` (fs <*> xs)
  where
  append (One x) ys = Cons x ys
  append (Cons x xs) ys = Cons x (xs `append` ys)
```

Option 3 is analogous to the same Applicative instance we knows from regular lists, so is a valid Applicative instance. Options 2 and 4 don't obey the first Applicative law, pure id <*>v=v. Option 1 is also a valid applicative instance, analogous to the ZipList instance available in the Haskell standard library.

Question 5

Suppose I wanted to write a function pair, which takes two Applicative data structures and combines them in a tuple, of type:

```
pair :: (Applicative f) => f a -> f b -> f (a, b)
```

Select all correct implementations of pair.

```
1. X
```

```
pair fa fb = pure fa <*> pure fb
```

2. X

```
pair fa fb = pure (,) <*> pure fa <*> pure fb
```

3. ✓

```
pair fa fb = pure (,) <*> fa <*> fb
```

4.

```
pair fa fb = fmap (,) fa <*> fb
```

5. X There is no way to implement this function.

```
Options 1 and 2 are not type correct. Options 3 and 4 are both correct, and equivalent, as fmap f x = (pure f <*> x), if the Applicative and Functor instances are law-abiding.
```

Monads

Question 6

Which of the following type definitions are examples of Monad, or admit law-abiding Monad instances?

```
    ✓ Maybe
    X String
    ✓ (->) a for any a
    ✓ (,) a for any a
    ✓ 10
    ✓ []
    ✓ Gen
    X
    Tree where:
```

```
data Tree a = Leaf | Branch a (Tree a) (Tree a)
```

Monad instances can be written for Maybe, (->) a and [], and IO and Gen are abstract types that also implement Monad. The Tree type is not a (straightforward) instance of Monad, as we would have to somehow transform a Tree (Tree a) into a Tree a in a structure-preserving way, which I'm pretty sure is impossible.

```
instance Monad Maybe where
  Just x >>= f = f x
  Nothing >>= f = Nothing

instance Monad ((->) x) where
  (xa >>= axb) = \x -> axb (xa x) x

instance Monad [] where
  xs >>= each = concatMap each xs
```

Question 7

We wish to write a function s of type [m a] -> m [a], for any monad m. It will unpack each given value of type m a and collect their results into a list. Which of the following is a correct implementation of this function?

1. X

```
s :: Monad m => [m a] -> m [a]
s [] = []
s (a:as) = do
    x <- a
    xs <- s as
    pure (x : xs)</pre>
```

2. **X**

```
s :: Monad m => [m a] -> m [a]
s [] = return []
s (a:as) = do
    x <- a
    xs <- as
    pure (x : xs)</pre>
```

3. ✓

```
s :: Monad m => [m a] -> m [a]
s [] = return []
s (a:as) = do
    x <- a
    xs <- s as
    pure (x : xs)</pre>
```

4. X

```
s :: Monad m => [m a] -> m [a]
s [] = return []
s (a:as) = do
    a
    s as
    pure (a : as)
```

Only answer 3 is type correct.

Question 8

Now suppose we wish to write a function m of type, which applies a given function to each element of a list and collects the results:

```
m :: Monad m => (a -> m b) -> [a] -> m [b]
```

What is a correct implementation of m?

1. X

```
m :: Monad m => (a -> m b) -> [a] -> m [b]
m f [] = []
m f (x:xs) = do
    y <- f x
    ys <- m f xs
    return (y:ys)</pre>
```

2. X

```
m :: Monad m => (a -> m b) -> [a] -> m [b]
m f [] = []
m f (x:xs) = do
    y <- f x
    ys <- f xs
    return (y:ys)</pre>
```

3. ✓

```
m :: Monad m => (a -> m b) -> [a] -> m [b]
m f = s . map f
```

4. X

```
m :: Monad m => (a -> m b) -> [a] -> m [b]
m = s . map
```

Only answer 3 is type correct.

Submission is already closed for this quiz. You can click here to check your submission (if any).