

```

(define (arith-eval expr env)
  (cond
    [ (constant? expr) expr ]
    [ (variable? expr) (lookup expr env) ]
    [ (plus? expr) (+ (arith-eval (op1 expr) env)
                      (arith-eval (op2 expr) env)) ]
    [ (mult? expr) (* (arith-eval (op1 expr) env)
                     (arith-eval (op2 expr) env)) ]
  ))

```

#2

1. **(arith-eval (multi-simp E1 E2) env) = (arith-eval (* E1 E2)) env)**
 - a. **Assume (and (constant? E1) (constant? E2))**
 - i. $(\text{multi-simp } E1 \ E2) = (* \ E1 \ E2)$ by definition of multi-simp
 - ii. $(\text{arith-eval } (\text{multi-simp } E1 \ E2) \ \text{env}) = (\text{arith-eval } (* \ E1 \ E2) \ \text{env})$ by Line i
 - b. **Assume (equal? E1 0)**
 - i. $(\text{multi-simp } E1 \ E2) = 0$ by definition of multi-simp
 - ii. $(\text{arith-eval } (\text{multi-simp } E1 \ E2) \ \text{env}) = (\text{arith-eval } 0 \ \text{env}) = 0$ by definition of arith-eval and line i
 - iii. $(\text{arith-eval } (* \ 0 \ E2) \ \text{env}) = (* \ (\text{arith-eval } 0 \ \text{env}) \ (\text{arith-eval } E2 \ \text{env})) = (* \ 0 \ (\text{arith-eval } E2 \ \text{env})) = 0$ by definition of arith-eval
 - iv. $(\text{arith-eval } (\text{multi-simp } E1 \ E2) \ \text{env}) = (\text{arith-eval } (* \ E1 \ E2) \ \text{env})$ by Lines ii and iii
 - c. **Assume (equal? E2 0)**
 - i. $(\text{multi-simp } E1 \ E2) = 0$ by definition of multi-simp
 - ii. $(\text{arith-eval } (\text{multi-simp } E1 \ E2) \ \text{env}) = (\text{arith-eval } 0 \ \text{env}) = 0$ by definition of arith-eval and line i
 - iii. $(\text{arith-eval } (* \ E1 \ 0) \ \text{env}) = (* \ (\text{arith-eval } E1 \ \text{env}) \ (\text{arith-eval } 0 \ \text{env})) = (* \ (\text{arith-eval } E1 \ \text{env}) \ 0) = 0$ by definition of arith-eval
 - iv. $(\text{arith-eval } (\text{multi-simp } E1 \ E2) \ \text{env}) = (\text{arith-eval } (* \ E1 \ E2) \ \text{env})$ by Lines ii and iii
 - d. **Assume (equal? E1 1)**
 - i. $(\text{multi-simp } E1 \ E2) = E2$ by definition of multi-simp
 - ii. $(\text{arith-eval } (\text{multi-simp } E1 \ E2) \ \text{env}) = (\text{arith-eval } E2 \ \text{env})$ by definition of arith-eval and Line i
 - iii. $(\text{arith-eval } (* \ 1 \ E2) \ \text{env}) = (* \ (\text{arith-eval } 1 \ \text{env}) \ (\text{arith-eval } E2 \ \text{env})) = (* \ 1 \ (\text{arith-eval } E2 \ \text{env})) = (\text{arith-eval } E2 \ \text{env})$
 - iv. $(\text{arith-eval } (\text{multi-simp } E1 \ E2) \ \text{env}) = (\text{arith-eval } (* \ E1 \ E2) \ \text{env})$ by Lines ii and iii
 - e. **Assume (equal? E2 1)**
 - i. $(\text{multi-simp } E1 \ E2) = E1$ by definition of multi-simp
 - ii. $(\text{arith-eval } (\text{multi-simp } E1 \ E2) \ \text{env}) = (\text{arith-eval } E1 \ \text{env})$ by definition of arith-eval and Line i
 - iii. $(\text{arith-eval } (* \ E1 \ 1) \ \text{env}) = (* \ (\text{arith-eval } E1 \ \text{env}) \ (\text{arith-eval } 1 \ \text{env})) = (* \ (\text{arith-eval } E1 \ \text{env}) \ 1) = (\text{arith-eval } E1 \ \text{env})$
 - iv. $(\text{arith-eval } (\text{multi-simp } E1 \ E2) \ \text{env}) = (\text{arith-eval } (* \ E1 \ E2) \ \text{env})$ by Lines ii and iii

- f. **Assume that Lines 3-7 are not met**
 - i. $(\text{arith-eval } (\text{mult-simp } E1 \ E2) \ \text{env}) = (\text{arith-eval } (\text{make-mult } E1 \ E2)) \ \text{env}) = (\text{arith-eval } (* \ E1 \ E2) \ \text{env})$ by definition of `make-mult`
 - g. $(\text{arith-eval } (\text{mult-simp } E1 \ E2) \ \text{env}) = (\text{arith-eval } (* \ E1 \ E2)) \ \text{env})$ has been proven by considering all the different cases of `mult-simp`
- 2. **$(\text{arith-eval } (\text{arith-simp } \text{expr } \text{env}) = (\text{arith-eval } \text{expr } \text{env}); \text{expr} = (* \ E1 \ E2)$**
 - a. Base Case: $E1, E2 = \text{constant/variable}$
 - b. Inductive Hypothesis:
 - i. $(\text{arith-eval } (\text{arith-simp } E1) \ \text{env}) = (\text{arith-eval } E1 \ \text{env})$
 - ii. $(\text{arith-eval } (\text{arith-simp } E2) \ \text{env}) = (\text{arith-eval } E2 \ \text{env})$
 - c. Inductive Proof: Prove $(\text{arith-eval } (\text{arith-simp } (* \ E1 \ E2)) \ \text{env}) = (\text{arith-eval } (* \ E1 \ E2) \ \text{env})$
 - i. RHS:
 - 1. $(\text{arith-eval } (* \ E1 \ E2) \ \text{env}) = (* \ (\text{arith-eval } E1 \ \text{env}) \ (\text{arith-eval } E2 \ \text{env}))$ by definition of `arith-eval`
 - ii. LHS:
 - 1. $(\text{arith-eval } (\text{arith-simp } (* \ E1 \ E2)) \ \text{env}) = (\text{arith-eval } (\text{mult-simp } (\text{arith-simp } E1) \ (\text{arith-simp } E2)) \ \text{env})$ by definition of `arith-simp`
 - 2. $(\text{arith-eval } (\text{mult-simp } (\text{arith-simp } E1) \ (\text{arith-simp } E2)) \ \text{env}) = (\text{arith-eval } (* \ (\text{arith-simp } E1) \ (\text{arith-simp } E2)) \ \text{env})$ by proof for `mult-simp` in Line 1
 - 3. $(\text{arith-eval } (* \ (\text{arith-simp } E1) \ (\text{arith-simp } E2)) \ \text{env}) = (* \ (\text{arith-eval } (\text{arith-simp } E1) \ \text{env}) \ (\text{arith-eval } (\text{arith-simp } E2) \ \text{env}))$ by definition of `arith-eval`
 - 4. $(* \ (\text{arith-eval } (\text{arith-simp } E1) \ \text{env}) \ (\text{arith-eval } (\text{arith-simp } E2) \ \text{env})) = (* \ (\text{arith-eval } E1 \ \text{env}) \ (\text{arith-eval } E2 \ \text{env}))$ by Inductive Hypothesis
 - iii. $(\text{arith-eval } (\text{arith-simp } (* \ E1 \ E2)) \ \text{env}) = (\text{arith-eval } (* \ E1 \ E2) \ \text{env})$ has been proven by Lines i and ii

#3

```
(define (is-simplified? expr)
  (if (constant? expr)
      #t
      (and (noconstant-arith? expr) (nozeros? expr) (nomult1?
expr))
  )
)
```

3. **(is-simplified? (arith-simp expr)) = #t**

4. (is-simplified? (arith-simp expr)) = (and (noconstant-arith? (arith-simp expr)) (nozeros? (arith-simp expr)) (nomult1? (arith-simp expr)))

5. **(noconstant-arith? (arith-simp expr))**

a. Base Case: expr = constant/variable

i. (arith-simp expr) = expr

ii. (noconstant-arith? expr) = #t by definition of nonconstant-arith?

b. Base Case: expr = (+ E1 E2)

i. (arith-simp expr) = (plus-simp E1 E2)

ii. (and (constant? E1) (constant? E2)) = #t

1. (plus-simp E1 E2) = (+ E1 E2)

2. (noconstant-arith? (arith-simp expr)) = (noconstant-arith? (+ E1 E2)) = #t by definition of noconstant-arith?

iii. (and (constant? E1) (constant? E2)) = #f

1. (noconstant-arith? (+ E1 E2)) = (and (noconstant-arith? E1) (no-constant-arith? E2)) = (and #t #t) = #t

c. Base Case: expr = (* E1 E2); (and (constant? E1) (constant? E2)) = #f

i. (and (constant? E1) (constant? E2)) = #t

1. (plus-simp E1 E2) = (* E1 E2)

2. (noconstant-arith? (arith-simp expr)) = (noconstant-arith? (* E1 E2)) = #t by definition of noconstant-arith?

ii. (and (constant? E1) (constant? E2)) = #f

1. (noconstant-arith? (* E1 E2)) = (and (noconstant-arith? E1) (no-constant-arith? E2)) = (and #t #t) = #t

d. Inductive Hypothesis:

i. (and (noconstant-arith? (arith-simp E1)) (noconstant-arith? (arith-simp E2))) = #t

e. Inductive Proof: (noconstant-arith? (arith-simp (+ E1 E2)))

i. (noconstant-arith? (arith-simp (+ E1 E2))) = (no-constant-arith? (+ (arith-simp E1) (arith-simp E2))) = (and (no-

constant-arith? (arith-simp E1)) (no-constant-arith? (arith-

simp E2))) = (and #t #t) = #t by Inductive Hypothesis

f. Inductive Proof: (noconstant-arith? (arith-simp (* E1 E2)))

i. (noconstant-arith? (arith-simp (* E1 E2))) = (no-constant-

arith? (* (arith-simp E1) (arith-simp E2))) = (and (no-

constant-arith? (arith-simp E1)) (no-constant-arith? (arith-

simp E2))) = (and #t #t) = #t by Inductive Hypothesis

g. (noconstant-arith? expr) = #t has been proved by Induction

6. **(nozeros? (arith-simp expr))**

a. Base Case: (variable? expr)

- i. $(\text{arith-simp } \text{expr}) = \text{expr}$
 - ii. $(\text{nozeros? } \text{expr}) = \#t$ by definition of nozeros?
 - b. Base Case: $(\text{and } (\text{constant? } \text{expr}) (\text{not } (\text{equal? } \text{expr } 0)))$
 - i. $(\text{arith-simp } \text{expr}) = \text{expr}$
 - ii. $(\text{nozeros? } \text{expr}) = \#t$ by definition of nozeros?
 - c. Inductive Hypothesis
 - i. $(\text{and } (\text{nozeros? } (\text{arith-simp } E1)) (\text{nozeros? } (\text{arith-simp } E2)))$
 - d. Inductive Proof $(\text{nozeros? } (\text{arith-simp } (+ E1 E2))) = \#t$
 - i. $(\text{no-zeros? } (\text{arith-simp } (+ E1 E2))) = (\text{no-zeros? } (+ (\text{arith-simp } E1) (\text{arith-simp } E2))) = (\text{and } (\text{no-zeros? } (\text{arith-simp } E1)) (\text{no-zeros? } (\text{arith-simp } E2))) = (\text{and } \#t \#t) = \#t$ by Inductive Hypothesis
 - e. Inductive Proof $(\text{nozeros? } (\text{arith-simp } (* E1 E2))) = \#t$
 - i. $(\text{no-zeros? } (\text{arith-simp } (* E1 E2))) = (\text{no-zeros? } (* (\text{arith-simp } E1) (\text{arith-simp } E2))) = (\text{and } (\text{no-zeros? } (\text{arith-simp } E1)) (\text{no-zeros? } (\text{arith-simp } E2))) = (\text{and } \#t \#t) = \#t$ by Inductive Hypothesis
 - f. $(\text{nozeros? } (\text{arith-simp } \text{expr})) = \#t$ has been proven by induction
7. **$(\text{no-mult1? } (\text{arith-simp } \text{expr}))$**
- a. Base Case: $(\text{or } (\text{constant? } \text{expr}) (\text{variable? } \text{expr}))$
 - i. $(\text{arith-simp } \text{expr}) = \text{expr}$
 - ii. $(\text{no-mult1? } \text{expr}) = \#t$ by definition of nomult1?
 - b. Inductive Hypothesis:
 - i. $(\text{and } (\text{no-mult1? } E1) (\text{no-mult1? } E2)) = \#t$
 - c. Inductive Proof: $(\text{no-mult1? } (\text{arith-simp } (+ E1 E2))) = \#t$
 - i. $(\text{no-mult1? } (\text{arith-simp } (+ E1 E2))) = (\text{no-mult1? } (+ (\text{arith-simp } E1) (\text{arith-simp } E2))) = (\text{and } (\text{no-mult1? } (\text{arith-simp } E1)) (\text{no-mult1? } (\text{arith-simp } E2))) = (\text{and } \#t \#t) = \#t$ by Inductive Hypothesis
 - d. Inductive Proof: $(\text{no-mult1? } (\text{arith-simp } (* E1 E2))) = \#t$
 - i. $(\text{no-mult1? } (\text{arith-simp } (* E1 E2))) = (\text{no-mult1? } (* (\text{arith-simp } E1) (\text{arith-simp } E2))) = (\text{and } (\text{no-mult1? } (\text{arith-simp } E1)) (\text{no-mult1? } (\text{arith-simp } E2))) = (\text{and } \#t \#t) = \#t$ by Inductive Hypothesis
 - e. $(\text{no-mult1? } (\text{arith-simp } \text{expr})) = \#t$ has been proven by induction
8. $(\text{is-simplified? } (\text{arith-simp } \text{expr})) = (\text{and } (\text{noconstant-arith? } (\text{arith-simp } \text{expr})) (\text{nozeros? } (\text{arith-simp } \text{expr})) (\text{nomult1? } (\text{arith-simp } \text{expr}))) = (\text{and } \#t \#t \#t) = \#t$