

## Assignment 1- Paper Exercise

As a paper exercise, you have to state and prove the theorem that your compiler+stack machine *calculates* a bigint whose value is the same as what *eval computes*.

**Claim,  $P(h)$ :** Given any exptree,  $t$ , of height  $h$ ,  $(\text{eval } t) = \text{stackmc stk}(\text{compile } t)$

**Assumptions:** 1. Bigint operations and normal ocaml inbuilt operations give the same result.  
2. Bigint and int differ in only representations, for the purpose of this proof/assignment, and they are equated freely without loss of implications.

**We shall perform induction over  $h$  to support our claim.**

**Base step,  $P(0)$ :**

Consider an exptree  $t$ , of height 0. The tree can only be of form  $N$  of int, say  $N(a)$ .

$(\text{Eval } t)$  will match  $t$  to  $N$  of some constant  $a$ , and return the constant  $a$ .

$(\text{Compile } t)$  will also match  $t$  to  $N$  of some constant  $a$ , and return a list with only 1 element :  $\text{CONST}$  of (bigint form of) constant  $a$ . Call this list  $\text{pgm}$   
 $\text{stackmc stk pgm}$  will, in the first iteration, push  $a$  to the stack and recursively call itself by passing the modified stack with the tail of  $\text{pgm}$ , which is, an empty list.  
In this iteration, seeing that  $\text{pgm}$  is empty,  $\text{stackmc}$  returns the top value of  $\text{stk}$ , that is  $a$ .

Therefore the base case holds true.

**We now assume all  $P(i)$  to be true for  $i$  less than equal to some integer  $k$ , for the sake of the our inductive proof.**

**To show:  $P(k+1)$  is true**

Consider an exptree  $t$ , of height  $k+1$ . 2 cases arise.

**Case 1:  $t$  is of the form  $\langle \text{oper} \rangle$  of exptree, where  $\langle \text{oper} \rangle$  is a unary operation.**

Let  $t'$  be the child of  $t$ .

$\text{Eval } t$  will equate to  $\langle \text{oper} \rangle (\text{eval } t')$

$(\text{Compile } t)$  will operate to give a conjunction of lists,  $(\text{compile } t')$  and  $[\langle \text{oper} \rangle]$ . Let this list be of length  $l$ .

Passing the above to  $\text{stackmc}$  as  $\text{pgm}$ , with any arbitrary list as  $\text{stk}$ , we observe that  $\text{stackmc}$  will continue modifying  $\text{stk}$  as per  $\text{pgm}$  and recursively call itself, each time, shortening the length of  $\text{pgm}$  by 1. By the time only 1 element is left in  $\text{pgm}$ , we notice that the top most element of  $\text{stk}$  will be equivalent to  $(\text{stackmc stk}(\text{compile } t'))$ , as the first  $l-1$  elements in  $\text{pgm}$  are identical to  $(\text{compile } t')$ . Note that  $t'$  is an exptree with height less than or equal to  $k$  (as the height of its parent,  $t$ , is itself  $k+1$ ), and therefore by our inductive assumption,  $(\text{stackmc stk}(\text{compile } t'))$  is equal to  $(\text{eval } t')$ . Therefore, by the time  $\text{pgm}$  becomes of length 1, the top element of  $\text{stk}$  will be equal to  $(\text{eval } t')$  and the only element inside  $\text{pgm}$  will be  $\langle \text{oper} \rangle$ . In this call,  $\text{stackmc}$  pops the top of  $\text{stk}$ , calculates  $(\langle \text{oper} \rangle \text{stk.top})$  and pushes it back to the  $\text{stk}$ . This value is returned in the

next function call, as `pgm` is shortened by 1. Therefore the final answer returned by `(stackmc stk (compile t))` is equal to `<oper> (eval t')`.

Therefore our inductive step is true for this case.

**Case 2:  $t$  is of the form `<oper> of exptree*exptree`, where `<oper>` is a binary operation.**

Let  $t_1$  and  $t_2$  be the left and right children of  $t$  respectively.

Note that both  $t_1$  and  $t_2$  have heights less than or equal to  $k$ , as their parent,  $t$  has a height  $k+1$  itself. Therefore, by our inductive assumption,

$(\text{eval } t_1) = (\text{stackmc } [] (\text{compile } t_1)) \dots\dots (1)$

$(\text{eval } t_2) = (\text{stackmc } [] (\text{compile } t_2)) \dots\dots (2)$

Eval  $t$  will equate to  $(\text{eval } t_1) \text{ <oper> } (\text{eval } t_2)$

`(Compile t)` will operate to a conjunction of lists, `(compile t1)`, `(compile t2)` and `[<oper>]` in this order. Let  $l_1$  be the length of `(compile t1)`,  $l_2$  of `(compile t2)`.

Passing the above to `stackmc` as `pgm`, with any arbitrary list as `stk`, we observe that `stackmc` will continue modifying `stk` as per `pgm` and recursively call itself, each time, shortening the length of `pgm` by 1.

After  $l_1$  function calls, the top most element of `stk` will be `(stackmc [] (compile t1))`, which is equal to  $(\text{eval } t_1)$  from eqn 1.

Note that `stackmc` never modifies the elements initially passed to it in `stk`, and at the end there is only one new element added to the top of the `stk`. Therefore, over the next  $l_2$  function calls, `stk` gets another element appended to its top, which will be equal to `(stackmc [] (compile t2)) = (eval t2)` ...using (2).

During the next function call, `pgm` only had `<oper>` in it, so `stackmc` pops the top 2 elements from `stk`, which are  $(\text{eval } t_1)$  and  $(\text{eval } t_2)$  and pushes  $(\text{eval } t_1) \text{ <oper> } (\text{eval } t_2)$  on `stk`. This is returned in the next function call.

Therefore our inductive step is true for this case as well.

**Therefore, by induction, we have shown that  $P(h)$  holds for all exptrees of height  $h$ , where  $h$  may be any whole number.**

**Vidit Jain  
2017CS10389**