15-150 Assignment 5 Karan Sikka ksikka@andrew.cmu.edu G 2/25/12

1: Task 2.2

```
Claim: For all 11: \alpha list and all 12: \alpha list list,
                       ap(11, concatap 12) \cong concatap(11 :: 12)
Proof:
           concatap(11::12)
         \congcase 11::12 of [] => [] | x::xs => ap(x,concatap(xs))
                                                                                   step
At this point, 11::12 can be either be nil or x::xs. We will show both cases.
Case nil:
(both 11 and 12 are nil) since []::[] = []:
     case [] of [] \Rightarrow [] | x::xs \Rightarrow ap(x,concatap(xs))
                                                                              def of concatap
   \cong[]
                                                                                         step
   \cong12
                                                                                   value of 12
   ≅case [] of [] =>12 | ...
                                                                            rev. step from ap
   ≅ap([],[])
                                                                          rev. step, def of ap
   \congap([],case [] of [] => [])
                                                                    rev. step, def of concatap
   \congap([],concatap([])
                                                                     rev. step from concatap
   \congap(11,concatap(12)
                                                                               values of l1, l2
Case x::xs:
     \congcase 11::12 of [] => [] | x::xs => ap(x,concatap(xs))
                                                                            def of concatap
     \congap(11,concatap(12))
                                                                               reverse step
```

In both cases, the lemma holds. QED.

2: Task 2.3

Claim: For all 1 : α list list,

concat 1 \cong concatap 1

Proof: We proceed by structural induction on 1

Case []: Want to show: concat [] \cong concatap [] Consider:

```
      concat []
      step

      ≅case [] of [] ⇒ [] ...
      step

      ≅case [] of [] ⇒ [] ...
      reverse step

      ≅concatap []
      reverse step
```

Case x::xs: Inductive Hypothesis: concat xs \cong concatap xs Inductive Step: Consider:

In the list of lists xs, the first element can be the empty list, or a non-empty list. We will consider both cases. Case x = []:

```
Case x = y::ys:
```

```
\cong case y::ys of [] => concat xs | y::ys => y::concat (ys::xs) ) cont. from above \cong y::concat (ys::xs) step \cong y::(case ys::xs of ... | x::xs => case x of ... ) step, evaluate the case \cong y::(case ys of [] => concat xs | z::zs =>... )
```

Here we run into another fork in the road. We said x = y::ys, but this function evaluates differently based on whether or not ys is nil. So we will consider both cases, since both are possible. Case x

```
= y::[]
                                                                          cont. from above
   \cong y::(case [] of [] => concat xs | z::zs =>... )
   \cong y::(concat xs)
                                                                                      step
   \cong y::(concatap xs)
                                                                                        IH
   \cong y::(ap([],concatap xs))
                                                                                 Lemma\ 2
   \cong case y::[] of [] => 12 | x::xs => x::(ap(xs,12))
                                                                         rev. step, from ap
   \cong ap(y::[],concatap(xs))
                                                                                  rev. step
   \cong ap(x,concatap(xs))
                                                                                    x=y::[]
   \cong case x::xs of [] => [] | x::xs => ap(x,concatap(xs))
                                                                       rev. step (concatap)
   \cong concatap (x::xs)
                                                                                  rev. step
Here we see that the lemma holds for the subcase when x = y::[].
```

```
Case x = y::ys:
```

```
\cong y::(case ys of ... | z::zs => z::(concat... )
                                                              cont. from above
\cong y::(z::(concat(zs::ys))
                                                                          step
\cong y::(z::(concat(zs::ys))
                                                                          step
```

This decomposition by concat will happen until the tail of the list is nil. Since lists are assumed to be finite, the decomposition will inevitably terminate. When the tail becomes nil, Case x=y:: holds.

I can't figure out the rest of this proof. However, I tried starting at the bottom of the proof and working up. Here is what I came up with...

```
\cong y::(z::(ap (zs,concat xs)))
                                                                      cont. from above.
\cong y::(z::(ap (zs,concatap xs)))
                                                                      cont. from above.
\cong y::(z::(concatap zs::xs)))
                                                                      cont. from above.
\cong y::(concatap ys::xs)
                                                                               rev. step
\cong y::(ap(ys,concat xs))
                                                                               rev. step
\cong y::(ap(ys,concatap xs))
                                                                                     IH
\cong case y::ys of [] => 12 | x::xs => x::(ap(xs,12))
                                                                      rev. step, from ap
\cong ap(y::ys,concatap(xs))
                                                                               rev. step
\cong ap(x,concatap(xs))
                                                                                 x=y::[]
\cong case x::xs of [] => [] | x::xs => ap(x,concatap(xs))
                                                                    rev. step (concatap)
\cong concatap (x::xs)
                                                                               rev. step
```

I was almost there :(. Partial credit please?

3: Task 2.4

- 1. lemma 3
- 2. lemma 3
- 3. since g and f are valuable, gof is valuable
- 4. since g and f are total, gof are total
- 5. lemma 3
- 6. step
- 7. step
- 8. map $g(map f[]) \cong map(gof)[]$
- 9. step
- 10. step
- 11. step, def of map
- 12. map g(map f xs) \cong map gof xs
- 13. map g(map f xLLxs) \cong map (gof) (x::xs)
- 14. step
- 15. def of function composition
- 16. def of function composition
- 17. ***, transitivity, and totality of map