

## Question 1 - CPS

### 1.1) b.

We will prove that  $(\text{append\$ lst1 lst2 cont}) = (\text{cont} (\text{append lst1 lst2}))$  for any lists  $\text{lst1}$  and  $\text{lst2}$  and a continuation procedure  $\text{cont}$  by induction on  $n$  where  $n$  will be the length of  $\text{lst1}$ .

Base Case:  $n=0$

when  $n=0$ ,  $\text{lst1}$  is empty then

$\text{a-e } [ (\text{append\$ lst1 lst2 cont}) ] \Rightarrow^* \text{a-e } [ (\text{cont lst2}) ]$

$\text{a-e } [ (\text{cont} (\text{append lst1 lst2})) ] \Rightarrow^* \text{a-e } [ (\text{cont lst2}) ]$

Therefore  $(\text{append\$ lst1 lst2 cont}) = (\text{cont lst2}) = (\text{cont} (\text{append lst1 lst2}))$ .

Assume that the equation holds for  $n = k$ . Now we will prove the equation for  $n = k+1$

Inductive Step:

let  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $n=k+1$  :

$n = k+1$  so the length of  $\text{lst1}$  is  $k+1$

$\text{a-e } [ (\text{append\$ lst1 lst2 cont}) ] \Rightarrow^*$

$\text{a-e } [ (\text{append\$ (cdr lst1) lst2 (lambda (res) (cont (cons (car lst1) res)))) ]$

we will define

From the induction assumption:

$\text{a-e } [ (\text{append\$ (cdr lst1) lst2 (lambda (res) (cont (cons (car lst1) res)))) ] =$

$\text{a-e } [ ((\text{lambda (res) (cont (cons (car lst1) res))) (\text{append (cdr lst1) lst2})) ] \Rightarrow^*$

$\text{a-e } [ (\text{cont (cons (car lst1) (\text{append (cdr lst1) lst2)))) ]$

$\text{a-e } [ (\text{cont} (\text{append lst1 lst2})) ] \Rightarrow^*$

$\text{a-e } [ (\text{cont (cons (car lst1) (\text{append (cdr lst1) lst2))}) ]$

Therefore  $(\text{append\$ lst1 lst2 cont}) = (\text{cont} (\text{append lst1 lst2}))$ .

## Question 3 - Logic programming

### 3.1 Unification

1.  $\text{unify}[t(s(s), G, s, p, t(K), s), t(s(G), G, s, p, t(K), U)]$

let  $s = \{ \}$ ,  $A = t(s(s), G, s, p, t(K), s)$ ,  $B = t(s(G), G, s, p, t(K), U)$

$$1) s = s \circ \{G = s\} = \{G = s\}$$

$$A \circ s = t(s(s), s, s, p, t(K), s)$$

$$B \circ s = t(s(s), s, s, p, t(K), U)$$

$$2) s = s \circ \{U = s\} = \{G = s, U = s\}$$

$$A \circ s = t(s(s), s, s, p, t(K), s)$$

$$B \circ s = t(s(s), s, s, p, t(K), s)$$

result:  $s = \{G = s, U = s\}$

2.  $\text{unify}[g(l, M, g, G, U, g, v(M)), g(l, v(U), g, v(M), v(G), g, v(M))]$

let  $s = \{ \}$ ,  $A = g(l, M, g, G, U, g, v(M))$ ,  $B = g(l, v(U), g, v(M), v(G), g, v(M))$

1)  $s = s \circ \{M = v(U)\} = \{M = v(U)\}$

$A \circ s = g(l, v(U), g, G, U, g, v(v(U)))$

$B \circ s = g(l, v(U), g, v(v(U)), v(G), g, v(v(U)))$

2)  $s = s \circ \{G = v(v(U))\} = \{M = v(U), G = v(v(U))\}$

$A \circ s = g(l, v(U), g, v(v(U)), U, g, v(v(U)))$

$B \circ s = g(l, v(U), g, v(v(U)), v(v(v(U))), g, v(v(U)))$

3)  $s = s \circ \{U = v(v(v(U)))\}$

*U appears on both sides of the equation so the algorithm will fail  
when running the occurs check*

*result: There is no suitable substitution.*

3.  $\text{unify}[m(M, N), n(M, N)]$

let  $s = \{ \}$ ,  $A = m(M, N)$ ,  $B = n(M, N)$

$s = s \circ \{m(M, N) = n(M, N)\}$

*will fail immediately because m, n are different predicates.*

*result: There is no suitable substitution.*

4.  $\text{unify}[p([v \mid [V \mid VV]]), p([[v \mid V] \mid VV])]$

let  $s = \{ \}$ ,  $A = p([v \mid [V \mid VV]])$ ,  $B = p([[v \mid V] \mid VV])$

$s = s \circ \{v = [v \mid V]\}$

*v appears on both sides of the equation so the algorithm will fail  
when running the occurs check*

*result: There is no suitable substitution.*

5.  $\text{unify}[g([T]), g(T)]$

let  $s = \{ \}$ ,  $A = g([T])$ ,  $B = g(T)$

$s = s \circ \{[T] = T\}$

*T appears on both sides of the equation so the algorithm will fail  
when running the occurs check*

*result: There is no suitable substitution.*

### 3.1 Proof Tree

?- le(X,s(zero)),times(X,s(s(zero)),Y)).

