

15-150 Assignment 5

Jonathan Li

jlli

Section S

June 2, 2016

Task 2.1

```
fun elephant (dumbo, ears) =  
  case dumbo of  
    [] => ears  
  | oooo::TRUMPET => "BEEP" ^ elephant TRUMPET, ears)  
Here, elephant : 'a list -> string.
```

Task 2.2

`fn x => (fn y => x)`

The most general type of this expression is `'a -> ('b -> 'a)`.

Task 2.3

`(fn x => (fn y => x)) []`

The most general type of this expression is `'a -> 'b list`.

Task 5.1

Theorem 1: \forall types \mathbf{t} and values $L : \mathbf{t} \text{ list list}$,

$$\text{concat } L \cong \text{concatap } L.$$

Proof: By structural induction on L .

Base Case: $L \cong []$

To show: $\text{concat } [] \cong \text{concatap } []$

Proof:

$$\begin{array}{llll} \text{concat } [] & \cong & \text{case } [] \text{ of } [] \Rightarrow [] \mid \dots & [\text{step}] \\ & \cong & [] & [\text{step}] \\ \text{concatap } [] & \cong & \text{case } [] \text{ of } [] \Rightarrow [] \mid \dots & [\text{step}] \\ & \cong & [] & [\text{step}] \end{array}$$

From the above, we can see that:

$$\begin{array}{lll} \text{concat } [] & \cong & [] \\ \text{concatap } [] & \cong & [] \\ \therefore \text{concat } [] & \cong & \text{concatap } [] \quad [\text{Extensional Equivalence}] \end{array}$$

Inductive Step: $L \cong l :: ls$ for some $l : 'a \text{ list}$, $ls : 'a \text{ list list}$

Inductive Hypothesis: For $ls : 'a \text{ list list}$, $\text{concat } ls \cong \text{concatap } ls$.

To show: For $L \cong l :: ls$, where $l : 'a \text{ list}$, $\text{concat } L \cong \text{concatap } L$.

Proof: By nested structural induction on l .

Nested Base Case: $l \cong []$

To show: $\text{concat } [] :: ls \cong \text{concatap } [] :: ls$.

Proof:

$$\begin{array}{llll} \text{concat } [] :: ls & \cong & \text{case } [] :: ls \text{ of } \dots & [\text{step, totality of concat, } [] :: ls \text{ is a value}] \\ & \cong & \text{concat } ls & [\text{step}] \\ & \cong & \text{concatap } ls & [\text{Outer IH}] \\ \text{concatap } [] :: ls & \cong & \text{case } [] :: ls \text{ of } \dots & [\text{step, totality of concatap, } [] :: ls \text{ is a value}] \\ & \cong & \text{append } ([], \text{concatap } ls) & [\text{step}] \\ & \cong & \text{concatap } ls & [\text{step}] \end{array}$$

From the above, we can see that:

$$\begin{array}{lll} \text{concat } [] :: ls & \cong & \text{concatap } ls \\ \text{concatap } [] :: ls & \cong & \text{concatap } ls \\ \therefore \text{concat } [] :: ls & \cong & \text{concatap } [] :: ls \quad [\text{Extensional Equivalence}] \end{array}$$

Nested Inductive Step: $l \cong x::xs$ for some $x : 'a$ and $xs : 'a$ list

Nested Inductive Hypothesis: For $xs : 'a$ list, $\text{concat } xs::ls \cong \text{concatap } xs::ls$ To show:
 $\text{concat } (x::xs)::ls \cong \text{concatap } (x::xs)::ls$

Proof:

$$\begin{aligned}
 \text{concat } (x::xs)::ls &\cong \text{case } (x::xs)::ls \text{ of } \dots && [\text{step, totality of } \text{concat}, \\
 &&& (x::xs)::ls \text{ is a value}] \\
 &\cong \text{case } x::xs \text{ of } \dots && [\text{step}] \\
 &\cong x::\text{concat}(xs::ls) && [\text{step}] \\
 &\cong x::\text{concatap}(xs::ls) && [\text{Nested IH, Referential Transparency}] \\
 \text{concatap } (x::xs)::ls &\cong \text{case } (x::xs)::ls \text{ of } \dots && [\text{step, totality of } \text{concatap}, \\
 &&& (x::xs)::ls \text{ is a value}] \\
 &\cong \text{append}((x::xs), \text{concatap } ls) && [\text{step}] \\
 &\cong x::\text{append}(xs, ls) && [\text{step}] \\
 &\cong x::\text{concatap}(xs::ls) && [\text{Lemma 1, Referential Transparency}]
 \end{aligned}$$

From the above, we can see that:

$$\begin{aligned}
 \text{concat } (x::xs)::ls &\cong x::\text{concatap}(xs::ls) \\
 \text{concatap } (x::xs)::ls &\cong x::\text{concatap}(xs::ls) \\
 \therefore \text{concat } (x::xs)::ls &\cong \text{concatap } (x::xs)::ls && [\text{Extensional Equivalence}]
 \end{aligned}$$

Since the Nested Base Case and the Nested Inductive Step hold, then the (outer) Inductive Step must be true. Furthermore, since the (outer) Base Case and the (outer) Inductive Step hold, Theorem 1 must be true.

Task 6.2

My implementation of `all_available` involves the following function calls:

```

map (fn intervals : (int * int) list => (startList intervals, endList intervals)) L
map (fn (sList : int list, eList : int list) => getFreeTimes (sList, eList) 0) startsEnds
    foldr mergeFreeIntervals initial rest

```

Essentially, my implementation of `all_available` is $O(n \log n)$ because each of the helper functions, including `map`, `foldr`, and `getFreeTimes`, is at most $O(n)$, linearly stepping through each element of the list provided. The only function call that takes $O(n \log n)$ is the call to `msort` in each of the functions `startList` and `endList`, which sort the lists of start and end times. Those functions are called in parallel by the `val` declaration for `startsEnds`, so their runtimes do not compound into a larger big-O.