

Reasoning about Programs

Jeremy Bradley and Francesca Toni

Room 372. Office hour - Tuesdays at noon. Email: jb@doc.ic.ac.uk

Department of Computing, Imperial College London

Produced with prosper and \LaTeX

Haskell Lectures I

Proving correctness of Haskell functions

- ➔ Induction over natural numbers
 - ➔ summing natural numbers: `sumInts`
 - ➔ summing fractions: `sumFrac`
 - ➔ natural number sequence: `uList`
 - ➔ proving induction works
- ➔ Structural induction
- ➔ Induction over Haskell data structures
 - ➔ induction over lists: `subList`, `revList`
 - ➔ induction over user-defined structures:
`evalBoolExpr`

Haskell Lectures II

Proving correctness of Haskell functions

- Failed induction: `nub`
- Tree sort example: `sortInts`, `flattenTree`,
`insTree`

Induction Example

Given the following Haskell program:

```
sumInts :: Int -> Int
```

```
sumInts 1 = 1
```

```
sumInts n = n + (sumInts (n-1))
```

- ➔ There are constraints on its input i.e. on the variable r in the function call `sumInts r`
- ➔ What is its output?

$$\begin{aligned} \text{sumInts } r &= r + (r - 1) + \cdots + 2 + 1 \\ &= \sum_{n=1}^r n \end{aligned}$$

sumInts: Example

- ➔ Input constraints are the *pre-conditions* of a function
- ➔ Output requirements are the *post-conditions* for a function
- ➔ Function should be rewritten with conditions:

```
-- Pre-condition: n >= 1
```

```
-- Post-condition: sumInts r = ?
```

```
sumInts :: Int -> Int
```

```
sumInts 1 = 1
```

```
sumInts n = n + (sumInts (n-1))
```

sumInts: Example

Variable and output

n	sumInts n
1	1
2	3
<hr/>	
3	6
4	10
<hr/>	
5	15
6	21
<hr/>	
7	28
8	36
<hr/>	
9	45
10	55

```
-- Pre-condition: n >= 1
-- Post-condition: sumInts r = ?
sumInts :: Int -> Int
sumInts 1 = 1
sumInts n = n + (sumInts (n-1))
```

sumInts: Example

- ➔ Let's guess that the post-condition for `sumInts` should be:

$$\text{sumInts } n = \frac{n}{2}(n + 1)$$

- ➔ How do we prove our conjecture?
- ➔ We use *induction*

Induction in General

The structure of an *induction proof* always follows the same pattern:

- ➔ State the proposition being proved: e.g. $P(n)$
- ➔ Identify and prove the *base case*: e.g. show true at $n = 1$
- ➔ Identify and state the *induction hypothesis* as assumed e.g. assumed true for the case, $n = k$
- ➔ Prove the $n = k + 1$ case is true as long as the $n = k$ case is assumed true. This is the *induction step*

sumInts: Induction

1. Base case, $n = 1$:
$$\text{sumInts } 1 = \frac{1}{2} \times 2 = 1$$
2. Induction hypothesis,
 $n = k$: Assume
$$\text{sumInts } k = \frac{k}{2}(k + 1)$$
3. Induction step, $n = k + 1$:
Using assumption, we
need to show that:
$$\text{sumInts } (k + 1) = \frac{k+1}{2}(k + 2)$$

Trying to prove for all
 $n \geq 1$:

$$\text{sumInts } n = \frac{n}{2}(n + 1)$$

sumInts: Induction Step

- ➔ Need to keep in mind 3 things:
 - ➔ Definition: $\text{sumInts } n = n + (\text{sumInts } (n - 1))$
 - ➔ Induction assumption: $\text{sumInts } k = \frac{k}{2}(k + 1)$
 - ➔ Need to prove: $\text{sumInts } (k + 1) = \frac{k+1}{2}(k + 2)$
-

Case, $n = k + 1$:

$$\begin{aligned}\text{sumInts } (k + 1) &= (k + 1) + \text{sumInts } k \\ &= (k + 1) + \frac{k}{2}(k + 1) \\ &= (k + 1)\left(1 + \frac{k}{2}\right) \\ &= \frac{k + 1}{2}(k + 2) \quad \square\end{aligned}$$

Induction Argument

An *infinite* argument:

- ➔ Base case: $P(1)$ is true
- ➔ Induction Step: $P(k) \Rightarrow P(k + 1)$ for all $k \geq 1$
 - ➔ $P(1) \Rightarrow P(2)$ is true
 - ➔ $P(2) \Rightarrow P(3)$ is true
 - ➔ $P(3) \Rightarrow P(4)$ is true
 - ➔ ...
- ➔ and so $P(n)$ is true for any $n \geq 1$

Example: sumFrac

- ➔ Given the following program:

```
-- Pre-condition: n >= 1
-- Post-condition: sumFrac n = n / (n + 1)
sumFrac :: Int -> Ratio Int
sumFrac 1 = 1 % 2
sumFrac n = (1 % (n * (n + 1)))
            + (sumFrac (n - 1))
```

- ➔ Equivalent to asking:

$$\frac{1}{1 \times 2} + \frac{1}{2 \times 3} + \frac{1}{3 \times 4} + \dots + \frac{1}{n(n+1)} = \frac{n}{n+1}$$

sumFrac: Induction

- ➔ Proving that post-condition holds:
 - ➔ Base case, $n = 1$: $\text{sumFrac } 1 = 1/2$ (i.e. post-condition true)
 - ➔ Assume, $n = k$: $\text{sumFrac } k = k/(k + 1)$
 - ➔ Induction step, $n = k + 1$:

$$\begin{aligned}\text{sumFrac } (k + 1) &= \frac{1}{(k + 1)(k + 2)} + \text{sumFrac } k \\ &= \frac{1}{(k + 1)(k + 2)} + \frac{k}{k + 1} \\ &= \frac{k^2 + 2k + 1}{(k + 1)(k + 2)} \\ &= \frac{(k + 1)^2}{(k + 1)(k + 2)} \\ &= \frac{k + 1}{k + 2} \quad \square\end{aligned}$$

Strong Induction

- Induction arguments can have:
 - an induction step which depends on more than one assumption
 - as long as the assumption cases are $<$ the induction step case
 - e.g. it may be that $P(k - 5)$ and $P(k - 3)$ and $P(k - 2)$ have to be assumed true to show $P(k + 1)$ true
 - this is called *strong induction* and occasionally *course-of-values induction*
 - several base conditions if needed
 - e.g. $P(1), P(2), \dots, P(5)$ may all be base cases

Example: uList function

Given the following program:

```
uList :: Int -> Int
```

```
uList 1 = 1
```

```
uList 2 = 5
```

```
uList n = 5 * (uList (n-1))  
         - 6 * (uList (n-2))
```

- ➔ Pre-condition: call `uList r` with $r \geq 1$
- ➔ Post-condition: require $\text{uList } r = 3^r - 2^r$

Induction Example

In mathematical terms induction problem looks like:

- We define a sequence of integers, u_n , where $u_n = 5u_{n-1} - 6u_{n-2}$ for $n \geq 2$ and base cases $u_1 = 1, u_2 = 5$.
- We want to prove, by induction, that:
 $u_n = \text{uList } n = 3^n - 2^n$
- (Note that this time we have two base cases)

Proof by Induction

- Start with the *base cases*, $n = 1, 2$
 - $\text{uList } 1 = 3^1 - 2^1 = 1$
 - $\text{uList } 2 = 3^2 - 2^2 = 5$
- State *induction hypothesis* for $n = k$ (that you're assuming is true for the next step):
 - $\text{uList } k = 3^k - 2^k$

Proof by Induction

- Looking to prove: $\text{uList } (k + 1) = 3^{k+1} - 2^{k+1}$
- Prove *induction step* for $n = k + 1$ case, by using the induction hypothesis case:

$$\begin{aligned}\text{uList } (k + 1) &= 5 * \text{uList } k - 6 * \text{uList } (k - 1) \\ &= 5(3^k - 2^k) - 6(3^{k-1} - 2^{k-1}) \\ &= 5(3^k - 2^k) - 2 \times 3^k + 3 \times 2^k \\ &= 3 \times 3^k - 2 \times 2^k \\ &= 3^{k+1} - 2^{k+1} \quad \square\end{aligned}$$

- Note we had to use the hypothesis twice

Induction Argument

An *infinite* argument for induction based on natural numbers:

- ➔ Base case: $P(0)$ is true
- ➔ Induction Step: $P(k) \Rightarrow P(k + 1)$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$
 - ➔ $P(0) \Rightarrow P(1)$ is true
 - ➔ $P(1) \Rightarrow P(2)$ is true
 - ➔ $P(2) \Rightarrow P(3)$ is true
 - ➔ ...
- ➔ and so $P(n)$ is true for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$

(Note: Induction can start with any value base case that is appropriate for the property

being proved. It does not have to be 0 or 1)

Proof by Contradiction

- ➔ We have a proposition $P(n)$ which we have proved by induction, i.e.
 - ➔ $P(0)$ is true
 - ➔ $P(k) \Rightarrow P(k + 1)$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$
- ➔ Taken this to mean $P(n)$ is true for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$
- ➔ Let's assume instead that despite using induction on $P(n)$, $P(n)$ is not true for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$
- ➔ If we can show that this assumption gives us a logical contradiction, then we will know that the assumption was false

Proof of Induction

- ➔ Proof relies on fact that:
 - ➔ the set of natural numbers $\mathbb{N} = \{0, 1, 2, 3, \dots\}$ has a least element
 - ➔ also any subset of natural numbers has a least element: e.g. $\{8, 13, 87, 112\}$ or $\{15, 17, 21, 32\}$
 - ➔ and so the natural numbers are ordered. i.e. $<$ is defined for all pairs of natural numbers (e.g. $4 < 7$)

Proof of Induction

- Assume $P(n)$ is not true for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$
- ⇒ There must be largest subset of natural numbers, $S \subset \mathbb{N}$, for which $P(n)$ is not true.
($0 \notin S$)
- ⇒ The set S must have a least element $m > 0$, as it is a subset of the natural numbers
- ⇒ $P(m)$ is false, but $P(m - 1)$ must be true otherwise $m - 1$ would be least element of S
- However we have proved that
 $P(k) \Rightarrow P(k + 1)$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$
- ⇒ $P(m - 1) \Rightarrow P(m)$ is true. Contradiction!

Induction in General

- ➔ In general we can perform induction across data structures (i.e. the same or similar proof works) if:
 1. the data structure has a least element or set of least elements
 2. an ordering exists between the elements of the data structure
- ➔ For example for a list:
 - ➔ `[]` is the least element
 - ➔ `xs < ys` if `length xs < length ys`

Induction over Data Structures

Given a conjecture $P(xs)$ to test:

➔ Induction on $[a]$:

- ➔ Base case: test true for $xs = []$
- ➔ Assume true for $xs = zs :: [a]$
- ➔ Induction step: prove for $xs = (z : zs)$

➔ For structure `MyList`:

```
data MyList a = EmptyList | Cons a (MyList a)
```

- ➔ Base case: test true for $xs = \text{EmptyList}$
- ➔ Assume true for general $xs = zs :: \text{MyList } a$
- ➔ Induction step: prove for $xs = \text{Cons } z \text{ } zs$ for any z

Induction over Data Structures

Given a conjecture $P(xs)$ to test:

- ➔ For a binary tree:

```
data BTree a
  = BEmpty
  | BNode (BTree a) a (BTree a)
```

- ➔ Base case: test true for $xs = BEmpty$
- ➔ Assume true for general cases: $xs = t1 :: BTree a$
and $xs = t2 :: BTree a$
- ➔ Induction step: prove true for $xs = BNode t1 z t2$
for any z

Structural Induction in General I

The structure of an *structural induction proof* always follows the same pattern:

- ➔ For generic data structure:

```
data DataS a
  = Rec1 (DataS a) | Rec2 (DataS a) (DataS a) | ...
  | Base1 | Base2 | ...
```

- ➔ State the proposition being proved: e.g.

$$P(xs :: \text{DataS } a)$$

- ➔ Identify and prove the *base cases*: e.g. show $P(xs)$ true at $xs = \text{Base1}, \text{Base2}, \dots$

Structural Induction in General II

- ➔ For generic data structure:

```
data DataS a
```

```
= Rec1 (DataS a) | Rec2 (DataS a) (DataS a) | ...  
| Base1 | Base2 | ...
```

- ➔ Identify and state the *induction hypothesis* as assumed e.g. assume $P(x_s)$ true for all cases, $x_s = z_s$
- ➔ Finally, assuming all the $x_s = z_s$ cases are true. Prove the *induction step* $P(x_s)$ true for the cases $x_s = \text{Rec1 } z_{s1}$, $x_s = \text{Rec2 } z_{s1} z_{s2}, \dots$

Example: subList

- ➔ `subList xs ys` removes any element in `ys` from `xs`

```
subList :: Eq a => [a] -> [a] -> [a]
```

```
subList [] ys = []
```

```
subList (x:xs) ys
```

```
    | elem x ys = subList xs ys
```

```
    | otherwise = (x:subList xs ys)
```

- ➔ $P(xs) =$ for any `ys`, no elements of `ys` exist in `subList xs ys`
- ➔ Is this a post-condition for `subList`?

Induction: subList

- Base case, $xs = []$:
 - $P([]) =$ for any ys , no elements of ys exist in $(\text{subList } [] \text{ } ys) = []$. i.e. True.
- Assume case $xs = zs$:
 - $P(zs) =$ for any ys , no elements of ys exist in $(\text{subList } zs \text{ } ys)$
- Induction step, (require to prove) case $xs = (z : zs)$:
 - $P(z : zs) =$ for any ys , no elements of ys exist in $(\text{subList } (z : zs) \text{ } ys)$

Induction: subList

- ➔ Induction step, $xs = (z : zs)$:
 - ➔ $P(z : zs) =$ for any ys , no elements of ys exist in $(\text{subList } (z : zs) \text{ } ys)$

$\text{subList } (z : zs) \text{ } ys$

$$= \begin{cases} \text{subList } zs \text{ } ys & : \text{ if } z \in ys \\ (z : \text{subList } zs \text{ } ys) & : \text{ if } z \notin ys \end{cases}$$

$$P(z : zs) = \begin{cases} P(zs) & : \text{ if } z \in ys \\ (z \notin ys) \text{ AND } P(zs) & : \text{ if } z \notin ys \end{cases}$$



Example: revList

- ➔ Given the following program:

```
revList :: [a] -> [a]
```

```
revList [] = []
```

```
revList (x:xs) = (revList xs) ++ [x]
```

- ➔ We want to prove the following property:

- ➔ $P(xs) =$ for any ys :

$$\text{revList } (xs ++ ys) = (\text{revList } ys) ++ (\text{revList } xs)$$

Induction: revList

→ Program:

```
revList :: [a] -> [a]
```

```
revList [] = []
```

```
revList (x:xs) = (revList xs) ++ [x]
```

→ Base case, $xs = []$:

→ $P([]) =$ for any ys ,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{revList } ([] ++ ys) &= (\text{revList } ys) \\ &= (\text{revList } ys) ++ [] \\ &= (\text{revList } ys) ++ (\text{revList } []) \end{aligned}$$

Induction: revList

→ Assume case, $xs = zs$:

→ $P(zs) =$ for any ys :

$$\text{revList } (zs++ys) = (\text{revList } ys)++(\text{revList } zs)$$

→ Induction step, $xs = (z : zs)$:

→ $P(z : zs) =$ for any ys ,

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{revList } ((z : zs)++ys) \\ &= \text{revList } (z : (zs++ys)) \\ &= (\text{revList } (zs++ys))++[z] \\ &= ((\text{revList } ys)++(\text{revList } zs))++[z] \\ &= (\text{revList } ys)++((\text{revList } zs)++[z]) \\ &= (\text{revList } ys)++(\text{revList } (z : zs)) \quad \square \end{aligned}$$

Example: BoolExpr

- ➔ Given the following representation of a Boolean expression:

```
data BoolExpr
  = BoolAnd BoolExpr BoolExpr
  | BoolOr BoolExpr BoolExpr
  | BoolNot BoolExpr
  | BoolTrue
  | BoolFalse
```

Example: BoolExpr

- ➔ The following function attempts to simplify a BoolExpr:

```
evalBoolExpr :: BoolExpr -> BoolExpr
```

```
evalBoolExpr BoolTrue = BoolTrue
```

```
evalBoolExpr BoolFalse = BoolFalse
```

```
evalBoolExpr (BoolAnd x y)
```

```
= (evalBoolExpr x) `boolAnd` (evalBoolExpr y)
```

```
evalBoolExpr (BoolOr x y)
```

```
= (evalBoolExpr x) `boolOr` (evalBoolExpr y)
```

```
evalBoolExpr (BoolNot x)
```

```
= boolNot (evalBoolExpr x)
```

Example: BoolExpr

➔ Definition of boolNot:

```
-- Pre-condition: input BoolTrue or BoolFalse
boolNot :: BoolExpr -> BoolExpr
boolNot BoolTrue = BoolFalse
boolNot BoolFalse = BoolTrue
boolNot _
  = error ("boolNot: input should be"
    ++ "BoolTrue or BoolFalse")
```

Example: BoolExpr

➔ Definitions of boolAnd and boolOr:

```
boolAnd :: BoolExpr -> BoolExpr -> BoolExpr
```

```
boolAnd x y
```

```
  | isBoolTrue x = y
```

```
  | otherwise = BoolFalse
```

```
boolOr :: BoolExpr -> BoolExpr -> BoolExpr
```

```
boolOr x y
```

```
  | isBoolTrue x = BoolTrue
```

```
  | otherwise = y
```

```
isBoolTrue :: BoolExpr -> Bool
```

```
isBoolTrue BoolTrue = True
```

```
isBoolTrue _ = False
```

Induction: BoolExpr

- ➔ Trying to prove statement:
 - ➔ For all ex , $P(ex) = (\text{evalBoolExpr } ex)$ evaluates to BoolTrue Or BoolFalse
- ➔ Base cases: $ex = \text{BoolTrue}$; $ex = \text{BoolFalse}$:
 - ➔ $P(\text{BoolTrue}) = (\text{evalBoolExpr BoolTrue}) = \text{BoolTrue}$
 - ➔ $P(\text{BoolFalse}) = (\text{evalBoolExpr BoolFalse}) = \text{BoolFalse}$

Induction: BoolExpr

- ➔ Assume cases, $ex = kx, kx1, kx2$:
 - ➔ e.g. $P(kx) = (\text{evalBoolExpr } kx)$ evaluates to BoolTrue or BoolFalse

- ➔ Three inductive steps:

1. Case $ex = \text{BoolNot } kx$

$$\begin{aligned} P(\text{BoolNot } kx) &= (\text{evalBoolExpr } (\text{BoolNot } kx)) \\ &= \text{boolNot } (\text{evalBoolExpr } kx) \\ &= \begin{cases} \text{BoolFalse} & : \text{ if } (\text{evalBoolExpr } kx) = \text{BoolTrue} \\ \text{BoolTrue} & : \text{ otherwise} \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

Induction: BoolExpr

- ➔ Assume cases, $ex = kx, kx1, kx2$:
 - ➔ e.g. $P(kx1) = (\text{evalBoolExpr } kx1)$ evaluates to BoolTrue Or BoolFalse
-

2. Case $ex = \text{BoolAnd } kx1 \ kx2$

$$\begin{aligned} &P(\text{BoolAnd } kx1 \ kx2) \\ &= (\text{evalBoolExpr } (\text{BoolAnd } kx1 \ kx2)) \\ &= (\text{evalBoolExpr } kx1) \text{ 'boolAnd' } (\text{evalBoolExpr } kx2) \\ &= \begin{cases} (\text{evalBoolExpr } kx2) & : \text{ if } (\text{evalBoolExpr } kx1) \\ & = \text{BoolTrue} \\ \text{BoolFalse} & : \text{ otherwise} \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

Induction: BoolExpr

- ➔ Assume cases, $ex = kx, kx1, kx2$:
 - ➔ e.g. $P(kx2) = (\text{evalBoolExpr } kx2)$ evaluates to BoolTrue Or BoolFalse
-

3. Case $ex = \text{BoolOr } kx1 \ kx2$

$$\begin{aligned} &P(\text{BoolOr } kx1 \ kx2) \\ &= (\text{evalBoolExpr } (\text{BoolOr } kx1 \ kx2)) \\ &= (\text{evalBoolExpr } kx1) \text{ 'boolOr' } (\text{evalBoolExpr } kx2) \\ &= \begin{cases} \text{BoolTrue} & : \text{ if } (\text{evalBoolExpr } kx1) = \text{BoolTrue} \\ (\text{evalBoolExpr } kx2) & : \text{ otherwise} \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$



Example: nub

- ➔ What happens if you try to prove something that is not true?
- ➔ nub [from Haskell List library] removes duplicate elements from an arbitrary list

```
nub :: Eq a => [a] -> [a]
```

```
nub [] = []
```

```
nub (x:xs) = x : filter (x /=) (nub xs)
```

- ➔ We are going to attempt to prove:
 - ➔ For all lists, xs , $P(xs) =$ for any ys :

$$\text{nub } (xs ++ ys) = (\text{nub } xs) ++ (\text{nub } ys)$$

Induction: nub

→ False proposition:

→ For all lists, xs , $P(xs) =$ for any ys :

$$\text{nub } (xs ++ ys) = (\text{nub } xs) ++ (\text{nub } ys)$$

→ Base case, $xs = []$:

$$P([]) = \text{for any } ys,$$

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{nub } ([] ++ ys) \\ &= \text{nub } ys \\ &= [] ++ (\text{nub } ys) \\ &= (\text{nub } []) ++ (\text{nub } ys) \end{aligned}$$

Induction: nub

→ Assume case, $xs = ks$:

→ $P(ks) =$ for any ys ,

$$\text{nub } (ks ++ ys) = (\text{nub } ks) ++ (\text{nub } ys)$$

→ Inductive step, $xs = (k : ks)$:

→ $P(k : ks) =$ for any ys ,

$$\text{nub } ((k : ks) ++ ys)$$

$$= \text{nub } (k : (ks ++ ys))$$

$$= k : (\text{filter } (k \neq) (\text{nub } (ks ++ ys)))$$

$$= k : \text{filter } (k \neq) ((\text{nub } ks) ++ (\text{nub } ys))$$

$$= (k : \text{filter } (k \neq) (\text{nub } ks)) ++ (\text{filter } (k \neq) (\text{nub } ys))$$

$$= (\text{nub } (k : ks)) ++ (\text{filter } (k \neq) (\text{nub } ys))$$

Example: nub

- ➔ Review of failed induction:
 - ➔ Our proposition was: $P(ks) = \text{for any } ys, \text{ nub } (ks ++ ys) = (\text{nub } ks) ++ (\text{nub } ys)$
 - ➔ If true, we would expect the inductive step to give us: $P(k : ks) = \text{for any } ys, \text{ nub } ((k : ks) ++ ys) = (\text{nub } (k : ks)) ++ (\text{nub } ys)$
 - ➔ In fact we actually got: $P(k : ks) = \text{for any } ys, \text{ nub } ((k : ks) ++ ys) = (\text{nub } (k : ks)) ++ (\text{filter } (k \neq) (\text{nub } ys))$
- ➔ Hence the induction failed

Induction: Beware!

- ➔ Good news:
 - ➔ If you can prove a statement by induction – then it's true!
- ➔ Bad news!
 - ➔ If an induction proof fails – it's not necessarily false!
- ➔ i.e. induction proofs can fail because:
 - ➔ the statement is not true
 - ➔ induction is not an appropriate proof technique for a given problem

Fermat's Last Theorem

- ➔ Fermat stated and didn't prove that:

$$x^n + y^n = z^n$$

had no positive integer solutions for $n \geq 3$

- ➔ Base case: it's been proved that $x^3 + y^3 = z^3$ has no solutions

- ➔ Assuming: $x^k + y^k = z^k$ has no solutions for $n \geq 3$

- ➔ There is no way of showing that $x^{k+1} + y^{k+1}$ does not have (only) $k + 1$ identical factors, from the assumption for the $n = k$ case

Induction over Data Structures

Given a conjecture $P(xs)$ to test:

- ➔ For a binary tree:

```
data BTree a
  = BEmpty
  | BNode (BTree a) a (BTree a)
```

- ➔ Base case: test true for $xs = BEmpty$
- ➔ Assume true for general cases: $xs = t1 :: BTree a$
and $xs = t2 :: BTree a$
- ➔ Induction step: prove true for $xs = BNode t1 z t2$
for any z

Induction in General

- ➔ In general we can perform induction across data structures (i.e. the same or similar proof works) if:
 1. the data structure has a least element or set of least elements
 2. an ordering exists between the elements of the data structure
- ➔ For example for a list:
 - ➔ `[]` is the least element
 - ➔ `xs < ys` if `length xs < length ys`

Well-founded Induction

- ➔ For this induction we need an ordering function $<$ for trees (as we already have for lists)
- ➔ $<$ is a well-founded relation on a set/datatype S if there is no infinite decreasing sequence. i.e. $t_1 < t_2 < t_3 < \dots$ where t_1 is a minimal element
- ➔ For trees, $t_1, t_2 :: \text{BTree } a$, $t_1 < t_2$ if $\text{numBTelem } t_1 < \text{numBTelem } t_2$

```
numBTelem :: BTelem a -> Int
numBTelem BEmpty = 0
numBTelem (BNode lhs x rhs)
    = 1 + (numBTelem lhs) + (numBTelem rhs)
```

Example: Tree Sort

- ➔ We are going to sort a list of integers using the tree data structure:

```
data BTree a
  = BEmpty
  | BNode (BTree a) a (BTree a)
```

- ➔ and function, `sortInts`:

```
sortInts :: [Int] -> [Int]
sortInts xs = flattenTree ts where
  ts = foldr insTree BEmpty xs
```

Example: Tree Sort

- `flattenTree` creates an inorder list of all elements of `t`

```
-- pre-condition: input tree is sorted
```

```
flattenTree :: BTree a -> [a]
```

```
flattenTree BEmpty = []
```

```
flattenTree (BNode lhs i rhs)
```

```
    = (flattenTree lhs) ++ [i]
```

```
      ++ (flattenTree rhs)
```

- `inorder`: = `lhs ++ element ++ rhs`
- `preorder`: = `element ++ lhs ++ rhs`
- `postorder`: = `lhs ++ rhs ++ element`

Example: Tree Sort

- ➔ `insTree` inserts an integer into the correct place in a sorted tree

```
-- pre-condition: input tree is pre-sorted,  
--   i is arbitrary Int  
-- post-condition: output is sorted tree  
--   containing all previous elements and i  
insTree :: Int -> BTree Int -> BTree Int  
insTree i BEmpty = (BNode BEmpty i BEmpty)  
insTree i (BNode t1 x t2)  
    | i < x      = (BNode (insTree i t1) x t2)  
    | otherwise = (BNode t1 x (insTree i t2))
```

Example: Tree Sort

- ➔ In order to show that `sortInts` does sort the integers – we need to show:
 - ➔ `flattenTree` does produce an inorder traversal of a tree
 - ➔ `insTree`
 - ➔ inserts the relevant element
 - ➔ keeps the tree sorted
 - ➔ does not modify any of the pre-existing elements

Induction: flattenTree

- Proposition: $P(t) = (\text{flattenTree } t)$ creates inorder listing of all elements of t
- Base case, $t = \text{BEmpty}$:

$$P(\text{BEmpty}) = (\text{flattenTree BEmpty}) = []$$

- Assume cases, $t = t1$ and $t2$, e.g. :
 $P(t1) = (\text{flattenTree } t1)$ creates inorder listing of all elements of $t1$

Induction: flattenTree

- ➔ Proposition: $P(t) = (\text{flattenTree } t)$ creates inorder listing of all elements of t
- ➔ Inductive step, $t = \text{BTnode } t1 \text{ } i \text{ } t2$:

$$\begin{aligned} P(\text{BTnode } t1 \text{ } i \text{ } t2) &= (\text{flattenTree } (\text{BTnode } t1 \text{ } i \text{ } t2)) \\ &= (\text{flattenTree } t1)++[i]++(\text{flattenTree } t2) \end{aligned}$$

Induction: insTree

- We can split the proof of correctness of `insTree` into two inductions:
 1. keeps the tree sorted after the element is inserted
 2. inserts the relevant element and does not modify any of the pre-existing elements

Induction 1: insTree

- A tree (`BTnode t1 x t2`) is sorted if
 - `t1` and `t2` are sorted
 - all elements in `t1` are less than `x`
 - all elements in `t2` are greater than or equal to `x`
- Define induction hypothesis to be:

$$P(t) = \text{for any } i, (\text{insTree } i \ t) \text{ is sorted}$$

Induction 1: insTree

→ Base case, $t = \text{BTreeEmpty}$:

→ $P(\text{BTreeEmpty}) = \text{for any } i,$

$\text{insTree } i \text{ BTreeEmpty} = \text{BTreeNode BTreeEmpty } i \text{ BTreeEmpty}$

is sorted

→ Assume $P(t)$ true for cases,

$\text{BTreeEmpty} \leq t < \text{BTreeNode } t1 \ i' \ t2$

→ e.g. $P(t1) = \text{for any } i,$

$(\text{insTree } i \ t1)$ is sorted

Induction 1: insTree

→ Induction step, case $t = \text{BTnode } t1 \ i' \ t2$:

→ $P(\text{BTnode } t1 \ i' \ t2) =$ for any i ,

$\text{insTree } i \ (\text{BTnode } t1 \ i' \ t2)$

$$= \begin{cases} \text{BTnode } (\text{insTree } i \ t1) \ i' \ t2 & : \text{ if } i < i' \\ \text{BTnode } t1 \ i' \ (\text{insTree } i \ t2) & : \text{ otherwise} \end{cases}$$

→ By our assumptions, we know that $t1$, $t2$, $(\text{insTree } i \ t1)$, $(\text{insTree } i \ t2)$ are sorted

Induction 2: insTree

→ $Q(t) =$ there exist some ms, ns such that:

→ $(ms++[i]++ns) = (\text{flattenTree } (\text{insTree } i \ t))$

→ $(\text{flattenTree } t) = (ms++ns)$

→ **Base case, $t = \text{BTEmpy}$:**

→ $Q(\text{BTEmpy}) =$ there exist some ms, ns such that:

$$(ms++[i]++ns)$$

$$= (\text{flattenTree } (\text{insTree } i \ \text{BTEmpy}))$$

$$= \text{flattenTree } (\text{BTnode } \text{BTEmpy } i \ \text{BTEmpy})$$

$$= (\text{flattenTree } \text{BTEmpy})++[i]++(\text{flattenTree } \text{BTEmpy})$$

$$= []++[i]++[]$$

→ i.e. $ms = ns = []$

→ $(\text{flattenTree } \text{BTEmpy}) = [] = (ms++ns)$

Induction 2: insTree

→ $Q(t) =$ there exist some ms, ns such that:

- $(ms++[i]++ns) = (\text{flattenTree } (\text{insTree } i \ t))$
 - $(\text{flattenTree } t) = (ms++ns)$
-

→ Assume cases, $t = t1, t2$:

→ $Q(t1) =$ there exist some $ms1, ns1$ such that:

- $(ms1++[i]++ns1) = (\text{flattenTree } (\text{insTree } i \ t1))$
- $(\text{flattenTree } t1) = (ms1++ns1)$

→ $Q(t2) =$ there exist some $ms2, ns2$ such that:

- $(ms2++[i]++ns2) = (\text{flattenTree } (\text{insTree } i \ t2))$
- $(\text{flattenTree } t2) = (ms2++ns2)$

Induction 2: insTree

→ (Part 1) Case $t = \text{BTnode } t1 \ i' \ t2$:

→ $Q(\text{BTnode } t1 \ i' \ t2) =$ there exist some ms, ns such that:

→ if $i < i'$:

$$(ms++[i]++ns)$$

$$= (\text{flattenTree } (\text{insTree } i \ (\text{BTnode } t1 \ i' \ t2)))$$

$$= \text{flattenTree } (\text{BTnode } (\text{insTree } i \ t1) \ i' \ t2)$$

$$= (\text{flattenTree } (\text{insTree } i \ t1))++[i']++(\text{flattenTree } t2)$$

→ i.e. $ms = ms1$ and $ns = ns1++[i']++ms2++ns2$

$$\text{flattenTree } (\text{BTnode } t1 \ i' \ t2)$$

$$= (\text{flattenTree } t1)++[i']++(\text{flattenTree } t2)$$

$$= ms1++ns1++[i']++ms2++ns2$$

$$= ms++ns$$

Induction 2: insTree

→ (Part 2) Case $t = \text{BTnode } t1 \ i' \ t2$:

→ $Q(\text{BTnode } t1 \ i' \ t2) =$ there exist some ms, ns such that:

→ if $i \geq i'$:

$$(ms++[i]++ns)$$

$$= (\text{flattenTree } (\text{insTree } i \ (\text{BTnode } t1 \ i' \ t2)))$$

$$= \text{flattenTree } (\text{BTnode } t1 \ i' \ (\text{insTree } i \ t2))$$

$$= (\text{flattenTree } t1)++[i']++(\text{flattenTree } (\text{insTree } i \ t2))$$

→ i.e. $ms = ms1++ns1++[i']++ms2$ and $ns = ns2$

$$\text{flattenTree } (\text{BTnode } t1 \ i' \ t2)$$

$$= (\text{flattenTree } t1)++[i']++(\text{flattenTree } t2)$$

$$= ms1++ns1++[i']++ms2++ns2$$

$$= ms++ns \quad \square$$