

General datatypes and algorithms

Yves Bertot

October 2018

Objectives

- ▶ Explore more varied data-types
 - ▶ More cases and more components
 - ▶ With dependency between the components
- ▶ Explore more general recursion

Trees

- ▶ We already saw how to represent a programming language
 1. As many cases as there kinds of instructions
 2. Each instruction may have several sub-components
- ▶ As a smaller example we show a data-type of binary trees

```
Inductive btree (T : Type) : Type :=  
  Leaf | Node (val : T) (t1 t2 : btree T).
```

recursive programming on binary trees

```
Fixpoint rev_tree {T : Type} (t : btree T) : btree T :=
match t with
| Leaf => Leaf
| Node x t1 t2 => Node x (rev_tree t1) (rev_tree t2)
end.
```

Arguments Leaf {T}.

Arguments Node {T}.

recursive programming on binary trees (2)

```
Fixpoint count {T : Type} (p : T -> bool)
  (t : btree T) : nat :=
match t with
| Leaf => 0
| Note x t1 t2 =>
  (if p x then 1 else 0) + (count p t1 + count p t2)
end.
```

```
Definition size {T} (t : btree T) :=
  count (fun x => true) t.
```

- ▶ recursive calls are allowed on both sub-trees

Proof by induction on trees

- ▶ The same as for induction on natural numbers or lists
- ▶ Now there are two induction hypotheses
- ▶ Other kinds of “smaller” trees not easily handled

Example of a proof by induction

```
Lemma count_rev_tree {T} (p : T -> bool) t :  
  count p (rev_tree t) = count p t.
```

Proof.

```
induction t as [ | a t1 IH1 t2 IH2].
```

2 subgoals

```
count p (rev_tree Leaf) = count p Leaf
```

easy.

```
count (rev_tree (Node a t1 t2)) = count p (Node a t1 t2)
```

simpl.

```
(if p a then 1 else 0) +  
  (count p (rev_tree t2) + count p (rev_tree t1)) =  
  (if p a then 1 else 0) + (count p t1 + count p t2)
```

Example of a proof by induction (2)

rewrite IH1.

$$\begin{aligned} & (\text{if } p \text{ a then } 1 \text{ else } 0) + \\ & \quad (\text{count } p \text{ (rev_tree } t2) + \text{count } p \text{ } t1) = \\ & (\text{if } p \text{ a then } 1 \text{ else } 0) + (\text{count } p \text{ } t1 + \text{count } p \text{ } t2) \end{aligned}$$

rewrite IH2.

$$\begin{aligned} & (\text{if } p \text{ a then } 1 \text{ else } 0) + (\text{count } p \text{ } t2 + \text{count } p \text{ } t1) = \\ & (\text{if } p \text{ a then } 1 \text{ else } 0) + (\text{count } p \text{ } t1 + \text{count } p \text{ } t2) \end{aligned}$$

rewrite (Nat.add_comm (count p t2)).

$$\begin{aligned} & (\text{if } p \text{ a then } 1 \text{ else } 0) + (\text{count } p \text{ } t1 + \text{count } p \text{ } t2) = \\ & (\text{if } p \text{ a then } 1 \text{ else } 0) + (\text{count } p \text{ } t1 + \text{count } p \text{ } t2) \end{aligned}$$

easy.

Qed.

Induction on the size of trees

```
Definition btree_size_ind
  forall P : btree T -> Prop,
  (forall t, (forall t', size t' < size t -> P t') -> P t) ->
  forall t, P t
:=
well_founded_induction
  (wf_inverse_image _ _ _ size PeanoNat.Nat.lt_wf_0).
```

- ▶ Now only one induction hypothesis
- ▶ But it can be used for any tree, even with different values
- ▶ The same pattern can be used for programming

Preparatory lemmas for `bree_size_ind`

```
Lemma size1 T (a : T) t1 t2 : size t1 < size (Node a t1 t2).
```

```
Proof.
```

```
unfold size; simpl.
```

```
unfold lt; apply Peano.le_n_S, Nat.le_add_r.
```

```
Qed.
```

```
Lemma size2 T (a : T) t1 t2 : size t2 < size (Node a t1 t2).
```

```
Proof.
```

```
unfold size; simpl.
```

```
unfold lt; apply Peano.le_n_S; rewrite Nat.add_comm; apply Nat.l
```

```
Qed.
```

A proof using `btree_size_ind`

```
Lemma redo_count_rev_tree T (p : T -> bool) t :  
  count p (rev_tree t) = count p t.
```

Proof.

```
induction t as [t IH] using btree_size_ind.
```

```
destruct t as [ | a t1 t2].
```

```
  easy.
```

```
simpl.
```

```
rewrite IH.
```

```
  rewrite IH.
```

```
    rewrite (Nat.add_comm (count p t2)).
```

```
    easy.
```

```
  apply size1.
```

```
apply size2.
```

```
Qed.
```

Dependent components and certified data

- ▶ In pairs, the two components are independent
- ▶ Extension: sigma-types where the second components depends on the first one
- ▶ Example: bounded integers (n, h) where h is a proof that n is within bounds
- ▶ You need some for of “proof irrelevance”
- ▶ Used extensively in the *Mathematical Components* library
- ▶ Recursive programming on bounded integers is slightly more complex