

Functional Data Structures

Exercise Sheet 12

Exercise 12.1 Amortized Complexity

A “stack with multipop” is a list with the following two interface functions:

fun *push* :: “ $'a \Rightarrow 'a \text{ list} \Rightarrow 'a \text{ list}$ ” **where**
“*push* $x \ xs = x \# \ xs$ ”

fun *pop* :: “ $\text{nat} \Rightarrow 'a \text{ list} \Rightarrow 'a \text{ list}$ ” **where**
“*pop* $n \ xs = \text{drop } n \ xs$ ”

You may assume

definition *T_push* :: “ $'a \Rightarrow 'a \text{ list} \Rightarrow \text{nat}$ ” **where**
“*T_push* $x \ xs = 1$ ”

definition *T_pop* :: “ $\text{nat} \Rightarrow 'a \text{ list} \Rightarrow \text{nat}$ ” **where**
“*T_pop* $n \ xs = \text{min } n \ (\text{length } xs)$ ”

Use the potential method to show that the amortized complexity of *push* and *pop* is constant.

If you need any properties of the auxiliary functions *length*, *drop* and *min*, you should state them but you do not need to prove them.

Exercise 12.2 Sparse Binary Numbers

Implement operations *carry*, *inc*, and *add* on sparse binary numbers, analogously to the operations *link*, *ins*, and *merge* on binomial heaps.

Show that the operations have logarithmic worst-case complexity.

type_synonym *rank* = *nat*
type_synonym *snat* = “*rank list*”

abbreviation *invar* :: “*snat* $\Rightarrow \text{bool}$ ” **where** “*invar* $s \equiv \text{sorted_wrt } (<) \ s$ ”

definition α :: “*snat* $\Rightarrow \text{nat}$ ” **where** “ $\alpha \ s = \text{sum_list } (\text{map } ((\text{ } ^ 2) \ s))$ ”

lemmas [*simp*] = *sorted_wrt_append*

```

fun carry :: "rank  $\Rightarrow$  snat  $\Rightarrow$  snat"

lemma carry_invar[simp]:
  assumes "invar rs"
  shows "invar (carry r rs)"

lemma carry_ $\alpha$ :
  assumes "invar rs"
  and " $\forall r' \in \text{set } rs. r \leq r'$ "
  shows " $\alpha$  (carry r rs) =  $2^{\widehat{r}}$  +  $\alpha$  rs"

definition inc :: "snat  $\Rightarrow$  snat"

lemma inc_invar[simp]: "invar rs  $\Longrightarrow$  invar (inc rs)"

lemma inc_ $\alpha$ [simp]: "invar rs  $\Longrightarrow$   $\alpha$  (inc rs) = Suc ( $\alpha$  rs)"

fun add :: "snat  $\Rightarrow$  snat  $\Rightarrow$  snat"

lemma add_invar[simp]:
  assumes "invar rs1"
  and "invar rs2"
  shows "invar (add rs1 rs2)"

lemma add_ $\alpha$ [simp]:
  assumes "invar rs1"
  and "invar rs2"
  shows " $\alpha$  (add rs1 rs2) =  $\alpha$  rs1 +  $\alpha$  rs2"

thm sorted_wrt_less_sum_mono_lowerbound

lemma size_snat:
  assumes "invar rs"
  shows " $2^{\text{length } rs} \leq \alpha$  rs + 1"

fun T_carry :: "rank  $\Rightarrow$  snat  $\Rightarrow$  nat"

definition T_inc :: "snat  $\Rightarrow$  nat"

lemma T_inc_bound:
  assumes "invar rs"
  shows " $T\_inc$  rs  $\leq \log 2$  ( $\alpha$  rs + 1) + 2"

fun T_add :: "snat  $\Rightarrow$  snat  $\Rightarrow$  nat"

lemma T_add_bound:
  fixes rs1 rs2
  defines "n1  $\equiv$   $\alpha$  rs1"
  defines "n2  $\equiv$   $\alpha$  rs2"

```

assumes *INVAR*S: “*invar rs₁*” “*invar rs₂*”
shows “*T_add rs₁ rs₂ ≤ 4*log 2 (n₁ + n₂ + 1) + 2*”

Homework 12.1 A counter with increment and decrement operations

Submission until Thursday, July 18, 23:59pm.

A k -bit counter can be formalised as a list of booleans. An increment operation for such a counter is defined as follows:

```
fun incr :: “bool list ⇒ bool list” where
  “incr [] = []” |
  “incr (False#bs) = True # bs” |
  “incr (True#bs) = False # incr bs”
```

The running time of this increment operation can be defined as follows:

```
fun T_incr :: “bool list ⇒ nat” where
  “T_incr [] = 0” |
  “T_incr (False#bs) = 1” |
  “T_incr (True#bs) = T_incr bs + 1”
```

For such a k -bit counter with only an increment operation, an amortised analysis of the running time of a sequence of n increment operations reveals it is $O(n)$. However, if the counter has a decrement operation, then for a sequence of n operations, a lower bound for the running time must be at least linear in the product nk . This holds regardless of the time required to perform the decrement operation. In fact this holds for any operation *decr* satisfying the following two assumption:

```
decr ((replicate (k-1) False) @ [True]) = (replicate (k-(Suc 0)) True) @ [False]
length (decr bs) = length bs
```

Above, *replicate n x* is the list $[x, \dots, x]$ of length n . The following locale specifies a counter with such an operation.

```
locale counter_with_decr =
  fixes decr::“bool list ⇒ bool list” and k::“nat”
  assumes
    decr[simp]: “decr ((replicate (k-(Suc 0)) False) @ [True]) =  

      (replicate (k-(Suc 0)) True) @ [False]” and
    decr_len_eq[simp]: “length (decr bs) = length bs” and
    k[simp]: “1 ≤ k”
  begin
```

In this homework you are required to show that indeed the running time of a sequence of operations of length n is $\Theta(nk)$. You can assume that the running time of the decrement operation is 1.

```
fun T_decr::“bool list ⇒ nat” where
  “T_decr _ = 1”
```

To prove the required running time, you will need to prove an upper and a lower bound on the running time that are linear in nk . To prove either bound, you will need to reason about lists whose elements are of the type op . Such lists correspond to lists of operations on the counter.

datatype $op = Decr \mid Incr$

The running time of a list of operations is given by the function T_exec , is defined as follows:

fun $exec1::“op \Rightarrow (bool\ list \Rightarrow bool\ list)”$ **where**
 $“exec1\ Incr = incr”$ |
 $“exec1\ Decr = decr”$

fun $T_exec1::“op \Rightarrow (bool\ list \Rightarrow nat)”$ **where**
 $“T_exec1\ Incr = T_incr”$ |
 $“T_exec1\ Decr = T_decr”$

fun $T_exec :: “op\ list \Rightarrow bool\ list \Rightarrow nat”$ **where**
 $“T_exec\ []\ bs = 0”$ |
 $“T_exec\ (op\ \#\ ops)\ bs = (T_exec1\ op\ bs + T_exec\ ops\ (exec1\ op\ bs))”$

Prove the following upper bound on the running time of sequences of operations:

theorem $inc_dec_seq_ubound: “length\ bs = k \Longrightarrow T_exec\ ops\ bs \leq length\ ops * length\ bs”$

To prove the lower bound, you will need to define a function $oplist$ that, given a natural number n , constructs a list of operations whose running time is at least linear in nk for at least one counter initial configuration, $bs0$.

fun $oplist :: “nat \Rightarrow op\ list”$

definition $bs0$

In the following, the two-element list induction scheme and nat case distinction might be helpful.

lemma $induct_list012[case_names\ empty\ single\ multi]:$
 $“P\ [] \Longrightarrow (\bigwedge x. P\ [x]) \Longrightarrow (\bigwedge y\ xs. P\ xs \Longrightarrow P\ (x\ \#\ y\ \#\ xs)) \Longrightarrow P\ xs”$
by $(rule\ List.induct_list012)$

lemma $case_nat012[case_names\ zero\ one\ two]:$
 $“\llbracket n = 0 \Longrightarrow P; n = 1 \Longrightarrow P; \bigwedge n'. n = Suc\ (Suc\ n') \Longrightarrow P \rrbracket \Longrightarrow P”$
by $(metis\ One_nat_def\ nat.exhaust)$

You are required to prove the following lower bound:

theorem $inc_dec_seq_lbound: “length\ (oplist\ n) * k \leq 2 * (T_exec\ (oplist\ n)\ bs0)”$