

15–150: Principles of Functional Programming: *Totality of depth*

Michael Erdmann

Spring 2024

This note proves totality of the function `depth` discussed in lecture. Here is the relevant code:

```
datatype tree = Empty | Node of tree * int * tree

(* depth : tree -> int
   REQUIRES: true
   ENSURES: depth(T) computes the depth of tree T.
  *)

fun depth (Empty : tree) : int = 0
  | depth (Node(t1, _, t2) : tree) : int = 1 + Int.max(depth t1, depth t2)
```

Theorem: `depth` is total.

Proof: Establishing totality of `depth` means proving that `depth(T)` reduces to a value (of type `int`) for all values `T : tree`. We will prove that assertion by structural induction on `T`.

BASE CASE: `T = Empty`.

NEED TO SHOW: `depth (Empty)` reduces to a value (of type `int`).

SHOWING: `depth (Empty)`

$\implies 0$ [first clause of `depth`]

0 is a value (of type `int`), so we have established the base case.

INDUCTIVE CASE: `T = Node(t1, x, t2)`, for some values `t1:tree`, `x:int`, and `t2:tree`.

INDUCTION HYPOTHESIS: We have one hypothesis for each subtree:

(1) `depth(t1)` \leftrightarrow `d1`, for some value `d1 : int`

(2) `depth(t2)` \leftrightarrow `d2`, for some value `d2 : int`.

NEED TO SHOW: `depth(Node(t1, x, t2))` \leftrightarrow `d` for some value `d : int`.

SHOWING:

`depth (Node(t1, x, t2))`

$\implies 1 + \text{Int.max}(\text{depth } t_1, \text{depth } t_2)$ [second clause of `depth`]

$\implies 1 + \text{Int.max}(d_1, \text{depth } t_2)$ [Induction Hypothesis (1)]

$\implies 1 + \text{Int.max}(d_1, d_2)$ [Induction Hypothesis (2)]

$\implies d$ [for some value `d:int`, assuming SML math is correct (*)]

(*) Relevant here in particular is that the functions `Int.max` and `+` are total.

That establishes the inductive case.

The base case and the inductive case together establish the Theorem, by a principle of structural induction for type `tree`.