

Verifying Richard Bird's "On building trees of minimum height"

L.T. van Binsbergen J.P. Pizani Flor

Department of Information and Computing Sciences, Utrecht University

Wednesday 26th June, 2013

The pearl
The algorithm
Implementation



Universiteit Utrecht

“Combining a list of trees”

Given a list of trees, build a tree (of minimum height) that has the elements of the list as frontier (preserving order).

- ▶ We want to minimize *cost*, where *cost* means:

$$\text{cost } t = (\max i : 1 \leq i \leq N : \text{depth}_i + h_i)$$

- ▶ depth_i is the length of a path from root to tip i
- ▶ h_i is the height of the i^{th} element of the input list

The pearl

The algorithm
Implementation



Universiteit Utrecht

Simpler but equivalent problem

The problem can be stated with natural numbers instead of trees being the elements of the input list.

- ▶ $hs = [h_1, h_2, \dots, h_N]$
- ▶ Each element of the list is then considered the *height* of the tree.
- ▶ We use this “simplified” form of the problem in an example, but the “full” form is the one verified.

The pearl

The algorithm

Implementation



Universiteit Utrecht

LMP - Local Minimum Pair

The pearl

The algorithm

Implementation

The basis of the algorithm proposed is the concept of a “local minimum pair”:

- ▶ A pair (t_i, t_{i+1}) in a sequence $t_i (1 \leq i \leq N)$ with heights h_i such that:
 - $\max(h_{i-1}, h_i) \geq \max(h_i, h_{i+1}) < \max(h_{i+1}, h_{i+2})$
- ▶ An alternative set of conditions, used in the proof of correctness:
 - $h_{i+1} \leq h_i < h_{i+2}$, or
 - $(h_i < h_{i+1} < h_{i+2}) \wedge (h_{i-1} \geq h_{i+1})$



Universiteit Utrecht

Greedy algorithm - example

The pearl

The algorithm

Implementation

- ▶ There is *at least* one LMP, the rightmost one.
- ▶ The algorithm combines the rightmost LMP at each stage.
- ▶ Example in the whiteboard...



Universiteit Utrecht

Correctness of the algorithm

The correctness of this algorithm relies fundamentally on the so-called “Lemma 1”:

“**Suppose** that (t_i, t_{i+1}) in an *Imp* in a given sequence of trees $t_j (1 \leq j \leq N)$. **Then** the sequence can be combined into a tree T of **minimum height** in which (t_i, t_{i+1}) are **siblings**.”

The pearl

The algorithm

Implementation



Universiteit Utrecht

Correctness of the algorithm

The correctness of this algorithm relies fundamentally on the so-called “Lemma 1”:

“**Suppose** that (t_i, t_{i+1}) in an *Imp* in a given sequence of trees $t_j (1 \leq j \leq N)$. **Then** the sequence can be combined into a tree T of **minimum height** in which (t_i, t_{i+1}) are **siblings**.”

- ▶ In the paper, the proof of this lemma is done *by contradiction* and case analysis on whether the trees are *critical*.

The pearl

The algorithm

Implementation



Universiteit Utrecht

Correctness of the algorithm

How we expressed “Lemma 1” in Coq:

```
Theorem Lemm1: forall (l s : list tree) (a b : tree)
  (sub : l = [a;b] ++ s),
  lmp a b l ->
  exists (t : tree), siblings t a b -> minimum l t.
```

Proof.

Admitted.

```
Fixpoint siblings (t : tree) (a b : tree) : Prop :=
  match t with
  | Tip _      => False
  | Bin _ x y => a = x /\ b = y \/ siblings x a b \/ siblings y a b
  end.
```

```
Definition minimum (l : list tree) (t : tree) : Prop :=
  forall (t' : tree), flatten t' = l -> ht t <= ht t'.
```

The pearl

The algorithm

Implementation



The “build” function and *foldl1*

The “top level” function of the algorithm looks like this:

```
build = foldl1 join . foldr step []
```

- ▶ The first big issue we face is how to describe a **total** version of *foldl1* in Coq.

The pearl

The algorithm

Implementation



The “build” function and *foldl1*

The “top level” function of the algorithm looks like this:

```
build = foldl1 join . foldr step []
```

- ▶ The first big issue we face is how to describe a **total** version of *foldl1* in Coq.
- ▶ We modeled this by passing a proof that the list is non-empty:

```
Definition foldl1 (f : tree -> tree -> tree) (l : list tree)
(P : l <> nil) : tree.
  case l as [| x xs].
    contradiction P.
    reflexivity.
  apply fold_left with (B := tree).
  exact f. exact xs. exact x.
Defined.
```

The pearl
The algorithm
Implementation



Non-structural recursion in *step*

The other BIG issue faced by us is the use of non-structural recursion in the function *step*:

```
step t [] = [t]
step t [u]
  | ht t < ht u = [t,u]
  | otherwise   = [join t u]
step t (u : v : ts)
  | ht t < ht u = t : u : v : ts
  | ht t < ht v = step (join t u) (v : ts)
  | otherwise   = step t (step (join u v) ts)
```

We tried:

- ▶ “Function” keyword.
- ▶ *Bove-Capretta*
 - Termination predicate and *step* are *mutually recursive*.
- ▶ Define *step* using structural recursion on a natural $n \geq \text{len}(l)$.

The pearl

The algorithm

Implementation

