
Abstract Programming in Nuprl

“The Majority Vote Algorithm”

- Jason Hickey
 - November 23, 1993
-
-

Outline

- **Abstraction**
- **Majority vote algorithm**
- **Abstract implementation**
- **Solution to majority vote**
- **Concrete implementation**
- **Compare with other languages**

Themes of high-level programming

- **Abstraction**
 - Hides underlying implementation
 - Packages structure into a modules for reuse
 - Provides high-level features
 - Nuprl provides pretty syntax
 - Useful for hypertext
- **Inheritance**
 - Add features to an existing object
 - Customize features of an existing object

Transformation-real abstraction

- **We should be able to specify an abstraction without an implementation**
- **Virtual program is transformed to an executable program by replacing the virtual abstraction with a concrete implementation.**

Majority Vote

- **Given a bag X of size n and the majority k**
 - If b has at least k distinct values, delete them
 - Perform at most $n \div k$ times
 - Every value occurring more than $n \div k$ in X is in every reduced bag for X

```
P 0 ≤ j ≤ n ∧ B is a reduced bag → or b[0j - 1]
var j, B = 0, ∅
while j < n
do j ≠ n → j, B = j + 1, B ∪ {b[j]}
    Delete k distinct values from B, if possible
od
∅ B is a reduced bag → or b[0n - 1]
Remove all duplicates from B
```

Multiset

- **Multiset is the major data type–target for abstraction**
- **Follow presentation given in Manna and Waldinger**
- **Basic elements and operations**
 - empty set
 - add element
 - membership
 - equality
 - atom equality
 - well-formedness

Multiset Signature

car:U{i}

- × empty:car
- × gen:(car → Atom → car)
- × member:(car → Atom → P{i})
- × equal:(car → car → P{i})
- × syneq:(car → car → P{i})
- × atomeq:(Atom → Atom → P{i})
- × ind:MSetIndType{i}(Atom, car, empty, gen, syneq)
- × mem p:MSetMemType(Atom, car, empty, member, gen, equal, atomeq)
- × unique p:MSetUniqType(Atom, car, empty, gen, equal, syneq, atomeq)
- × equality p:MSetEqType(Atom, car, gen, equal)
- × atomeq p:MSetAEqType(Atom, atomeq)
- × syneq p:MSetSeqType(car, syneq)
- × B

Multiset Axioms

- **induction principle**
- **uniqueness (free generation)**
- **equality axioms**
- **membership axioms**

Multiset Theorems

* THM mset ind thm

$$\begin{aligned} & \forall \text{Atom}: \text{U}\{i\} \\ & \quad \forall m: \text{MSetSig}\{i\}(\text{Atom}) \\ & \quad \forall P: m.\text{car} \rightarrow P\{i\} \\ & \quad (\forall b: m.\text{car}. b \equiv m.\text{empty} \in m \Rightarrow P[b]) \\ & \quad \Rightarrow (\forall b: m.\text{car}. \forall x: \text{Atom}. P[b] \Rightarrow P[b \cup_m x]) \\ & \quad \Rightarrow \{\forall b: m.\text{car}. P[b]\} \end{aligned}$$

* THM mset mem empty

$$\forall \text{Atom}: \text{U}\{i\}. \forall m: \text{MSetSig}\{i\}(\text{Atom}). \forall x: \text{Atom}. \neg(x \in_m m.\text{empty})$$

* THM mset mem thm

$$\begin{aligned} & \forall \text{Atom}: \text{U}\{i\} \\ & \quad \forall m: \text{MSetSig}\{i\}(\text{Atom}) \\ & \quad \forall b: m.\text{car}. \forall x: \text{Atom}. \forall y: \text{Atom}. (y \in_m b \cup_m x) \iff \\ & \quad (x = y \in m.\text{Atom}) \vee (y \in_m b) \end{aligned}$$

* THM mset mem eq

$$\begin{aligned} & \forall \text{Atom}: \text{U}\{i\} \\ & \quad \forall m: \text{MSetSig}\{i\}(\text{Atom}). \forall b: m.\text{car}. \forall c: m.\text{car}. (b = c \text{ in } m) \Rightarrow \\ & \quad (\forall x: \text{Atom}. (x \in_m b) \iff (x \in_m c)) \end{aligned}$$

Two ways to define a size function

```
* THM mset size exists
 $\forall \text{Atom}:U\{i\}$ 
   $\forall m:\text{MSetSig}\{i\}(\text{Atom})$ 
     $\exists \text{sizef}:m.\text{car} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ 
      ( $\forall c:m.\text{car}.$   $\forall x:\text{Atom}.$   $\text{sizef } c < \text{sizef } c \cup m \ x$ )
       $\wedge (\forall b:m.\text{car}.$   $\text{sizef } b = 0 \iff (b = m.\text{empty in } m))$ 

* THM mset size exists 1
 $\forall \text{Atom}:U\{i\}.$   $\forall m:\text{MSetSig}\{i\}(\text{Atom}).$   $\forall b:m.\text{car}.$ 
   $\exists i:\mathbb{N}.$   $\text{MSetSizeProp}(\text{Atom}, m, b, i)$ 

* ML mset size prop ml
% Test the number of elements in the multiset %
add rec def MSetSizeProp(Atom, m, b, i)
  ((b = m.empty in m)  $\wedge$   $i = 0$ )
   $\vee (\neg(b = m.empty in m)$ 
     $\wedge (\forall c:m.\text{car}$ 
       $\forall x:\text{Atom}$ 
        (b = c  $\cup$  m x  $\in$  m.car)
         $\Rightarrow$   $\text{MSetSizeProp}(\text{Atom}, m, c, i - 1)))$  ;;
```

Other functions and Theorems

- **Decomposition**
- **Equality Theorems**
- **MSet union**
- **MSet difference**
- **etc.**

Abstraction

- **These definition are totally abstract**
- **Set of operations described by their types and properties**
- **Any implementation inhabiting the type can be used as a multiset**
- **If we are only interested in the logical part of the theory, we don't have to provide an implementation.**
- **(Axioms may be inconsistent).**

Return to Majority Vote

- **Define a predicate that is true when an element has the majority vote:**
 - $\text{MajVoteProp}[k](\text{Atom}, m, b, x)$
 - x has a majority in b
- **Define a predicate that is true when a multiset is a set of k distinct elements**
 - $\text{MajDistinctProp}[k](\text{Atom}, m, b)$
 - b is a set, and it has k distinct elements
- **Define a one-step reduction**
 - $\text{ReducedBag}[k](\text{Atom}, m, b \rightarrow c)$
 - There is a set d with k distinct elements and $c \gg d = b$

Majority Vote II

- **Define a predicate for a reduced bag**
 - $\text{MajRedBag}[k](\text{Atom}, m, b \rightarrow c)$
 - c has fewer than k distinct elements
 - all elements x having a majority vote in b have a majority vote in c

Theorems

- **The elements with a majority vote are in every reduced bag**
- **Normalization:**
 - if $b - c = d$ and $d \rightarrow e$ and c is a set of k distinct elements, then $b \rightarrow e$
- **Main Result:**
 - For every bag, there is a reduced bag
 - Proof is by induction on the size of the bag
 - If the bag has fewer than k distinct elements, done
 - Otherwise, remove k distinct elements. The result holds by induction.
- **Gries's algorithm has two bags for efficiency**

Comparison of the two developments

- **Gries logic separates computation from verification**
 - Logic is classical
 - Every proof is for a particular program
- **Nuprl combines computation and verification**
 - Better--why do more than necessary?
 - Worse--computation is hidden
 - Its hard to understand the complexity of an algorithm
 - The algorithm is accompanied by a proof

Transformation

- **It would be nice to try out this algorithm**
- **Brief presentation of an implementation based on lists.**
 - empty: []
 - add: cons
 - member: member
 - equality: there is a bijection $f: N \rightarrow N$ such that $b[i] = c[f\ i]$
uses nth_element function

Transformation II

- **All the properties of the multiset are properties of this simple implementation**
- **Its not a very efficient implementation**
- **Other options:**
 - function that returns the multiplicity of an element in a bag
- **Computation of majority vote**
 - $\text{ReducedBag}([1;1;2]) = [1]$

What I learned in this process

- **Time to learn the system--its huge!**
- **Existing documentation is good, but its incomplete**
- **Power of abstraction**
- **Power of transformation**
- **Delayed/lazy development**
- **All these things are possible, and they work!**
- **Is this the new way to program?**

Proofs

- **These proofs are tedious!**
- **Many of the proofs are small, and conceptually trivial**
 - " b: Bag " x: Atom b » x p 0
 - Three of four steps to prove this
- **Many such trivial proofs**
- **Many well-formedness proofs**
- **Auto tactic is limited to a fixed set of rules**

Incremental Development

- **Small modifications wipe out an entire theorem or library**
 - Save the proof tree?
- **Hypothesis numbering**
- **Libraries as first class objects**
 - Axioms as assumptions
 - Naming

Advantages

- **Higher level of abstraction than any other language I know**
- **Transformation is natural**
- **The problem with tedious proofs can be solved with appropriate ATP's**
- **Display forms are wonderful!**
- **Algorithms must obey their specification**

Other languages

- **Most languages do not have specifications**
- **Polya--how do you constrain the transformation?**
- **SPL--we can't deal with constraint management**

Example in C++

```
class MSet{  
private:  
    LinkedList car;  
public:  
    Bool aeq(int, int);  
    Bool eq(MSet x);  
    Bool member(Atom x);  
    void add(Atom x);  
    Atom head();  
    Atom tail();  
    MSet extract(Atom x);  
};
```


Features of Object Orientation

- **Abstraction**
- **Inheritance**
 - Add features
 - For example, add a size function to MSet
 - Can do this, possibly a little awkward

```
class MSetWithSize : public MSet{  
    int size();  
};
```

Inheritance II

Modify features

- **Improve efficiency**
- **Modify behavior**
- **Implement a mset as a subclass of a list**
- **Reuse similar class in a different way**

```
class MSetLinkedList : private LinkedList{  
    Bool eq(Atom b, Atom c);  
};
```

Conclusion

- **Powerful abstraction and transformation mechanism**
- **Majority vote algorithm has a simple solution**
- **Proofs can be tedious, but can be fixed with tactic help**
- **We can provide some features of an object oriented language, do we want them all?**
- **What is the correct model for a theory?**