LVA 185.A05 Advanced Functional Programming (SS 2020) Self-Assessment Test 3

Monday, 30 March 2020

Topics: Part II, Chapter 4; Part IV, Chapters 9, 10, 11, and 14 Functional Pearls, Equational Reasoning, Monoids, Functors, Applicatives, Kinds (No submission, no grading)

Part II, Chapter 4 'Equational Reasoning for Functional Pearls'

- 1. The symbol = is used by both functional programming languages like Haskell and imperative/objectorientied programming languages like C or Java. How do the 'functional' and the 'imperative/object-oriented' = differ from each other?
- 2. What does equational reasoning refer to. Explain and illustrate it by a striking example.
- 3. Where are the roots of equational reasoning?
- 4. Referential transparency supports equational reasoning. Why?
- 5. Why is equational reasoning important for functional pearls?
- 6. What constitutes a *functional pearl*? Can you illustrate your answer by means of an example?
- 7. What is meant if someone speaks of 'wholemeal' programming? What are its benefits?
- 8. What 'tricks' does Richard Bird implement in his Soduko solver for gaining efficiency over the initial solver?
- 9. What is 'lawful' programming? Illustrate your answer by an example.
- 10. What is the link of Jon Bentley to functional pearls programming?
- 11. Gofer, an overloaded term. Why?
- 12. What is the SFN problem?
- 13. Is solving the SFN problem efficiently of practical relevance? Why? Or, why not?
- 14. The MNSS problem and the MSS problem are closely related. Why? In what respect?
- 15. Comparing the initial algorithms for the *MNSS* and *MSS* problem, which one is computationally more complex? Why?

Part IV, Chapter 9 'Monoids'

- 1. What is a monoid? What can be made an instance of Monoid?
- 2. Monoid foresees an operation called mappend for its instances. Is the name mappend well chosen? Why? Or, why not?
- 3. Are their other names related to Monoid which could be considered weak choices? Why?
- 4. What are the monoid laws? What do they require?
- 5. Who is in charge that Monoid instances satisfy the monoid laws?
- 6. Why is it not just a matter of taste, an issue of a 'good' or 'bad' programming style but dangerous to implement a monoid instance failing the monoid laws? Illustrate your reasoning by an example.
- 7. The implementation of mappend of proper monoids must be:
 - (a) commutative.
 - (b) associative.
 - (c) distributive.

Right or wrong?

- 8. The below can be made monoids:
 - (a) Int
 - (b) Bool
 - (c) Char
 - (d) Ordering
 - (e) IO
 - (f) [Int]
 - (g) [a]
 - (h) []
 - (i) Maybe Int
 - (j) Maybe a
 - (k) Maybe
 - (l) Either Int
 - (m) Either a
 - (n) Either
 - (o) (Int -> Int)
 - (p) (a -> Int)
 - (q) (Int \rightarrow b)
 - (r) (a -> b)
 - (s) (a ->)
 - (t) (-> b)
 - (u) (->)

Right or wrong? Meaningful or not? Why?

- 9. Implement a monoid instance of your choice. Prove that it is a proper monoid.
- 10. Monoids are made for folding values. Why?

Part IV, Chapter 10 'Functors'

- 1. What is a functor?
- 2. What (in principle) can ben made an instance of Functor?
- 3. Give the default implementation of the list functor.
- 4. The below can be made functors:
 - (a) Int
 - (b) Bool
 - (c) Char
 - (d) Ordering
 - (e) IO
 - (f) [Int]
 - (g) [a]
 - (h) []
 - (i) Maybe Int
 - (j) Maybe a
 - $\left(k
 ight)$ Maybe
 - (l) Either Int
 - $\left(m\right)$ Either a
 - (n) Either
 - (o) (Int -> Int)
 - (p) (a -> Int)
 - (q) (Int -> b)
 - (r) (a -> b)
 - (s) (a ->)
 - (t) (-> b)
 - (u) (->)

Right or wrong? Meaningful or not? Why?

- 5. fmap :: (a -> b) -> f a -> f b can be read in a *curried* and *uncurried* fashion. Explain the two views of fmap.
- 6. Show that

fmap (h . g) = fmap h . fmap g
is type-correct.

- 7. What is the meaning of fmap of the map functor?
- 8. Give the standard implementation of the Maybe functor together with the laws it has to satisfy.
- 9. Prove that the standard implementation of the Maybe functor satisfies the functor laws.
- 10. Consider:

data Either a b = Left a | Right b
instance Functor (Either a) where
fmap g (Right x) = Right (g x)
fmap g (Left x) = Left (g x)

Does the instance implementation satisfy the functor laws? If yes, is it meaningful, desirable? Explain your reasoning.

Part IV, Chapter 11 'Applicatives'

- 1. What is an applicative?
- 2. What functions have to be implemented for an applicative?
- 3. The below can be made applicatives:
 - (a) Int
 - (b) Bool
 - (c) Char
 - (d) Ordering
 - (e) IO
 - (f) [Int]
 - (g) [a]
 - (h) []
 - (i) Maybe Int
 - (j) Maybe a
 - $\left(k \right)$ Maybe
 - (l) Either Int
 - (m) Either a
 - (n) Either
 - (o) (Int -> Int)
 - (p) (a -> Int)
 - (q) (Int -> b)
 - (r) (a -> b)
 - (s) (a ->)
 - (t) (-> b)
 - (u) (->)

Right or wrong? Meaningful or not? Why?

- 4. The sets of monoids and applicatives defined in Haskell programs must be disjoint. Why?
- 5. The list applicative and list comprehension are closely linked to each other. Why? In what respect?
- 6. Make (Either a) an applicative.
- 7. Show that the defining equations of the applicative operations pure and (<*>) of your (Either a) instance are type correct. Annotate the laws with the (most general) type information applying.
- 8. Prove that your (Either a) instance of Applicative satisfies the applicative laws.
- 9. Complete step by step the below computation sequence assuming that the applicative oerations are the ones of the map applicative:

(\x y z -> [x,y,z]) <\$> (+3) <*> (*2) <*> (/2) \$ 5
->> (fmap (\\x y z -> [x,y,z]) (+3)) <*> (*2) <*> (/2) \$ 5
->> ((\x y z -> [x,y,z]) . (+3)) <*> (*2) <*> (/2) \$ 5
->> ...
->> [8.0,10.0,2.5]

10. The list and the ziplist applicative are different **Applicative** instances of lists. How do they differ? Can you ilustrate your answer by some example?

Part IV, Chapter 14 'Kinds'

- 1. What are *kinds*? What are they good for?
- 2. What is the kind of
 - (a) Maybe Int
 - (b) Maybe a
 - (c) Maybe
 - (d) Either Int
 - (e) Either a
 - (f) Either
 - (g) (Float -> Int)
 - (h) (a -> b)
 - (i) (a->)
 - (j) (->)
 - (k) []
 - (l) [a]
 - (m) [Int]

3. Give types of the below kinds, where possible:

```
(a) *
(b) * -> *
(c) * -> * -> *
(d) * -> * -> * -> *
(e) (*,*)
(f) (*,*,*)
(g) (*,*,*,*)
(h) (*,*) -> *
(i) (* -> *) -> *
(j) [*]
```

4. Let t_1, t_2, t_3 be of kind $*, * \rightarrow *$ and $* \rightarrow * \rightarrow *$, respectively. Are t_1, t_2, t_3 eligible (in principle) as instances of

- (a) Eq?
- $(b) \; \texttt{Monoid}?$
- (c) Functor?
- (d) Applicative?

Why? Or, why not?

```
5. There can be
```

- (a) applicatives
- (b) functors and applicatives
- (c) monoids and functors

differing in their kind. Right or wrong? Why?