COMP 410 Fall 2019 Final Practice Exam

The topics on this practice exam reflect **ONLY** those which have been covered since the last exam. The real final is **CUMULATIVE**, so it will include questions similar to the previous practice exams. However, the final will be biased towards the sort of questions below.

Prolog Metainterpreters

1.) Write a metainterpreter which shows the number of conjunctions which were needed to compute a particular solution. Example queries follow. Your metainterpreter needs to handle only the rules necessary to execute these queries below.

```
?- interpret ((X is 1 + 1, Y is 2 + 2), ConjunctionCount).
X = 2, Y = 4, ConjunctionCount = 1.
% This definition is used in the query below
% myLength([], 0).
% myLength([ |T], Len) :-
    myLength(T, TLen),
%
    Len is TLen + 1.
?- interpret(myLength([a, b, c, d], Len), ConjunctionCount).
Len = 4, ConjunctionCount = 4.
interpret(true, 0) :- !.
interpret(is(A, B), 0) :-
   !,
    is(A, B).
interpret((A, B), FinalCount) :-
   !,
    interpret(A, ACount),
    interpret(B, BCount),
   FinalCount is ACount + BCount + 1.
interpret(Call, Count) :-
    clause(Call, Body),
    interpret(Body, Count).
```

Constraint Logic Programming and Peano Arithmetic

2.) Using CLP constraints, write a query which finds all integers X and Y such that:

```
X >= 0
X <= 10
Y >= 0
Y <= 10
X + Y < 10

?- X #>= 0,
    X #=< 10,
    Y #>= 0,
    Y #=< 10,
    X + Y #< 10,
    Label([X, Y]).</pre>
```

3.) Via the Peano axioms, we can define natural numbers n as follows:

```
n ::= zero \mid succ(n)
```

...where succ (n) represents the successor to some other natural number n.

3.a.) Write out 5 as a natural number encoded with the Peano axioms.

```
succ(succ(succ(succ(zero)))))
```

3.b.) Assume the presence of a procedure add/3, which takes three natural numbers encoded with the Peano axioms. The first two arguments are inputs, and the third argument is the sum of the two inputs. Define a procedure multiply/3, which takes three natural numbers encoded with the Peano axioms. multiply/3 multiplies the first two arguments together, placing the result in the third argument. You may assume the first two inputs will always be provided. As a hint:

```
• 0 * n = 0
• 1 * n = n
• n * m = m + ((n - 1) * m) for n, m > 1

multiply(zero, _, zero) :- !.
multiply(_, zero, zero) :- !.
multiply(succ(zero), N, N) :- !.
multiply(N, succ(zero), N) :- !.
multiply(succ(N), M, Result) :-
multiply(N, M, Rest),
add(M, Rest, Result).
```

Mercury

4.) Write a procedure named sublist which will take a list and nondeterministically produce lists which contain contain elements in the input list. Example queries follow:

```
?- sublist([], List).
List = [].
?- sublist([1], List).
List = [1];
List = [].
?- sublist([1, 2], List).
List = [1, 2];
List = [1];
List = [2];
List = [].
```

Be sure to write appropriate pred and mode annotations. You only need to write mode annotations corresponding to the queries above.

```
:- pred sublist(list(A), list(A)).
% :- pred sublist(list(int), list(int)). % also acceptable
:- mode sublist(in, out) is multi.
sublist([], []).
sublist([H|T], [H|Rest]) :-
    sublist(T, Rest).
sublist([_|T], Rest) :-
    sublist(T, Rest).
```

5.) Write a procedure that conforms to the following pred and mode annotations:

```
:- pred foo(int, int).
:- mode foo(in, out) is multi.
:- mode foo(in, in) is semidet.
foo(1, 2).
foo(_, 3).
```

6.) Consider the following Mercury code, which does not compile as written:

```
:- type my_type(A) ---> foo(A); bar(A, A); baz(A, A, A).
:- pred something(my_type(A), A).
:- mode something(in, out) is det.
something(foo(A), A).
something(bar(A, ), A).
```

6.a) Why doesn't this code compile?

The mode annotation claims that this code is deterministic for (in, out), but currently it's only semideterministic for (in, out). The code is missing a case for baz.

6.b) It is possible to get this code to compile by changing the type definition. Write a revised type definition below which will allow this code to compile. You may assume that this code is in complete isolation, so changing the type definition won't break anything elsewhere.

```
:- type my type(A) ---> foo(A); bar(A, A).
```

6.c) It is possible to get this code to compile by changing the mode annotation. Write a revised mode annotation below which will allow this code to compile. As before, you may assume the code is in complete isolation.

```
:- mode something(in, out) is semidet.
```

6.d) It is possible to get this code to compile by adding another line of code at the end. Write this added line below. This line may do whatever it wants, as long as it allows the code to compile. As before, you may assume the code is in complete isolation.

```
something(baz(A, _{-}, _{-}), A).
```