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1 Introduction

Suppose the tail segments of a given list are sorted into dictionary order. What segment comes last? For example, the last tail of ‘testing’ is ‘ting’ and the last tail of ‘redared’ is ‘redared’ itself since ‘red’ precedes ‘redared’ in dictionary order.

The function $lt$ for returning the last tail is specified by

$$lt = \sqcup / \cdot tails,$$

(1)

where $tails$ returns the set of tail segments of a list and $\sqcup /$ distributes $\sqcup$ over a set. The binary operator $\sqcup$ returns the larger of its arguments under the lexical ordering $\sqsubseteq$ (defined later). Given a suitable implementation of $\sqsubseteq$, equation (1) can be used to compute $lt$ but the result is a quadratic time algorithm even with lazy evaluation. Our purpose is to derive a linear time functional algorithm. Given such a simply stated problem, this turns out to be surprisingly difficult.

2 First steps

Our strategy is to head for an inductive characterisation of $lt$. Since $tails [] = \{[]\}$, we get $lt [ ] = [ ]$. For the general case we can try to express either $lt ([a] \mapsto x)$ or $lt (x \mapsto [a])$ in terms of $a$ and $lt x$. But since, for example, the largest tail of ‘zebra’ (namely, ‘zebra’ itself) cannot be expressed in terms of ‘z’ and the largest tail of ‘ebra’ (namely, ‘ra’), it is apparent that the first method cannot work. So we will look for an $\oplus$ such that

$$lt (x \mapsto [a]) = lt x \oplus a.$$

(2)

To this end, let $lt x = y$ and $lt (x \mapsto [a]) = z \mapsto [a]$. For (2) to be satisfied we need $z \in tails y$. We reason

$$lt x = y \land lt (x \mapsto [a]) = z \mapsto [a]$$

$\Rightarrow$ \{(1), since $y$ and $z$ are both tails of $x$\}

$$z \sqsubseteq y \land y \mapsto [a] \sqsubseteq z \mapsto [a].$$

To proceed we need the definition of the lexical ordering $\sqsubseteq$:

$$z \sqsubseteq y = z \in \text{inits } y \lor z < y$$

$$z < y = (\exists k : 0 \leq k < \min\{\#z, \#y\} : z \uparrow k = y \uparrow k \land z!k < y!k).$$
Here, $x \uparrow k$ is the initial segment of $x$ of length $k$ and $x!k$ is the element of $x$ at position $k$ (counting from 0). The function $\text{inits}$ returns the set of initial segments of a list. The following two properties of $\subseteq$ are easily proved from the definition and we omit details:

$$z \in \text{inits } y \land z \neq y \Rightarrow (a \leq \text{hd} (y \rightarrow z) \equiv z + [a] \subseteq y + [a]) \quad (3)$$

$$z \notin \text{inits } y \land z \subseteq y \Rightarrow z + [a] \subseteq y + [a]. \quad (4)$$

Here, $y \rightarrow z$ (pronounced $y$ 'drop' $z$) is what remains when initial segment $z$ of $y$ is removed from $y$, and $\text{hd} x$ returns the first element of the nonempty sequence $x$. In (4) the strict lexical order $\subset$ is defined by $z \subset y = z \subseteq y \land z \neq y$. The conclusion of (4) can be strengthened to read: $z + u \subseteq y + v$ for all $u$ and $v$.

Now we can continue:

$$z \subseteq y \land y + [a] \subseteq z + [a]$$

\Rightarrow \quad \{\text{contrapositive of (4)}\}

$$z \subseteq y \land (y \subseteq z \lor z \in \text{inits } y)$$

\Rightarrow \quad \{\text{since } z \subseteq y \land y \subseteq z \Rightarrow z = y\}

$$z \in \text{inits } y$$

\Rightarrow \quad \{\text{since one of } y \text{ and } z \text{ is a tail of the other}\}

$$z \in \text{tails } y.$$}

Hence we get the desired result. In fact we have that $z \in \{y\} \cup \text{rims } y$, where we define

$$\text{rims } y = (\text{inits } y \cap \text{tails } y) - \{y\}.$$}

To determine $\emptyset$, suppose $lt x = y \neq []$ and let $\text{rims } y = [z_0, z_1, \ldots, z_n]$ be arranged in order of decreasing length. We have $\text{rims } z_i = [z_{i+1}, \ldots, z_n]$ for $0 \leq i < n$. In particular, if we define $\text{rim } w$ to be the longest element of $\text{rims } w$, then $z_{i+1} = \text{rim } z_i$ for $0 \leq i < n$.

We now claim that if $y = \text{lt } x$, then

$$0 \leq i < j \leq n \Rightarrow \text{hd} (y \rightarrow z_i) \leq \text{hd} (y \rightarrow z_j). \quad (5)$$

To prove (5), observe that both $z_i$ and $z_j$ are initial segments of $y$, so $y = z_i + [a] + u$ and $y = z_j + [b] + v$ for some $u$ and $v$, where $a = \text{hd} (y \rightarrow z_i)$ and $b = \text{hd} (y \rightarrow z_j)$. Since $z_i$ and $z_j$ are also both tails of $y$, and $z_j$ is shorter than $z_i$, we have that $z_j$ is a tail of $z_i$. Hence $z_j + [a] + u$ is a tail of $y$. But since $y$ is a largest tail, $z_j + [a] + u \subseteq y = z_j + [b] + v$, and so $a \leq b$ by definition of $\subseteq$.

We can exploit (5) in conjunction with (3) to get, in the case $y \neq []$,

$$a \leq \text{hd} (y \rightarrow \text{rim } y) \land z \in \text{rims } y \Rightarrow z + [a] \subseteq y + [a],$$

Hence we have

$$lt (x + [a]) = \begin{cases} [a], & \text{if } y = [] \\ y + [a], & \text{if } a \leq \text{hd} (y \rightarrow \text{rim } y) \\ lt (\text{rim } y + [a]), & \text{if } a > \text{hd} (y \rightarrow \text{rim } y) \end{cases}$$
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Thus we can define an $\oplus$ satisfying (2) by taking $[] \oplus a = [a]$ and for $y \neq []$

$$y \oplus a = \begin{cases} 
y \oplus [a], & \text{if } a \leq \text{hd} (y \rightarrow z) \\
lt (z \oplus [a]), & \text{otherwise} \\
\text{where } z = \text{rim } y
\end{cases}$$  \hspace{1cm} (6)$$

There is an important optimisation we can make in the case $a > \text{hd} (y \rightarrow z)$ of (6). Suppose $y = z \oplus w$ (so $w$ is a tail of $y$ and $y \rightarrow z = w$). We claim that

$$\#w \leq \#z \Rightarrow \lt (z \oplus [a]) = \lt (\text{tail } w \oplus [a]),$$

where $\text{tail } ([b] \oplus w) = w$. For the proof, note that $\#w \leq \#z$ implies $w \in \text{tails } z$ since both $z$ and $w$ are tails of $y$. By assumption $\text{hd } w < a$, so $u \oplus w \oplus [a] \subseteq u \oplus [a]$ for any $u$ and, in particular, for any $u$ such that $u \oplus w \in \text{tails } z$. Hence $\lt (z \oplus [a])$ is no longer than $\text{tail } w \oplus [a]$.

It follows that we can replace (6) by

$$y \oplus a = \begin{cases} 
y \oplus [a], & \text{if } a \leq \text{hd} (y \rightarrow z) \\
lt (u \oplus [a]), & \text{otherwise} \\
\text{where } z = \text{rim } y \text{ and } u = z \cap \# \text{tail } (y \rightarrow z)
\end{cases}$$  \hspace{1cm} (7)$$

where $\cap \#$ returns the shorter of its two arguments.

3 An iterative algorithm

In order to time the program for $\lt$ it is convenient to turn it into an iterative algorithm. Define $\lti$ for $x \neq []$ by

$$\lt (x \oplus t) = \lti (\lt x, t).$$

In particular, $\lt ([a] \oplus t) = \lti ([a], t)$. With $\lt x = y$ we have

$$\lti (y, [a] \oplus t) = \{\text{specification of } \lti\}$$

$$\lti (x \oplus [a] \oplus t) = \{\text{specification of } \lti\}$$

$$\lti (\lt (x \oplus [a]), t) = \{\text{given } y = \lt x \text{ and specification of } \oplus\}$$

$$\lti (y \oplus a, t).$$

We now install the program (7) for $\oplus$. The interesting case is when $a > \text{hd} (y \rightarrow z)$, where $z = \text{rim } y$, when we get

$$\lti (y \oplus a, t) = \{\text{case assumption}\}$$

$$\lti (\lt (u \oplus [a]), t) = \{\text{specification of } \lti\}$$

$$\lt (u \oplus [a] \oplus t).$$
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Hence we obtain the following program for \(lt\):

\[
lt \; [] = []
\]

\[
lt \; ([a] + t) = lti \; ([a], t)
\]

\[
l ti \; (y, []) = \begin{cases} 
lti \; (y + [a], t), & \text{if } a \leq \hd \; (y \rightarrow z) \\
lt \; (u + [a] + t), & \text{otherwise}
\end{cases}
\]

\[
l ti \; (y, [a] + t) = \begin{cases} 
lti \; (y + [a], t), & \text{if } a \leq \hd \; (y \rightarrow z) \\
l t \; (u + [a] + t), & \text{otherwise}
\end{cases}
\]

where \(z = \text{rim} \; y\) and \(u = z \cap \# \text{ tail} \; (y \rightarrow z)\).

Ignoring the cost of computing \(+, \rightarrow, \text{rim}\) and \(\cap \#\) we can now show that this program for computing \(lt \; ([a] + t)\) is linear in \(#t\). We claim that there are at most \(2\#t + 1\) calls to \(lti\) during the computation. To prove the claim we show that the value \(#y + 2\#t\) decreases by at least one at each call of \(lti\). The only non-trivial case is the last one. Suppose first that \(u = z\) so \(#z \leq (#y - #z - 1)\). Then since \(lt \; (u + [a] + t)\) rewrites to \(lti \; ([b], v)\), where \(u + [a] + t = [b] + v\), we have

\[
1 + 2(#(u + [a] + t) - 1) = 1 + 2#z + 2\#t < #y + 2\#([a] + t).
\]

On the other hand, if \(u = \text{tail} \; (y \rightarrow z)\), so \(#y - #z - 1 \leq #z\), we have

\[
1 + 2(#(u + [a] + t) - 1) = 1 + 2(#y - #z) + 2\#t < #y + 2\#([a] + t).
\]

### 4 Computing \(\text{rim}\)

The function \(\text{rims}\) can also be computed inductively. We have \(\text{rims} \; [a] = \{[\]\}) and for \(y \neq []\)

\[
\text{rims} \; (y + [a]) = \{z + [a] \mid z \in \text{rims} \; y \land \hd \; (y \rightarrow z) = a\} \cup \{[]\}.
\]

The proof of this claim is straightforward and we omit details. Hence we obtain \(\text{rim} \; [a] = []\) and for \(y \neq []\)

\[
\text{rim} \; (y + [a]) = \begin{cases} 
z + [a], & \text{if } \hd \; (y \rightarrow z) = a \\
\text{rim} \; (z + [a]), & \text{otherwise}
\end{cases}
\]

where \(z = \text{rim} \; y\).

Since \(\text{rim} \; y\) is needed only for \(y\) satisfying \(y = lt \; y\), we can appeal to (5) to optimise the computation, obtaining

\[
\text{rim} \; (y + [a]) = \begin{cases} 
[\], & \text{if } a < \hd \; (y \rightarrow z) \\
z + [a], & \text{if } a = \hd \; (y \rightarrow z) \\
\text{rim} \; (z + [a]), & \text{if } a > \hd \; (y \rightarrow z)
\end{cases}
\]

where \(z = \text{rim} \; y\).

### 5 Combining computations

The computations of \(lt\) and \(\text{rim}\) have turned out to be very similar, and the next step is to combine them into one. We also take the opportunity to eliminate the expensive operation \(\hd \; (y \rightarrow z)\). For \(x \neq []\) define

\[
le \; x = (lt \; x, \text{rim} \; (lt \; x), lt \; x \rightarrow \text{rim} \; (lt \; x)).
\]
In particular, \( le \; [a] = ([a], [], [a]) \). We omit details of the routine derivation that establishes for \( x \neq [] \)

\[
le \; (x + [a]) = le \; x \otimes a,
\]

(8)

where

\[
(y, z, [b] + w) \otimes a = \begin{cases} 
(y + [a], [], y + [a]), & \text{if } a < b \\
(y + [a], z + [a], w + [a]), & \text{if } a = b \\
le \; ([z \sqcap y \# w] + [a]), & \text{if } a > b
\end{cases}
\]

The value \( lt \; x \) can be recovered as the first component of \( le \; x \). In the same way as we did for \( lt \) we can rewrite the program for \( le \) as an iterative algorithm. Define \( lti \) for \( x \neq [] \) by

\[
lt (x + t) = lti \; (le \; x, t)
\]

It is routine to obtain the following program for \( lt \):

\[
\begin{align*}
lt \; [] &= [] \\
ltn \; ([a] + t) &= lti \; ([a], [], [a], t) \\
lti \; (y, z, w, []) &= \begin{cases} 
lti \; (y + [a], [], y + [a], t), & \text{if } a < b \\
lti \; (y + [a], z + [a], w + [a], t), & \text{if } a = b \\
lt \; ([z \sqcap y \# w] + [a] + t), & \text{if } a > b
\end{cases}
\end{align*}
\]

This program is linear for the same reason as before.

6 Final optimisations

The remaining tasks are to eliminate the operations \( + \) and \( \sqcap \) since we cannot suppose \( + \) takes constant time in a standard functional language. We can compute \( \sqcap \) in constant time by adding the lengths of the various arguments as additional parameters (giving a total of no fewer than eight arguments!). To eliminate \( + \) define \( lti \) by the equation

\[
lti \; (y, z, w, t) = lti \; (y + t, z + t, w + t, t).
\]

Using the program for \( lti \) we obtain

\[
\begin{align*}
ltn \; [] &= [] \\
ltn \; ([a] + t) &= lti \; ([a] + t, t, [a] + t, t) \\
ltnj \; (y, z, w, []) &= y \\
ltnj \; (y, z, [b] + w, [a] + t) &= \begin{cases} 
ltnj \; (y, t, t, t), & \text{if } a < b \\
ltnj \; (y, z, w, t), & \text{if } a = b \\
ltn \; ([z \sqcap y \# w], & \text{if } a > b
\end{cases}
\end{align*}
\]
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