Out of 49

		1	
a/ <b>2</b>	b <b>/2</b>	c/ <b>3</b>	d/ <b>3</b>
Correct, though it would		Solution correct and	
have been more accurate		explained, though the	Solution correct but
to write 'there exists i'		explanation could have	explanation of steps not
rather than 'smallest i'		been written more clearly	provided
2	2	3	2

		2	
a <b>/2</b>	b/ <b>2</b>	c/ <b>2</b>	d <b>/2</b>
			The steps shown In these
			proofs is insufficient. The
			full set of steps for an
			equivalence should be
			shown
1	1	1	1

3				
a/ <b>3</b>	b/ <b>2</b>			
Insufficient explanation on why each of the path formulae hold	Well reasoned explanation of the reason that the example does not hold			
2	2			

	4	
/5		
F		

	5
a/ <b>2</b>	b/ <b>2</b>
	Example given but not justified
2	1

6	7	8
/6	/6	/5
Induction is well carried out. It would have been better, however, to insert the proof concerning the A operator, rather than state its similarity to E	Correct methodology but no attempt or mention of the back relation is seen	Good guess. However, I would have liked to have seen a more formal induction regarding points 5 and 7.

3 4 5