		Out of	49			
			1			
a <b>/2</b>		b <b>/2</b>	c/ <b>3</b>	d/ <b>3</b>		
			Solution correct but the	Again, whilst the		
			proof is lacking. Next time	definitions used are		
			it would be better to	correct, it would be more		
		Solution could have been	provide a direct proof of	prudent to give a direct		
		simplified futher	the equivalence of the statements	proof of the equivalence of the statements.		
	2	1	2	2		
	2	ı		2		
			2			
a/ <b>2</b>		b/ <b>2</b>	c/ <b>2</b>	d/ <b>2</b>		
	2	2	2	2		
			3			
a/ <b>3</b>		b/2				
No	attempt at expl	aining or showing the solution				
	1		2			
			4			
/5						
	let it ie clear tha	t the state formulas have the same	e truth conditions the nath	formulae are not so trivial		
VVIII		nese should have been justified. H				
	2		onoron, and onampione nome	7		
	_			_		
		· ·	5			
a <b>/2</b>			b/ <b>2</b>			
	2		2			

	6		7	8
/6		/6		/5
				Inductions are correct,
				but no comment is made
				regarding the apparent
	6		6	4