

**Question 1.** [9 MARKS]

Consider the following recursive definition of a set  $S$  of strings.

Notice that each string contains only the characters “ $a$ ” and/or “ $b$ ”.

We use the Python syntax  $s + t$  to mean the concatenation of strings  $s$  and  $t$ .

1. “ $a$ ”  $\in S$ .
2. If  $s \in S$  and  $t \in S$ , then “ $b$ ”  $+ s + t \in S$  and  $s + t +$  “ $b$ ”  $\in S$ .

**Part (a)** [1 MARK]

Write 4 examples of strings in  $S$ .

$a, baa, bbaaa, baabaab$

**Part (b)** [8 MARKS]

For each string  $s$ , let  $P(s)$  be defined as:  $s$  has more “ $a$ ”s than “ $b$ ”s.

Use structural induction on the definition of  $S$  to prove:  $\forall s \in S, P(s)$ .

Clearly indicate where you use your Induction Hypothesis.

Let  $u$  be an arbitrary element of  $S$ . Assume  $P(u')$  holds for every  $u' \in S$  that is structurally smaller than  $u$  (i.e.  $u'$  can be generated with fewer applications of the rules defining  $S$  than can  $u$ .)

Case 1:  $u \in S$  by rule 1. So  $u =$  “ $a$ ”, which has one more “ $a$ ” than “ $b$ ”.

Case 2:  $u \in S$  by rule 2.

Case 2.a)  $u =$  “ $b$ ”  $+ s + t$  for some  $s, t \in S$ . By the IH on  $s$  and  $t$  (since they are structurally smaller than  $u$ ),  $s$  and  $t$  each have at least one more “ $a$ ” than “ $b$ ”s. So  $s + t$  has at least two more “ $a$ ”s than “ $b$ ”s. So “ $b$ ”  $+ s + t = u$  has at least one more “ $a$ ” than “ $b$ ”s.

Case 2.b)  $u = s + t +$  “ $b$ ” for some  $s, t \in S$ . Same reasoning as in Case 2.a.

**Question 2.** [13 MARKS]

```

1 # PREcondition: m and n are positive natural numbers.
2 def f(m, n):
3     r = m
4     s = n
5     while r != s:
6         if r < s:
7             s = s - r
8         else:
9             r = r - s
10    return r

```

Let  $r_i, s_i$  be the values of  $r$  and  $s$  just before the  $i$ -th iteration of the loop, where  $r_0 = m, s_0 = n$  are the initial values. The sequences are finite iff the loop terminates after some  $t \geq 0$  loop iterations, and in that case we define the final,  $t$ -th elements of the sequences to be the values of  $r$  and  $s$  just after the last iteration.

**Part (a)** [1 MARK]

Fill in the following table, showing the sequence of values for  $r$  and  $s$  when  $f(30, 42)$  is executed:

loop iteration number	$r_i$	$s_i$
(before loop) 0	30	42
1	30	12
2	18	12
3	6	12
4	6	6

**Part (b)** [1 MARK]

List all positive natural numbers  $c$  such that both of 30 and 42 are multiples of  $c$ :

1, 2, 3, 6

**Part (c)** [1 MARK]

State a variant (measure) for the loop: a combination of the values of the variables, that is always a natural number and that decreases at each iteration of the loop.

$i \mapsto \max(r_i, s_i)$  (or written  $\max(r, s)$ ).

$i \mapsto r_i + s_i$  and  $i \mapsto r_i \cdot s_i$  also work.

**Part (d)** [1 MARK]

Assuming  $r$  and  $s$  are always positive, prove your variant is a decreasing sequence.

In every loop iteration when the loop condition is true, the quantity  $k := \max(r, s) - \min(r, s)$  is positive, and  $k$  is subtracted from the larger of  $r$  or  $s$ , which makes the max of  $r$  and  $s$  strictly smaller. Thus, if  $i + 1 \leq t$ , then  $\max(r_{i+1}, s_{i+1}) < \max(r_i, s_i)$ .

**Part (e)** [1 MARK]

Consider this POSTcondition:  $f(m, n)$  returns a number  $r$ , such that if both of  $m$  and  $n$  are multiples of a positive natural number  $c$ , then  $r$  is a multiple of that number  $c$ . Equivalently:

$$\forall \text{ positive } c \in \mathbb{N}, [(m \text{ is a multiple of } c \text{ and } n \text{ is a multiple of } c) \implies (r \text{ is a multiple of } c)]$$

What does this POSTcondition say for  $f(30, 42)$ ? Fill in the blanks:

Since 30 and 42 are both multiples of 1, 2, 3, and 6,  
 $f(30, 42)$  returns a number  $r$  that is a multiple of 1, 2, 3, and 6.

**Part (f)** [2 MARKS]

State an invariant that would prove the POSTcondition from part (e):

$$\forall \text{ positive } c \in \mathbb{N}, [(m \text{ and } n \text{ are multiples of } c) \implies (r_i \text{ and } s_i \text{ are multiples of } c)]$$

That is, a loop iteration does not result in  $r$  and  $s$  losing any common divisors (to see that this statement is equivalent, recall that  $r$  and  $s$  are initially  $m$  and  $n$ ).

**Part (g)** [4 MARKS]

Prove your invariant is true.

This is by simple induction on  $i$ . You did not need to say so to get full points.

The invariant is true for  $i = 0$ , since then it just says the triviality: For all  $c$ , if  $m$  and  $n$  are multiples of  $c$  then  $m$  and  $n$  are multiples of  $c$ .

Let  $i < t$  be arbitrary and assume the invariant (IH) is true for  $i$ . We will show it is true for  $i + 1$ . Let  $c$  be an arbitrary positive natural number such that  $m$  and  $n$  are multiples of  $c$ . The invariant for  $i$  says that  $r_i$  and  $s_i$  are multiples of  $c$ . Let  $a_r$  and  $a_s$  be such that  $ca_r = r_i$  and  $ca_s = s_i$ . It remains to show that  $r_{i+1}$  and  $s_{i+1}$  are multiples of  $c$ . Since  $i < t$ , have  $r_i \neq s_i$ .

Case  $r_i < s_i$ .

Then  $r_{i+1} = r_i$  so  $r_{i+1}$  is a multiple of  $c$ .

And  $s_{i+1} = s_i - r_i = ca_s - ca_r = c(a_s - a_r)$ . Note that  $a_s > a_r$  since  $s_i > r_i$ . Thus  $s_{i+1}$  is also a multiple of  $c$ .

Case  $s_i < r_i$  is symmetric:

Then  $s_{i+1} = s_i$  so  $s_{i+1}$  is a multiple of  $c$ .

And  $r_{i+1} = r_i - s_i = ca_r - ca_s = c(a_r - a_s)$ . Note that  $a_r > a_s$  since  $r_i > s_i$ . Thus  $r_{i+1}$  is also a multiple of  $c$ .

**Part (h)** [1 MARK]

Consider this second POSTcondition:  $f(m, n)$  returns a number  $r$ , such that if  $r$  is a multiple of a positive natural number  $c$ , then both of  $m$  and  $n$  are multiples of that number  $c$ . Equivalently:

$$\forall \text{ positive } c \in \mathbb{N}, [(r \text{ is a multiple of } c) \implies (m \text{ is a multiple of } c \text{ and } n \text{ is a multiple of } c)]$$

State an invariant that would prove this POSTcondition, assuming the loop terminates:

$$\forall \text{ positive } c \in \mathbb{N}, [(r_i \text{ and } s_i \text{ are multiples of } c) \implies (m \text{ and } n \text{ are multiples of } c)]$$

That is, a loop iteration does not result in  $r$  and  $s$  gaining any common divisors (to see that this statement is equivalent, recall that  $r$  and  $s$  are initially  $m$  and  $n$ ).

Combined with the previous invariant, this means that the set of common divisors of  $r$  and  $s$  stays the same throughout execution of the loop.

**Part (i)** [1 MARK]

Prove your invariant is true.

This is by simple induction on  $i$ . You did not need to say so to get full points.

The invariant is true for  $i = 0$ , since then it just says the triviality: For all  $c$ , if  $m$  and  $n$  are multiples of  $c$  then  $m$  and  $n$  are multiples of  $c$ .

Let  $i < t$  be arbitrary and assume the invariant (IH) is true for  $i$ . We will show it is true for  $i + 1$ . Let  $c$  be an arbitrary positive natural number such that  $r_{i+1}$  and  $s_{i+1}$  are multiples of  $c$ . It suffices to show that  $r_i$  and  $s_i$  are multiples of  $c$  as well, since then the invariant for  $i$  implies that  $m$  and  $n$  are multiples of  $c$ .

Let  $a_r$  and  $a_s$  be such that  $ca_r = r_{i+1}$  and  $ca_s = s_{i+1}$ .

Case  $r_{i+1} < s_{i+1}$ .

Then  $r_{i+1} = r_i$  so  $r_i$  is a multiple of  $c$ .

And  $s_{i+1} = s_i - r_i$ , so

$$\begin{aligned} s_i &= s_{i+1} + r_i \\ &= s_{i+1} + r_{i+1} \quad \text{since } r_i = r_{i+1} \\ &= ca_s + ca_r \\ &= c(a_s + a_r) \end{aligned}$$

So  $s_i$  is a multiple of  $c$ .

Case  $r_{i+1} > s_{i+1}$  is symmetric:

Then  $s_{i+1} = s_i$  so  $s_i$  is a multiple of  $c$ .

And  $r_{i+1} = r_i - s_i$ , so

$$\begin{aligned} r_i &= r_{i+1} + s_i \\ &= r_{i+1} + s_{i+1} \quad \text{since } s_i = s_{i+1} \\ &= ca_r + ca_s \\ &= c(a_r + a_s) \end{aligned}$$

So  $r_i$  is a multiple of  $c$ .