

Q1: Prop Logic Relations (6m)

Mock: $R(A, B) \Leftrightarrow \exists C.(A \wedge C \equiv B)$

Circle true: (a) $R(A, A)$ all A ? (b) $\exists A, B$ both $R(A, B)$ & $R(B, A)$? (c) $R(A, B)$ when $B \models A$? (d) $R(\top, B)$ some B ? (e) $R(\perp, B)$ all B ?

Answers: (a),(b),(d)(a)✓: $C = \top$, then $A \wedge \top \equiv A$ (b)✓: $A = B$ works, pick $C = \top$ for both(c)✗: Cex: $A = p \wedge q, B = p$. $B \models A$ but no C s.t. $A \wedge C \equiv p$ (d)✓: Pick $B = \top, C = \top$: $\top \wedge \top \equiv \top$ (e)✗: $\perp \wedge C \equiv \perp$ only if $B = \perp$ **Final:** $R(A, B) \Leftrightarrow \exists C.(A \vee C \equiv B)$

Circle true: (a) $R(A, B)$ when $A \equiv B$? (b) $R(A, B) \Rightarrow R(B, A)$? (c) $\exists A, B$ both false? (d) $R(A, B)$ when $A \models B$? (e) $R(A, \top)$ all A ? (f) $R(A, \top)$ some A ?

Answers: (a),(c),(e),(f)(a)✓: $C = \perp$, then $A \vee \perp \equiv A \equiv B$ (b)✗: $R(p, \top)$ true ($C = \neg p$) but $R(\top, p)$ false(c)✓: $A = p, B = q$ different atoms. No C works(d)✗: Cex: $A = p \wedge q, B = p$. $A \models B$ but can't get p from $p \wedge q \vee C$ (e)✓: $C = \neg A$, then $A \vee \neg A \equiv \top$

(f)✓: By (e)

Q2: Eliminate \rightarrow (3+3m)**Mock:** $H = [p \rightarrow (q \wedge \neg r)] \vee [\neg p \rightarrow (\neg q \vee r)]$ (a) Eliminate \rightarrow → (b) Tautology/Contradiction/Contingency?(a) Use $A \rightarrow B \equiv \neg A \vee B$: $H \equiv [\neg p \vee (q \wedge \neg r)] \vee [p \vee (\neg q \vee r)]$ Simplify: $[\neg p \vee (q \wedge \neg r)] \vee [p \vee \neg q \vee r]$ (b) Truth table: $p = T, q = T, r = T$: $[\neg T \vee F] \vee [T \vee F] = T$ $p = T, q = T, r = F$: $[\neg T \vee T] \vee [T \vee T] = T$
All 8 rows give T → **Tautology****Final:** $G = \neg(p \rightarrow q) \vee (q \wedge \neg r)$ (a) Eliminate \rightarrow (b) Type?(a) $\neg(p \rightarrow q) = \neg(\neg p \vee q) = p \wedge \neg q$ (De Morgan) $G \equiv (p \wedge \neg q) \vee (q \wedge \neg r)$ (b) Test: $p = T, q = T, r = T$: $(T \wedge F) \vee (T \wedge F) = F$ $p = T, q = F, r = T$: $(T \wedge T) \vee (F \wedge F) = T$ Mixed T/F → **Contingency****Q4: Induction Base/Step (varies)****Mock (a):** $\text{sum}[] = 0$, $\text{sum}(x : xs) = x + \text{sum}(xs)$ $P(l) = \text{sum}(l) \geq 1$. Why step $\forall x.P(l) \rightarrow P(x : l)$ true?If $P(l)$, i.e., $\text{sum}(l) \geq 1$, then: $\text{sum}(x : l) = x + \text{sum}(l) \geq x + 1 \geq 0 + 1 = 1$ since $x \in \mathbb{N}$ means $x \geq 0$. So $P(x : l)$ holds.**Mock (b):** Why not prove $\forall l.P(l)$?Base case fails: $P([])$ requires $\text{sum}[] = 0 \geq 1$, which is false. Without base case, can't complete induction.**Final (a):** Give $P(n)$ where step holds but base fails. $P(n) = (n \geq 1)$. Step: If $n \geq 1$ then $n + 1 \geq 2 > 1$, so $P(n) \rightarrow P(n + 1)$ ✓. Base: $P(0) = 0 \geq 1$ is false ✗**Final (b):** Given $P(k)$ true for $k > 0$ and step holds. Prove $\forall n \geq k.P(n)$?Define $Q(m) = P(m + k)$. Base: $Q(0) = P(k)$ true (given). Step: Assume $Q(m) = P(m + k)$. Then $P(m + k) \rightarrow P(m + k + 1)$ by P 's step, so $Q(m) \rightarrow Q(m + 1)$. By induction, $\forall m.Q(m)$, hence $\forall m.P(m + k)$, i.e., $\forall n \geq k.P(n)$.(a) $e(n, a) = 2^n \times a$. P expresses $2^{2n} = (2^n)^2$.
(b) IH: $e(2n, 1) = e(n, 1)^2$. Need: $e(2(n + 1), 1)$.But $e(2n + 2, 1) = e(2n + 1, 2) = e(2n, 4)$. IH only has $e(2n, 1)$ not $e(2n, 4)$. Parameter mismatch!(c) **Generalize:** $Q(n, a) \equiv e(2n, a) = e(n, a)^2$. $Q \Rightarrow P$: Set $a = 1$. Why easier: IH $Q(n, a)$ for all a , so use $Q(n, 2a)$: $e(2n, 2a) = e(n, 2a)^2$. Matches recursion!**Final:** $m(0, x, a) = a; m(n + 1, x, a) = m(n, x, a + x)$
 $P(n, x) \equiv m(n, x, 0) = m(x, n, 0)$
Same questions.(a) $m(n, x, a) = a + n \times x$. P expresses $n \times x = x \times n$ (commutativity).(b) IH: $m(n, x, 0) = m(x, n, 0)$. Need: $m(n + 1, x, 0)$.But $m(n + 1, x, 0) = m(n, x, x)$. IH only has $m(n, x, 0)$ not $m(n, x, x)$. Parameter mismatch!(c) **Generalize:** $Q(n, x, a) \equiv m(n, x, a) = m(x, n, a)$. $Q \Rightarrow P$: Set $a = 0$. Why easier: IH $Q(n, x, a)$ for all a , so use $Q(n, x, a+x)$: $m(n, x, a+x) = m(x, n, a+x)$. Matches recursion!

Q5: Generalization (2+1+3m)

Mock: $e(0, a) = a; e(n + 1, a) = e(n, 2a)$ $P(n) \equiv e(2n, 1) = e(n, 1) \times e(n, 1)$ (a) What does e compute? What is P ?
(b) Why induction hard? (c) Generalize?

Q6: Termination (varies)

Mock: $\text{sub}(n, 0) = n$; $\text{sub}(n, m) = \text{sub}(n - 1, m - 1)$

- (a) When terminate? Why yes/no for each?
- (b) Why not all despite both decrease?

(a) **Terminates:** $m \geq 0$ (any n).

Proof: If $m = 0$, returns n (base). If $m > 0$, calls $\text{sub}(n - 1, m - 1)$ where new m is $m - 1 < m$. Measure: m . After m steps, reaches $m = 0$, terminates.

Not terminate: $m < 0$.

Proof: Each call $m \rightarrow m - 1$ becomes more negative: $-1, -2, -3, \dots$ Never reaches base $m = 0$. Infinite recursion.

(b) \mathbb{Z} has no minimum element. Though $n - 1 < n$ and $m - 1 < m$, when $m < 0$, can decrease forever. Termination needs well-founded measure (maps to \mathbb{N} , which has min 0). \mathbb{Z} not well-founded.

Final: $\text{gcd}(a, 0) = a$; $\text{gcd}(a, b) = \text{gcd}(b, a \% b)$

- (a) Why terminate for $a, b \geq 0$?
- (b) Define measure, justify decrease.

(a) Base: $b = 0$ returns a directly. Recursive: $b > 0$ calls $\text{gcd}(b, a \% b)$. Key: $0 \leq a \% b < b$ (remainder property). So second parameter strictly decreases: $b \rightarrow a \% b$ where $a \% b < b$. Since $b \in \mathbb{N}$ and decreases, must reach 0 in finite steps. Terminates.

(b) **Measure:** Second parameter b .

Justification: In recursive call $\text{gcd}(b, a \% b)$, new measure is $a \% b$. By modulo definition, $a \% b < b$ when $b > 0$. So measure strictly decreases: $b \rightarrow a \% b < b$. Since $b \geq 0$ and decreases to 0, terminates.

Q7: Hoare Triples (4m)

Mock: Circle valid:

- (a) $\{x > 3\} y := x^2 \{y > 7\}$
- (b) $\{x > -3\} y := x^*(-2) \{y > 6\}$
- (c) $\{a = 3 \wedge b = 4\} \text{ while } a \neq 0 \text{ do } a := a + 1 \{a \leq 0\}$
- (d) $\{a = 9\} \text{ while } a = 0 \text{ do } a := -1 \{a = -1\}$

Valid: (a),(c)

(a)✓: Pre: $x > 3$, assume int so $x \geq 4$. Execute: $y := x \times 2$, so $y \geq 8$. Post: $y \geq 8 > 7$ ✓

(b)✗: Cex: $x = 0$ satisfies $0 > -3$. Execute: $y := 0 \times (-2) = 0$. Check: $0 \not> 6 \times$

(c)✓: Pre: $a = 3 > 0$, enter loop. Body: $a := a + 1$ increases a . Condition $a > 0$ remains true forever. Loop never exits. Partial correctness vacuously true (doesn't terminate).

(d)✗: Pre: $a = 9$. Condition: $a = 0$ is $9 = 0$, false. Loop body never executes. Post: a still 9, not -1 ✗

Final: Circle valid (all int):

- (a) $\{x = 3 \wedge y = x\} x := x - 1; y := x - 1 \{y = x\}$
- (b) $\{x = 3 \wedge y = x\} y := x - 1; x := x - 1 \{y = x\}$
- (c) $\{m > 0 \wedge n > m\} \text{ if } m \neq n \text{ then } x := 0 \text{ else } y := 0 \{n > x\}$
- (d) $\{m = n \wedge m < n\} \text{ if } x \neq 3 \text{ then } y := 4 \text{ else } z := 5 \{z \times y = 20\}$

Valid: (b),(d)

(a)✗: $x = 3, y = 3$. After $x := x - 1$: $x = 2, y = 3$. After $y := x - 1$: $x = 2, y = 1$. Check: $y \neq x$ ✗

(b)✓: $x = 3, y = 3$. After $y := x - 1$: $x = 3, y = 2$. After $x := x - 1$: $x = 2, y = 2$. Check: $y = x$ ✓

(c)✗: Pre: $m > 0 \wedge n > m$ so $m \not> n$. Else branch: $y := 0$. But x undefined or unchanged. Can't guarantee $n > x$ ✗

(d)✓: Pre: $m = n \wedge m < n$ is contradiction (impossible). Vacuously true (false precondition implies anything).

Q8: Partial vs Total (2m)

Mock: Example where $\{P\}S\{Q\}$ valid but $[P]S[Q]$ not? Or explain impossible.

Exists. Let $P = \text{true}$, $S = \text{while true do skip}$, $Q = \text{false}$.

Partial $\{P\}S\{Q\}$ valid: S never terminates, so "if S terminates then Q " is vacuously true (antecedent false).

Total $[P]S[Q]$ invalid: S must terminate, but while true loops forever. Violates termination requirement.

Final: Example where $[P]S[Q]$ valid but $\{P\}S\{Q\}$ not? Or explain impossible.

Impossible. Total correctness $[P]S[Q]$ means: if P holds, then S terminates AND Q holds after. This implies partial correctness $\{P\}S\{Q\}$ (if P and S terminates, then Q), since total guarantees termination. Therefore $[P]S[Q]$ valid $\Rightarrow \{P\}S\{Q\}$ valid. No counterexample exists.

Final: $[P(x)]$ while $b(x) \{x := g(x)\}$ [true] b, g terminate. Valid under:

- (a) $P(x) \rightarrow b(g(x)) \forall x$ (b) b constant
- (c) $g(x) < x \wedge b(x) = b(g(x)) \forall x$
- (d) $b(x) = \neg b(g(x)) \wedge P(x) \rightarrow b(x) \forall x$

(a)✗: Says $b(g(x))$ true but nothing about termination. Cex: $P = \text{true}$, $b(x) = \text{true}$, $g(x) = x$. Never exits.

(b)✗: If $b \equiv \text{true}$, loop never exits.

(c)✗: b value unchanged means loop may not exit. Cex: $b(x) = \text{true}$ constant, $g(x) = x - 1$. Loops forever.

(d)✓: b flips each iteration. If $P(x)$ then $b(x) = \text{true}$ (enter loop). After one iteration: $x' = g(x)$, $b(x') = b(g(x)) = \neg b(x) = \text{false}$. Exits immediately. Maximum 1 iteration, always terminates.

Quick Reference

Prop Logic: $A \rightarrow B \equiv \neg A \vee B$; $\neg(A \wedge B) \equiv \neg A \vee \neg B$; $\neg(A \vee B) \equiv \neg A \wedge \neg B$

FOL: $\forall x.P \equiv \exists x.\neg P$; $\exists x.P \equiv \forall x.\neg P$

Induction: Base + Step $\vdash \forall n$. For lists: $P(\square) + (\forall x, xs.P(xs) \rightarrow P(x : xs)) \vdash \forall l.P(l)$

Hoare: Assign: $\{Q[x \rightarrow E]\}x := E\{Q\}$; Seq: $\{P\}S_1\{R\}\{R\}S_2\{Q\} \Rightarrow \{P\}S_1; S_2\{Q\}$; If: $\{P \wedge b\}S_1\{Q\}\{P \wedge \neg b\}S_2\{Q\} \Rightarrow \{P\}$ if b then S_1 else $S_2\{Q\}$; While: $\{I \wedge b\}S\{I\} \Rightarrow \{I\}$ while b do $S\{I \wedge \neg b\}$

Partial vs Total: $\{P\}S\{Q\} = \text{IF } P \& S \text{ terminates THEN } Q$. $[P]S[Q] = \text{IF } P \text{ THEN } S \text{ terminates AND } Q$.