

Problem 1:

\mathcal{X} denotes the set of legal positions

$\text{Next}(x) = \{x' \in \mathcal{X} : x \rightarrow x'\}$: the set of legal positions that can be reached by one legal move from x

(a)

$$\text{WIN}(x) = \begin{cases} F & , \text{ if } x = (1, 0, 0, 0, 0) \\ \bigvee_{x' \in \text{Next}(x)} \neg(\text{WIN}(x')) & , \text{ otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

(b) proof:

we first prove these 2 observation:

The general observation (can you prove why?) is that

- (i) x is a winning position if and only if there exists a losing position x' such that $x \rightarrow x'$;
- (ii) x is a losing position if and only if for all x' such that $x \rightarrow x'$, x' is a winning position.

proof for (i):

if there exists a losing position x' , we can always do $x \rightarrow x'$

then, the against player will lose.

proof for (ii):

if all $x' \in \text{Next}(x)$ is False, which means no matter which x' is chosen,

the other player can never do a losing position.

now, prove the correctness of the recurrence:

denote $J(x) : \text{WIN}(x)$ is True, when x is a winning position

$\text{WIN}(x)$ is false, when x is a losing position.

, which means the correctness of $\text{WIN}(x)$.

Base: $x = (1, 0, 0, 0, 0)$: this means the player has to eat the poisoned square.

$$\therefore J(1, 0, 0, 0, 0) = F$$

for other positions, except $x = (1, 0, 0, 0, 0)$, denote the position x .

Induction hypothesis: $\forall x' \in \text{Next}(x)$, correctness for all $J(x')$

I. if $\exists x' \in \text{Next}(x)$, $\text{WIN}(x') = F$, so $\text{WIN}(x) = T$ (from observation (i))

II. if $\forall x' \in \text{Next}(x)$, $\text{WIN}(x') = T$, so $\text{WIN}(x) = F$. (from observation (ii))

we can find one recursive relationship for I, II:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{WIN}(x) &= \neg \left(\bigwedge_{x' \in \text{Next}(x)} \text{WIN}(x') \right) \\ &= \bigvee_{x' \in \text{Next}(x)} (\neg(\text{WIN}(x'))) \end{aligned}$$

$\therefore J(x)$ is correct.

\therefore we can prove the recurrence is correct.