

# 1 Question 1

For any network with  $m$  we can always set  $p = 0$ . From there we can build a counter example where  $q = 2^{m-1}$ . If we put no nodes between  $p$  and  $q$  ( $q-p = 0$ ) every entry in  $p$ 's lookup table will be  $q$ . This way we guarantee that  $q$  will be the next hop from  $p$ . If we set  $k$  to some value greater than  $q$ ,  $k-p=1$ . So any value of  $m$  can generate a network with  $p = 0$ ,  $q = 2^{m-1}$ , and  $k = 2^m - 1$ . This will always result in  $q-p=0$  and  $k-p=1$  which is a counter example to the generic case. Therefore this holds for all values of  $m$ .

Another counter example can if you always have  $p = 0$ ,  $q = 2$ , no node between  $p$  and  $q$ , and  $k = 3$  it doesn't matter how many nodes you add to this network or how you shift the value of  $m$  the equations of  $q-p=0$  and  $k-p=1$  will still hold which violates our claim.

# 2 Question 2

## 2.1 a)

NO IDEA WHAT TO DO

## 2.2 b)

When we add a node  $n$  into this network only one table will need to be updated. The node right before  $n$  will have to update its table to now have  $n$  as its successor. Everyone else will remain the same.

# 3 Question 3

## 3.1 a)

We know that the expected number of hops for a network is  $O(\log n)$ . We know that the finger table must have enough entries to accommodate  $n$  so  $n \leq 2^{m-1}$ . So we can sub in this value for  $n$  and still maintain this worst case relation, so  $O(\log 2^{m-1})$  if we simplify this we get that number of expected hops is  $O(m)$ . Based on this we can assume that there exists some case where the number of hops is less than linear.

## 3.2 b)

NO IDEA WHAT TO DO