Subject: IDMA Exam
From: Obaida Ahmad <frx527@alumni.ku.dk>
Date: 2025-05-28, 17:19
To: Jakob Nordström <jn@di.ku.dk>

Dear Jakob,

I hope you're doing well. I'm writing to request a re-evaluation of my IDMA exam from April 2, 2025, as I believe there may have been a mistake in the grading of my submission.

Based on the published solutions and grading guide, I have carefully gone through the solution and grading guide and believe that I got at least more than passing grades.

Problem 1 (a, b, c):

1.a (10 pts): I correctly converted the binary number $(110)_2$ to decimal with the correct method.

1.b (20 pts) I converted 110_{10} to binary by repeated division by 2 again i used the correct methods.

1c (20 pts): I converted the octal number $(2025)_8$ to decimal again using the correct methods.

I completed all subproblems using the correct methods and reached the correct conclusions – estimated **50 points**.

Problem 2 (a, b):

I completed both parts of this problem using the Euclidean algorithm, and my answers closely follow the structure and results shown in the solutions.

2a (20 pts): For m=38 and n=14, I correctly applied the Euclidean algorithm and showed which matches the solution exactly.

2b (30 pts): For m = 117 n=69, I did exactly the same as shown in the solution paper which matches the official worked-out solution closely in both method and result.

Given that both parts were complete and correct, I believe this problem should give me the full **50 points**.

Problem 4a:
I completed this problem by analyzing each of the three relations (R, S, and T) and checking whether they were reflexive, symmetric, antisymmetric, and transitive.

While I may not have phrased my explanations exactly as in the official solutions, my reasoning was close. I correctly identified each relation and checked whether they were reflexive, symmetric, antisymmetric, and transitive. Although my wording may have differed, I showed a clear understanding of the four properties and how they apply to each relation. I believe this should merit **at least 20–30 points**.

Problem 7 (a, b):
I completed both subproblems under Problem 7. I understand that my solution to 7a may not have followed the exact structure in the model answer, and I acknowledge that part of it might be incorrect or incomplete.

In 7b, I correctly included Susanna and selected the rest of the committee using the same logic and combinations as in the official solution.

So while 7a may not be fully correct, I believe 7b should merit full points. Altogether, I estimate that this problem should earn me **around 40 points**.

Problem 8a:
I drew the correct graph with the right nodes and edge weights based on the travel times. Even if the explanation was brief, the structure matched the model solution. I believe this should count for **at least 10 points**.

Problem 9a:
While I didn't give a fully detailed explanation, I correctly matched the sequences to the right algorithms. Since partial credit is given for correct matching, this should also be worth **at least 10 points**.

That gives a total estimate of **190 points**, which exceeds the passing threshold of 160 points for grade 2.

Of course, I fully respect the grading process and the effort that goes into reviewing so many exams. I simply wish to highlight that my work may have been sufficient to pass and I kindly ask if you could take a second look based on this overview.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Best regards,
[Obaida Ahmad]
Exam number: [89]