

1)

- a) When P makes a cryptographic commitment to the randomly chosen value of k , k is bound to that value meaning that P cannot change it later. Importantly, P can commit k without having to share the value with V. Overall, the significance of the cryptographic commitment is that P knows k and V can verify that k has not changed without needing to know the value of k .

b)

$$\begin{aligned} g^s &= y^c \cdot R \\ \Rightarrow g^{xc+k} &= y^c \cdot R \\ \Rightarrow g^{xc} \cdot g^k &= y^c \cdot R \\ \Rightarrow g^{xc} \cdot R &= y^c \cdot R \\ \Rightarrow (g^x)^c \cdot R &= y^c \cdot R \\ \Rightarrow y^c \cdot R &= y^c \cdot R \end{aligned}$$

P would not realistically be able to produce the exact value of s such that $g^s = Y^c \cdot R$ if it did not know x because s depends on x in the same way that Y depends on x . It is infeasible that P could produce a valid s without it having known x . This is how V can prove that it knows how to solve discrete logs without having to give the solution to a discrete log.

c)

V only knows c , Y , R , and s and $s = xc + k$. V does not know k . It is not possible for V to figure out x without knowing k .

2)

Paxos requires the majority of nodes to agree. If the majority does not agree, the paxos algorithm restarts.

3)

Safety: If a customer does not pay, they will not get their food.

Liveness: If a customer does pay, they must get their food.

4)

- a) The fact that asynchronous transmission is not accepted makes it more difficult for a node to be malicious.

b) If the system were asynchronous consensus would be very difficult to reach. It would likely cause forks to happen often because it is imperative for a node to take into account the nodes that came before it, which is much more difficult in an asynchronous system.