Question 2

s -> t -ft (su[sp] \ tu(sp]) and (su[t.p] \ tu[t.p])

Partl

not (s-st) implies not ((s,v(s,p] & t,v(s,p]) and (s,v(t,p] & t,v(t,p]))

L> (s.v(s.p] > E.v(s.p]) or (s.v(t.p] > E.v(t.p])

Case 1: s.p = t.p (if they belong to some process)

s occurs after t -> s.v(s.p] > t.v(s.p] correct

Cose 2: s.p # E.p (if they are events from different processes)

to connot occur after s, either to didn't update itself

after s is progressed > s.v (s.p) > t.v(s.p)

or s is updated itself after t sent message

S.U[Ep] > E.U[Ep] seems not possible, s.u[t.p] = E.U[E.p] is possible though, hence sultip] > tultip] > tultip] is correct.

Part 2

s->t implies (s.v[s.p] < t.v(s.p]) and (s.v[t.p] < t.v(t.p]) t definitely comes after sand there is a consolity. Time of sat

t invista be equal to time of s at sweeter or greater.

L) su[sp] & Eu(sp] is correct.

Since t comes after, there is a message passed from 5, so time of t must be incremented so time of t is strictly greater than the time at s. -> s.v(t.p] L t.v[t.p]

Hence the proposal is correct.