

## Exam 2

### Revisiting Exam 1

1. (Average: 6.1, Median: 7) Explain why the set of real numbers  $x$  where  $-1 \leq x \leq 1$  is not well ordered by  $<$ . (Expected answers will give a good intuitive reason; better-than-expected answers will provide a convincing proof.)

A well-written intuitive argument that there is no smallest real number above -1 would be worth 10 points. For 10 points, the intuitive answer must mention that there is a subset of the given set that has no minimum.

**Proof by contradiction:** Assume by contradiction that,  $R_1$ , the set of real numbers between -1 and 1 is well ordered. By the definition of a well-ordered set, all non-empty subsets of  $R_1$  have a minimum element. Consider  $S = R_1 - -1$ . We know  $S \subset R_1$  since every element of  $S$  is an element of  $R_1$ .

We show that  $R_1$  is not well-ordered by contradiction. By the assumption that  $R_1$  is well ordered, since  $S$  is a non-empty subset of  $R_1$  it must have a minimum,  $m$ .

Define  $m^* = (-1 + m)/2$ . Then  $m^* < m$  since  $m > -1$  and the average of  $-1$  and  $m$  must be greater than  $-1$ . But  $m^* \in S$  since it is a real number between -1 and 1. This contradicts the assumption that  $m$  is the minimum of  $S$ . This contradicts the assumption that  $R_1$  is well-ordered, since we have shown a nonempty subset of  $R_1$  that has no minimum.

### State Machines and Invariants

2. (Average 6.8, Median 7) Suppose  $M = (S, G \subseteq S \times S, q_0 \in S)$  is a state machine, and  $R$  is the set of reachable states in  $M$ . For each of the statements below, indicate if the implication stated is valid (must always be true) or invalid (might be false). Provide a short justification supporting your answer.

- a. If  $R = M$  (namely all the states are reachable), then  $G \cup \{(q_0, q_0)\}$  is a surjective relation.

Circle one: Valid or Invalid

Justification: Since all the states are reachable, there is at least one arrow into every state in  $G$  (except the start state  $q_0$ ). Thus,  $G \cup \{(q_0, q_0)\}$  is a surjective relation because it includes an arrow into  $q_0$ , as well as all the arrows in  $G$  which must include at least one arrow into every other state.

- b. If  $P(q)$  is a *preserved invariant* for machine  $M = (S, G, q_0)$ , and  $P(q)$  is false for some reachable state  $q \in R$ , then  $P(q_0)$  is false.

Circle one: Valid or Invalid

Justification: If  $P(q_0)$  is true, by the invariant principle,  $P(q)$  must hold for all  $q \in R$ . So, it must be the case that  $P(q_0)$  is false if there is any reachable state where  $P(q)$  is false.

- c. If  $R$  is a finite set, then  $G$  is a finite set as well. (Note that as a subset of  $S \times S$ ,  $G$  is a set itself.)

Circle one: *Valid* or **Invalid**

Justification: Here's one counterexample:  $S = \mathbb{N}$ ,  $G = \{(n, 2n) \mid n \in \mathbb{N}, n \geq 1\}$ .  $G$  is infinite, but  $R = \{0\}$  since  $q_0 = 0$  and there are no edges from 0.

## Recursive Data Types

Consider the recursive data types, *NBF* (short for Nand-Based Formula) defined by:

- **Base:** *True* is a *NBF*.
- **Base:** *False* is a *NBF*.
- **Constructor:** for all *NBF* objects  $f_1, f_2$ ,  $\text{NAND}(f_1, f_2)$  is a *NBF*.

The Value of a *NBF*,  $f$ , is logical Boolean value of it when evaluated as a logical formula based on NAND gates. So, for example,

$$\text{Value}(\text{NAND}(\text{NAND}(\text{True}, \text{True}), \text{False})) = \text{True}.$$

3. (Average 5.9, Median 6) Provide a precise and complete definition of Value for all *NBF* objects.

$$\text{Value}(\text{True}) = \text{True}$$

$$\text{Value}(\text{False}) = \text{False}$$

$$\text{Value}(\text{NAND}(f_1, f_2)) = \text{NAND}(\text{Value}(f_1), \text{Value}(f_2))$$

4. (Average 6.8, Median 8) Prove by structural induction that for all *NBF* objects  $f$  it holds that

$$\text{Value}(\text{NAND}(f, f)) = \neg(\text{Value}(f))$$

where  $\neg(Z)$  is simply the logical negation of the logical (True or False) variable  $Z$ . Note that for this problem it is important that you specify all the required steps of the structural induction.

Prove by structural induction:

1. Base cases: *True*, *False*

a.  $f = \text{True}$ :  $\text{Value}(\text{NAND}(\text{True}, \text{True})) = \text{False} = \neg(\text{Value}(\text{True}))$

b.  $f = \text{False}$ :  $\text{Value}(\text{NAND}(\text{False}, \text{False})) = \text{True} = \neg(\text{Value}(\text{False}))$

2. Constructor case:  $f = \text{NAND}(f_1, f_2)$ .

We need to show that  $\text{Value}(\text{NAND}(f, f)) = \neg(\text{Value}(f))$ . By the definition of *Value*,  $\text{Value}(f)$  could either be False or True. We have proved in the base case that the property holds for True and False. So, it holds for constructor case.

## Program Verification

Consider the Python program below, that returns the sum of the elements of the input list  $p$ . You may assume  $p$  is a non-empty list of natural numbers.

```
def sum_elements(p):
    x = 0
    i = len(p)
    while i > 0:
        i = i - 1
        x = x + p[i]
    return x
```

5. (Average 8.9, Median 9) Complete the definition of the state machine below that models `sum_elements`.

$$\begin{aligned}
 S &= \{(x, i) \mid x, i \in \mathbb{N}\} \\
 q_0 &= (0, \text{len}(p)) \\
 G &= \{(x, i) \rightarrow (x', i') \mid \\
 &\quad i > 0 \wedge \\
 &\quad i' = i - 1 \wedge \\
 &\quad x' = x + p[i - 1] \}
 \end{aligned}$$

6. (Average 9.8, Median 10) Prove that the state machine (from problem 5) always terminates.

Since we start in state  $(0, \text{len}(p))$  and each transition decreases the value of the  $i$  part of the state by one, it will reach  $i = 0$  in  $\text{len}(p)$  steps. There are no transitions from a state where  $i \leq 0$ , hence the machine must eventually terminate.

7. (Average 7.1, Median 7) Prove that `sum_elements`, as modeled by the state machine from Problem 6, always returns the sum of the elements of that list. (Hint: for this goal, you need to (1) find an appropriate invariant property (and prove that it is indeed a preserved invariant), (2) show that the property at a final ending state implies correctness, and (3) it also holds over the original state.)

We prove the sum correctness using the Invariant Principle. For the preserved invariant we choose:

$$P(q = (x, i)) ::= x = p[i] + p[i + 1] + \dots + p[\text{len}(p) - 1].$$

Our goal is to prove that in all final states,  $x = p[0] + p[1] + \dots + p[\text{len}(p) - 1]$ . So, we need to show that (1)  $P$  is a preserved invariant for  $M$ , that (2)  $P(\text{final}) \implies x = \text{the sum of all elements in } p$ , and (3) the  $P(q_0)$  is true.

- (1) We need to show  $P$  is a preserved invariant. All transitions are from  $(x, i) \rightarrow (x + p[i - 1], i - 1)$  when  $i > 0$ . So,  $P(q = (x, i)) = x = p[i] + p[i + 1] + \dots + p[\text{len}(p) - 1]$ . Because the transition is  $q \rightarrow r = (x + p[i - 1], i - 1)$ , we can add  $p[i - 1]$  to both sides:  $x + p[i - 1] = (p[i] + p[i + 1] + \dots + p[\text{len}(p) - 1]) + p[i - 1] = p[i - 1] + p[i] + \dots + p[\text{len}(p) - 1]$ . This is  $P(r = (x + p[i - 1], i - 1))$ , so we have shown the invariant  $P$  is preserved.
- (2) As we argued for 6, the final states are states where  $i = 0$ . So, if we are in a final state  $q_f = (x, 0)$ ,  $P(q_f) = x = p[0] + p[1] + \dots + p[\text{len}(p) - 1]$ . This is the correctness property we need, so we have satisfied  $P(\text{final}) \implies x = \text{the sum of all elements in } p$ .
- (3)  $P(q_0 = (0, \text{len}(p)))$  is true since  $x = 0 = \text{empty sum}$ . The sum is empty since it is  $p[i] + p[i + 1] + \dots + p[\text{len}(p) - 1]$ , and  $i = \text{len}(p)$  which is greater than the last index.

## Infinite Cardinalities

8. (Average 9.0, Median 10) For each set defined below, answer if the set is = *Finite* or *Countably Infinite* or *Uncountable*. Support your answer with a convincing and concise justification. Recall that  $\mathbb{N}$  is the set of natural numbers,  $\mathbb{Z}$  is the set of integers,  $\mathbb{R}$  is the set of real numbers, and  $\text{pow}(A)$  is the set of subsets of  $A$ .

- a.  $\text{pow}(Z)$  where  $Z$  is the set of all electrons in the Milky Way galaxy.

Circle one: **Finite** or *Countably Infinite* or *Uncountable*

Justification: The number of all electrons finite, and the power set of any finite set is also finite. (We gave full credit to answers that interpreted  $Z$  here as  $\mathbb{Z}$  (the integers), and explained that  $\text{pow}(\mathbb{Z})$  is uncountable, so long your justification made it clear, since the question used a confusing notation (and misspelled the name of our galaxy).

- b.  $\text{pow}(\mathbb{R})$

Circle one: *Finite* or *Countably Infinite* or **Uncountable**

Justification:  $\mathbb{R}$  is uncountable and we know for all sets  $|\text{pow}(S)| > |S|$ , so  $\text{pow}(\mathbb{R})$  must be uncountable.

- c.  $\{(a, b) \mid a \in \mathbb{N}, b \in \mathbb{R}, b = a/2\}$

Circle one: *Finite* or **Countably Infinite** or *Uncountable*

Justification:  $\mathbb{N}$  is countably infinite. There is a bijection between  $S = \{(a, b) \mid a \in \mathbb{N}, b \in \mathbb{R}, b = a/2\}$  and  $\mathbb{N}$ : simply map each element of  $S = (a, b)$  to the element of  $\mathbb{N}$  that matches its  $a$  value. Since there is a bijection, the sets have the same cardinality, and  $S$  is countably infinite.