

### Exercise 1:

**N.B:** to avoid any confusion, replace "processor i may have failed or not" by "nothing can be said about processor i" (otherwise you can troll with "may or may not have is always true" : ) )

- a. False: some processors can fail because of another reason than the failure of i. Nothing can be said about processor i.
- b. True. (see a)
- c. False, for the same reason.
- d. False. If no processor  $j \neq i$  fails, this implies "some processor  $j \neq i$  does not fail" which is the negation of "all processors  $j \neq i$  fail" which, by contraposition ([https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ik2x\\_hOEXDw](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ik2x_hOEXDw)), implies the negation of "processor i fails" which is "processor i does not fail"
- e. False
- f. True (this implies the only correct formulation of the contraposition )
- g. False. Even if the failure of processor i is a cause of the failure of all processors  $j \neq i$ , it is not **necessarily** the only cause (if  $\neq$  if and only if).
- h. True. Nothing can be said about i.
- i: False
- j: False: "if some processor  $j \neq i$  does not fail" is the beginning of the contraposition ([https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ik2x\\_hOEXDw](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ik2x_hOEXDw)) of statement #, which implies that "processor i has not failed"
- k: False
- l: True, this is the only correct formulation of the contraposition.

As the only correct formulation of the contraposition, (l) not only implies, but is equivalent to #.

Correct answers are (l) and (f).

### Exercise 2:

- a. False for the same reason as ex1
- b. True for the same reason as ex1
- c. False for the same reason as ex1
- d. Now this becomes True because of the "eventually".
- e. False.
- f. This becomes false because of the "eventually".
- g. False (other cause possible)
- h. True same reason as Ex1
- i: False idem
- j: True, nothing can be said about processor i because of the "eventually".
- k: False
- l: False, nothing can be said about i because of the "eventually"

None of them implies #

### Exercise 3:

Here is a sketch of a (more than) acceptable prove for the exam:

Let  $P(n)$  be proposition "the number of edges in a complete graph of  $n$  vertices is  $n(n-1)/2$ "

We prove by induction that  $P(n)$  is valid for every integer  $n \geq 1$ :

Base case:

for  $n=1$ , the number of edges is equal to 0, which corresponds to " $P(1)$  is true".

Induction:

assume that  $P(n)$  is true for a certain  $n \geq 1$ ,

Let  $G$  be an  $n+1$  complete graph

Let  $v$  be any vertex in  $G$ , and  $G' = G - \{v\}$ , you are left with 1 vertex ( $v$ ) and an  $n$ -vertices complete graph  $G'$ , the number of edges incoming to  $v$  is  $n$  (one edge to all the  $n$  vertices of  $G'$ , since  $G$  is complete) , and by the induction hypothesis, since  $G'$  is an  $n$ -vertices complete graph, it contains  $n(n-1)/2$  vertices

leading to a total of  $n + n(n-1)/2 = (n+1)n/2$  , which proves  $P(n+1)$

Since  $P(n)$  implies  $P(n+1)$  and  $P(1)$  is true,  $P(n)$  is true for every integer  $n \geq 1$ .