QUESTION 1. [5 MARKS]

A binary string is a (possibly empty) sequence of 0's and 1's. Let B(n) be the number of binary strings of length n. Use simple induction to prove that for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $B(n) = 2^n$.

Let P(n) be " $B(n) = 2^{n}$."

CLAIM P(n) is true for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

- PROOF (INDUCTION ON n) : If n = 0, then P(0) asserts that $B(n) = 2^0 = 1$ binary string of length 0. This is certainly true, since the unique binary string of length 0 is the empty string.
- INDUCTION STEP: Assume that P(n) is true for some arbitrary natural number n. I want to show that this implies P(n+1). I can partition the binary strings of length n+1 into two sets, those that end in the digit 1, and those that end in the digit 0. Binary strings of length n+1 ending with the digit 1 consist of an arbitrary binary string of length n, with the suffix 1, so by the IH there are B(n) $= 2^n$ of them. Similarly, binary strings of length n+1 that end in 0 consist of an arbitrary binary string of length n with a suffix 0, so by the IH there are $B(n) = 2^n$ of them. This accounts for all binary strings of length n+1, and counts none of them twice (since they end with either a 1 or a 0, and not both), so there are $2^n + 2^n = 2^{n+1}$ binary strings of length n+1, so $B(n+1) = 2^{n+1}$. This is exactly what P(n+1) claims, so $P(n) \Rightarrow P(n+1)$.

I conclude that P(n) is true for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. QED.

MARKING SCHEME: -1 mark for confusing the function B(n) (which has a numerical value) with some predicate B(n) (a predicate has a boolean value). -1 mark for including " $\forall n$ " in the predicate to be proved or the induction hypothesis. -1 mark for assuming P(n) and then "proving" it. -0.5marks for a small gap or error in your argument, or a confused argument. -2 marks if there is no explanation of why the induction step works. -1 mark for a missing conclusion. -2 marks if the induction step argues about a power set (set of subsets) rather than binary strings, without showing that they are connected. QUESTION 2. [5 MARKS]

Define f(n) by

$$f(n) = egin{cases} 5, & n = 0 \ 5, & n = 1 \ f(n-1) + 6f(n-2), & n > 1 \end{cases}$$

Let P(n) be " $f(n) = 3^{n+1} + 2(-2)^n$." Prove that P(n) is true for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

CLAIM: P(n) is true for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

- PROOF (COMPLETE INDUCTION ON n): When n = 0, P(0) asserts that $f(0) = 3^1 + 2(-2)^0 = 5$, so P(0) is true, by inspecting the definition of f(0). When n = 1, P(1) asserts that $f(1) = 3^2 + 2(-2)^1 = 5$, so P(1) is true, by inspecting the definition of f(1). Thus the base cases hold.
- INDUCTION STEP: Assume that $P(\{0, ..., n-1\})$ is true, for some arbitrary natural number n. I want to show that this implies P(n). If $n \leq 1$, then P(n) was established in the base cases. Otherwise, if n > 1 then $0 \leq n 1, n 2 < n$, so we have assumed P(n 1) and P(n 2) in the IH, and

$$\begin{array}{rcl} f(n) &=& f(n-1)+6f(n-2) & [\text{by definition of } f(n), \, n>1] \\ &=& 3^n+2(-2)^{n-1}+6(3^{n-1}+2(-2)^{n-2}) & [\text{by IH } P(n-1) \text{ and } P(n-2)] \\ &=& 3^n+2(-2)^{n-1}+2(3)^n+3(4(-2)^{n-2}) \\ &=& 3^{n+1}-(-2)^n+3(-2)^n & [4=(-2)^2] \\ &=& 3^{n+1}+2(-2)^n. \end{array}$$

This is exactly what P(n) claims, so $P(\{0, \ldots, n-1\}) \Rightarrow P(n)$.

I conclude that P(n) is true for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

MARKING SCHEME: -1 mark for incorrect base cases. -1 mark for missing induction hypothesis, or assuming P(n) for n > 1 -1 mark for not setting up complete induction properly, so that the IH cover n - 1 and n - 2. Between -0.5 and -1 marks for missing algebra. -1 for solving the related quadratic equation, without proving that the closed form is equal to f(n). -1 mark for assuming $\forall n P(n)$. QUESTION 3. [5 MARKS]

Let \mathcal{E} be defined as the smallest set such that:

BASIS: x, y, and z are elements of \mathcal{E} .

INDUCTION STEP: If e_1 and e_2 are elements of \mathcal{E} , then so is (e_1, e_2) .

Let lp(e) be the number of left parentheses in e, and c(e) be the number of commas in e. Prove there is no element $e \in \mathcal{E}$ such that lp(e) = c(e) + 19. (The left parenthesis is the "(" character, and the comma is the "," character).

- CLAIM: Define lp(e) as the number of left parentheses in e, and c(e) as the number of commas in e, and let P(e) be "lp(e) = c(e)." Then $\forall e \in \mathcal{E}, P(e)$.
- PROOF (STRUCTURAL INDUCTION ON e): If e is defined in the basis, then $e \in \{x, y, z\}$, and so lp(e) = 0 = c(e), since these expressions have no left parentheses nor commas. Thus P(e) is true for the basis.
- INDUCTION STEP: Let e_1 and e_2 be arbitrary elements of \mathcal{E} , assume that $P(e_1) P(e_2)$ hold, and $e = (e_1, e_2)$. Then e has one more comma than the sum of the commas in e_1 and e_2 (it adds one in the middle), and one more left parenthesis than the sum of the left parentheses in e_1 and e_2 (it adds one on the left), so

 $lp(e) = lp(e_1) + lp(e_2) + 1$ [by the remark above] = $c(e_1) + c(e_2) + 1$ [by $P(e_1)$ and $P(e_2)$] = c(e) [by the remark above]

This is exactly what P(e) asserts, so $P(\{e_1, e_2\}) \Rightarrow P(e)$.

I conclude that P(e) is true for all $e \in \mathcal{E}$. QED.

CLAIM: No element of $\mathcal E$ has 19 more left parentheses than it has commas.

- PROOF: By P(e) (above), every element of \mathcal{E} has the same number of left parentheses as commas, hence no element has 19 more left parentheses than commas. QED.
- MARKING SCHEME: -1 mark for messing up the construction of \mathcal{E} so that extraneous elements are included. -1 mark for omitting any explanation of why $lp(e) = lp(e_1) + lp(e_2) + 1$, or why $c(e) = c(e_1) + c(e_2) + 1$. -1 mark for confusing a predicate, say P(e) (boolean valued), with an expression in \mathcal{E} . -1 mark for omitting the induction hypothesis. -2 for no explanation of why lp(e) = c(e). -1 for assuming $P(e), \forall e \in \mathcal{E}$ before proving it.