



Figure 1: The tree for Question 2

COT 3420
Section U2
Fall 2005

EXAM # 1 SOLUTIONS

QUESTIONS

Question 1. (40 points)

1. b 2. c 3. a 4. b 5. d 6. d 7. c 8. c 9. a 10. b 11. c
12. a 13. b 14. c 15. d 16. a 17. c 18.c 19. a 20.d

Grading Criteria

2 points for each correct answer.

Question 2. (15 points)

The tree is shown in Figure 1.

Grading Criteria

1. 2.5 points for each correct resolvent, up to 6.
2. -2 points if the \square is not reached in 6 steps.
3. There is no credit for inferences whose parents are not driven correctly, i.e. there was an error on the path from a leaf to a parent.
4. -1.5 points for each misdirected arrow.

Question 3. (20 points)

Prove, by structural induction, that every non-empty suffix of F that has an equal number of left and right parentheses is a formula.

Proof: We need to prove the proposition below.

If S is a suffix of F , $S \neq \lambda$ and $n[(, S] = n[), S]$, then S is a formula.

Case 1: F is an atom, say P_i . The only non-empty suffix of F is F itself, a formula.

Case 2: $F = \neg G$. Let S be a suffix of F that satisfies the conditions $S \neq \lambda$ and $n[(, S] = n[), S]$. We have 2 subcases.

Subcase 2.1: S is a suffix of G . Then S is a formula by the IH applied to G .

Subcase 2.2: $S = F$. Then S is a formula.

Cases 3,4,5,6: $F = (GCH)$, where C is one of the binary connectives $\vee, \wedge, \rightarrow, \leftarrow$. Let S be a suffix of F that satisfies the conditions $S \neq \lambda$ and $n[(, S] = n[), S]$. We have 3 subcases.

Subcase 3.1: $S = J$ where J is a suffix of H . We'll show that the condition $n[(, S] = n[), S]$ is false, so the proposition is vacuously true.

$$\begin{aligned} n[), S] &= n[), J] && S = J \\ &= n[), J] + 1 \\ &> n[), J] \\ &\geq n[(, J] && \text{By Lemma 1.2.8 applied to the suffix } J \text{ of } H \\ &= n[(, J)] \\ &= n[(, S] && S = J \end{aligned}$$

So, $n[), S] > n[(, S]$.

Subcase 3.2: $S = ICH$ where I is a suffix of H . We'll show that the condition $n[(, S] = n[), S]$ is false, so the proposition is vacuously true.

$$\begin{aligned} n[), S] &= n[), ICH] && S = ICH \\ &= n[), I] + n[), H] + 1 \\ &> n[), I] + n[), H] \\ &\geq n[(, I] + n[(, H] && \text{By Lemma 1.2.8 applied to the suffix } I \text{ of } G \\ &\geq n[(, I] + n[(, H] && \text{By Lemma 1.2.8 applied to the suffix } H \text{ of } H \\ &= n[(, ICH)] \\ &= n[(, S] && S = ICH \end{aligned}$$

So, $n[), S] > n[(, S]$.

Subcase 3.3: $S = F$. Then S is a formula.

Grading Criteria:

1. Listing the cases: 1 point

2. Case 1: 1 point
3. Case 2: 6 points (2 points for listing the subcases, 3 points for subcase 3.1, 1 point for subcase 2.2)
4. Case 3: 12 points (3 points for listing the subcases, 4 points for subcases 3.1 and 3.2, and 1 point for subcase 3.3).

Question 4 (20 points)

Find a CNF for $F = \neg\{[(A \vee B) \longleftrightarrow C] \wedge [(A \wedge C) \longleftrightarrow D]\}$.

Show your work.

$$\begin{aligned}
 F &= \neg\{[(A \vee B) \longleftrightarrow C] \wedge [(A \wedge C) \longleftrightarrow D]\} \\
 &\equiv \neg\{[(A \vee B) \longrightarrow C] \wedge [C \longrightarrow (A \vee B)] \wedge [(A \wedge C) \longrightarrow D] \wedge [D \longrightarrow (A \wedge C)]\} \\
 &\quad \longleftrightarrow\text{-elim, line 1} \\
 &\equiv \neg\{[\neg(A \vee B) \vee C] \wedge [\neg C \vee (A \vee B)] \wedge [\neg(A \wedge C) \vee D] \wedge [\neg D \vee (A \wedge C)]\} \\
 &\quad \longrightarrow\text{-elim, line 2} \\
 &\equiv \neg[\neg(A \vee B) \vee C] \vee \neg[\neg C \vee (A \vee B)] \vee \neg[\neg(A \wedge C) \vee D] \vee \neg[\neg D \vee (A \wedge C)] \\
 &\quad \text{generalized DeMorgan's, line 3} \\
 &\equiv [\neg\neg(A \vee B) \wedge \neg C] \vee [\neg\neg C \wedge \neg(A \vee B)] \vee [\neg\neg(A \wedge C) \wedge \neg D] \vee [\neg\neg D \wedge \neg(A \wedge C)] \\
 &\quad \text{DeMorgan's 4 times, line 4} \\
 &\equiv [(A \vee B) \wedge \neg C] \vee [C \wedge \neg(A \wedge \neg B)] \vee [A \wedge C \wedge \neg D] \vee [D \wedge \neg(A \vee \neg C)] \\
 &\quad \neg\neg\text{-elim twice, DeMorgan's, } \neg\neg\text{-elim twice, DeMorgan's, line 5} \\
 &\equiv \{[(A \vee B) \wedge \neg C] \vee [\neg A \wedge \neg B \wedge C]\} \vee \{[A \wedge C \wedge \neg D] \vee [\neg A \vee \neg C] \wedge D\} \\
 &\quad \text{grouping and ordering, line 6} \\
 &\equiv \{(A \vee B \vee \neg A) \wedge (A \vee B \vee \neg B) \wedge (A \vee B \vee C) \wedge (\neg C \vee \neg A) \wedge (\neg C \vee \neg B) \wedge (\neg C \vee C)\} \vee \{(A \vee \neg A \vee \neg C) \wedge (A \vee D) \wedge (C \vee \neg A \vee \neg C) \wedge (C \vee D) \wedge (\neg D \vee \neg A \vee \neg C) \wedge (\neg D \vee D)\} \\
 &\quad \text{Generalized distributivity, line 7} \\
 &\equiv \{(A \vee B \vee C) \wedge (\neg C \vee \neg A) \wedge (\neg C \vee \neg B)\} \vee \{(A \vee D) \wedge (C \vee D) \wedge (\neg D \vee \neg A \vee \neg C)\} \\
 &\quad \text{tautology law, line 8} \\
 &\equiv (A \vee B \vee C \vee A \vee D) \wedge (A \vee B \vee C \vee C \vee D) \wedge (A \vee B \vee C \vee \neg D \vee \neg A \vee \neg C) \wedge (\neg C \vee \neg A \vee A \vee D) \wedge (\neg C \vee \neg A \vee C \vee D) \wedge (\neg C \vee \neg A \vee \neg D \vee \neg A \vee \neg C) \wedge (\neg C \vee \neg B \vee A \vee D) \wedge (\neg C \vee \neg B \vee C \vee D) \wedge (\neg C \vee \neg B \vee \neg D \vee \neg A \vee \neg C) \\
 &\quad \text{Generalized distributivity, line 9} \\
 &\equiv (A \vee B \vee C \vee D) \wedge (\neg C \vee \neg A \vee \neg D) \wedge (\neg C \vee \neg B \vee A \vee D) \wedge (\neg C \vee \neg B \vee \neg D \vee \neg A) \\
 &\quad \text{tautology law, idempotency, line 10} \\
 &\equiv (A \vee B \vee C \vee D) \wedge (\neg A \vee \neg C \vee \neg D) \wedge (A \vee \neg B \vee \neg C \vee D) \quad \text{absorbtion,} \\
 &\quad \text{ordering, line 11}
 \end{aligned}$$

Grading Criteria

You receive credit up to the first line that contains an error.

No line is correct 1 point.

1 correct line: 2 points

- 2 correct lines: 3 points
- 3 correct lines: 5 points
- 4 correct lines: 7 points
- 5 correct line: 9 points
- 6 correct lines: 11 points
- 7 correct lines: 13 points
- 8 correct lines: 15 points
- 9 correct lines: 17 points
- 10 correct lines: 19 points
- 11 correct lines: 20 points

Question 5. (20 points)

Prove or disprove: Let F, G, H, I be 4 formulas such that $(F \wedge G) \wedge H$, $(G \wedge H) \wedge I$, $(H \wedge I) \wedge F$, and $(I \wedge F) \wedge G$ are satisfiable. Then $(F \wedge G) \wedge (H \wedge I)$ is satisfiable.

First write proof or disproof, and then continue. If you don't make a choice or if you indicate both choices, you get 0 points.

Disproof: Let $F = P_1 \wedge P_2$, $G = P_1 \wedge \neg P_2$, $H = \neg P_1 \wedge P_2$, $I = \neg P_1 \wedge \neg P_2$. We can go directly to the table, but we can do it by simplification.

$$\begin{aligned} (F \wedge G) \wedge H &= ((P_1 \wedge P_2) \wedge (P_1 \wedge \neg P_2)) \wedge (\neg P_1 \wedge P_2) \\ &\equiv (P_1 \wedge (P_2 \vee \neg P_2)) \wedge (\neg P_1 \wedge P_2) && \text{by distributivity} \\ &\equiv P_1 \wedge (\neg P_1 \wedge P_2) && \text{by the tautology law} \\ &\equiv P_1 \wedge P_2 && \text{because } U \wedge (\neg U \vee W) \equiv U \wedge W. \end{aligned}$$

In a similar fashion

$$(G \wedge H) \wedge I \equiv \neg P_1 \wedge \neg P_2, (H \wedge I) \wedge F \equiv \neg P_1 \wedge P_2 \text{ and } (I \wedge F) \wedge G \equiv P_1 \wedge \neg P_2.$$

Each of these 4 formulas has a model. Now let us compute $(F \wedge G) \wedge (H \wedge I)$.

$$\begin{aligned} (F \wedge G) \wedge (H \wedge I) &\equiv ((F \wedge G) \wedge H) \wedge I && \text{by the associativity of } \wedge \\ &\equiv P_1 \wedge P_2 \wedge (\neg P_1 \vee \neg P_2) && \text{evaluating } (F \wedge G) \wedge H \text{ and } I \\ &\equiv P_1 \wedge P_2 \wedge \neg P_2 && \text{we apply } U \wedge (\neg U \vee W) \equiv U \wedge W \text{ to } P_2 \text{ and } (\neg P_1 \vee \neg P_2) \\ &\equiv \square && \text{by the contradiction law} \end{aligned}$$

Grading Criteria

1. If you wrote **Proof** you get 3 points.
2. If you wrote **Disproof** you get 7 points for the guess, 2 points for each correct value of a meta-variable, and 5 points for the proof that the picks are a counter-example. A truth table proof is acceptable, but you cannot get credit for proof unless all 4 picks are good.

PS I will add 8 points to the score of the students who took the test. The promises must be kept ...