

## Webinar

$$\text{Convert: } (900)_{10} = (?)_2$$

### #1 Weight Method

$$\begin{array}{cccccccccccc} \underline{0} & \underline{0} & \underline{1} & \underline{1} & \underline{1} & \underline{0} & \underline{0} & \underline{0} & \underline{0} & \underline{1} & \underline{0} & \underline{0} \\ 2048 & 1024 & 512 & 256 & 128 & 64 & 32 & 16 & 8 & 4 & 2 & 1 \end{array}$$

$$900 - 512 = 388 - 256 = 132 - 128 = 4 - 4 = 0$$
$$(1110000100)_2 = (900)_{10}$$

### #2 Succession Division

$$\begin{array}{l} 900 \div 2 = 450 \text{ r } 0 \\ 450 \div 2 = 225 \text{ r } 0 \\ 225 \div 2 = 112 \text{ r } 1 \\ 112 \div 2 = 56 \text{ r } 0 \\ 56 \div 2 = 28 \text{ r } 0 \\ 28 \div 2 = 14 \text{ r } 0 \\ 14 \div 2 = 7 \text{ r } 0 \\ 7 \div 2 = 3 \text{ r } 1 \\ 3 \div 2 = 1 \text{ r } 1 \\ 1 \div 2 = 0 \text{ r } 1 \end{array}$$

Write  
Up to Down

- Divide Conversion Number by 2

(1110000100)  
from left to right

$$\text{Convert } (708)_{10} = (?)_{16}$$

$$\begin{array}{l} 708 \div 16 = 44 \text{ r } 4 \\ 44 \div 16 = 2 \text{ r } 12 \\ 2 \div 16 = 0 \text{ r } 2 \\ (708)_{10} = (2C4)_{16} \end{array}$$

When using decimal number system you can symbolize decimal point numbers by  $2^{-k}$

Example  $(52.5)_{10} = (?)_2$

$$52 < 64 = 2^6$$

$$\begin{array}{cccccc} 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 64 & 32 & 16 & 8 & 4 & 2 & 1 \end{array} \quad (52)_{10} = (110100)_2$$

$$52 - 32 = 20 - 16 = 4 - 4 = 0$$

Now to find  $(.5)_{10} \rightarrow (?)_2$  do  $2^{-k}$  i.e.  $\frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{4} \frac{1}{8} \frac{1}{16} \dots$

$$(.5)_{10} \leq \frac{1}{2} = 2^{-1}$$

$$\text{so } (52)_{10} + (.5)_{10} = (110100.1)_2$$

$$\begin{array}{cc} 0 & 1 \\ \frac{1}{4} & \frac{1}{2} \end{array}$$

- 2's Complement representation is NOT equivalent in a Binary System
- 2's Complement is ITS OWN number system

$$\text{so } (11001000)_{2s \text{ comp}} \neq (11001000)_2$$

## Propositional Logic

Example:  $\neg p \rightarrow (q \rightarrow r) \equiv q \rightarrow (p \vee r)$

$$\begin{aligned}\neg p \rightarrow (q \rightarrow r) &\equiv \\ \neg \neg p \vee (q \rightarrow r) &\equiv \text{Conditional Identities} \\ p \vee (q \rightarrow r) &\equiv \text{Double Negation Law} \\ p \vee (\neg q \vee r) &\equiv \text{Conditional Identities} \\ (p \vee \neg q) \vee r &\equiv \text{Associative Law} \\ q \rightarrow (p \vee r) &\equiv \text{Conditional Identities}\end{aligned}$$

## Predicate Logic

$\bigcup$  universe: (Mention where in the universe the predicates take value)  
 $\forall x p(x)$  universal: for all values of  $(x)$   $p$  should be true for them  
quantifier

$\exists x p(x)$  existential quantifier: There "exist" an " $x$ " for each  $p$

Example: True or False in Domain = (set of all ints)

a)  $\exists x (x+2=1)$

True ( $x=1$ ) exist in Domain

b)  $\exists x (x+x=1)$

False (if  $x=1$   $1+1 \neq 1$ )

c)  $\forall x (x^2 - x \neq 0)$

False (for all  $x$  this is not true  $x=1$   $1-1=0$ )

d)  $\forall x (x^2 > 0)$

False (Not all  $x$ 's satisfy;  $x=0$   $0^2 \not> 0$ )

e)  $\exists x (x^2 > 0)$  True there exist an " $x$ " where  $x^2 > 0$

Example: domain = (set of students at a Uni)

Define the predicates

$E(x)$  =  $x$  is enrolled in the class

$T(x)$  =  $x$  took the test

Translate from English to logical expressions with same meaning

a) Someone who is enrolled in class took a test

$$\exists x [E(x) \wedge T(x)]$$

\* A lot of times when we use existential statements, it's weak  
- we want to make them "stronger". The way to make them stronger is to use "and" ( $\wedge$ ).

\* KEEP MEANING JUST TRANSLATE TO PREDICATE

b) All students enrolled in the class took the test

$$\forall x [E(x) \Rightarrow T(x)]$$

\* When we use as universal statement, it's strong.  
- We want to make them "weaker". The way to make them weaker is to use "implication" ( $\Rightarrow$ ).

c) Everyone who took the test is enrolled in the class.

$$\forall x [T(x) \Rightarrow E(x)]$$

d) At least

Example. Domain = (set of real numbers)

Determine True or False

A)  $\forall x \exists y (x+y=0)$

$\forall x \exists y (x+y=0)$

Universal

For All  $x$  this needs to be  $\forall$

$x=1 \exists y (1+y=0) y=-1 \text{ T}$

$x=7 \exists y (7+y=0) y=-7 \text{ T}$

$x=3.5 \exists y (3.5+y=0) y=-3.5 \text{ T}$

All True!

$\exists x \forall y (x+y=0)$

Existential

$x=1 \forall y (1+y=0) \text{ F}$

$x=7 \forall y (7+y=0) \text{ F}$

All False!

The Order Matters!

Not All  $y$

Not All  $y$