

Rules:

- Rule (R1): $\text{HighGrades}(x) \wedge \text{StudentLeader}(x) \wedge \text{Applied}(x) \rightarrow \text{Eligible}(x)$
- Rule (R2): $\text{Eligible}(x) \rightarrow \text{Scholarship}(x)$
- Rule (R3): $\text{Scholarship}(x) \rightarrow \text{FinancialSupport}(x)$

Facts:

- $\text{HighGrades}(\text{Juan}), \text{Applied}(\text{Juan})$
- $\text{HighGrades}(\text{Maria}), \neg \text{Applied}(\text{Maria})$
- $\text{StudentLeader}(\text{Carlos}), \neg \text{HighGrades}(\text{Carlos})$
- $\text{HighGrades}(\text{Ana}), \text{StudentLeader}(\text{Ana}), \text{Applied}(\text{Ana})$

Part 1 – Unification

- Unify: $\text{Eligible}(x) \rightarrow \text{Scholarship}(x)$
- $\text{Eligible}(x) / \text{Eligible}(\text{Ana})$
- Substitution: $\{ x / \text{Ana} \}$
- $\text{Eligible}(\text{Anna}) \rightarrow \text{Scholarship}(\text{Anna})$
- $\text{Scholarship}(\text{Anna})$

Part 2 – Forward Chaining

Applying rules:

Anna -

- $\text{HighGrades}(\text{Ana}) \wedge \text{StudentLeader}(\text{Ana}) \wedge \text{Applied}(\text{Ana}) \rightarrow \text{R1: Eligible}(\text{Ana})$
- From $\text{Eligible}(\text{Ana})$ and R2 infer $\text{Scholarship}(\text{Ana})$
- From $\text{Scholarship}(\text{Ana})$ and R3 infer $\text{FinancialSupport}(\text{Ana})$
- $\text{Eligible}(\text{Ana}), \text{Scholarship}(\text{Ana}), \text{FinancialSupport}(\text{Ana})$

Juan -

- $\text{HighGrades}(\text{Juan})$ and $\text{Applied}(\text{Juan})$, missing $\text{StudentLeader}(\text{Juan})$
- Cannot infer $\text{Eligible}(\text{Juan})$ therefore Juan cannot infer $\text{Scholarship}(\text{Juan})$ and $\text{FinancialSupport}(\text{Juan})$

Part 3 – Backward Chaining

Goal 1: $\text{Scholarship}(\text{Maria})$

- Check rules that produce $\text{Scholarship}(x) \rightarrow \text{R2: Eligible}(x) \rightarrow \text{Scholarship}(x)$. Subgoal = $\text{Eligible}(\text{Maria})$.
- To prove $\text{Eligible}(\text{Maria})$, look at R1: $\text{HighGrades}(x) \wedge \text{StudentLeader}(x) \wedge \text{Applied}(x) \rightarrow \text{Eligible}(x)$. Subgoals: $\text{HighGrades}(\text{Maria}), \text{StudentLeader}(\text{Maria}), \text{Applied}(\text{Maria})$.
- Check facts: $\text{HighGrades}(\text{Maria})$ is true, $\text{Applied}(\text{Maria})$ is false, $\text{StudentLeader}(\text{Maria})$ is not given = assume false. Cannot prove $\text{Eligible}(\text{Maria})$.
- Since $\text{Eligible}(\text{Maria})$ fails, $\text{Scholarship}(\text{Maria})$ fails.

Conclusion: $\text{Scholarship}(\text{Maria})$ cannot be proved.

Goal 2: $\text{FinancialSupport}(\text{Ana})$

- Use R3: $\text{Scholarship}(x) \rightarrow \text{FinancialSupport}(x)$. Subgoal: $\text{Scholarship}(\text{Ana})$.
- To prove $\text{Scholarship}(\text{Ana})$, use R2: subgoal $\text{Eligible}(\text{Ana})$.
- To prove $\text{Eligible}(\text{Ana})$, use R1: need $\text{HighGrades}(\text{Ana}) \wedge \text{StudentLeader}(\text{Ana}) \wedge \text{Applied}(\text{Ana})$. All facts are present.
- Therefore we derive $\text{Eligible}(\text{Ana}) \rightarrow \text{Scholarship}(\text{Ana}) \rightarrow \text{FinancialSupport}(\text{Ana})$.

Conclusion: $\text{FinancialSupport}(\text{Ana})$ is provable.

Part 4 – Validity Check

Student	High Grades	Student Leader	Applied	A $(HG \wedge SL \wedge A$ $p)$	Eligible	$(A \rightarrow \text{Eligible})$
Juan	T	F	T	F	(Not derived) F	T
Maria	T	F	F	F	F	T
Carlos	F	T	?	F	F	T
Ana	T	T	T	T	(Derived) T	T

Part 5 – Reflection

Logical reasoning makes decisions explicit, reproducible, and verifiable. By having clear logical rules, any inconsistencies in conclusions and decision making are eliminated while systematic updates to beliefs are enabled when new facts are presented. AI and real-life scenarios rely on Logical reasoning to make sound decisions or reach logical conclusions.