CITS2211 Assignment 1

Name: Baasil Siddiqui
Student Id: 23895849

Question 1

A **Tautology** is a compound proposition which is true under all possible assignments of truth values of it's identifiers

A **contradiction** is a compound proposition which is false under all possible assignments of truth values of its identifiers

A **contingent** proposition is one which is neither a tautology nor a contradiction.

a) P ∨ (Q ∨ ¬P)

The statement is a tautology because if P is true then so is $P \lor (Q \lor \neg P)$
if P is false then, $Q \lor \neg P$ is true. Therefore, $P \lor (Q \lor \neg P)$ is true

The proposition is a tautology because it's true under all possible assignments of the truth values of P or Q

b) (P ∧ ¬P) ∨ ¬Q

$(P \land \neg P) \lor \neg Q \equiv F \lor \neg Q$ (by contradiction)
$F \lor \neg Q \equiv \neg Q$ (by absorption)

The proposition is a contingent because it depends on the truth value of Q

c) Q → (P ∧ ¬Q)

if Q is true then, $(P \land \neg Q)$ is false, making the implication false,
and if Q is false the implication is true

The proposition is a contingent because it depends on the truth value of Q

Question 2

$\mathbf{P \lor \neg(P \lor \neg Q) \equiv P \lor Q}$

1. $P \lor \neg (P \lor \neg Q)$	Premise
2. $P \lor (\neg P \land Q)$	1, Demorgan's laws
3. $(P \lor \neg P) \land (P \lor Q)$	2, distributivity
4. $T \land (P \lor Q)$	3, excluded middle
5. $P \lor Q$	4, absorption

5. $P \lor Q$
Q.E.D.

Question 3

$\forall n\ \exists x\ (n \leq x \leq n+5 \land (\exists a\ \exists b\ (a \neq x) \land (b \neq x) \land (a \times b = x)))$

Question 4

let N(x, y) be the predicate "x is a neighbour of y"

a) Anna has no neighbours

$\neg(\exists x.N(x, a))$

b) Ben has two neighbours

$\exists x\, \exists y\, (N(x, b) \land N(y, b) \land x \neq y \land \forall z\, (N(z, b) \rightarrow (z = x \lor z = y)))$

c) If somebody is a neighbour of Ben, Ben is also a neighbour of that person

$\forall x\, (N(x, b) \rightarrow N(b, x))$

d) Except for Anna, everyone is the neighbour of someone

$\forall x\, (x \neq a \rightarrow \exists y(N(x, y)))$

Question 5

An inference rule is sound iff assignment of truth values that makes all the antecedents of the rule true must also make the consequent true.

a) $\dfrac{\boldsymbol{P}}{\boldsymbol{P}}$

$P \equiv P$ by rule of identity
Therefore, the inference rule is sound

b) $\dfrac{\boldsymbol{P}}{\boldsymbol{P \leftrightarrow Q}}$

Counter example: if Q if false and P is true then, the axiom is true but the conclusion is false

Therefore, the inference rule is unsound

c) $\dfrac{\boldsymbol{P \leftrightarrow Q}}{\boldsymbol{P}}$

Counter example: if P and Q are false, the axiom is true but the conclusion is false

Therefore, the inference rule is unsound

d) $\dfrac{\boldsymbol{P\ Q}}{\boldsymbol{P \vee Q}}$

From the premise P we can infer P $\vee$ Q by disjunction introduction rule

Therefore, the inference rule is sound

e) $\dfrac{\boldsymbol{P \rightarrow Q\ \neg\neg P}}{\boldsymbol{Q}}$

1. $\neg\neg$P	Premise
2. P $\rightarrow$ Q	Premise
3. P	1, double negation
4. Q	2, 3, Modus ponens

Therefore, the inference rule is sound

Question 6

∀x.(¬ Q(x) ∨ P(x)) ∨ ∃ x(Q(x) ∨ (P(x) ∧ R(x))) → ∃x.R(x)

1. $\forall x(\neg Q(x) \wedge P(x))$	premise
2. $\exists x(Q(x) \vee (P(x) \wedge R(x)))$	premise
3. $Q(a) \vee (P(a) \wedge R(a))$	2, Exist elimination
4. $\neg Q(a) \wedge P(a)$	1, Forall elimination
5. $\neg Q(a)$	4, conjunction elimination
6. $\neg Q(a) \to (P(a) \wedge R(a))$	3, implication law
7. $P(a) \wedge R(a)$	6, 5, Modus ponens
8. R(a)	7, conjunction elimination
9. $\exists x.R(x)$	8, Exists introduction
Q.E.D.	

Question 7

Assume that the difference beetween a squidgy and a non-squidgy number multiplied by 2 produces a squidgy number

let k be a non-squidgy number and l be a squidgy number
If l is a squidgy number there exists integers p and q such that
l = $\frac{p}{q}$

$$(\frac{p}{q} - k) * 2 = \frac{p'}{q'}$$

where p' and q' are integers (by our assumption that the result is a squidgy number)

$$k = \frac{2pq' - p'q}{2q'q} \text{ (By arithmetic)}$$

2pq' - p'q and 2q'q are integers

We showed that k can be represented in the form of $\frac{a}{b}$ where a and b are integers,
therefore, we have a contradiction as k is a non-squidgy number yet,
can be represented as a fraction of integers

Our assumption that the result is a squidgy number must be false.
Therefore, the result of multiplying the difference betweeen a squidgy and a non-squidgy number by 2 is a non-squidgy number
Q.E.D.

Question 8

Definition: even numbers are divisible by 2 while odd numbers are not.

this is a bidirection proof so firstly, we prove that if x is odd then 5x-1 is even,
and then secondly, prove that if 5x-1 is even then x is odd.

first direction: if x is odd then 5x-1 is even

let x be an arbitary odd integer then x is of the form 2k-1 where k is an integer

$$\begin{aligned} x &= 2k - 1 \\ 5x &= 10k - 5 \text{ (multiplying both sides by 5)} \\ 5x - 1 &= 10k - 6 \text{ (substracting 1 from both sides)} \\ &= 2(5k - 3) \text{ (factoring out 2)} \\ &= 2k' \text{ (where } k' = \text{5k-3)} \end{aligned}$$

5x-1 is of the form $2k'$ which is an even number.
therefore, for any odd integer x, 5x -1 is an even integer

second direction: if 5x-1 is an even integer then x is an odd integer

The contrapositive of the statement is -
if x is not an odd integer then 5x-1 is not an even integer
We need to prove that if x is an even integer then 5x-1 is an odd integer

let x be an arbitary even integer then x is of the form 2k where k is an integer

$$\begin{aligned} x &= 2k \\ 5x &= 10k \text{ (multiplying both sides by 5)} \\ 5x - 1 &= 10k - 1 \text{ (substracting 1 from both sides)} \\ &= 2(5k) - 1 \text{ (factoring out 2)} \\ &= 2k' - 1 \text{ (where } k' = \text{5k)} \end{aligned}$$

5x - 1 is of the form $2k' - 1$ which is an odd number
therefore, for any even integer x, 5x - 1 is an odd integer

Conclusion
therefore, we have proved that if x is odd, then 5x-1 is even
and if 5x-1 is even then x is odd.
It follows that x is odd if and only if 5x-1 is even
Q.E.D.

Question 9

let P(n) be "there exists an ordering of players $p_1, p_2 ... p_n$ such that p_i defeats p_{i+1} for all $i \in 1, 2, ...n-1$"

<u>**Base case**</u>:
when n = 1, there is no valid value of i so the condition is satisfied for any arrangement
the 1 player can be arranged as "p_1"
Therefore, P(1) is true.

<u>**Inductive case**</u>:
We want to show that $P(K) \to P(K+1)$ for some arbitary $k \geq 1$

Inductive hypothesis:
We can Assume that P(K) holds for an arbitary $K \geq 1$

Inductive step:
Now, we need to show that P(K+1) holds given the inductive hypothesis

We can arrange the first K players as $p_1, p_2, \ldots, p_k$ such that p_i defeats p_{i+1} for all $i = 1, 2, \ldots, k-1$.
note that we haven't considered any matches with p_{k+1} yet

Now, we need to add a new player p_{k+1}. Since p_{k+1} plays a match against every other player, it either wins or loses each match.

Case 1: if p_{k+1} beat all other players it can be inserted at the front of the arrangement. "$p_{k+1}, p_1, p_2 \ldots p_k$" will satisfy the condition

Case 2: if p_{k+1} loses to all other players it can be inserted at the end of the arrangement. "$p_1, p_2 \ldots p_k, p_{k+1}$" will satisfy the condition

Case 3: If p_{k+1} defeated some players and lost to others.
Find a player p_j among the existing k players such that p_j defeats p_{k+1} and p_{k+1} defeats p_{j+1}

We will consider the case where such a value cannot be found in case 4

Insert p_{k+1} between p_j and p_{j+1}, resulting in the new sequence:
$p_1, p_2, \ldots, p_j, p_{k+1}, p_{j+1}, \ldots, p_k$.
In this new order:
p_i defeats p_{i+1} for all $i = 1, 2, \ldots, j-2$.
p_j defeats p_{k+1}.

p_{k+1} defeats p_{j+1}.
p_i defeats p_{i+1} for all $i = j+1, j+2, \ldots, k$.

Case 4: The only possible arrangement where the value j cannot be found in case 3 is when all the players p_{k+1} beat are at the front of the arrangement and all the players he lost to are at the end.

In this case p_{k+1} can be inserted at the front of the arrangement The resulting arrangement $p_{k+1}, p_1, p_2 \ldots p_k$ satisfies the condition because p_{k+1} beat p_1, p_1 beat p_2 and so on.

Thus, we have arranged $k+1$ players such that p_i defeats p_{i+1} for all $i \in 1, 2, \ldots k$
Q.E.D.

Question 10

Base cases:
in the formula a, A(ϕ) = 1 and B(ϕ) = 0
in the formula baa, A(ϕ) = 2 and B(ϕ) = 1

Thus, A(ϕ) $\geq$ 2B(ϕ) holds for the base cases

Inductive case ψaϕ:
by the inductive Hypothesis, we can assume that $A(\psi) \geq 2B(\psi)$ and $A(\phi) \geq 2B(\phi)$

$$\begin{aligned} A(\psi a \phi) &= 1 + A(\psi) + A(\phi) \\ &\geq 1 + 2B(\psi) + 2B(\phi) \\ &= 1 + 2B(\psi\phi) \\ &= 1 + 2B(\psi a \phi) \\ &\geq 2B(\psi a \phi) \end{aligned}$$

Inductive case abaψ:
by the inductive Hypothesis, we can assume that $A(\psi) \geq 2B(\psi)$

$$\begin{aligned} A(aba\psi) &= 2 + A(\psi) \\ &\geq 2 + 2B(\psi) \\ &= 2B(aba) + 2B(\psi) \text{ (since 2B(aba) = 2)} \\ &= 2B(aba\psi) \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, $\forall \phi. A(\phi) \geq 2B(\phi)$
Q.E.D

Question 11

Union: The union of sets A and B is a set containing all elements appearing in either A or B or both.
Intersection: The intersection of sets A and B is a set containing all elements appearing in both A and B

(i) $(A \cap \neg B \cap \neg C) \cup (B \cap C)$

(ii) $(A \cap \neg B \cap \neg C) \cup (B \cap \neg A \cap \neg C) \cup (C \cap \neg A \cap \neg B)$

Question 12

(a) Definition: A relation R is reflexive iff $\forall x \in X, R(x, x)$

I will disprove the given proposition with a counter-example:
let X = {1, 2, 3, 4}
Suppose R = {(1, 2)(2, 3)(3, 4)(4, 4)} and S = {(2, 1)(3, 2)(4, 3)(4, 4)}
then T = {(1, 1)(2, 2)(3, 3)(4, 4)(3, 4)(4, 3)}
Here, R and S are not reflexive since 1 $\in X$ but (1, 1) ∉ R and (1, 1) ∉ S
but T is reflexive since $\forall x \in X, T(x, x)$

(b) Definition: A relation R is reflexive iff $\forall x \in X, R(x, x)$

For any arbitary element x in set X,
(x, x) ∈ R and (x, x) ∈ S (by defination of reflexive relations)
(x, x) belongs to T as well (by definition of T)
we have proved that for any arbitary element x in X, (x, x) ∈ T
Therefore, if R and S are reflexive then so is T.
Q.E.D.

(c) Definition: A relation R is symmetric iff $\forall a, b \in X.((a, b) \in R \rightarrow (b, a) \in R)$

I will disprove the given proposition with a counter-example:
Suppose R = {(1, 2)(2, 1)(3, 4)(4, 3)(1, 3)(3, 1)} and S = {(5, 6)(6, 5)(4, 3)(3, 4)}
Then T = {(3, 3)(4, 4)(1, 4)}
here, R and S are symmetric
but T is not symmetric because (1, 4) ∈ T but (4, 1) ∉ T