

# Artificial Intelligence: Solutions to Exercise 4

Maik Kschischo, Elina Unruh

1. Transform the following formulas to conjunctive normal form.

- (a)  $a \Leftrightarrow b$
- (b)  $a \wedge b \Leftrightarrow a \vee b$
- (c)  $a \wedge (a \Leftrightarrow b) \Rightarrow b$

Solution:

- (a) We use  $p \Rightarrow q \equiv q \vee \neg p$ . Thus  $a \Rightarrow b \equiv b \vee \neg a$  and  $b \Rightarrow a \equiv a \vee \neg b$ . Thus  $a \Leftrightarrow b \equiv (a \vee \neg b) \wedge (b \vee \neg a)$ .
- (b) One can follow the algorithm from the lecture. here, it is faster to use a truth table to see that  $(a \wedge b \Leftrightarrow a \vee b) \equiv a \vee b$ , which is in conjunctive normal form.

Alternatively, we follow the algorithm in the lecture

- i. Remove implications

$$\begin{aligned} a \wedge b \Leftrightarrow a \vee b &\equiv (a \wedge b \Rightarrow a \vee b) \wedge (a \vee b \Rightarrow a \wedge b) \\ &\equiv ((a \vee b) \vee \neg(a \wedge b)) \wedge ((a \wedge b) \vee \neg(a \vee b)) \end{aligned}$$

- ii. Use De Morgan's laws to move negations in front of each symbol

$$\begin{aligned} &((a \vee b) \vee \neg(a \wedge b)) \wedge ((a \wedge b) \vee \neg(a \vee b)) \\ &\equiv \underbrace{((a \vee b) \vee (\neg a \vee \neg b))}_{=p} \wedge \underbrace{((a \wedge b) \vee (\neg a \wedge \neg b))}_{=q} \end{aligned}$$

- iii. We use the distributive laws for the two formulas  $p$  and  $q$ . Actually,  $p$  is already a clause, but we will try to further simplify

$$\begin{aligned} p &\equiv (a \vee b) \vee (\neg a \vee \neg b) \equiv ((a \vee b) \vee \neg a) \vee ((a \vee b) \vee \neg b) \\ &\equiv a \vee \neg a \vee b \vee a \vee b \vee \neg b \\ &\equiv a \vee b \\ q &\equiv (a \wedge b) \vee (\neg a \wedge \neg b) \equiv ((a \wedge b) \vee \neg a) \wedge ((a \wedge b) \vee \neg b) \\ &\equiv ((a \vee \neg a) \wedge (b \vee \neg a)) \wedge ((a \vee \neg b) \wedge (b \wedge \neg b)) \\ &\equiv (b \vee \neg a) \wedge (a \vee \neg b) \end{aligned}$$

Now, since  $p$  is a clause and  $q$  is already in conjunctive normal form we find

$$a \wedge b \Leftrightarrow a \vee b \equiv p \wedge q \equiv (a \vee b) \wedge (b \vee \neg a) \wedge (a \vee \neg b)$$

$$(c) \ a \wedge (a \Leftrightarrow b) \Rightarrow b \equiv T$$

2. Explain the difference between the following expressions

$$p \Rightarrow q$$

$$p \models q$$

$$p \vdash q$$

Solution: Todo

3. The resolution rule

$$\frac{A \vee B \quad \neg A \vee C}{B \vee C}$$

is an inference rule and not an equation. Check, whether  $(A \vee B) \wedge (\neg A \wedge C) \equiv (B \vee C)$  is correct?

Solution: Already the second row of the following truth table shows that the formula is incorrect.

$A$	$B$	$C$	$\neg A$	$A \vee B$	$\neg A \vee C$	$(A \vee B) \wedge (\neg A \vee C)$	$B \vee C$
T	T	T	F	T	T	T	T
T	T	F	F	T	F	<b>F</b>	<b>T</b>
$\vdots$	$\vdots$	$\dots$	$\dots$	$\dots$	$\dots$	$\dots$	$\vdots$

4. Show by resolution that

(a) the formula  $(a \vee b) \wedge (\neg b \vee c) \Rightarrow (a \vee c)$  is a tautology.

(b) the formula  $\neg(\neg \text{gasintank} \wedge (\text{gasintank} \vee \neg \text{carstarts})) \Rightarrow \neg \text{carstarts}$  is unsatisfiable.

Solution:

(a) We look for complementary literals and find  $b$  and  $\neg b$ . Then

$$\frac{a \vee b \quad \neg b \vee c}{a \vee c}$$

Now

$$\frac{a \vee c \quad \neg(a \vee c)}{\emptyset}$$

(b) Here  $\neg \text{gasintank}$  and  $\text{gasintank}$  are complementary literals and the resolution

$$\frac{\text{gasintank} \vee \neg \text{carstarts} \quad \neg \text{gasintank}}{\neg \text{carstarts}}$$

Thus  $(\neg \text{gasintank} \wedge (\text{gasintank} \vee \neg \text{carstarts})) \vdash \neg \text{carstarts}$ . Negating yields  $\text{carstarts} \Rightarrow \neg \text{carstarts}$ , which is unsatisfiable.

5. Solve the following case with the help of a resolution proof: “If the criminal had an accomplice, then he came in a car. The criminal had no accomplice and did not have the key, or he had the key and an accomplice. The criminal had the key. Did the criminal come in a car or not?”

Solution: We read from the text the following formulas (as usually connected by conjunctions  $\wedge$ ) and assumed to be true.

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{accomplice} \Rightarrow \text{car} \\ & (\neg \text{accomplice} \wedge \neg \text{key}) \vee (\text{accomplice} \wedge \text{key}) \\ & \text{key} \end{aligned}$$

We form a conjunctive normal form for the first

$$\text{accomplice} \Rightarrow \text{car} \equiv \text{car} \vee \neg \text{accomplice}$$

and for the second formula using the distributive law

$$\begin{aligned} & (\neg \text{accomplice} \wedge \neg \text{key}) \vee (\text{accomplice} \wedge \text{key}) \\ & \equiv (\neg \text{accomplice} \vee (\text{accomplice} \wedge \text{key})) \wedge (\neg \text{key} \vee (\text{accomplice} \wedge \text{key})) \\ & \equiv ((\neg \text{accomplice} \vee \text{accomplice}) \wedge (\neg \text{accomplice} \vee \text{key})) \\ & \quad \wedge ((\neg \text{key} \vee \text{accomplice}) \wedge (\neg \text{key} \wedge \text{key})). \end{aligned}$$

With  $a \vee \neg a = T$  and  $c \wedge T = c$  we find

$$\begin{aligned} & (\neg \text{accomplice} \wedge \neg \text{key}) \vee (\text{accomplice} \wedge \text{key}) \\ & \equiv T \wedge (\neg \text{accomplice} \vee \text{key}) \wedge ((\neg \text{key} \vee \text{accomplice}) \wedge T) \\ & \equiv (\neg \text{accomplice} \vee \text{key}) \wedge (\neg \text{key} \vee \text{accomplice}) \end{aligned}$$

This is a conjunction of two clauses, which can be used in the axioms. We find

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{car} \vee \neg \text{accomplice} \\ & \neg \text{accomplice} \vee \text{key} \\ & \neg \text{key} \vee \text{accomplice} \\ & \text{key}. \end{aligned}$$

For a proof by contradiction we add the negation of the query  $\text{car}$

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{car} \vee \neg \text{accomplice} \\ & \neg \text{accomplice} \vee \text{key} \\ & \neg \text{key} \vee \text{accomplice} \\ & \text{key} \\ & \neg \text{car} \end{aligned}$$

We use resolution

$$\frac{\begin{array}{l} key \\ \neg key \vee accomplice \end{array}}{accomplice}$$

and using the resolvent we have

$$\frac{\begin{array}{l} accomplice \\ \neg accomplice \vee car \end{array}}{car}$$

The last resolution

$$\frac{\begin{array}{l} car \\ \neg car \end{array}}{\emptyset}$$

proves the contradiction. Thus, the criminal came in a car.