

CS 543: Homework Assignment 5

Aditya Mehrotra
amehrotra@wpi.edu

1 Chp 7, Ex. 7.3

- a** We can assume the language has predefined functions for if, or, and, not, if and only if, etc.

```
function PL-True? (s,m) returns true, or false
  if s = True then return true
  else if s = False then return false
  else if SYMBOL?(s) then return LOOKUP(s, m)
  else branch on the operator of s
     $\neg$  : return not PL-True?(ARG1(s), m)
     $\vee$  : return PL-True?(ARG1(s),m) or (ARG2(s), m)
     $\wedge$  : return PL-True?(ARG1(s), m) and (ARG2(s), m)
     $\implies$  : not PL-True?(ARG1(s), m) or (ARG2(s), m)
     $\Leftrightarrow$  : return PL-True?(ARG1(s), m) iff (ARG2(s), m)
```

- b** In all such models, the sentences $P \wedge \neg P$, $\text{True} \vee \neg P$, and $\text{False} \wedge P$ may be true or false in a partial model.

- c** A general algorithm must be able to handle empty partial models without any assignments. In such cases, the algorithm has to determine unsatisfiability or/and validity, which are NP-complete and co-NP-complete.

- d** If and and or analyze their arguments in order, terminating on false or true arguments, it serves better. In such scenario, the algorithm already has the necessary properties: $P \vee Q$ returns true in the partial model when P is true and Q is unknown, and $\neg P \wedge Q$ returns false in the partial model where P is true and Q is unknown. The truth values of $Q \vee \text{true}$, $Q \vee \neg Q$ and $Q \wedge \neg Q$, on the other hand, are not discovered.

e The use of early termination in Boolean operators will result in a significant performance improvement. Because the Boolean operators in most languages already have the desired characteristic, you'd have to build special unintelligent versions and expect a lag.

2 Chp 7, Ex. 7.6

a Since this follows monotonicity, this statement is True.

b True. If $(\beta \wedge \gamma)$ is True for all models of α , then β and γ are true for all models of α . So, this implies $\models \beta$ and $\models \gamma$.

c False. This statement doesn't hold for $\beta \equiv \alpha$; $\gamma \equiv \neg\alpha$

3 Chp 7, Ex. 7.18

a A statement is considered satisfiable if certain truth value assignments can make the statement true. A statement is considered valid if all truth value assignments to the variables make it true.

A simple truth table has eight rows and gets a true output for all cases, hence the statement is valid.

b Considering the LHS

$$(\text{Food} \implies \text{Party}) \vee (\text{Drinks} \implies \text{Party})$$

$$(\neg \text{Food} \vee \text{Party}) \vee (\neg \text{Drinks} \vee \text{Party})$$

$$(\neg \text{Food} \vee \text{Party} \vee \neg \text{Drinks} \vee \text{Party})$$

$$(\neg \text{Food} \vee \neg \text{Drinks} \vee \text{Party})$$

Now consider RHS,

$$(\text{Food} \wedge \text{Drinks}) \implies \text{Party}$$

$$\neg (\text{Food} \wedge \text{Drinks}) \vee \text{Party}$$

$$(\neg \text{Food} \vee \neg \text{Drinks}) \vee \text{Party}$$

$$(\neg \text{Food} \vee \neg \text{Drinks} \vee \text{Party})$$

Clearly, LHS = RHS. Since the statement is of the form $S \implies S$, it is valid.

c If the negation of the statement is unsatisfiable, the statement must be valid.

$$\neg [(\text{Food} \implies \text{Party}) \vee (\text{Drinks} \implies \text{Party})] \implies [(\text{Food} \wedge \text{Drinks}) \implies \text{Party}]$$

$$[(\text{Food} \implies \text{Party}) \vee (\text{Drinks} \implies \text{Party})] \wedge \neg [(\text{Food} \wedge \text{Drinks}) \implies \text{Party}]$$

$$(\neg \text{Food} \vee \neg \text{Drinks} \vee \text{Party}) \wedge \text{Food} \wedge \text{Drinks} \wedge \neg \text{Party}$$

Each clause here is negated with itself, thus, resulting in an empty set.