

1. Let  $D$  be the set that contains precisely  $-1, 0, 1, 2$ . Which of the following propositions are true? Which are false? Briefly explain your answers.

(a)  $\forall x \in D (2x \geq 5 \rightarrow 2x \leq -5)$ . [2 marks]

**Solution.** True, because for any  $x \in D$ , we know  $2x \leq 2 \times 2 = 4 < 5$ , and thus the conditional is vacuously true.

(b)  $\forall x, y \in D (x + y < 2x \vee x + y < 2y)$ . [2 marks]

**Solution.** False: take  $x = 0$  and  $y = 0$ .

(c)  $\exists x \in D (2x = 2 \vee x - 1 = 0)$ . [2 marks]

**Solution.** True, because  $1 \in D$  and  $2 \times 1 = 2$  (or  $1 - 1 = 0$ ).

(d)  $\exists x \in D \forall y, z \in D x \neq y - z$ . [3 marks]

**Solution.** False, because given any  $x \in D$ , we can choose  $y = x$  and  $z = 0$ , so that  $y - z = x - 0 = x$ .

(e)  $\forall x \in D (\neg \exists y \in D y = -x \rightarrow x = 2)$ . [3 marks]

**Solution.** True, because for all  $x \in D$ , if  $x$  is  $-1, 0$  or  $1$ , then  $-x$  is  $1, 0$  or  $-1$ , so that  $-x \in D$  and thus the conditional is true vacuously; else  $x = 2$ , in which case the conditional is also true.

**Comments.** • Many misinterpreted the meaning of the proposition. According to Convention 2.2.8(3), the proposition reads

$$\forall x \in D ((\neg \exists y \in D y = -x) \rightarrow x = 2).$$

This is *not* equivalent to  $\forall x \in D \neg \exists y \in D (y = -x \rightarrow x = 2)$ , which is a false proposition.

- Some who interpreted the proposition correctly failed to explain all the cases.

2. Rewrite the following propositions symbolically. In your answers, you can use  $\text{Even}(n)$  and  $\text{Odd}(n)$  to stand for  $\exists x \in \mathbb{Z} n = 2x$  and  $\exists x \in \mathbb{Z} n = 2x + 1$  respectively.

(a) Any two natural numbers whose product is odd must sum to a positive even integer. [2 marks]

**Solution.**  $\forall m, n \in \mathbb{N} (\text{Odd}(mn) \rightarrow m + n > 0 \wedge \text{Even}(m + n) \wedge m + n \in \mathbb{Z})$ .

Another correct answer is  $\forall m, n \in \mathbb{N} (\text{Odd}(mn) \rightarrow m + n > 0 \wedge \text{Even}(m + n))$ .

(b) Being the square of some rational number is not a necessary condition for an integer to be even. [2 marks]

**Solution.**  $\neg \forall n \in \mathbb{Z} (\text{Even}(n) \rightarrow \exists x \in \mathbb{Q} n = x^2)$ .

Some acceptable but less preferable answers include

$$\begin{aligned} \neg \forall n \in \mathbb{Z} \quad \exists x \in \mathbb{Q} \quad (\text{Even}(n) \rightarrow n = x^2), \\ \exists n \in \mathbb{Z} \quad \neg \exists x \in \mathbb{Q} \quad (\text{Even}(n) \rightarrow n = x^2), \\ \exists n \in \mathbb{Z} \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{Q} \quad \neg (\text{Even}(n) \rightarrow n = x^2), \\ \exists n \in \mathbb{Z} \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{Q} \quad (\text{Even}(n) \wedge n \neq x^2), \\ \exists n \in \mathbb{Z} \quad \neg (\text{Even}(n) \rightarrow \exists x \in \mathbb{Q} n = x^2), \\ \exists n \in \mathbb{Z} \quad (\text{Even}(n) \wedge \neg \exists x \in \mathbb{Q} n = x^2), \\ \exists n \in \mathbb{Z} \quad (\text{Even}(n) \wedge \forall x \in \mathbb{Q} n \neq x^2). \end{aligned}$$

**Extra explanations.** The given sentence is the negation of “Being the square of some rational number is a necessary condition for an integer to be even”, which is intended to apply to all integers.

**Comments.** • Very few got this completely correct. Some have the negation in the wrong place. Some wrote the wrong quantifiers. Some misinterpreted “is not a necessary condition” as “is a sufficient condition”.

- Some used predicates such as  $\text{Even}(n)$  like a number, as in “ $\text{Even}(n) = y$ ”, where  $y$  is a number variable. One should *not* equate objects of different types: predicates take T or F after suitable substitutions, whereas number variables take numerical values.
- Some used numerical terms such as  $x^2$  like a predicate, as in “ $x^2 \rightarrow \text{Even}(n)$ ”. We did not define what expressions like “ $2^2 \rightarrow \text{Even}(4)$ ” mean.

3. Let  $p$  and  $q$  be propositional variables. Which of the following pairs of compound expressions are equivalent? Which are not? Prove that your answers are correct.

(a)  $p \wedge \neg q \rightarrow q \vee \neg p$  and  $p \rightarrow q$ . [3 marks]

**Solution.** Yes, as shown below.

$$\begin{aligned}
 p \wedge \neg q \rightarrow q \vee \neg p &\equiv \neg(p \wedge \neg q) \vee q \vee \neg p && \text{by the logical identity on implication;} \\
 &\equiv \neg p \vee q \vee q \vee \neg p && \text{by De Morgan's Laws and the Double Negative Law;} \\
 &\equiv \neg p \vee q && \text{by the Idempotence Laws;} \\
 &\equiv p \rightarrow q && \text{by the logical identity on implication.}
 \end{aligned}$$

Alternatively, one can draw a truth table to show the equivalence.

$p$	$q$	$\neg p$	$\neg q$	$p \wedge \neg q$	$q \vee \neg p$	$p \wedge \neg q \rightarrow q \vee \neg p$	$p \rightarrow q$
T	T	F	F	F	T	T	T
T	F	F	T	T	F	F	F
F	T	T	F	F	T	T	T
F	F	T	T	F	T	T	T

Since the column for  $p \wedge \neg q \rightarrow q \vee \neg p$  and the column for  $p \rightarrow q$  are exactly the same, the two compound expressions are equivalent.

(b)  $(p \leftrightarrow q) \vee p$  and  $p$ . [3 marks]

**Solution.** No, because if we substitute false propositions into  $p$  and  $q$  then  $(p \leftrightarrow q) \vee p$  evaluates to T while  $p$  evaluates to F.

4. Mathematics student Eloise just successfully proved the fact that, for every non-negative real number  $x$ , there exists a real number  $y$  such that  $y^2 = x$ . She then moves on to consider the following proposition:

for every real number  $a$ , if  $a < 1$ , then no real number  $z$  makes  $z^2 + 2az + 1 = 0$ .

- (i) Eloise attempts to prove this proposition as follows.

We prove this by contraposition. Suppose  $a \geq 1$ . Then  $a^2 - 1 = a \times a - 1 \geq a \times 1 - 1 \geq 1 \times 1 - 1 = 0$ . So the fact just established gives  $y \in \mathbb{R}$  such that  $y^2 = a^2 - 1$ . Define  $z = y - a$ . Then  $z \in \mathbb{R}$  and

$$\begin{aligned}
 z^2 + 2az + 1 &= (y - a)^2 + 2a(y - a) + 1 && \text{as } z = y - a; \\
 &= (y^2 - 2ay + a^2) + (2ay - 2a^2) + 1 = y^2 - a^2 + 1 \\
 &= (a^2 - 1) - a^2 + 1 && \text{as } y^2 = a^2 - 1; \\
 &= 0.
 \end{aligned}$$

What is wrong with this attempt? [1 mark]

**Solution.** This attempt shows the inverse/converse of the proposition, which may not be equivalent to the proposition being considered.

**Comments.** Some got the contrapositive of the proposition wrong.

- (ii) Prove that this proposition is false. If you decide to use any facts about discriminants, then you should prove them as well. [2 marks]

**Solution.** Let  $a = -1$  and  $z = 1$ . Then  $a = -1 < 1$  and  $z^2 + 2az + 1 = 1^2 + 2 \times (-1) \times 1 + 1 = 0$ .  $\square$

**Comments.** Many got full marks for this part. Some used discriminants without further explanation despite the warning.