

Assignment - 1

Name : Ashna Mittal

ID : 251206758

Problem 1 →

let A : "Dog is brown."

let B : "Dog is fluffy."

let C : "Dog is good."

let D : "Dog loves treats."

let E : "Dog is white."

1 → A dog that is brown or fluffy is a good dog.

Logic statement : $(A \vee B) \rightarrow C \wedge C$

2 → If a dog loves treats then they are a good dog.

Logic statement : $D \rightarrow C$

3 → Fluffy white Dogs don't like treats.

Logic statement : $(B \wedge E) \wedge \neg D$

4 → Every dog is fluffy or loves treats
or is a good dog.

Logic statement : $(B \vee C \vee D)$

5 → A dog which does not like treats and
is not fluffy is a bad dog.

Logic statement : $(\neg D \wedge \neg B) \rightarrow \neg C$

① $(A \vee B) \wedge C$

A	B	C	$(A \vee B)$	$(A \vee B) \wedge C$
T	T	T	T	T
T	T	F	T	F
T	F	T	T	T
T	F	F	T	F
F	T	T	T	T
F	T	F	T	F
F	F	T	F	F
F	F	F	F	F

② $D \rightarrow C$

D	C	$D \rightarrow C$
T	T	T
T	F	F
F	T	T
F	F	T

③ $(B \wedge E) \wedge \neg D$

B	D	E	$(B \wedge E)$	$(B \wedge E) \wedge \neg D$
T	T	T	T	F
T	T	F	F	F
T	F	T	T	T
T	F	F	F	F
F	T	T	F	F
F	T	F	F	F
F	F	T	F	F
F	F	F	F	F

④ $B \vee C \vee D$

B	C	D	$B \vee C \vee D$
T	T	T	T
T	T	F	T
T	F	T	T
T	F	F	T
F	T	T	T
F	T	F	T
F	F	T	T
F	F	F	F

⑤ $(\neg D \wedge \neg B) \rightarrow \neg C$

B	C	D	$(\neg D \wedge \neg B)$	$\neg C$	$(\neg D \wedge \neg B) \rightarrow \neg C$
T	T	T	F	F	T
T	T	F	F	F	T
T	F	T	F	T	T
T	F	F	F	T	T
F	T	T	F	F	T
F	T	F	T	F	F
F	F	T	F	T	T
F	F	F	T	T	T

A	B	C	D	E	$(A \vee B) \wedge C$	$D \rightarrow C$	$(B \wedge E) \wedge \neg D$	$B \vee C \vee D$	$(\neg D \wedge \neg B) \rightarrow C$
T/F	T	T	F	T	T	T	T	T	T

$$((A \vee B) \wedge C) \wedge (D \rightarrow C) \wedge ((B \wedge E) \wedge \neg D) \wedge (B \vee C \vee D) \wedge (\neg D \wedge \neg B) \rightarrow C = T$$

This set of propositions is consistent because a truth assignment exists for each propositional variable $(A, B, C, D, E) = (T, T, T, F, T)$, such that the set of propositions is consistent.

— / —

A B C D E $(A \vee B) \wedge C$ $D \rightarrow C$ $(B \wedge E) \rightarrow D$ $B \vee C \vee D$ $\neg(D \wedge B) \rightarrow \neg C$ Con

T T T T T T F T T F T F T F

T T T T F T T F T T F T F

→ T T T F T T T T T T T F T

T T T F F T T F T T T F T

T T F T T F F F T T F T

T T F T F F F F T T F T

T T F F T F T T T T F T

T T F F F F T F T T F T

T F T T T T T F T T F T

T F T T F T T F T T F T

T F T F T T T F T T F F

T F T F F T T F T T F F

T F F T T F F F T T F F

T F F T F F F F T T F F

T F F F T F T F F T T F

T F F F F T F F F T T F

F T T T T T T F T T F T

F T T T F T T F T T F T

→ F T T F T T T T T T F T

F T T F F T T F T T F F

F T F T T F F F T T F F

F T F F T F T T T T F F

F T F F F F T F T T F F

F F T T T F T F T T F F

F F T T F F T F T T F F

F F T F T F T F T T F F

F F T F F F T F T T F F

F F F T T F F F F T T F

F F F T F F F F F T T F

F F F F T F F F F F T F

Question 2 →

Let A : "A mushroom is poisonous."

Let B : "A mushroom doesn't have gills."

Let C : "A mushroom is red in colour."

Let D : "A mushroom has pores."

Let E : "A mushroom is found growing out of a living tree."

Let F : "A mushroom is bioluminescent."

Rules for poisonous mushroom :-

$$\textcircled{1} \quad A \rightarrow B$$

$$\textcircled{2} \quad A \rightarrow C$$

$$\textcircled{3} \quad \neg A \rightarrow D$$

$$\textcircled{4} \quad \neg A \rightarrow E$$

$$\textcircled{5} \quad F \rightarrow A$$

Characteristics of the three mushrooms translated into propositional logic :

Mushroom A : D & E & F & \rightarrow C & C

Mushroom B : D & E & \rightarrow F

Mushroom C : \rightarrow E & C & B & \rightarrow D

Mushroom A is Poisonous since it emits a faint glowing light which makes it bioluminescent. As per the given rules, if a mushroom is bioluminescent, then it is poisonous. i.e., $F \rightarrow A$. Also, the uncertainty about the color of the mushroom suggests that there is a chance that it is a dark shade of red, which as per the rules ($A \rightarrow C$, converse being $C \rightarrow A$) further suggests that Mushroom A is poisonous. It is not safe to eat.

Mushroom B is Not Poisonous since it was gathered from a living tree, has pores, is dark brown in color, and is not bioluminescent, implies suggests that it is not poisonous. Rules that are given ($\neg A \rightarrow D$, converse: $D \rightarrow \neg A$; $\neg A \rightarrow E$, converse: $E \rightarrow \neg A$; $F \rightarrow A$, converse $A \rightarrow F$) further help to determine the characteristics of this non-poisonous mushroom. It is safe to eat.

Mushroom C is Poisonous since it was gathered from a fallen tree, is red coloured, and neither has pores or gills. Converse of rules ($B \rightarrow A$, $C \rightarrow A$, $\neg D \rightarrow A$, $\neg E \rightarrow A$) further help to establish that it is not safe to eat.

Question 3 →

① $n \leq n^2$

This statement is true; Let $f(n) = n \leq n^2$

Proof: By direct proof.

Predicate Logic Statement : $\forall n (n \leq n^2)$ or $\forall n \in \mathbb{Z} (n \leq n^2)$
 proof → Let the domain of n be all integers.
 Since n is an integer, and n^2 is $n \times n$ which is n times n . The square of any integer is always greater than or equal to the given integer. Therefore, n^2 is always greater than or equal to n , i.e., $n^2 \geq n$. Thus, the statement $n \leq n^2$ is true for all or any integers.

A few examples include:

$$\text{Let } n = -3, n^2 = (-3)^2 = 9; \\ -3 < 9$$

$$\text{Let } n = 4, n^2 = (4)^2 = 16; \\ 4 < 16.$$

Hence, for any integer n , $n \leq n^2$

$$\text{Let } n = 1, n^2 = (1)^2 = 1; \\ 1 = 1$$

Hence, for any integer n , $n \leq n^2$ is true by direct proof.

Furthermore, $(n^2 - n) \geq 0$ or $n(n-1) \geq 0$

Case 1: if $n > 0$,

(i) $n-1 \geq 0$ (ii) As n are only integers

The product of equation (i) and (ii) will be 0 or greater than 0.
 (Multiplying two positives gives a positive)

11

Case 2 : if $n \leq 0$

(i) $n-1 < 0$ (ii) As n are only integers
the product of equations (i) and (ii) will
 0 or greater than 0 .
(multiplying two negatives gives negative)

From Case 1 and 2 , we can clearly say
that for every value of $n \in$ integer ,
 $n(n-1) > 0 \Rightarrow (n^2 - n) > 0 \Rightarrow n^2 > n$.

② Four Integers : a, b, c, d

Predicate logic statement :

$$\forall a, b, c, d ((a+b) \% 2 = 1) \Leftrightarrow ((c+d) \% 2 = 1)$$

Let the domain be a set of Integers : \mathbb{Z}

Proof : proof by Contrapositive Cases

~~If $(c+d)$ is even if and only if $(a+b)$ is even.~~

Case 1: a, b are odd and c, d are even.

Here, $(a+b)$ is even and $(c+d)$ is even

For example, let $a = \cancel{5}2k+1$ and $b = \cancel{7}2l+1$
 $(a+b) = (\cancel{5}2k+\cancel{7}2l+1) = \cancel{2}(2k+2l+1) = \cancel{2}(6k+1)$
 $\Rightarrow (a+b)$ is even.

Let $c = 2k$ and $d = 2l$

$(c+d) = 2k+2l = 2(k+l)$
 $\Rightarrow (c+d)$ is even.

Case 2: a, b are even and c, d are odd

Here, $(a+b)$ is even and $(c+d)$ is even.

For example, let $a = 2m$ and $b = 2n$

$(a+b) = 2m + 2n = 2(m+n)$

Let $c = 2m+1$ and $d = 2n+1$

$(c+d) = 2m+1 + 2n+1 = 2(m+n)+2$
 $\Rightarrow (a+b)$ is even and $(c+d)$ is even.

Case 3: a, c are even and b, d are odd

Here, $(a+b)$ is odd and $(c+d)$ is odd

Since the addition of even and odd is odd and because there are two even and two odd integers off the four integers.

For example, Let $a = 2m$ and $b = 2n+1$
 $a+b = 2m + 2n+1 = 2(m+n) + 1$
 $\Rightarrow (a+b)$ is odd.

Let $c = 2n$ and $d = 2m+1$
 $(c+d) = 2n+2m+1 = 2(m+n)+1$
 $\Rightarrow (c+d)$ is odd.

Hence, $(a+b)$ is odd when $(c+d)$ is odd
Alternatively, any two variables like even b, d could be taken as even and a, c as odd to prove the above shown proof.

Therefore, by proof by contrapositive, $(a+b)$ is odd if and only if $(c+d)$ is odd. This statement is true.

③

Let the first integer be a

Let the second integer be b.

Let the domain be a set of Integers : \mathbb{Z}^+

predicate logic statement : ~~$\forall a \in \mathbb{Z}^+ \exists b \in \mathbb{Z}^+,$~~

$\forall a \exists b (a^2 \leq b < a^3)$

~~Proof : by proof by Cases~~ This statement is False

Counterexample : Let a be 1 ~~and b be 1~~

$$\Rightarrow 1 \leq b < 1$$

Here, b might greater than or equal

- / /

to $a^2=1$, but it cannot be less than $a^3=1$. When $b=1$, the predicate logic statement $1 \leq 1 \neq 1$ is false. Similarly, for $b=2$, $1 \leq 2 \neq 1$ is false, and so on.

Therefore, it is not the case that for any positive integer, there exists a second positive integer which is greater than or equal to the square of first integer, but smaller than the cube of first integer as shown in the above example where $a=1$ and $b=1, 2, 3 \dots$. The statement is hence false.