

1 101100001000 101100001000 101100001000 101100001000 101100001000

# CSCI 2824: Discrete Structures

## Lecture 14: Exam 1 Review

---

Rachel Cox

Department of  
Computer Science

1 101100001000 101100001000 101100001000 101100001000 101100001000

**Time and Location:**

6:30-8:00 PM on Tuesday October 1<sup>st</sup>

- BESC 185 – Last Names Abbasi - Finley
- EDUC 220 – Last Names Fitze - Mackillip
- HALE 270 – Last Names Mahre - Zuyus

**Exam Rules:**

- You are allowed to use a calculator. No smartphones or other devices that can store large amounts of data or access the internet.
- You are allowed one 3x5-inch notecard as a cheat sheet. You can write whatever you want on it and you can use both sides.
- You do not need to bring bluebooks or anything like that.
- Do bring your Buff OneCard
- Do bring multiple writing utensils.
- Get there early. If you arrive late, you will not receive extra time.

**Exam format:**

Some combination of (a) multiple choice, (b) short answer (brief justification type problems) and (c) free response (more involved problems; think along the lines of the written homework problems.)

**Exam content:**

Beginning of the semester through Proof Methods and Strategy (Lecture 11)

## **Special Accommodations:**

If you have a documented special need for accommodations and have presented me with the requisite paperwork before the exam, then you can take the exam in **ECES 112 starting at 6:30 PM on Tuesday October 1<sup>st</sup>** and ending whenever your particular accommodation indicates. It is your responsibility to keep track of your time – the proctors are instructed not to bother you, since that's kind of the point.

This is a classroom with seating for about 20 people. If your particular needs require some different accommodation, just let me know in a private Piazza message (or email) and we'll sort it out.

Note: If you do not have a documented need through Disability Services then this doesn't apply to you, and you must take the exam in the regularly scheduled place/time.

# Binary Representation of Numbers

Example: Represent 209 as a binary number

$$N = 209$$

$$(209)_{10} = (11010001)_2$$
$$N = \frac{209-1}{2} = 104$$

$$104$$

$$0 \quad 2^0$$

$$N = 52$$

$$52$$

$$0 \quad 2^1$$

$$N = 26$$

$$26$$

$$0 \quad 2^2$$

$$N = 13$$

$$13$$

$$1 \quad 2^3$$

$$N = \frac{13-1}{2} = 6$$

$$6$$

$$0 \quad 2^4$$

$$N = 3$$

$$3$$

$$1 \quad 2^5$$

$$N = \frac{3-1}{2} = 1$$

$$1$$

$$1 \quad 2^6$$

$$N = 0$$

Done.

# Logical Equivalences

---

$$p \rightarrow q \equiv \neg p \vee q$$

$$p \rightarrow q \equiv \neg q \rightarrow \neg p$$

$$p \Leftrightarrow q \equiv (p \rightarrow q) \wedge (q \rightarrow p)$$

$$p \oplus q \equiv (p \vee q) \wedge \neg(p \wedge q)$$

Relation by Implication (RBI)

Contraposition

Definition of Biconditional

Alternate Definition of xor

**TABLE 6** Logical Equivalences.

| Equivalence  | Name                |
|--|---------------------|
| $p \wedge \mathbf{T} \equiv p$<br>$p \vee \mathbf{F} \equiv p$   | Identity laws       |
| $p \vee \mathbf{T} \equiv \mathbf{T}$<br>$p \wedge \mathbf{F} \equiv \mathbf{F}$   | Domination laws     |
| $p \vee p \equiv p$<br>$p \wedge p \equiv p$   | Idempotent laws     |
| $\neg(\neg p) \equiv p$  | Double negation law |
| $p \vee q \equiv q \vee p$<br>$p \wedge q \equiv q \wedge p$   | Commutative laws    |
| $(p \vee q) \vee r \equiv p \vee (q \vee r)$<br>$(p \wedge q) \wedge r \equiv p \wedge (q \wedge r)$                     | Associative laws    |
| $p \vee (q \wedge r) \equiv (p \vee q) \wedge (p \vee r)$<br>$p \wedge (q \vee r) \equiv (p \wedge q) \vee (p \wedge r)$ | Distributive laws   |
| $\neg(p \wedge q) \equiv \neg p \vee \neg q$<br>$\neg(p \vee q) \equiv \neg p \wedge \neg q$                             | De Morgan's laws    |
| $p \vee (p \wedge q) \equiv p$<br>$p \wedge (p \vee q) \equiv p$   | Absorption laws     |
| $p \vee \neg p \equiv \mathbf{T}$<br>$p \wedge \neg p \equiv \mathbf{F}$   | Negation laws       |

# Rules of Inference

---

**TABLE 1** Rules of Inference.

| <i>Rule of Inference</i>  | <i>Tautology</i>   | <i>Name</i>            |
|---|--|------------------------|
| $\begin{array}{c} p \\ p \rightarrow q \\ \therefore q \end{array}$                             | $(p \wedge (p \rightarrow q)) \rightarrow q$                                 | Modus ponens           |
| $\begin{array}{c} \neg q \\ p \rightarrow q \\ \therefore \neg p \end{array}$                   | $(\neg q \wedge (p \rightarrow q)) \rightarrow \neg p$                       | Modus tollens          |
| $\begin{array}{c} p \rightarrow q \\ q \rightarrow r \\ \therefore p \rightarrow r \end{array}$ | $((p \rightarrow q) \wedge (q \rightarrow r)) \rightarrow (p \rightarrow r)$ | Hypothetical syllogism |
| $\begin{array}{c} p \vee q \\ \neg p \\ \therefore q \end{array}$                               | $((p \vee q) \wedge \neg p) \rightarrow q$                                   | Disjunctive syllogism  |
| $\begin{array}{c} p \\ \therefore p \vee q \end{array}$   | $p \rightarrow (p \vee q)$   | Addition               |
| $\begin{array}{c} p \wedge q \\ \therefore p \end{array}$                                       | $(p \wedge q) \rightarrow p$   | Simplification         |
| $\begin{array}{c} p \\ q \\ \therefore p \wedge q \end{array}$                                  | $((p) \wedge (q)) \rightarrow (p \wedge q)$                                  | Conjunction            |
| $\begin{array}{c} p \vee q \\ \neg p \vee r \\ \therefore q \vee r \end{array}$                 | $((p \vee q) \wedge (\neg p \vee r)) \rightarrow (q \vee r)$                 | Resolution             |

# Logical Inference

\* practice show  
 $(p \vee q) \rightarrow r \equiv (p \rightarrow r) \wedge (q \rightarrow r)$

Example: Show that  $(p \rightarrow r) \wedge (q \rightarrow r)$  is logically equivalent to  $(p \vee q) \rightarrow r$

| p | q | r | $p \rightarrow r$ | $q \rightarrow r$ | $(p \rightarrow r) \wedge (q \rightarrow r)$ | $p \vee q$ | $(p \vee q) \rightarrow r$ |
|---|---|---|-------------------|-------------------|--|------------|----------------------------|
| T | T | T | T                 | T                 | T  | T          | T                          |
| T | T | F | F                 | F                 | F  | T          | F                          |
| T | F | T | T                 | T                 | T  | T          | T                          |
| T | F | F | F                 | T                 | F  | T          | F                          |
| F | T | T | T                 | T                 | T  | T          | T                          |
| F | T | F | T                 | F                 | F  | T          | F                          |
| F | F | T | T                 | T                 | T  | F          | T                          |
| F | F | F | T                 | T                 | T  | F          | T                          |

# Truth Tables & Knights / Knaves

Example: The Island of Knights and Knaves has two types of inhabitants: Knights, who always tell the truth, and Knaves, who always lie. As you are exploring the Island of Knights and Knaves you encounter two people named A and B.

A tells you “Of B and myself, exactly one of us is a Knight.”  
B tells you “A is a Knave.”

$p$ : A is a Knight.  
 $q$ : B is a Knight.

Determine the nature of A and B, if you can.

| $P$ | $q$ | $\neg P$ | $P \oplus q$ | $P \Leftrightarrow p \oplus q$ | $q \Leftrightarrow \neg P$ | $(1) \wedge (2)$ | $P \Leftrightarrow p \oplus q \wedge q \Leftrightarrow \neg P$ |
|-----|-----|----------|--------------|--------------------------------|----------------------------|------------------|--|
| T   | T   | F        | F            | F                              | F                          | F                |  |
| T   | F   | F        | T            | T                              | T                          | T                |  |
| F   | T   | T        | T            | F                              | T                          | F                |  |
| F   | F   | T        | F            | T                              | F                          | T                |  |

A is a knight.  
B is a knave

# Rules of Inference

---

Example: If it <sup>P</sup>snows and it is <sup>q</sup>dark out, then Tony will <sup>r</sup>crash his bicycle. Suppose you see Tony and he has crashed his bicycle. What then, do you know must also be true?

- a) It is snowing.
- b) It is dark out.
- c) It is snowing and it is dark out.
- d) Nothing
- e) It is not snowing and it is not dark out.

$$\begin{array}{c} (P \wedge q) \rightarrow r \\ \hline r \\ \therefore \end{array}$$

Fallacy of Affirming the Conclusion

# Valid Arguments

---

Example: Is the following argument valid?

1. If an animal is a tapir, then it has short legs.
2. This animal is not a tapir.
3. Therefore, this animal does not have short legs.

Not Valid!

Fallacy of Denying the  
Hypothesis .

# Quantifiers

---



Select the quantifier translation that best matches the following English statement.

$\forall x (C(x) \rightarrow L(x, \text{pizza})) \wedge \exists x (C(x) \wedge L(x, \text{soda})) \wedge \neg \exists x (C(x) \wedge L(x, \text{asparagus}))$   
All computer scientists like pizza, and some computer scientists like soda, but no computer scientists like asparagus.

$\forall x (C(x) \rightarrow L(x, \text{pizza})) \wedge \exists x (C(x) \wedge L(x, \text{soda})) \wedge \forall x \neg (C(x) \wedge L(x, \text{asp}))$

Let  $L(x, y)$  denote " $x$  likes  $y$ ", let  $C(x)$  denote " $x$  is a computer scientist" and suppose the domain for  $x$  is all people.

$\forall x (C(x) \rightarrow L(x, \text{pizza})) \wedge \exists x (C(x) \wedge L(x, \text{soda})) \wedge \forall x (\neg C(x) \vee \neg L(x, \text{asp.}))$

Select one:

a.  $\forall x [C(x) \rightarrow (L(x, \text{pizza}) \wedge \neg L(x, \text{asparagus}))] \wedge \exists x (C(x) \wedge L(x, \text{soda}))$

b.  $\forall x (C(x) \wedge L(x, \text{pizza}) \wedge \neg L(x, \text{asparagus})) \wedge \exists x (C(x) \wedge L(x, \text{soda}))$

c.  $\neg \exists x [(C(x) \wedge \neg L(x, \text{pizza})) \wedge (C(x) \wedge L(x, \text{asparagus}))] \wedge \exists x (C(x) \wedge L(x, \text{soda}))$

d.  $\forall x [C(x) \rightarrow (L(x, \text{pizza}) \wedge \neg L(x, \text{asparagus}))] \wedge \neg \forall x (C(x) \wedge \neg L(x, \text{soda}))$

# Proofs

---

Example: Prove that a solution to  $x^2 - 2x + 1 = 0$  exists.

quadratic formula:  $x = \frac{-b \pm \sqrt{b^2 - 4ac}}{2a}$

$$x = \frac{-(-2) \pm \sqrt{(-2)^2 - 4(1)(1)}}{2(1)} = \frac{+2 \pm \sqrt{4-4}}{2} = \frac{2}{2} = 1$$

$$\boxed{x=1}$$

Example: Prove that a solution to  $2x + 4 = 0$  is unique.

Suppose  $x_1$  and  $x_2$  are both solutions.

$$\Rightarrow 2x_1 + 4 = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad 2x_2 + 4 = 0$$

$$2x_1 + 4 = 2x_2 + 4$$

$$2x_1 = 2x_2$$

$$x_1 = x_2$$

# Proofs

Example: If  $n$  is an integer and  $3n+2$  is even, then  $n$  is even.

## Proof by Contradiction

Pf: Assume  $n$  is an integer and  $3n+2$  is even.  $P \wedge \neg q$   
For a contradiction proof, let's assume that  $n$  is odd.

$n = 2k+1$  for some integer  $k$ .

$$\begin{aligned}3n+2 &= 3(2k+1) + 2 \\&= 6k + 3 + 2 \\&= 6k + 4 + 1 \\&= 2(3k+2) + 1\end{aligned}$$

contradiction

$3n+2$  can't be both even + odd.  $\Rightarrow \Leftarrow$   
Thus it must be that  $3n+2$  even  $\Rightarrow n$  even.  $\blacksquare$

## Proof by Contraposition $\neg q \rightarrow \neg p$

Pf: Assume that  $n$  is odd,  $\neg q$   
 $n = 2k+1$  for some  $k$

$$3n+2 = 3(2k+1) + 2$$

$$= 6k + 3 + 2$$

$$= 6k + 5$$

$$= 6k + 4 + 1$$

$$= 2(3k+2) + 1$$

$$\Rightarrow 3n+2 \text{ is odd. } \} \neg p$$

By contraposition, we've proven that  $3n+2$  even  $\Rightarrow n$  even  $\blacksquare$

Happy Studying!

(and good luck!)

