

Biconditionals

The converse

Given an implication $P \implies Q$, its *converse* is the statement $Q \implies P$.

Statement and Converse are different

If I own a BMW 335xi, then I own a car

- ▶ P is “I own a BMW 335xi”
- ▶ Q is “I own a car”

The converse is “If I own a car, then I own a BMW 335xi”.

$P \implies Q$ is true but $Q \implies P$ is false.

Biconditionals or Equivalence

$P \iff Q$ means “If P , then Q ” AND “If Q , then P ”. It is often read “if and only if” since

- ▶ P if Q means $Q \implies P$
- ▶ P only if Q means $P \implies Q$.

It can also be read “necessary and sufficient” (P is necessary and sufficient for Q).

Truth Table for Equivalence

Synonyms

- ▶ P if and only if Q
- ▶ P is necessary and sufficient for Q
- ▶ P is equivalent to Q
- ▶ If P , then Q , and conversely.

Sample problem

Put the statement “If $xy = 0$ then $x = 0$ or $y = 0$, and conversely” in the form “P if and only if Q”.