

CS225 Assignment 1

Liam Rohrer
Iroh486
973023817

1.a.

P	Q	$\neg Q$	$P \rightarrow \neg Q$	$(P \rightarrow \neg Q) \vee Q$	$((P \rightarrow \neg Q) \vee Q) \rightarrow P$
0	0	1	1	1	0
0	1	0	1	1	0
1	0	1	0	0	1
1	1	0	1	1	1

Contingent

b.

P	Q	$\neg Q$	$\neg Q \vee P$	$(\neg Q \vee P) \wedge Q$	$((\neg Q \vee P) \wedge Q) \rightarrow P$
0	0	1	1	0	1
0	1	0	0	0	1
1	0	1	1	0	1
1	1	0	1	1	1

Tautology

2.a.

P	Q	R	$P \vee Q$	$\neg(P \vee Q)$	$\neg(\neg(P \vee Q)) \wedge R$	$\neg Q, (\neg(\neg(P \vee Q)) \wedge R) \rightarrow \neg Q$
0	0	0	0	1	0	1
0	0	1	0	1	1	1
0	1	0	1	0	0	0
0	1	1	1	0	0	0
1	0	0	1	0	0	1
1	0	1	1	0	0	1
1	1	0	1	0	0	0
1	1	1	1	0	0	1

Tautology

b. We want to show that $(P \rightarrow Q) \wedge (Q \vee \neg R) \Leftrightarrow (P \vee R) \rightarrow Q$:

$$(P \rightarrow Q) \wedge (Q \vee \neg R) \equiv (\neg P \vee Q) \wedge (Q \vee \neg R) \quad * \text{Implication} *$$

$$\equiv (\neg P \wedge \neg R) \vee Q \quad * \text{Distribution/Factoring} *$$

$$\equiv \neg(\neg P \wedge R) \vee Q \quad * \text{De Morgan's} *$$

$$\equiv (P \vee R) \rightarrow Q \quad * \text{Implication} *$$

Therefore, $(P \rightarrow Q) \wedge (Q \vee \neg R) \Leftrightarrow (P \vee R) \rightarrow Q$

3. a. $((\neg p \rightarrow q) \wedge q) \rightarrow \neg p$ is not a tautology. Let $p=T$ and $q=T$. This gives us:

$$\begin{aligned} ((\neg T \rightarrow T) \wedge T) \rightarrow \neg T &\equiv ((F \rightarrow T) \wedge T) \rightarrow F \\ &\equiv (T \wedge T) \rightarrow F \\ &\equiv T \rightarrow F \\ &\equiv F \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, $((\neg p \rightarrow q) \wedge q) \rightarrow \neg p$ is not a tautology.

b. $((p \vee \neg q) \wedge p) \rightarrow p$ is a tautology. We can see this by:

$$\begin{aligned} ((p \vee \neg q) \wedge p) \rightarrow p &\equiv ((p \wedge p) \vee (p \wedge \neg q)) \rightarrow p \quad * \text{Distribution*} \\ &\equiv (p \vee (p \wedge \neg q)) \rightarrow p \quad * \text{Idempotent*} \\ &\equiv p \rightarrow p \end{aligned}$$

Tautology

Therefore, $((p \vee \neg q) \wedge p) \rightarrow p$ is a tautology.

4. a. Given that n is an integer, we want to show that if $2n^2 + 3n$ is odd, then n is odd. We will do this using contraposition, showing that if n is not odd, then $2n^2 + 3n$ is not odd. Because we know n is an integer, we can also write this as if n is even then $2n^2 + 3n$ is even.

Let $n = 2k$.

$$\text{Then } 2n^2 + 3n = 2(2k)^2 + 3(2k) = 2(4k^2) + 6k = 2(4k^2) + 2(3k)$$

$4k^2, 3k \in \mathbb{Z}$, therefore $2(4k^2)$ and $2(3k)$ are both even by definition. We also know that the sum of two even integers will be even, giving us $2(4k^2) + 2(3k)$ is even.

We can then conclude that if n is even then $2n^2 + 3n$ is even, and, by contraposition, if $2n^2 + 3n$ is odd, then n is odd.

b. We want to show that the converse of the statement, "If $2n^2+3n$ is odd, then n is odd" is also true. This can be written as, "If n is odd, then $2n^2+3n$ is odd." Let $n = 2k+1$, where $k \in \mathbb{Z}$.

$$\text{Then } 2n^2 + 3n = 2(2k+1)^2 + 3(2k+1) = 2(4k^2 + 4k + 1) + 6k + 3$$

$$= 8k^2 + 8k + 2 + 6k + 3 = 8k^2 + 14k + 5$$

$$= 2(4k^2 + 7k + 2) + 1$$

Since k is an integer we know that $4k^2 + 7k + 2$ is an integer by integer multiplication and addition.

Then let $4k^2 + 7k + 2 = j$ and we can say $j \in \mathbb{Z}$.

We can then rewrite $2(4k^2 + 7k + 2) + 1$ as $2(j) + 1$ which is odd by definition. Therefore, by direct proof we can say that if n is odd, then $2n^2+3n$ is odd.

5. a. To prove that if $n^2+n \leq 0$, then $n \notin \{-1, 0\}$ we will use proof by contraposition and cases. The contrapositive of the statement can be written as, "If $n \in \{-1, 0\}$, then $n^2+n > 0$."

Take the case where $n = -1$:

$$(-1)^2 + (-1) > 0 \Rightarrow 1 - 1 > 0 \Rightarrow 0 > 0 \text{ Which is true}$$

Then take the case where $n = 0$:

$$(0)^2 + (0) > 0 \Rightarrow 0 + 0 > 0 \Rightarrow 0 > 0 \text{ Which is true}$$

Since all cases hold true, we can say that if $n \in \{-1, 0\}$, then $n^2+n > 0$, and by contraposition, if $n^2+n \leq 0$, then $n \notin \{-1, 0\}$.

b. The converse of this statement, which can be written as, "If $n \notin \{-1, 0\}$, then $n^2+n > 0$ ", is also true.

We will show this with a proof by cases.

(continued on next page)

Since n is an integer and $n \in \{-1, 0\}$, we have two possibilities. Either $n > 0$ or $n \leq -1$. We can also say that $n^2 + n = n(n+1)$.

Take the case where $n > 0$. In this case n is positive and therefore $n+1$ is also positive. This makes the term $n(n+1)$ a product of two positive numbers greater than 0 which makes $n(n+1)$ a positive number greater than 0 by definition.

Next, take the case where $n \leq -1$. In this case n is a negative number less than -1 so we know that $n+1$ is also negative and must be less than 0. This makes the term $n(n+1)$ a product of two negative numbers less than 0 which makes $n(n+1)$ a positive number greater than 0 by definition.

Since all cases hold true we can say by proof by cases that if $n \notin \{-1, 0\}$, then $n^2 + n > 0$.