



## Informační systém Masarykovy univerzity Zodpovězení odpovědníku (student)

Michal Lukáč (učo 430614)  
Studium FIN-IN UMI [sem 1, roč 1]  
podzim 2013 ([jiné](#))

### Odpovědník Exam-18-12

Odpovědi k průchodu Út 17. 12. 2013 13:54.52, operaci St 18. 12. 2013 12:42.31, osobě M. Lukáč, učo 430614 (číslo zadání: 46)

• Klikněte: [Ukaž Přehled nastavení parametrů odpovědníku.](#)

#### Přehled nastavení parametrů odpovědníku

*Kdy lze s odpovědníkem pracovat:*

- od 18. 12. 2013 08:00 do 18. 12. 2013 09:30

*Zobrazují se pouze správné odpovědi: ne*

*Test můžu skládat opakovaně: test nelze skládat, je přístupná pouze prohlídka (typicky skenovací písemky)*

*Implicitní počet bodů za správně zodpovězenou otázku (ok): 1*

*Implicitní počet bodů za špatně zodpovězenou otázku (nok): -0.5*

*Implicitní počet bodů za nezodpovězenou otázku (null): -0.25*

*Při vyplňování záleží na velikosti písmen: ne*

*Při vyplňování záleží na diakritice: ne*

*Při vyplňování nedovolují zaměnit různé typy apostrofů a uvozovek: ne*

*Při vyplňování záleží na interpunkci: ne*

Zeleně jsou vyznačeny správné odpovědi.

#### 1. (2 points)

How many steps are necessary to specialize the clause  $p(X, W) : \neg q(X, Y), r(Z, W)$ . to the clause  $p(a, b) : \neg q(a, Y), r(Z, b), s(Y, Y)$ ?

☒ \*five

☐ seven

☐ six

body = 2 = 2

#### 2. Which is a functionally complete set of connectives?

☒ \*{  $\vee, \wedge, \text{NOR}$  }

☐ {  $\vee, \wedge, \Leftrightarrow$  }

☐ {  $\vee, \wedge$  }

body = ok = 1

#### 3. Let F, a formal system for propositional logic, be given. Let T be a set of all theorems that can be derived in F, $\forall$ a set of all well-formed formulas of propositional logic and P a set of all tautologies. Which of the following statements is true?

☒ \*if F is complete then  $T = \forall$

☐ \*if F is correct then  $T \subseteq P$

☐ if F is contradictory then  $T = P$

body = nok = -0.5

4. Suppose  $F$  is a given formal system for propositional logic. Let  $T$  be a set of all theorems that can be derived in  $F$ ,  $\forall$  a set of all well-formed formulas of propositional logic and  $P$  a set of all tautologies. Which of the following statements is true?

- ☒ \*if  $F$  is sound and complete then  $P = T$   
☐ if  $F$  is contradictory then  $P = \forall$   
☐ if  $F$  is not contradictory then  $T = \forall$

body = ok = 1

5. Transformation of a predicate formula into prenex normal form preserves

- ☐ satisfiability but not equivalence  
☒ \*both satisfiability and equivalence  
☐ equivalence but not satisfiability

body = ok = 1

6. There exists a tableau proof for a propositional formula  $A$ .

Which statement is true?

- ☐  $A$  is a contradiction  
☒ \* $A$  is true in every interpretation  
☐  $A$  is true only in one interpretation

body = null = -0.25

7. For the formulas  $p \Leftarrow (a \wedge b \wedge c)$  and  $p \Leftarrow (a \wedge c \wedge d)$ , where  $p, a, b, c, d$  are propositional letters, it holds that

- ☐  $p \Leftarrow (a \wedge b \wedge c)$  is a generalization of the formula  $p \Leftarrow (a \wedge c \wedge d)$   
☐  $p \Leftarrow (a \wedge c \wedge d)$  is a generalization of the formula  $p \Leftarrow (a \wedge b \wedge c)$   
☒ \*the formulas are not in generalization relation

body = ok = 1

8. By processing of a next example the algorithm for the version space computation

- ☒ \*can decrease the version space size  
☐ can increase the version space size  
☐ always decreases the version space size

body = null = -0.25

9. A tableau for a propositional formula containing an infinite path

- ☐ can be finished  
☒ \*does not exist  
☒ ~~X~~ is always finished

body = nok = -0.5

10. Let  $P$  be a predicate formula which is neither a contradiction nor a tautology. Then

- ☐ there is exactly one formula in prenex conjunctive normal form equivalent to  $P$   
☒ \*there is at least one formula in prenex conjunctive normal form equivalent to  $P$   
☐ it is possible that a formula in prenex conjunctive normal form equivalent to  $P$  does not exist

body = null = -0.25

11. For an SLD-tree, it is true that

- ☐ it contains at least one finite branch  
☐ it contains finitely many nodes  
☒ \*it may contain an infinite branch

body = ok = 1

12. An LI-resolution tree of a derivation of  $\square$  from  $P \cup \{G\}$  where  $P$  is a set of Horn clauses and  $G$  is a goal, is always

- ☐ an LD-resolution derivation of  $G$  from  $P$   
☒ ~~an SLD-resolution derivation of  $\square$  from  $P \cup \{G\}$~~   
☐ ~~a linear resolution refutation of  $P \cup \{G\}$~~

body = nok = -0.5

13. Which of the sets contain all of its mutually nonequivalent logical consequences (with only proposition symbols from premises)?

- ☒  ~~$\{p \vee \neg p, q \vee \neg q, q \Rightarrow q\}$~~   
☐  $\{p \vee \neg q, q \vee p, (p \vee \neg q) \wedge (q \vee \neg p)\}$   
☐  $\{p \vee \neg p, q \vee \neg q, q \vee q\}$

body = ok = 1

14. When  $B$  is a domain knowledge,  $H$  is a resulting theory and  $E^+$ ,  $E^-$  are sets of positive and negative examples, *prior necessity* in inductive logic programming represents the condition

- ☐  $\forall e \in E^+ : B \cup H \vdash e$   
☒  $\exists e \in E^+ : B \not\vdash e$   
☐  $\forall e \in E^- : B \not\vdash e$

body = null = -0.25

15. (2 points)

Suppose we have the following Prolog code:

```
prove(true).
prove((A,B)):- prove(A), prove(B).
prove(A):- clause(A,B), prove(B).
```

To obtain a metainterpreter that can interpret *itself* it is necessary to

- ☐ add the clause `prove(A):- built_in(A), A.`  
☒ ~~add the clauses `prove(A):- built_in(A), A.`~~

```
built_in(clause(_, _)).
```

- ☐ add the clause `prove(A):- built_in(A), A.` and remove the clause `prove(A):- clause(A,B), prove(B).`

body = -0.25 = -0.25

16. One minimal generalization of  $p(a, X, c)$  is

- ☐  ~~$p(a, X, Y)$~~   
☒  $p(Z, X, Y)$   
☐  $p(a, b, c)$

body = nok = -0.5

17. (2 points)

Build a DCG grammar for the recognition and evaluation of inverted binary codes of numbers (i.e. binary codes where all

zeroes become ones and all ones become zeroes). The grammar returns a decimal value for every correct input, e.g.

```
?- i(X, [0, 1, 1], []). X=4 Yes
```

Every nonempty list of ones and zeroes is supposed to be a correct representation of an inverted binary number.

The beginning of the grammar is

```
c(0) --> [1]. c(1) --> [0]. i(X) --> i(0, X).
```

Select the correct choice for rest of the grammar:

☐  $i(X, Y) \rightarrow i(X, Y1), c(Z), \{Y \text{ is } 2*Y1 + Z\}.$

☐  $i(X, X) \rightarrow [].$

$i(X, Y) \rightarrow c(Z), i(X1, Y), \{X1 \text{ is } 2*X + Z\}.$

☐  $*i(X, Y) \rightarrow c(Z), \{Y \text{ is } 2*X + Z\}.$

$i(X, Y) \rightarrow c(Z), \{X1 \text{ is } 2*X + Z\}, i(X1, Y).$

body = -0.25 = -0.25

18. For Horn clauses, SLD-resolution is

☐ not sound but complete

☒  $\checkmark$  \*sound and complete

☐ sound and not complete

body = ok = 1

19. Transformation of a predicate formula into Skolem normal form preserves

☐ equivalence

☒  $\checkmark$  \*satisfiability

☐ neither satisfiability nor equivalence

body = ok = 1

20. Which of the following clauses is not a specialization of the clause  $p(X, Y) : \neg q(X, Z), r(Z, f(Y)).?$

☐  $p(X, f(c)) : \neg q(X, b), r(b, f(f(c))), p(c, Y).$

☐  $p(f(X), Y) : \neg q(f(X), Z), r(Z, f(Y)), p(Z, f(Z)).$

☐  $*p(X, X) : \neg q(X, X), r(X, f(c)), s.$

body = null = -0.25

21. In 5-valued Lukasiewicz logic with truth values  $\{0, 0.25, 0.5, 0.75, 1\}$ , given  $\text{val}(p)=1$  and  $\text{val}(q)=0$ , then  $\text{val}(p \wedge \neg q)$  is

☐ 0

☒  $\checkmark$  \*1

☐ 0.5

body = ok = 1

22. In fuzzy logic, given  $\text{val}(p)=1$ ,  $\text{val}(q)=0.5$ ,  $\text{val}(r)=0.2$ , then

$\text{val}(\neg(p \Rightarrow q) \vee r)$  is

☒  $\checkmark$  \*0.5

☐ 1

☐ 0

body = ok = 1

23. Let  $P(\text{Adam}, \text{Eve}, \text{apple})$  represent the statement, *Adam gives Eve an apple*. Which of the formulas represents the statement equivalent to *Eve gives something to Adam and someone gives an apple to everyone*?

☐  $\exists x P(\text{Adam}, \text{Eve}, x) \wedge \forall x \exists y P(x, y, \text{apple})$

☐  $\exists x P(\text{Eve}, x, \text{Adam}) \wedge \forall y \exists x P(x, y, \text{apple})$

☒  $\checkmark$  \* $\exists x P(\text{Eve}, \text{Adam}, x) \wedge \exists x \forall y P(x, y, \text{apple})$

body = ok = 1

24. (2 points)

How many steps are necessary to specialize the clause  $p(X, W) : \neg q(X, Y), r(Z, W).$  to the clause  $p(a, b) : \neg q(a, Y), r(Y, b), s(Y, Y).?$

☐ \*six

☒  $\times$  five

☐ seven

body = -1 = -1

25. There is a tableau (not yet finished) with nodes  $wSv, vSu, Tv \Vdash \varphi(c)$ , among others.

Without any further assumptions we can use the constant  $c$  in next reductions only in nodes that concern world(s)

☐  $v, w$  but not  $u$

☐  $*u, v$  but not  $w$


☐ all  $u, v$  and  $w$

body = null = -0.25

26. Forward chaining is

☐ an inference method which starts with a hypothesis (list of goals)


☐ a model for debugging Prolog

☒   $*an$  inference method which starts with the available data (list of facts)

body = ok = 1

27. Suppose  $p$  is interpreted as true. Then the formula  $p \Rightarrow q$  is

☐ false

☒   $*true$  or false depending on the interpretation of  $q$

☐ true

body = ok = 1

28. For a Prolog program  $p(X) :- p(Y). p(a). p(b). p(c).$  and a goal  $?- p(Z).$  it is true :

☐ The program is looping, the output is  $Z=a$

☒  The program is looping, the output is  $Z=a ; Z=b ; Z=c ; no$

☐  $*The$  program is looping, there is no output.

body = nok = -0.5

29. There exists an interpretation  $I$  such that a propositional formula  $A$  that contains  $\wedge, \vee$ , and  $\neg$  is not true in  $I$ . Then

☐  $*there$  exists a noncontradictory path in a finished tableau for  $\mathbf{F}A$

☐ there exists a tableau proof of  $A$

☒  there exists a noncontradictory path in a finished tableau for  $\mathbf{T}A$

body = nok = -0.5

30. Given  $F$ , a formal system for propositional logic, let  $T$  be a set of all theorems that can be derived in  $F$ ,  $V$  a set of all well-formed formulas of propositional logic and  $P$  a set of all tautologies. Which of the following statements is true?

☐ if  $F$  is correct then  $P = T$

☐  $*if$   $F$  is contradictory then  $T = V$

☐ if  $F$  is complete then  $P \subset T$

body = null = -0.25

31. We know that a finished contradictory tableau for  $\mathbf{F}w \Vdash \varphi$  exists. Which of the following statements is true?

☐  $\varphi$  is not true at least in one world of each Kripke frame.

☐  $*\varphi$  is true in all worlds of all Kripke frames.

☐  $\varphi$  is not true at least in one world of at least one Kripke frame

body = null = -0.25

32. In description logic  $\mathcal{ALC}$  with concepts  $Man$ ,  $Person$  and roles  $hasChild$ ,  $hasSibling$  is a concept  $Uncle$  of the meaning "men, whose siblings have children" defined as follows

☐  $Uncle \equiv \exists hasSibling.(Man \sqcap \exists hasChild.Person)$

- ☐ Uncle  $\equiv \text{Man} \sqcap \exists \text{hasSibling.Person} \sqcap \exists \text{hasChild.Person}$   
☒ \*Uncle  $\equiv \text{Man} \sqcap \exists \text{hasSibling.}(\text{Person} \sqcap \exists \text{hasChild.Person})$

body = ok = 1

33. If the program P contains the clause  $p : \neg a$ , which of the following operators creates its generalization?

- ☐ addition of a literal  $b$  into a body of the clause  
☐ addition of a literal  $p$  into a body of the clause  
☒ \*addition of a clause  $p : \neg b$  into the program P

ok

body = ok = 1

34. The inference strategy in Prolog is

- ☐ forward chaining  
☒ \*backward chaining  
☐ Bayesian inference

body = ok = 1

35. (2 points)

A modal tableau proof of the formula  $\Box\varphi \Rightarrow \Box\Box\varphi$  proves that the formula is not a tautology and gives the following Kripke frame  $(W, S, C(w)_{w \in W})$  as a counterexample (except for variable naming) where:

- ☒ \* $W = \{p, q, r\}, S = \{(p, q), (q, r)\}, \varphi$  is true in  $q, \varphi$  is not true in  $r$   
☐  $W = \{p, q, r\}, S = \{(p, q), (p, r)\}, \varphi$  is true in  $r, q, \varphi$  is not true in  $p$   
☐  $W = \{p, q\}, S = \{(p, q), (q, p)\}, \varphi$  is true in  $q, \varphi$  is not true in  $p$

body = -0.25 = -0.25

**Celkem bodů: 11.25 (z maximálních 40)** (celkem otázek: 35, z toho špatně 7, nezodpovězených 11)

- [Zpět na výběr operace](#)

**Bez uložení:**

- [Zpět na výběr odpovědníku](#)
- [Moje studium](#)
- [Osobní administrativa](#)