1.No, they are different.

Let $\forall x \ P(x) \land Q(x)$ be True then $\forall x \ P(x)$ is True and Q(x) is True from $\forall x \ P(x)$ is True we got P(x) is True then $\exists x (P(x) \land Q(x))$ Is True but $\forall x P(x) \land Q(x)$ is different to $\exists x (P(x) \land Q(x))$

2. $\exists y \forall x P(x, y) \text{ imply } \forall x \exists y P(x, y),$ We suppose $\exists y \forall x P(x, y) \text{ is true, then for any constant c}$ $\exists y P(c, y) \text{ is true so } \forall x \exists y P(x, y) \text{ is true}$

3.wp's of the assignment statement is

 $(x>y) \rightarrow (temp:=x; x:=y; y:=temp;) = \{x < y\} \land \neg (x>y) \rightarrow \{nothing\} = \{x < y\}$

For (x>y) -> $(temp:=x; x:=y; y:=temp;) = \{x < y\}$, x in post condition will becomes to y and y will becomes to x so ((x>y) -> (y<x)) and y will become y = $\{x < y\}$ no change which is y = $\{x < y\}$ -> $\{x < y\}$.

((x>y) -> (y>x) also can write to ((x>y) -> (x>y) which is True because A->A will always be True.

 \neg (x>y) -> (x<y) can be write to (x>y) \lor (x<y).

Wp =
$$\neg$$
 (x>y) -> (x\land ((x>y) -> (y>x)
= (x>y) \lor (x\lor True
= (x>y) \lor (x

4.(a) $\exists x(P(x) \rightarrow Q(x))$ ≡ $\exists x(\neg P(x) \lor Q(x))$ ------ Implication law ≡ $\exists x \neg P(x) \lor \exists x Q(x)$ ------ associative ≡ $\neg \exists x P(x) \lor \exists x Q(x)$ ------ Commutativity? ≡ $\forall x P(x) \rightarrow \exists x Q(x)$ ------ De Morgan's laws and Implication law

```
we want to prove
(\forall p (D(p) \rightarrow L(p)) \land (\exists p(\neg L(p))) \rightarrow \exists p(\neg D(p))) is correct
From LHS
Let (\forall p(D(p) \rightarrow L(p)) \land (\exists p(\neg L(p))) be true
\equiv \neg(\forall p(D(p) \land \neg \forall p L(p)) \land (\exists p(\neg L(p)))
-----Implication law and associative
\equiv (\neg \forall p \ D(p) \ \forall \ p \ L(p)) \land (\exists p \ \neg L(p)) ----- Associativity
\equiv (\exists p \neg D(p) \land \exists p \neg L(p)) \lor (\forall p L(p) \land (\forall p \neg L(p)))
-----De Morgan's laws and Distributive rules
\equiv (\exists p \neg D(p) \land \exists p \neg L(p)) \lor False ----negation law
\equiv \exists p \neg D(p) \land \exists p \neg L(p)
                                                 -----Identity
So (\exists p \neg D(p)) is true
so(\forall p (D(p) \rightarrow L(p)) \land (\exists p(\neg L(p))) \rightarrow \exists p(\neg D(p))) is correct
(c) s: statements F(s): Statements is false K(s): speaker knows it is false
Lies = K(s) \wedge F(s)
So the description can be write as
\exists s(\neg K(s) \land F(s)) \rightarrow \exists s (F(s) \land \neg (K(s) \land F(s))), to prove it's correct
Let \exists s(\neg K(s) \land F(s)) be true
RHS can be simplify,
\exists s (F(s) \land \neg (K(s) \land F(s)))
\equiv \exists s (F(s) \land (\neg K(s) \lor \neg F(s))) ----- De Morgan's laws
\equiv \exists s ((F(s) \land \neg K(s)) \lor (F(s) \land \neg F(s))) ----- Distributive rules
\equiv \exists s ((F(s) \land \neg K(s)) \lor False -----Negation
\equiv \exists s (F(s) \land \neg K(s))
                                                    ----Identity
which is same to LHS
So let LHS be True, \exists s(\neg K(s) \land F(s)) \rightarrow \exists s (F(s) \land \neg (K(s) \land F(s))) is correct
```

(b) p: people L(p): people have license D(p): people drive car

5.

- (a). Returns the location of the last 0 in the list
 - If there is no 0 in the array, return -1
- (b).Input must not smaller than 1,

return value must in domain(-1,n-1)

all the index values after the index of return value in array should not equals to 0

the index value of return value in array should equals to 0.

(c)

We want to prove

$$r\!\in\! [-1,n-1] \land (\forall i\!\in\! [r+1,n-1]A[i] !=0) \land \neg (r !=-1 \&\& A[r] !=0)$$

Ξ

$$r \in [-1, n-1] \land (\forall i \in [r+1, n-1]A[i] != 0) \land (r \in [0, n-1] \rightarrow A[r] = 0)$$

so we have to prove \neg (r!= -1 && A[r]!= 0) \equiv (r \in [0, n - 1] \rightarrow A[r] = 0)

$$\neg (r != -1 \&\& A[r] != 0)$$

$$\equiv r == -1 \mid \mid A[r] == 0$$

$$\equiv r != -1 -> A[r] == 0$$

And if $r \in [-1, n - 1]$ is True then

$$\neg (r != -1 \&\& A[r] != 0) \equiv (r \in [0, n-1] \rightarrow A[r] = 0)$$

And whatever we suppose

 \equiv r \in [0, n -1] -> A[r] == 0 LHS or RHS is True, r \in [-1, n - 1] will also be True So

$$r\!\in\![-1,\,n-1]\,\wedge\,(\forall i\!\in\!\ [r\!+\!1,\,n-1]A[i] \;!\!=0)\,\wedge\,\neg\,(r\;!\!=\!-1\;\&\&\;A[r]\;!\!=0)$$

Ξ

$$r \in [-1, n-1] \land (\forall i \in [r+1, n-1]A[i] != 0) \land (r \in [0, n-1] \rightarrow A[r] = 0)$$