

<b><u>Artificial Intelligence</u></b> <b><u>Course Instructor</u></b> <b>Ms. Mahzaib Younas</b>		
<b>Time allowed = 30 min</b>	<b>Quiz 5</b>	<b>Total Marks = 30</b>

**BCS Section E**

Roll No	Name	Signature
---------	------	-----------

**Question No 01: For each question statement below, choose the correct option.[6]**

<b>1. Which rule is equal to the resolution rule of first-order clauses?</b> a) <b>Propositional resolution rule</b> b) Inference rule c) Resolution rule d) None of the mentioned	<b>2. What is meant by factoring?</b> a) Removal of redundant variable b) <b>Removal of redundant literal</b> c) Addition of redundant literal d) Addition of redundant variable
<b>3. What will happen if two literals are identical?</b> a) Remains the same b) Added as three c) <b>Reduced to one</b> d) None of the mentioned	<b>4. The statement comprising the limitations of FOL is/are _____</b> a) Expressiveness b) Formalizing Natural Languages c) Many-sorted Logic d) <b>All of the mentioned</b>
<b>5. Which are more suitable normal form to be used with definite clause?</b> a) Positive literal b) Negative literal c) <b>Generalized modus ponens</b> d) Neutral literal	<b>6. Translate the following statement into FOL. "For every a, if a is a philosopher, then a is a scholar"</b> a) <b><math>\forall a \text{ philosopher}(a) \text{ scholar}(a)</math></b> b) $\exists a \text{ philosopher}(a) \text{ scholar}(a)$ c) All of the mentioned d) None of the mentioned

**Question No 02: Translate the following English sentences into first-order logic formulas: [6]**

<b>a) Every student takes at least one course.</b>	
$\forall x (\text{Student}(x) \Rightarrow \exists y (\text{Course}(y) \wedge \text{Takes}(x,y)))$	
<b>b) Every student who takes Analysis also takes Geometry.</b>	
$\forall x (\text{Student}(x) \wedge \text{Takes}(x,\text{Analysis}) \Rightarrow \text{Takes}(x,\text{Geometry}))$	

c) No student failed Chemistry but at least one student failed History

( $\neg \exists s (Student(s) \wedge Failed(s, Chemistry)) \wedge (\exists x (Student(x) \wedge Failed(x, History))$ )

**Question No 03: Apply the unification**

**[6 Marks]**

a-  $\{Q(a, g(x,a), f(y)); Q((a), g(f(b),a), x)\}$   
 $\{Q(a, g(x,a), f(y)); Q((a), g(f(b),a), x)\}$ , subst(x/f(b)  
 $\{Q(a, g(f(b),a), f(y)); Q((a), g(f(b),a), f(b))\}$ , subs(y/b)  
 $\{Q(a, g(f(b),a), f(b)); Q((a), g(f(b),a), f(b))\}$   
**Successfully unified.**

b-  $\{p(b, X, f(g(Z))); \text{and } p(Z, f(Y), f(y))\}$   
 $\{p(b, X, f(g(b))); \text{and } p(b, f(Y), f(y))\}$  sub(Z/b)  
 $\{p(b, f(Y), f(g(b))); \text{and } p(b, f(Y), f(y))\}$  sub(X, f(y))  
 $\{p(b, f(g(b)), f(g(b))); \text{and } p(b, f(g(b)), f(g(b)))\}$  sub(Y/g(b))

**Unified successfully.**

**Question No 03: Consider the following axioms:**

**[12 Marks]**

1. All hounds howl at night.
2. Anyone who has any cats then anyone will not have any mice. (**Hint : after then statement used with the negation of Quantifiers**)
3. Light sleepers do not have anything which howls at night.
4. John has either a cat or a hound.
5. (Conclusion) If John is a light sleeper, then John does not have any mice.

The conclusion can be proved using Resolution as shown below. The first step is to write each axiom as a well-formed formula in first-order predicate calculus. The clauses written for the above axioms are shown below, using LS(x) for 'light sleeper'.

**Part 1: Make the FOL statements for each above Statement;**

**[4 Marks]**

1.  $\forall x (HOUND(x) \rightarrow HOWL(x))$
2.  $\forall x \forall y (HAVE(x,y) \wedge CAT(y) \rightarrow \neg \exists z (HAVE(x,z) \wedge MOUSE(z)))$
3.  $\forall x (LS(x) \rightarrow \neg \exists y (HAVE(x,y) \wedge HOWL(y)))$
4.  $\exists x (HAVE(John,x) \wedge (CAT(x) \vee HOUND(x)))$
5.  $LS(John) \rightarrow \neg \exists z (HAVE(John,z) \wedge MOUSE(z))$



**Part 2: Drop the universal and existential quantifiers of each statement.**

**[2 Marks]**

1.  $\forall x (HOUND(x) \rightarrow HOWL(x))$   
 $\neg HOUND(x) \vee HOWL(x)$
2.  $\forall x \forall y (HAVE(x,y) \wedge CAT(y) \rightarrow \neg \exists z (HAVE(x,z) \wedge MOUSE(z)))$   
 $\forall x \forall y (HAVE(x,y) \wedge CAT(y) \rightarrow \forall z \neg (HAVE(x,z) \wedge MOUSE(z)))$   
 $\forall x \forall y \forall z (\neg (HAVE(x,y) \wedge CAT(y)) \vee \neg (HAVE(x,z) \wedge MOUSE(z)))$   
 $\neg HAVE(x,y) \vee \neg CAT(y) \vee \neg HAVE(x,z) \vee \neg MOUSE(z)$
3.  $\forall x (LS(x) \rightarrow \neg \exists y (HAVE(x,y) \wedge HOWL(y)))$   
 $\forall x (LS(x) \rightarrow \forall y \neg (HAVE(x,y) \wedge HOWL(y)))$   
 $\forall x \forall y (LS(x) \rightarrow \neg HAVE(x,y) \vee \neg HOWL(y))$   
 $\forall x \forall y (\neg LS(x) \vee \neg HAVE(x,y) \vee \neg HOWL(y))$   
 $\neg LS(x) \vee \neg HAVE(x,y) \vee \neg HOWL(y)$
4.  $\exists x (HAVE(John,x) \wedge (CAT(x) \vee HOUND(x)))$   
 $HAVE(John,a) \wedge (CAT(a) \vee HOUND(a))$
5.  $\neg [LS(John) \rightarrow \neg \exists z (HAVE(John,z) \wedge MOUSE(z))]$  (negated conclusion)  
 $\neg [\neg LS(John) \vee \neg \exists z (HAVE(John,z) \wedge MOUSE(z))]$   
 $LS(John) \wedge \exists z (HAVE(John,z) \wedge MOUSE(z))$   
 $LS(John) \wedge HAVE(John,b) \wedge MOUSE(b)$

**Part 3: Apply the resolution theorem and draw the conclusion.**

**[6 Marks]**

**Set of CNF Clauses**

1.  $\neg HOUND(x) \vee HOWL(x)$
2.  $\neg HAVE(x,y) \vee \neg CAT(y) \vee \neg HAVE(x,z) \vee \neg MOUSE(z)$
3.  $\neg LS(x) \vee \neg HAVE(x,y) \vee \neg HOWL(y)$
4.
  1.  $HAVE(John,a)$
  2.  $CAT(a) \vee HOUND(a)$
5.
  1.  $LS(John)$
  2.  $HAVE(John,b)$
  3.  $MOUSE(b)$



**Resolution:**

- [1.,4.(b):] 6.  $CAT(a) \vee HOWL(a)$   
[2,5.(c):] 7.  $\neg HAVE(x,y) \vee \neg CAT(y) \vee \neg HAVE(x,b)$   
[7,5.(b):] 8.  $\neg HAVE(John,y) \vee \neg CAT(y)$   
[6,8:] 9.  $\neg HAVE(John,a) \vee HOWL(a)$   
[4.(a),9:] 10.  $HOWL(a)$   
[3,10:] 11.  $\neg LS(x) \vee \neg HAVE(x,a)$   
[4.(a),11:] 12.  $\neg LS(John)$   
[5.(a),12:] 13.  $\square$