(ii) Deterministic: $\forall r_1 \neq r_2 \in T \models \neg(F_{pre}(r_1) \wedge F_{pre}(r_2))$

Table 1: not deterministic, because

$\not\models \neg(\neg c_1 \wedge c_3) \wedge c_2$ - not a tautology

Table 2:

R_1 and R_2: $\models \neg(c_2 \wedge \neg c_2 \wedge c_3)$ - Tautology

R_1 and R_3: $\models \neg(c_2 \wedge \neg c_1 \wedge c_2 \wedge \neg c_3)$ - Tautology

R_1 and R_4: $\models \neg(c_2 \wedge \neg c_2 \wedge \neg c_3 \wedge c_1)$ - tautology

R_2 and R_3: $\models \neg(\neg c_2 \wedge c_3 \wedge \neg c_1 \wedge \neg c_2 \wedge \neg c_3)$ - tautology

R_2 and R_4: $\models \neg(\neg c_2 \wedge c_3 \wedge c_1 \wedge \neg c_2 \wedge \neg c_3)$ - tautology

R_3 and R_4: $\models \neg(\neg c_1 \wedge \neg c_2 \wedge \neg c_3 \wedge c_1 \wedge \neg c_2 \wedge \neg c_3)$ - tautolog.

$\Rightarrow$ Table 2 ist deterministic

(iii) T3: Strictly speaking there are no useless rules in Table 3, because according to the Def. a rule is useless if its premisse is implied by another rule and if its effect is the same as another rule's effect, and In Table 3 all the effects are different. But we assume that Rule 1 never occurs and for that reason Rule 1 is basically useless.

T2: No useless rules: no rules, that are implied by another and also no same actions.

(iv) Table 3 is consistent with respect to conflicting actions, because there are no rules, that are inconsistent with z. (no conflicting actions in its effect.)