

1)

CS 230 - Week 4

Tony Cui

a)

| A | B | C | $A \rightarrow B$ | $B \wedge C$ | $(A \rightarrow B) \rightarrow (B \wedge C)$ | $(B \wedge C) \rightarrow (A \rightarrow B)$ |
|---|---|---|-------------------|--------------|--|--|
| T | T | T | T | T | T | T |
| F | T | T | T | T | T | T |
| T | F | T | F | F | T | T |
| F | F | T | T | F | F | T |
| T | T | F | T | F | F | T |
| F | T | F | T | F | F | T |
| T | F | F | F | F | T | T |
| F | F | F | T | F | F | T |

$B \wedge C$ logically implies $A \rightarrow B$ since the truth table we used shows that

$(B \wedge C) \rightarrow (A \rightarrow B)$ is true for all truth value combinations of A, B , and C .

b) $(A \vee B) \rightarrow (A \leftrightarrow C)$

| A | B | C | $(A \vee B)$ | $(A \leftrightarrow C)$ | $(A \vee B) \rightarrow (A \leftrightarrow C)$ | $(A \vee B \wedge \neg C) \vee (A \vee \neg B \wedge C)$ | DNF |
|---|---|---|--------------|-------------------------|--|--|-----|
| T | T | T | T | T | T | T | T |
| F | T | T | T | F | F | F | F |
| T | F | T | T | T | T | T | T |
| F | F | T | F | F | T | T | T |
| T | T | F | T | F | F | F | F |
| F | T | F | T | T | T | T | T |
| T | F | F | T | F | F | F | F |
| F | F | F | F | T | T | T | T |

$$\text{CNF: } (\neg A \vee B \vee C) \wedge (A \vee B \vee \neg C) \wedge (A \vee \neg B \vee \neg C)$$

$$\text{DNF: } (A \wedge B \wedge C) \vee (A \wedge \neg B \wedge C) \vee (\neg A \wedge \neg B \wedge C) \vee (\neg A \wedge B \wedge \neg C) \vee (\neg A \wedge \neg B \wedge \neg C)$$

2) a) $\forall a, b \in \mathbb{Q}, \exists c \in \mathbb{Q}, (a=b) \vee ((\min(a,b) < c) \wedge (c < \max(a,b)))$

Proof: We can prove that S is true using a proof by cases, for $a, b, c \in \mathbb{Q}$.

Case 1: If a and b are the same rational number, then we can use the first part of S : $(a=b)$, since we know that $a=b$ would be true. Consequently, since $(a=b)$ is on one side of the OR statement, then propositional logic states that we have proved S to be true.

Case 2: If a and b are different rational numbers, then we can use the second part of S to prove S true:

$$((\min(a,b) < c) \wedge (c < \max(a,b)))$$

This statement alone can also be expressed as "a rational number c that is in between a and b ," which we can represent with

$c = \frac{a+b}{2}$ or $c = (a+b) \cdot \frac{1}{2}$, which will always guarantee that c is between a and b , we know c could still

be a rational number since the sum of two rational numbers is a number that is at least rational and

when we multiply a rational number by another rational number, we get a rational number that is at least rational.

This means the second part of S must be true since c can always represent a rational number that is in between a and b , and since the second part of S is on one side of the OR statement, then propositional logic states that we have proved S to be true.

□

Thus, we can conclude that S is true using a proof by cases.

2b)

$$\text{Simplify: } \sim (\forall a, b \in \mathbb{Z}, \exists c \in \mathbb{Z}, (a=b) \vee ((\min(a,b) < c) \wedge (c < \max(a,b))))$$

Simplified T
Using De Morgan's Law

$$\exists a, b \in \mathbb{Z}, \forall c \in \mathbb{Z}, \sim ((a=b) \vee ((\min(a,b) < c) \wedge (c < \max(a,b))))$$

$$\exists a, b \in \mathbb{Z}, \forall c \in \mathbb{Z}, (a \neq b) \wedge \sim ((\min(a,b) < c) \wedge (c < \max(a,b)))$$

$$\boxed{\exists a, b \in \mathbb{Z}, \forall c \in \mathbb{Z}, (a \neq b) \wedge ((\max(a,b) \leq c) \vee (c \leq \min(a,b)))}$$

2c) Proof: we can prove T to be true through a proof of cases where
 $a, b, c \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $a = b + 1$.

Case 1: $c > a$

— ^{mean T is true}
 This could \wedge because $a \neq b$ is true and $\max(a,b) \leq c$
 is true since c could be greater than the larger of a, b since
 he defined a to be larger than b and c is larger than a . By propositional
 logic we have proven both sides of the and statement true so T is true.

Case 2: $c < b$

— ^{mean T is}
 This could \wedge true because $a \neq b$ is true and $c \leq \min(a,b)$
 is true since c is less than the smaller of a, b since he defined
 a to be larger than b and c is smaller than b . By propositional
 logic, we have proven both sides of the and statement true so T is true.

Case 3: $b \leq c \leq a$

Since $a = b + 1$ and $b \leq c \leq a$, then c must equal to a or b due to c
 being an integer, which could prove the propositional statement true since $a \neq b$ and
 c is equal to either the smaller of a, b , which is just b , or
 the larger of a, b , which is just a .

This, T is proven to be true in all cases. □

3) a) \mathbb{N} \mathbb{Z} , y (e) \mathbb{Q}

b) \mathbb{Z} f) \mathbb{N}

c) \mathbb{Z} g) \mathbb{R}

d) \mathbb{Q}

4) a) Everybody loves someone else ; True because each person has at least one person to love.

b) There is somebody that loves everybody ; False because no one loves everyone else.
A loves everyone but not himself so they don't count,

c) There is someone that loves everyone except himself ; True because A loves everyone except himself

d) If someone loves someone else, then that person doesn't love ^{yourself} ; False because D loves himself and so himself could love D.

e) There are 2 people who are not the same person and who either both love each other or both don't love each other ;

True because B doesn't love D and D doesn't love B

5)

$$a) \quad x > 0 \wedge y \leq 0$$

$$b) \quad \forall \varepsilon \in \mathbb{R}^+, \exists M \in \mathbb{R}^+ [x > M \rightarrow (|f(x) - b| \leq \varepsilon)]$$

$$c) \quad \sin(x) > 0 \rightarrow \neg(0 \leq x \leq \pi)$$

$$d) \quad \forall \text{Prime}(p), \exists \text{Prime}(q) (q > p)$$

$$e) \quad \forall n \in \mathbb{N} [\exists a, b, c, d \in \mathbb{Z} (n = a^2 + b^2 + c^2 + d^2)]$$