CSE 2500-03: Homework 2 Due September 29, 2017 (before start of lecture)

November 28, 2017

1. (10 points) Imagine that *num_orders* and *num_instock* are particular values (as in a computer program. Write a negation for the following (Use De Morgan's Law on the original statement form $(p \land q) \lor ((r \land s) \land t))$:

 $(num_orders < 50 \text{ and } num_instock > 300)$ or (50 ≤ num_orders < 75 and num_instock > 500).

2. (10 points) Is the following a tautology? A contradiction? Neither?

$$(\neg p \lor q) \lor (p \land \neg p).$$

- 3. (10 points) Is $(p \oplus p) \lor r \equiv (p \land r) \oplus (p \land r)$? Justify your answer (using a truth table).
- 4. (10 points) Show that $(p \to (q \to r)) \leftrightarrow ((p \land q) \to r)$. Alternatively, that $p \to (q \to r) \equiv (p \land q) \to r$.
- 5. (10 points) Write the following statements in logical form and show whether they are logically equivalent using a truth table and a short explanation.

If 2 is a factor of n and 3 is a factor of n, then 6 is a factor of n.

2 is not a factor of n or 3 is not a factor of n or 6 is a factor of n.

- 6. (10 points) Assume that the statement "If compound X is boiling, then its temperature must be at least 150° C". Which of the following statements is true? Justify your answers.
 - (a) Compound X will boil only if its temperature is at least 150° C.
 - (b) If compound X is not boiling, then its temperature is at less than 150° C.
 - (c) A necessary condition for compound X to boil is that its temperature is at least 150° C.
 - (d) A sufficient condition for compound X to boil is that its temperature is at least 150°C.

- 7. (20 points) You have an encounter with an island with knights (who always tell the truth) and knaves (who always lie). Two natives C and D approach and C says "Both of us are knaves." What is C? What is D?
- 8. (20 points) You can assume the following statements:
 - (a) $p \rightarrow q$ (b) $r \lor s$. (c) $\neg s \rightarrow \neg t$. (d) $\neg q \lor s$ (e) $\neg s$. (f) $(\neg p \land r) \rightarrow u$. (g) $w \lor t$.

Construct an argument for $u \wedge w$. Do not use a truth table, instead justify each conclusion you make using one of the argument forms introduced in class (in Section 2.3 of book).

1 Suggested Problems

Problems in this section are not required for the homework. They are additional problems that will help you in your progress. If you put forth a good faith effort on all of these problems then you will receive 10 additional points on your homework grade (not to exceed 100).

1. Is the following a tautology? A contradiction? Neither?

$$(p \wedge p) \lor (\neg p \lor (p \land \neg q)).$$

- 2. Show that $(p \lor q) \to r \equiv (p \to r) \land (q \to r)$.
- 3. Assume x represents a fixed real number. You may assume that $(p \lor q) \rightarrow r \equiv (p \rightarrow r) \land (q \rightarrow r)$. Rewrite the following statement (using the above rule):

If x > 2 or x < -2, then $x^2 > 4$.

4. Show that proof by division into cases is a valid argument form. That is, show

$$((p \lor q) \land (p \to r) \land (q \to r)) \to r.$$

- 5. Give an example of a statement that is not logically equivalent to its converse.
- 6. Give an example of a statement that is not logically equivalent to its inverse.
- 7. Convert the following statement to if-then form: "passing the final exam is a necessary condition for passing the course."