

# CS 173: Discrete Structures, Fall 2009

## Homework 2 Solutions

---

### 1. [3 points] Translating notation into English

Suppose we define:

- $C(x)$  is “x grew up in Chicago.”
- $D(x)$  is “x drives well.”
- $M(x)$  is “x is taking CS 173.”
- $K(x)$  is “x is taking CS 225.”
- $S$  is the set of all students.

Translate the following into English:

$$\forall y \in S, (M(y) \wedge \neg K(y)) \rightarrow (D(y) \vee \neg C(y))$$

*Solution:* If a student is taking CS 173 and not taking CS 225, then he drives well or did not grow up in Chicago.

### 2. [9 points] Proofs with propositional equivalences

Prove that the following pairs of expressions are logically equivalent, using the known equivalences given in Table 6 of Rosen, plus the fact that  $p \rightarrow q$  is logically equivalent to  $\neg p \vee q$ . (Table 6 is reproduced on the handout for lecture 4.)

- (a)  $(p \rightarrow q) \vee (p \rightarrow r)$  and  $p \rightarrow (q \vee r)$   
(b)  $\neg p \rightarrow (q \rightarrow \neg r)$  and  $r \rightarrow (q \rightarrow p)$   
(c)  $(\neg p \vee q) \wedge (r \vee \neg q) \wedge (p \vee q)$  and  $q \wedge r$

*Solution:*

$$\begin{aligned} & (p \rightarrow q) \vee (p \rightarrow r) \equiv \text{(Definition)} \\ & (\neg p \vee q) \vee (\neg p \vee r) \equiv \text{(Commutative/Associative Law)} \\ \text{(a)} \quad & (\neg p \vee \neg p) \vee (q \vee r) \equiv \text{(Idempotent Law)} \\ & \neg p \vee (q \vee r) \equiv \text{(Definition)} \\ & p \rightarrow (q \vee r) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} & \neg p \rightarrow (q \rightarrow \neg r) \equiv \text{(Definition)} \\ & \neg \neg p \vee (\neg q \vee \neg r) \equiv \text{(Double Negation)} \\ \text{(b)} \quad & p \vee (\neg q \vee \neg r) \equiv \text{(Associative/Commutative Laws)} \\ & \neg r \vee (\neg q \vee p) \equiv \text{(Definition)} \\ & r \rightarrow (q \rightarrow p) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{array}{ll}
(\neg p \vee q) \wedge (r \vee \neg q) \wedge (p \vee q) \equiv & \text{(Commutative Law)} \\
(q \vee \neg p) \wedge (q \vee p) \wedge (r \vee \neg q) \equiv & \text{(Distributive Law)} \\
(q \vee (p \wedge \neg p)) \wedge (r \vee \neg q) \equiv & \text{(Negation Law)} \\
(c) \quad (q \vee F) \wedge (r \vee \neg q) \equiv & \text{(Identity Law)} \\
q \wedge (r \vee \neg q) \equiv & \text{(Distributive Law)} \\
(q \wedge r) \vee (q \wedge \neg q) \equiv & \text{(Negation Law)} \\
(q \wedge r) \vee F \equiv & \text{(Identity Law)} \\
q \wedge r &
\end{array}$$

### 3. [8 points] Negating things

Give the negation of the following logical expressions, using logical equivalences to move the “not” operators onto the smallest elements possible. For example, to negate  $\forall x, [P(x) \rightarrow Q(x)]$ , we first negate the whole thing  $\neg \forall x [P(x) \rightarrow Q(x)]$ , then convert this to  $\exists x [\neg (P(x) \rightarrow Q(x))]$ , and finally to  $\exists x [P(x) \wedge \neg Q(x)]$ . (For simplicity, we’ve omitted the domains for the quantified variables.)

- (a)  $\forall x [\neg M(x) \rightarrow Q(x)]$
- (b)  $\exists y [P(y) \wedge (\neg M(y) \vee R(y))]$
- (c)  $\exists x [\neg (P(x) \wedge Q(x)) \vee (F(x) \rightarrow P(x))]$
- (d)  $\forall z [(P(z) \wedge \neg M(z)) \rightarrow \neg P(z)]$

*Solution:*

- (a) (2 points)
 
$$\begin{aligned}
& \neg(\forall x[\neg M(x) \rightarrow Q(x)]) \equiv \\
& \exists x[\neg(\neg M(x) \rightarrow Q(x))] \equiv \\
& \exists x[\neg M(x) \wedge \neg Q(x)]
\end{aligned}$$
- (b) (2 points)
 
$$\begin{aligned}
& \neg(\exists y[P(y) \wedge (\neg M(y) \vee R(y))]) \equiv \\
& \forall y[\neg(P(y) \wedge (\neg M(y) \vee R(y)))] \equiv \\
& \forall y[\neg P(y) \vee \neg(\neg M(y) \vee R(y))] \equiv \\
& \forall y[\neg P(y) \vee (M(y) \wedge \neg R(y))]
\end{aligned}$$
- (c) (2 points)
 
$$\begin{aligned}
& \neg(\exists x[\neg(P(x) \wedge Q(x)) \vee (F(x) \rightarrow P(x))]) \equiv \\
& \forall x[\neg(\neg(P(x) \wedge Q(x)) \vee (F(x) \rightarrow P(x)))] \equiv \\
& \forall x[\neg\neg(P(x) \wedge Q(x)) \wedge \neg(F(x) \rightarrow P(x))] \equiv \\
& \forall x[(P(x) \wedge Q(x)) \wedge (F(x) \wedge \neg P(x))]
\end{aligned}$$
- (d) (2 points)
 
$$\begin{aligned}
& \neg(\forall z[(P(z) \wedge \neg M(z)) \rightarrow \neg P(z)]) \equiv \\
& \exists z[\neg((P(z) \wedge \neg M(z)) \rightarrow \neg P(z))] \equiv \\
& \exists z[(P(z) \wedge \neg M(z)) \wedge P(z)]
\end{aligned}$$

4. [10 points] **Direct proof and disproof**

(a) Prove the following claim:

Claim: For any integer  $k$ , if  $k$  is odd, then  $k^3$  is odd.

(b) Disprove the following claim, by giving a concrete counter-example. (You must use a specific counter-example. Don't try to write a general or abstract story about why this equation can't possibly hold.)

Claim: For any integers  $p$  and  $q$ ,  $(p + q)^2 = p^2 + q^2$ .

*Solution:*

(a) (7 points) Let  $k$  be an odd integer. Since  $k$  is odd it is equal to  $2i + 1$  for some integer  $i$ .

$$k = 2i + 1 \Rightarrow k^3 = (2i + 1)^3 = (2i)^3 + 3(2i)^2 + 3(2i) + 1 = 2(4i^3 + 6i^2 + 3i) + 1 = 2i' + 1$$

Because  $i'$  is an integer we conclude that  $k^3$  is an odd number.

(b) (3 points) If  $p = q = 1$ , then:  $(p + q)^2 = (1 + 1)^2 = 4$ , but,  $p^2 + q^2 = 1^2 + 1^2 = 2$ .

5. [10 points] **Another direct proof**

Suppose that  $(x, y)$  and  $(p, q)$  are two intervals of the real line. Let's define  $(x, y)$  to *contain*  $(p, q)$  if and only if  $x \leq p$  and  $q \leq y$ . Using this definition, prove the following claim:

Claim: For any intervals of the real line  $(a, b)$ ,  $(c, d)$ , and  $(e, f)$ , if  $(a, b)$  contains  $(c, d)$  and  $(c, d)$  contains  $(e, f)$ , then if  $(a, b)$  contains  $(e, f)$ .

*Solution:*

Suppose that  $(a, b)$ ,  $(c, d)$ , and  $(e, f)$  are real intervals,  $(a, b)$  contains  $(c, d)$  and  $(c, d)$  contains  $(e, f)$ .

$$((a, b) \text{ contains } (c, d)) \Rightarrow (a \leq c) \wedge (d \leq b).$$

$$((c, d) \text{ contains } (e, f)) \Rightarrow (c \leq e) \wedge (f \leq d).$$

So, we have:  $(a \leq e) \wedge (f \leq b)$ , which means  $(a, b)$  contains  $(e, f)$

6. [10 points] **Son of direct proof**

(a) Prove the following claim:

Claim 1: For any integer  $k$ , if  $k > 4$  then  $2k + 1 < k^2$ .

(b) Using your result from part (a), prove the following claim:

Claim 2: For any integer  $k$ , if  $k > 4$  and  $k^2 < 2^k$ , then  $(k + 1)^2 < 2^{k+1}$ .

*Solution:*

- (a) (4 points) Suppose that  $k$  is an integer, where  $k > 4$ . Since  $k > 4$ ,  $k^2 > 4k$ . But  $4k = 2k + 2k > 2k + 1$ . So  $k^2 > 2k + 1$ .
- (b) (6 points) Suppose that  $k$  is an integer, where  $k > 4$  and  $k^2 < 2^k$ .  
 $(k + 1)^2 = k^2 + 2k + 1 < k^2 + k^2 = 2 \cdot k^2 < 2 \cdot 2^k = 2^{k+1}$ .