

Course outline

How does an NPTEL online course work?

Propositional Logic

Predicate Logic, Proof Strategies and Induction

- Predicate Logic
- Rules of Inferences in Predicate Logic
- Proof Strategies I
- Proof Strategies II
- Induction
- Tutorial 2: Part I
- Tutorial 2: Part II

Quiz : Week 2 Assignment

- Tutorial problem

Sets and Relations

Equivalence Relations, Partitions, Partial Orderings and Functions

Theory of Countability

Combinatorics Part I

Combinatorics Part II

Graph Theory Part I

Graph Theory Part II

Number theory

Abstract Algebra : Part I

Abstract Algebra : Part II

Video download

Live Session

Text transcripts

Week 2 Assignment

The due date for submitting this assignment has passed.

Due on 2021-02-07, 23:59 IST.

As per our records you have not submitted this assignment.

Predicate logic, quantifiers (bounded and free variables), logical equivalence in predicate logic, nested quantifiers, rules of inference for quantifiers, proof strategies: direct and indirect (Proof by contrapositive, vacuous proof, proof by contradiction), proofs involving quantified statements, induction

- 1) Which of the following represents the statement "All real numbers are complex numbers"?

2 points

$\exists x: [\text{real}(x) \rightarrow \text{complex}(x)]$

$\forall x: [\text{real}(x) \wedge \text{complex}(x)]$

$\exists x: [\text{real}(x) \vee \text{complex}(x)]$

$\forall x: [\text{real}(x) \rightarrow \text{complex}(x)]$

No, the answer is incorrect.
Score: 0

Accepted Answers:

$\forall x: [\text{real}(x) \rightarrow \text{complex}(x)]$

- 2) Which of the following is/are true?

1 point

Backward reasoning technique is an example of direct proof methodology

To prove $p \rightarrow q$, we can show $\neg p \rightarrow \neg q$, which is proof by contradiction

To prove $p \rightarrow q$ by contradiction, we need to prove $p \wedge \neg q \rightarrow \text{FALSE}$ is a tautology

None of the given statements

No, the answer is incorrect.
Score: 0

Accepted Answers:

To prove $p \rightarrow q$ by contradiction, we need to prove $p \wedge \neg q \rightarrow \text{FALSE}$ is a tautology

- 3) Which of the following is/are false?

1 point

A statement that is existentially quantified to be true does not always imply it is universally quantified to be true

One counter example is enough to disprove a universally quantified true statement

One example is necessary to prove an existentially quantified statement

A universally quantified statement need not necessarily imply the existential quantification of the same statement

No, the answer is incorrect.
Score: 0

Accepted Answers:

A universally quantified statement need not necessarily imply the existential quantification of the same statement

- 4) Choose the domain(s) for $\forall x: P(x)$ is true where the predicate $P(x)$: x has a multiplicative inverse.

1 point

N, the set of natural numbers

C, the set of complex numbers

R, the set of real numbers

None of the options

No, the answer is incorrect.
Score: 0

Accepted Answers:

None of the options

- 5) How many free and bounded variable(s) the following expression has? $(\forall x: P(x) \wedge Q(x)) \vee (\forall y: [R(y) \vee S(y)]) \vee B(w) \wedge A(z)$

1 point

(2, 2)

(3, 2)

(2, 3)

None of the given options

No, the answer is incorrect.
Score: 0

Accepted Answers:

(3, 2)

- 6) Select the incorrect statement(s) from the following.

1 point

$\forall x: P(x) \wedge Q(x)$ is true given $P(x)$: x is an even number and $Q(x)$: x is divisible by 2 where domain = $\{0, 2, 4, 6, 8, 10\}$

If a statement is proved using Proof by induction, then it implies that the same statement can also be proved using Proof by strong induction

Proving existentially quantified statement automatically proves the uniqueness

Given the premises: "All books are rocks" and "No rock is hard". Then, the conclusion "There is a book which is hard" is valid.

No, the answer is incorrect.
Score: 0

Accepted Answers:

$\forall x: P(x) \wedge Q(x)$ is true given $P(x)$: x is an even number and $Q(x)$: x is divisible by 2 where domain = $\{0, 2, 4, 6, 8, 10\}$

Proving existentially quantified statement automatically proves the uniqueness

Given the premises: "All books are rocks" and "No rock is hard". Then, the conclusion "There is a book which is hard" is valid.

- 7) Let $M(x)$: x is a child, $V(x)$: x goes to school. Convert the following into its equivalent predicate logic statement where the domain is over set of all people. "Every child must go to school"

1 point

$\forall x: [M(x) \wedge V(x)]$

$\forall x: [M(x) \rightarrow V(x)]$

$\exists x: [M(x) \wedge \neg V(x)]$

$\forall x: [\neg M(x) \vee V(x)]$

No, the answer is incorrect.
Score: 0

Accepted Answers:

$\forall x: [M(x) \rightarrow V(x)]$

$\forall x: [\neg M(x) \vee V(x)]$

- 8) Which of the following statements is logically equivalent to $\forall x: [(P(x) \wedge Q(x)) \rightarrow R(x)] \wedge \forall x: [(P(x) \wedge R(x)) \rightarrow Q(x)]$.

0 points

$\exists x: [P(x) \rightarrow (Q(x) \leftrightarrow R(x))]$

$\forall x: [P(x) \rightarrow (Q(x) \leftrightarrow R(x))]$

$\exists x: [P(x) \wedge Q(x) \wedge R(x)]$

$\forall x: [(Q(x) \leftrightarrow R(x)) \rightarrow P(x)]$

No, the answer is incorrect.
Score: 0

Accepted Answers:

$\forall x: [P(x) \rightarrow (Q(x) \leftrightarrow R(x))]$

- 9) For which predicate(s) $P(x, y)$ over the specified domain is the following statement false? $(\forall x \exists y: P(x, y)) \rightarrow (\forall z: P(z, z))$

1 point

Domain is N, $P(x, y)$: x is divisible by y

Domain is N, $P(x, y)$: $x+y$ is prime

Domain is R, $P(x, y)$: $x = y$

Domain is R, $P(x, y)$: $x > y$

No, the answer is incorrect.
Score: 0

Accepted Answers:

Domain is N, $P(x, y)$: $x+y$ is prime

Domain is R, $P(x, y)$: $x > y$

- 10) Choose the valid conclusions given the following premises:

1 point

$\exists x: [P(x) \wedge \neg Q(x)]$

$\forall x: [\neg R(x) \rightarrow \neg P(x)]$

$\forall x: [R(x) \rightarrow S(x)]$.

$\exists x: R(x)$

$\exists x: [S(x) \wedge \neg Q(x)]$

$\forall x: [S(x) \wedge \neg Q(x)]$

$\forall x: P(x)$

No, the answer is incorrect.
Score: 0

Accepted Answers:

$\exists x: R(x)$

$\exists x: [S(x) \wedge \neg Q(x)]$