

CSE 311: Foundations of Computing I

Sample midterm - *with solutions*

1. **Prime factorization** (4 points) *Compute the prime factorization of 320 and 450. Compute $\gcd(320, 450)$ and $\text{lcm}(320, 450)$, expressing your answer as a product of prime factors.*

$$320 = 2^6 \cdot 5, 450 = 2 \cdot 3^2 \cdot 5^2. \gcd(320, 450) = 2 \cdot 5 \text{ and } \text{lcm}(320, 450) = 2^6 \cdot 3^2 \cdot 5^2.$$

2. **Sets** (12 points) *Let $A = \{z \in \mathbb{Z} \mid 1 \leq z \leq 8\}$, $B = \{z \in \mathbb{Z} \mid 2 \mid z\}$ and let C be the set of primes. Fill in the table below with the set that each expression evaluates to:*

| Expression | Value |
|------------------|------------------|
| $A \cap B$ | $\{2, 4, 6, 8\}$ |
| $B \cap C$ | $\{2\}$ |
| $A - (B \cup C)$ | $\{1\}$ |

3. **Primes and predicates** (8 points) *Translate the expression “ p is prime” into mathematical notation, i.e. using only $\forall, \exists, |, \mathbb{Z}$ and other mathematical symbols.*

$$\forall d \in \mathbb{Z}^+ (d \mid p \rightarrow (d = 1 \vee d = p)).$$

Other answers are also possible.

4. **Propositional logic** (20 points)

- (a) *Show that $\neg(p \oplus q) \equiv (p \rightarrow q) \wedge (\neg p \rightarrow \neg q)$ using logical equivalences from the table at the back of the exam and the fact that $p \oplus q \equiv \neg(p \leftrightarrow q)$.*
- (b) *Construct a truth table for $q \vee (p \rightarrow \neg q)$. Is this a tautology, contradiction or contingency? Briefly indicate why.*

(a)

$$\begin{aligned} \neg(p \oplus q) &\equiv \neg(\neg(p \leftrightarrow q)) && \text{given} && (1) \\ \neg(\neg(p \leftrightarrow q)) &\equiv p \leftrightarrow q && \text{double negation} && (2) \\ p \leftrightarrow q &\equiv (p \rightarrow q) \wedge (q \rightarrow p) && \text{Table 8, line 1} && (3) \\ q \rightarrow p &\equiv \neg p \rightarrow \neg q && \text{Table 7, line 2} && (4) \\ (p \rightarrow q) \wedge (q \rightarrow p) &\equiv (p \rightarrow q) \wedge (\neg p \rightarrow \neg q) && \text{Combining (3) and (4)} && (5) \end{aligned}$$

(b)

| p | q | $\neg q$ | $p \rightarrow \neg q$ | $q \vee (p \rightarrow \neg q)$ |
|-----|-----|----------|------------------------|---------------------------------|
| T | T | F | F | T |
| T | F | T | T | T |
| F | T | F | T | T |
| F | F | T | T | T |

5. **Predicate logic** (20 points)

(a) Let $S(x)$ be the predicate “ x is a student”, $R(y)$ the predicate “ y is a road in Seattle” and $V(x, y)$ the predicate “ x has visited road y .” Express the following statements using \forall, \exists, \neg .

- i. No student has visited all roads in Seattle.
- ii. At least two roads were visited by all students.
- iii. [0 points] There exist two roads such that I could not travel both and I took the one less traveled by.

(b) Express the negations of each of the following statements in a way such that \neg does not precede a \forall, \exists or $($.

- i. $\exists x \forall y (P(x, y) \wedge \exists z \neg Q(x, z))$
- ii. $\forall x (P(x) \rightarrow \exists y (Q(x, y)))$.

- (a)
- i. $\neg \exists x \forall y (V(x, y))$
 - ii. $\exists y_1, \exists y_2 (y_1 \neq y_2 \wedge \forall x (V(x, y_1) \wedge V(x, y_2)))$.
 - iii. Trick question. Note that the author didn't actually take the road less traveled by: he only imagines that in later retelling the story he'll claim that the road he took was the less popular one.

- (b)
- i. $\forall x \exists y (\neg P(x, y) \vee \forall z (Q(x, z)))$.
 - ii. $\exists x (P(x) \wedge \forall y (\neg Q(x, y)))$.

6. **Proof** (10 points) If A and B are sets, then does $A - B = \emptyset$ imply that $A = B$? Prove, or give a counter-example. No. Consider $A = \{1\}$, $B = \{1, 2\}$.

7. **Proof** (10 points) Prove that $\forall a, b, n \in \mathbb{Z} (4|n \wedge n = ab) \rightarrow (2|a \vee 2|b)$. We prove the contrapositive. Assume $\neg(2|a \vee 2|b)$ or, equivalently, that $2 \nmid a$ and $2 \nmid b$. Use the division algorithm to write

$$a = 2q_1 + r_1 \quad \text{and} \quad b = 2q_2 + r_2,$$

for some integers q_1, r_1, q_2, r_2 satisfying $0 \leq r_1, r_2 < 2$. If we had $r_1 = 0$ then it would imply that $2|a$; since we know this is not the case, we must have $r_1 = 1$. The same argument proves that $r_2 = 1$. Thus $ab = (2q_1 + 1)(2q_2 + 1) = 2(2q_1q_2 + q_1 + q_2) + 1$. Thus implies that $ab \equiv 1 \pmod{4}$ or $ab \equiv 3 \pmod{4}$ and that $4 \nmid ab$. Therefore either $4 \nmid n$ or $n \neq ab$ (or both). QED.

8. **Functions** (18 points) In each row, f is a function from $A \rightarrow B$. Mark Y/N to indicate whether f is surjective or injective. Briefly justify your answers.

| A | B | f | surjective | injective |
|--------------------------------|----------------|---------------------|------------|-----------|
| \mathbb{Z} | $\{0, 1, 2\}$ | $f(x) = x \pmod{3}$ | Y | N |
| \mathbb{Z} | \mathbb{Z}^+ | $f(x) = x - 1 $ | Y | N |
| $\mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{Z}$ | \mathbb{Z} | $f(x, y) = 3x + 7y$ | Y | N |

For the first function, we see that f is surjective by considering inputs 0,1,2, which together get sent to the entire codomain; we see it is not injective by considering inputs 0,3, which both get mapped to 0. For the second function, f is surjective because for any $y \in \mathbb{Z}^+$, $y + 1 \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $f(y + 1) = y$. f is not injective because $f(0) = f(2)$. For the third function, f is surjective because $\gcd(3, 7) = 1$. Using the extended Euclid's algorithm (or guess-and-check) we see that $3 \cdot (-2) + 7 = 1$. Therefore, for any $z \in \mathbb{Z}$, $f(-2z, z) = 3 \cdot (-2z) + 7z = z$. f is not injective because $f(7, 0) = f(0, 3) = 21$.

| TABLE 6 Logical Equivalences. | |
|--|---------------------|
| <i>Equivalence</i> | <i>Name</i> |
| $p \wedge \mathbf{T} \equiv p$ $p \vee \mathbf{F} \equiv p$ | Identity laws |
| $p \vee \mathbf{T} \equiv \mathbf{T}$ $p \wedge \mathbf{F} \equiv \mathbf{F}$ | Domination laws |
| $p \vee p \equiv p$ $p \wedge p \equiv p$ | Idempotent laws |
| $\neg(\neg p) \equiv p$ | Double negation law |
| $p \vee q \equiv q \vee p$ $p \wedge q \equiv q \wedge p$ | Commutative laws |
| $(p \vee q) \vee r \equiv p \vee (q \vee r)$ $(p \wedge q) \wedge r \equiv p \wedge (q \wedge r)$ | Associative laws |
| $p \vee (q \wedge r) \equiv (p \vee q) \wedge (p \vee r)$ $p \wedge (q \vee r) \equiv (p \wedge q) \vee (p \wedge r)$ | Distributive laws |
| $\neg(p \wedge q) \equiv \neg p \vee \neg q$ $\neg(p \vee q) \equiv \neg p \wedge \neg q$ | De Morgan's laws |
| $p \vee (p \wedge q) \equiv p$ $p \wedge (p \vee q) \equiv p$ | Absorption laws |
| $p \vee \neg p \equiv \mathbf{T}$ $p \wedge \neg p \equiv \mathbf{F}$ | Negation laws |

| TABLE 7 Logical Equivalences Involving Conditional Statements. |
|--|
| $p \rightarrow q \equiv \neg p \vee q$ |
| $p \rightarrow q \equiv \neg q \rightarrow \neg p$ |
| $p \vee q \equiv \neg p \rightarrow q$ |
| $p \wedge q \equiv \neg(p \rightarrow \neg q)$ |
| $\neg(p \rightarrow q) \equiv p \wedge \neg q$ |
| $(p \rightarrow q) \wedge (p \rightarrow r) \equiv p \rightarrow (q \wedge r)$ |
| $(p \rightarrow r) \wedge (q \rightarrow r) \equiv (p \vee q) \rightarrow r$ |
| $(p \rightarrow q) \vee (p \rightarrow r) \equiv p \rightarrow (q \vee r)$ |
| $(p \rightarrow r) \vee (q \rightarrow r) \equiv (p \wedge q) \rightarrow r$ |

| TABLE 8 Logical Equivalences Involving Biconditionals. |
|---|
| $p \leftrightarrow q \equiv (p \rightarrow q) \wedge (q \rightarrow p)$ |
| $p \leftrightarrow q \equiv \neg p \leftrightarrow \neg q$ |
| $p \leftrightarrow q \equiv (p \wedge q) \vee (\neg p \wedge \neg q)$ |
| $\neg(p \leftrightarrow q) \equiv p \leftrightarrow \neg q$ |

TABLE 1 Rules of Inference.

| <i>Rule of Inference</i> | <i>Tautology</i> | <i>Name</i> |
|--|--|------------------------|
| $\frac{p}{p \rightarrow q}$ $\therefore q$ | $[p \wedge (p \rightarrow q)] \rightarrow q$ | Modus ponens |
| $\frac{\neg q}{p \rightarrow q}$ $\therefore \neg p$ | $[\neg q \wedge (p \rightarrow q)] \rightarrow \neg p$ | Modus tollens |
| $\frac{p \rightarrow q}{q \rightarrow r}$ $\therefore p \rightarrow r$ | $[(p \rightarrow q) \wedge (q \rightarrow r)] \rightarrow (p \rightarrow r)$ | Hypothetical syllogism |
| $\frac{p \vee q}{\neg p}$ $\therefore q$ | $[(p \vee q) \wedge \neg p] \rightarrow q$ | Disjunctive syllogism |
| $\frac{p}{\therefore p \vee q}$ | $p \rightarrow (p \vee q)$ | Addition |
| $\frac{p \wedge q}{\therefore p}$ | $(p \wedge q) \rightarrow p$ | Simplification |
| $\frac{p}{q}$ $\therefore p \wedge q$ | $[(p) \wedge (q)] \rightarrow (p \wedge q)$ | Conjunction |
| $\frac{p \vee q}{\neg p \vee r}$ $\therefore q \vee r$ | $[(p \vee q) \wedge (\neg p \vee r)] \rightarrow (q \vee r)$ | Resolution |

TABLE 2 Rules of Inference for Quantified Statements.

| <i>Rule of Inference</i> | <i>Name</i> |
|--|----------------------------|
| $\frac{\forall x P(x)}{\therefore P(c)}$ | Universal instantiation |
| $\frac{P(c) \text{ for an arbitrary } c}{\therefore \forall x P(x)}$ | Universal generalization |
| $\frac{\exists x P(x)}{\therefore P(c) \text{ for some element } c}$ | Existential instantiation |
| $\frac{P(c) \text{ for some element } c}{\therefore \exists x P(x)}$ | Existential generalization |