

[6] (b) Use DPLL to test the satisfiability of the propositional formula

 $\phi = (p \lor \neg q \lor r) \land (\neg p \lor \neg q) \land (p \lor \neg q \lor \neg r) \land (q \lor \neg r) \land (q \lor r)$

(c) Compute the algebraic normal form of the boolean function

$$f(x, y, z) = x + (x + y) \cdot \overline{(y + z)}$$

Consider the boolean function $f(x, y, z) = x \oplus xy \oplus yz$ and the BDD B_q : |2|



- [7] (a) Construct a reduced OBDD for f with the variable ordering [x, y, z].
- [6] (b) Use Shannon's expansion to obtain a boolean function that is equivalent to B_q .
- [7] (c) Compute $apply(\oplus, B_g, B_g)$.

3 For each of the following sequents, either give a natural deduction proof or find a model which does not satisfy it.

- (a) $p \to q \to r \vdash \neg (p \land (q \land \neg r))$ [6]
- (b) $Q(a, a) \vdash \exists y \forall x (x = y \rightarrow Q(y, x))$ [7]
- (c) $\exists y \, \forall x \, (x = y \rightarrow Q(y, x)) \vdash Q(a, a)$ [7]





LVA 703026

Logik

1

[7]

[7]

[7] (a) Consider the model $\mathcal{M} = (S, \rightarrow, L)$ with

$$S = \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$$

 $\rightarrow = \{(1, 1), (1, 2), (1, 3), (1, 4), (2, 3), (3, 4), (4, 4)\}$

and L given as $L(1) = \{p\}, L(2) = \{p,q\}, L(3) = \{q\}, L(4) = \emptyset$. Use the labelling algorithm to determine the states in which the formula $\mathsf{E}[\mathsf{EF}(p \land q) \mathsf{U}(p \lor q)]$ is satisfied.

] (b) Consider the two CTL formulas $\phi = \mathsf{AX} p$ and $\psi = \mathsf{E}[p \, \mathsf{U} q]$.

i. Find a model \mathcal{M} and a state s such that $\mathcal{M}, s \models \phi$ and $\mathcal{M}, s \not\models \psi$.

ii. Find a model \mathcal{M} and a state s such that $\mathcal{M}, s \not\models \phi$ and $\mathcal{M}, s \models \psi$.

[7] (c) Give an LTL formula which is not expressible in CTL.

[20] 5 Determine whether the following statements are true or false. Every correct answer is worth 2 points. For every wrong answer 1 point is subtracted, provided the total number of points is non-negative.

statement

Presburger arithmetic is finitely axiomatizable.

 $\exists x \ (\phi \land \psi) \dashv \vdash \exists x \ \phi \land \exists x \ \psi$

Every path formula in CTL^{*} is also a state formula.

The depth of any sorting network for 16 wires is at least 9.

 $\mathsf{E}_C \mathsf{X} \phi \equiv \mathsf{E} \mathsf{X} ((\mathsf{E}_C \mathsf{G} \top) \land \phi)$

Resolution without factoring is unsound for predicate logic.

The conjunction of the negation of all decision literals when a conflict occurs is a backjump clause in basic DPLL.

The LTL formulas $\phi \cup \neg \psi$ and $\neg G\psi \land \neg \psi \land (\psi \to \phi)$ are semantically equivalent.

There are more affine binary boolean functions than non-affine binary boolean functions.

For every predicate logic formula there exists an equisatisfiable formula in prenex normal form.

[6]