

1. Consider the following conditional.

```

if P and Q then S1
else if R and T then {
  if P then S1
  if Q then S2
}
else {
  if T then S1
  else S2

```

In the language of propositional logic, write the conditions under which each of the statements S_1 and S_3 is executed. Simplify, at least move all \neg 's inward so they apply only to primes and factor out common terms.

2. A group of experts from different departments decides that procedure S_1 is done when P is true, that S_2 is done if P is false but R is true, and that S_3 is done Q is true but R is false.
- Write a GCL alternation statement that captures these requirements. (The conditions won't be mutually exclusive at this point.)
 - You point out to the experts that their conditions are not mutually exclusive. They decide among themselves that S_1 should take priority over the other two statements and that S_2 should take priority over S_3 . Rewrite the conditions so that they are mutually exclusive and respect these priorities.
 - For the cases not covered in **b**, add another alternative whose guard covers the remaining cases yet is disjoint from each of the other three guards. The command associated with this guard should be `skip`.
 - Translate the alternative statement in **c** into the language used in section 3.3. Minimize the number of primes that must be evaluated.

3. Convert the following into DNF.

- $\neg p \wedge q \Leftrightarrow p \Rightarrow \neg q \vee r$
- $(\neg p \vee q \Rightarrow r \wedge s) \wedge (p \vee \neg r \Rightarrow q)$

4. Convert the following into CNF.

$$(\neg p \vee q \Rightarrow r \vee s) \vee (\neg p \vee r \Rightarrow \neg q)$$

5. Convert the following CNF wff into the normal form with implications but no negations.

$$(p \vee q \vee r) \wedge (\neg q \vee \neg r)$$

6. Use the technique in Sec. 3.4.4 to convert the following in DNF to CNF. Simplify where possible.

$$(p \wedge q \wedge \neg r) \wedge (\neg p \wedge q \wedge r)$$