## **31268 Web Systems**



#### Week 08: Computer Science 2 Part 2: Advanced Logic

# **Mathematics and Computer Science**

#### Under the bonnet

- → Representation of information
- → Number systems

#### Logic and Mathematics

- → Boolean Algebra
- → Binary Arithmetic

#### Storage and processing of information

- → Computation
- Memory
- → Coding

Faculty of Information Technology

# **Objectives and Motivation**



## You must learn to:

- Write logical expressions
- Understand when two logical expressions mean the same thing

#### In order to:

- Translate between your reasoning and the computer's reasoning.
- Find the best way to write code and make chips!

# **Laws of Boolean logic**



- <u>http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Laws of classical logic</u>
- Associativity
- Distributivity
- Complement/Identity
- Commutativity
- De Morgans

# **Boolean Associativity**



• AND and OR are both associative operations i.e. order is not important for same operations

(x AND y) AND z = x AND (y AND z)(x OR y) OR z = x OR (y OR z)

 Therefore, one may write (x AND y) AND z

as

x AND y AND z

• But DO NOT mix the ANDs and ORs!

# **Boolean Associativity**



• AND and OR are both associative operations i.e. order is not important for same operations

(x AND y) AND z = x AND (y AND z) (x OR y) OR z = x OR (y OR z)

 Therefore, one may write (x AND y) AND z as looks like arithmetic rules? eg: (a \* b) \* c = a \* (b \* c)

- x AND y AND z
- But DO NOT mix the ANDs and ORs!



It can be proven that:

AND distributes over OR:
(x OR y) AND z = (x AND z) OR (y AND z)

OR distributes over AND:
(x AND y) OR z = (x OR z) AND (y OR z)



It can be proven that:

Looks like arithmetic? eg: (a + b) \* c= (a \* c) + (b \* c)

AND distributes over OR:
(x OR y) AND z = (x AND z) OR (y AND z)

OR distributes over AND:
(x AND y) OR z = (x OR z) AND (y OR z)





**Observation 1** 

x AND y OR z is not valid notation, since (x AND y) OR z is not equal to x AND (y OR z)

e.g. Let x=FALSE, y=FALSE, z=TRUE (FALSE and FALSE) or TRUE → TRUE FALSE and (FALSE or TRUE) → FALSE





#### **Observation 2**

Natural numbers are less distributive:
✓ Logic: (x OR y) AND z = (x AND z) OR (y AND z)
✓ Math: e.g. (1 + 1) \* 2 = (1 \* 2) + (1 \* 2)

but

Logic: (x AND y) OR z = (x OR z) AND (y OR z)
 Math: (1\*1) + 2 = (1 + 2)\*(1 + 2)





#### **Observation 2**

Natural numbers are **less** distributive:  $\checkmark$  Logic: (x OR y) AND z = (x AND z) OR (y AND z)  $\checkmark$  Math: e.g. (1 + 1) \* 2 = (1 \* 2) + (1 \* 2)

but

we can almost treat AND as \* Also OR as +

Logic: (x AND y) OR z = (x OR z) AND (y OR z)
 Math: (1\*1) + 2 = (1 + 2)\*(1 + 2)

## **Complement/Identity Law**

- X *OR TRUE* = TRUE
- X OR FALSE = X
- X AND TRUE = X
- X AND FALSE = FALSE
   → this implies X AND not(X) = FALSE
   -(also called non-Contradiction law!)



• not (P) OR not (Q) = not (P AND Q)

• not (P) AND not (Q) = not (P OR Q)

### Verify

- By experimenting with examples from daily life
- By constructing a table for each composite operation.



• not (P) OR not (Q) = not (P AND Q)

## • not (P) AND not (Q) = not (P OR Q)

Q: What did you have for dinner? A: not (pizza AND beer) ?

- Verify
- By experimenting with examples from daily life
- By constructing a table for each composite operation.



• not (P) OR not (Q) = not (P AND Q)

• not (P) AND not (Q) = not (P OR Q)

Q: What did you have for dinner? A: not (pizza AND beer) ? I didn't have pizza AND beer together?

- Verify
- By experimenting with examples from daily life
- By constructing a table for each composite operation.



- not (P) OR not (Q) = not (P AND Q)
- not (P) AND not (Q) = not (P OR Q)

Q: What did you have for dinner? A: not (pizza AND beer) ? I didn't have pizza AND beer together?

- Verify
- By experimenting with examples from daily life
- By constructing a table for each composite operation.

ie not(pizza) or not(beer) I MIGHT have had pizza, or MIGHT have had beer **BUT NOT BOTH TOGETHER!** 

# **Reasons for de Morgan's Laws**



- Allow **simplification** of complex Boolean expressions
- Can be used to prove that a NAND gate with negated Inputs is the equivalent of an OR gate.

# **Reasons for de Morgan's Laws**



- Allow simplification of complex Boolean expressions
- Can be used to prove that a NAND gate with negated Inputs is the equivalent of an OR gate.
- Allows Integrated Circuits (IC) to be produced with fewer

  - gates to perform the same functions.
    We only need NOT and NAND gates to do all functions!
    CHEAPER to build one set of gates
    Many modern IC now just consist of an array of NAND gates. Millions (if not Billions) of these gates. Easier to manufacture!
- Designing IC becomes mainly an exercise in making the right connections between NAND gates to produce logic functions.



• What does A or Not(B and A) = ?



• What does A or Not(B and A) = ?

• A or (Not(B) or Not(A)) using DeMorgan's Law's





• A or (Not(B) or Not(A))

 (A or Not(A)) or Not(B) using Associativity



• What does A or Not(B and A) = ?

• A or (Not(B) or Not(A))

```
• (A or Not(A)) or Not(B)
```

• True or Not(B) using Complement Law



• What does A or Not(B and A) = ?

- A or (Not(B) or Not(A)) using DeMorgan's Law's
- (A or Not(A)) or Not(B)
   using Associativity
- True or Not(B)

• True using Complement law

# **Questions?**

# • You will be required to know these laws to simplify logic in the exam