

True or False: (all questions are about **Pure Logic Programming (PLP), and Prolog**)

- a) The main goal of the **PLP** paradigm is for the programmer to fully utilize the *control* (execution details) to help the implementation of the *logic* of the problem's solution. **F**
- b) **PLP's** coding of a problem is much more efficient than regular (impure) Prolog coding. **F**
- c) In Prolog, the first step of any “**goal**” deduction is to unify it with a program clause. **F**
- d) The “**fail**” clause in Prolog is a clear violation of the purity of the PLP. **T**
- e) The **cut** “!” operator in Prolog is universally asserted. **T**
- f) A non-terminating (upper case name) symbol in any asserted Prolog program *goal* will be used to output all possible values that makes such goal asserted (true). **T**
- g) The *bottom-up* deduction mechanism is much better than peer *top-down* in avoiding the calculations of redundant intermediate subgoals solutions. **T**
- h) The fastest goal deduction is when we do not have any *cut* “!” operator on the code. **F**
- i) The Prolog programmer uses the **cut** subgoal to enforce more *logic* on the code. **F**
- j) The main reason of the inability to deduce in parallel all subgoals in some rule is its *impurity* (mixing logic and control issues). **T**

Extra Credit: (+ 3 if correct, otherwise - 2 pts)

- k) A never be resolved *goal* might still be possibly unified. **F**
- l) Once a goal name is matched to a rule/fact name, the it is automatically unified. **F**
- m) Unification of $f(X, 2)$ with $g(3, Y)$ results in the following assignments: $X=3, Y=2$. **F**
- n) The following code is the Prolog implementation of negating X: **F**
not(X):- !, Call(X), fail.
not(X).