Original expression:

To see if the expression is valid we check if we can satisfy an expression where all premises are true and the conclusion is false (which is equal to expression that is a conjunction of premises and negation of conclusion, where we aim to make all of them true):

Conversion to CNF: here I convert each part of the conjunction separately to avoid rewriting:

$P \rightarrow (R \rightarrow S) \equiv$	$f = Q \rightarrow (\neg (R \land S) \rightarrow (P \lor \neg B)) \equiv (\rightarrow is wight - (associative))$
[¬] Pv (R→S) = [¬] Pv (¬RvS) =	$\neg Q \lor (\neg (R \land S) \rightarrow (P \lor \neg B)) \equiv$
TPVTRVS	$\neg Q \lor ((R \lor P \lor \neg B) \land (S \lor P \lor B)) \equiv \leftarrow ((A \lor C) \land (B \lor C))$
17P, 7R, 53	(IQVRVPVIB) (IQVSVPVIB) V is distri-
	127Q, R, P, 7By, 12Q, 5, P, 7B}

FUL ONF: {{7P,7R,5}, {7Q,R,P,7B}, {7Q,5,P,7B}, {R,5}, {P,7Q}}

Resolution :

C

	\bigcirc		2			
P	tautology G	R	-	5	8	
{-P, -R, 5}	{R, 7R, 5, 7Q, 78}	Nothing	{s,-Q,	·B} Noth	ing t	Jothing.
{-Q, R, P, -B31	{ - R, S, - Q, S, - B32	resolve	{s,7Q?	wesol	ve	resolve
{-a, 5, P, -B31	{rR,s,rQ32					
{R, 532	5. C				- 1	
{P,-Q31	4				1	
		l l	1	1		
(Numbers n the clause	ext to clauses was mesolved	refer to	the st	ep in w	hich	
ounterexamples:	1) 5, 7Q, R, P 2) 5, 7Q, R, P 3) 5, 7Q, R, P 4) 5, 7Q, R, 7P 6) 5, 7Q, 7R, P 6) 5, 7Q, 7R, P 7) 5, 7Q, 7R, P 8) 5, 7Q, 7R, 7 9) 5, Q, P, R,	18 P.B P.B P.B P.B P.B P.B P.P.B P.P.B P.B	Com aud the so vo th ov th	ranation ranation clauses dution for neur niables, ruth com re allowe	of S Les all in the true, aining all ubinat d	ions
	10) 5, Q, P, R, 11) 5, Q, P, TR 12) 5, Q, P, TR	1B 1B 1,7B	} ^	ll clours	es tru	2
	13)-5,-Q,R, 14)-5,-Q,R,	7P,B 7P,7B	2 22	, TQ, R, T L clause > we and ich and for B	P make s true e gree z valu	es to

Since we resolved all clauses we could and did not derive the empty clause, our expression is satisfiable.

Counterexamples are valuations of the expression that make it true. Each counterexample makes the premises true and the negation of the conclusion true, which is equal to making premises true and conclusion false, proving that the entailment is invalid.

Note that only one counterexample is necessary, here all were shown for reference.