

Formalisation of Kneser's Theorem in Lean and Isabelle/HOL

Mantas Bakšys | Yaël Dillies | Angeliki Koutsoukou-Argyraki

mb2412@cam.ac.uk | yyd23@cam.ac.uk | ak2110@cam.ac.uk

University of Cambridge, UK

4 February 2024

Additive combinatorics is, at heart, the study of combinatorial questions involving *the additive structure of sets*



Given an additive abelian group G and finite subsets A and B we define:

- ▶ Sumset: $A + B = \{a + b | a \in A, b \in B\}.$
- ▶ Difference Set: $A B = \{a b | a \in A, b \in B\}.$
- ▶ Stabilizer: $S(A) = \{g \in G | g + A = A\}.$

Simple and broad concepts lead to many questions E.g. What are the bounds on the cardinality of sumsets? How close are sumsets to forming subgroups?

. . .

Kneser's Theorem

Theorem (Cauchy-Davenport)

Let *p* be a prime and $A, B \subseteq \mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z}$ be non-empty subsets, then

 $|A + B| \ge \min\{p, |A| + |B| - 1\}$

A natural generalisation of the Cauchy-Davenport theorem for arbitrary abelian groups is a theorem of Kneser:

Theorem (Kneser)

Let *G* be an abelian group with finite non-empty subsets $A, B \subseteq G$ and K = S(A + B), then

 $|A + B| \ge |A + K| + |B + K| - |K|$

Cauchy-Davenport from Kneser

Theorem

Kneser's theorem implies Cauchy-Davenport.

Proof.

 $\mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z}$ has prime order, so $K = \mathcal{S}(A + B)$ is either

- $\mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z}$ and $A + B = \mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z}$
- ► {0} and Kneser tells us

 $|A + B| \ge |A + K| + |B + K| - |K| = |A| + |B| - 1$



- Lean is an interactive theorem prover based on a version of Dependent Type Theory called Calculus of Inductive Constructions
- A non-trivial proportion of the modern literature formalised in Mathlib, the mathematics library





Isabelle/HOL and the Archive of Formal Proofs

- Isabelle/HOL is a modern interactive theorem prover based on Simple Type Theory
- Features a strong automation suite with Sledgehammer and human-readable proofs with Isar
- Many substantial theorems formalised in the fast-growing Isabelle Archive of Formal Proofs (AFP) library



Kneser's Theorem: A Blueprint



DeVos' proof of Kneser's theorem runs induction on the quantity |A+B|+|A|

Induction hypothesis is applied to the quotient group $G_{S(A+B)}$ \implies Non-trivial argument to formalise, which requires the induction argument to **quantify** over all abelian groups. DeVos' proof of Kneser's theorem runs induction on the quantity |A+B|+|A|

Induction hypothesis is applied to the quotient group $G_{S(A+B)}$

- ⇒ Non-trivial argument to formalise, which requires the induction argument to **quantify** over all abelian groups.
- $\implies \text{We ought to find a type } \beta \text{ such that for any type } \alpha, \text{ which can be made into an abelian group:}$

 $\alpha:\beta$

DeVos' proof of Kneser's theorem runs induction on the quantity |A+B|+|A|

Induction hypothesis is applied to the quotient group $G_{S(A+B)}$

- ⇒ Non-trivial argument to formalise, which requires the induction argument to **quantify** over all abelian groups.
- $\implies \text{We ought to find a type } \beta \text{ such that for any type } \alpha, \text{ which can be made into an abelian group:}$

 $\label{eq:alpha} \begin{array}{l} \alpha:\beta \\ \Longrightarrow \mbox{ Can we do this in each system?} \end{array}$

The Type Theory of Isabelle/HOL (STP) does not support Type Universes.

The Type Theory of Isabelle/HOL (STP) does not support Type Universes. → We cannot quantify over types (there is no type which contains all *abelian groups* as terms)

The Type Theory of Isabelle/HOL (STP) does not support Type Universes. → We cannot quantify over types (there is no type which contains all *abelian groups* as terms) → Is there a workaround?

The Type Theory of Isabelle/HOL (STP) does not support Type Universes. \implies We cannot quantify over types (there is no type which contains all *abelian groups* as terms) \implies Is there a workaround? Yes! In this case, just re-embed the quotient group $G_{\mathcal{S}(A+B)}$ into G by taking coset representatives.

Workaround for Isabelle/HOL

Preliminary definitions

definition ϕ :: 'a set \implies 'a where ϕ = (x. if x \in G // K then (SOME a. a G x = a \cdot | K) else undefined)

definition quot-comp-alt :: 'a \implies 'a \implies 'a where quot-comp-alt a b = ϕ ((a \cdot b) \cdot | K)

Excerpt from Kneser's proof:

let $?\phi$ = K.Class let ?K-repr = K. ϕ 'K.Partition then interpret K-repr: additive-abelian-group ?K-repr K.quot-comp-alt K. ϕ ?K by <proof>

Type Universes - Lean

Lean's Type Theory contains ω -many Universe levels

Lean's Type Theory contains ω -many Universe levels They are denoted by Type 0, Type 1, Type 2, ... Each type α in Lean has a **universe level** $u \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

 α : Type u

Lean's Type Theory contains ω -many Universe levels They are denoted by Type 0, Type 1, Type 2, ... Each type α in Lean has a **universe level** $u \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

 α : Type u

Lean also implements universe polymorphism, which means that u above may be taken as a *variable*.

Lean's Type Theory contains ω -many Universe levels They are denoted by Type 0, Type 1, Type 2, ... Each type α in Lean has a **universe level** $u \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

 α : Type u

Lean also implements universe polymorphism, which means that *u* above may be taken as a *variable*.

Induction argument in Lean code

induction' n using Nat.strong_induction_on with n ih
generalizing G

Stabilizers - different definitions

On pen-and-paper:

$$\mathcal{S}(A) = \{g \in G | g + A = A\}$$

In Isabelle:

definition stabilizer:: 'a set \implies 'a set where stabilizer S \equiv {x \in G. sumset {x} (S \cap G) = S \cap G}

In Lean:

def mulStab (s : Finset G) : Finset G :=
 (s / s).filter fun a => a · s = s

Stabilizers - different definitions

- Finset in Lean vs Set in Isabelle
- ▶ Use of filter and *s*/*s* in Lean. Why?
- ► What is the stabilizer of Ø?

Stabilizers - different definitions

- Finset in Lean vs Set in Isabelle
- ▶ Use of filter and *s*/*s* in Lean. Why?
- ▶ What is the stabilizer of Ø? Depends on the system!
- What could we have done differently?

Additive combinatorics uses identities of the form:

$$\blacktriangleright A + B = B + A$$

$$\blacktriangleright \ -(-A) = A$$

$$\blacktriangleright \ -(A-B) = B - A$$

$$\bullet \ A - (B - C) = A + C - B$$

•
$$(A - B) + (C - D) = (A + C) - (B + D)$$

► 2(A-3B) + 3(B-2C) = 2(A-3C) + 3(2B-B),

where A, B, C, D are sets in an abelian group.

Handling algebraic set expressions - Problem

Easily derivable from AddGroup lemmas. But Finset *G* is not a group even if *G* is.

AddGroup $G \implies$ AddGroup (Finset G)

Easily derivable from AddGroup lemmas. But Finset *G* is not a group even if *G* is.

AddGroup $G \implies$ AddGroup (Finset G)

Isabelle solution: Extensionality every time + automation bash Lean solution: Generalise relevant lemmas to something weaker than AddGroup that Finset *G* respects The AddGroup identities that hold for Finset *G* are exactly the ones where each variable (sign included) appears the same number of times on both sides.

 $A \neq -A$ $A - A \neq 0$ $A(B + C) \neq AB + AC$

Homework: Check this is the case for the identities two slides ago.

Addition identities are already covered by Monoid. So look at the most basic identities involving negation and subtraction:

$$A - B = A + (-B)$$
$$-(-A) = A$$
$$-(A + B) = (-B) + (-A)$$

This is enough to get all lemmas we care about on Finset G!

Handling algebraic set expressions - Definition

class SubtractionMonoid (G : Type u)
 extends AddMonoid G, Neg G, Sub G where
 sub_eq_add_neg (a b : G) : a - b = a + -b
 neg_neg (a : G) : -(-a) = a
 neg_add_rev (a b : G) : -(a + b) = -b + -a

SubtractionMonoid $G \implies$ SubtractionMonoid (Finset G)

Handling algebraic set expressions - Bonus

Mathlib used to prove lemmas like

$$\left(\frac{a}{b}\right)^{-1} = \frac{b}{a}$$
$$\frac{a}{\frac{b}{c}} = \frac{ac}{b}$$
$$\frac{a}{\frac{b}{c}} = \frac{ac}{bd}$$

separately for Group and GroupWithZero. DivisionMonoid unifies both versions!

Handling algebraic set expressions - Bonus

Mathlib used to prove lemmas like

$$\left(\frac{a}{b}\right)^{-1} = \frac{b}{a}$$
$$\frac{a}{\frac{b}{c}} = \frac{ac}{b}$$
$$\frac{a}{\frac{b}{c}} = \frac{ac}{bd}$$

separately for Group and GroupWithZero. DivisionMonoid unifies both versions!

This extra axiom lets us unify even more lemmas:

$$AB = 1 \implies A^{-1} = B$$

Concluding remarks

Kneser's theorem	Paper	Lean	Isabelle
.zip size (bytes)	2 829	7 236	10 611
De Bruijn factor	1	2.56	3.75

Additive Combinatorics is an area suitable in any modern proof assistant!

Acknowledgements and Contacts







Mantas¹ mb2412@cam.ac.uk

Yaël² yyd23@cam.ac.uk

Angeliki³ ak2110@cam.ac.uk

Source code:

► Isabelle AFP Entry:

https://www.isa-afp.org/entries/Kneser_Cauchy_Davenport.html

Lean formalisation: https://yaeldillies.github.io/LeanCamCombi/docs/ LeanCamCombi/Kneser/Kneser.html

Funding: This work was funded by the ERC Advanced Grant ALEXANDRIA (Project GA 742178)^{1,3}, the Cambridge Mathematics Placements (CMP) Internship Programme¹