

Combinatorics on Words formalized  
Graph Lemma

Štěpán Holub  
Štěpán Starosta

December 14, 2021

Funded by the Czech Science Foundation grant GAČR 20-20621S.

# Contents

<b>1 Graph Lemma</b>	<b>2</b>
1.1 Binary code . . . . .	4
<b>References</b>	<b>6</b>

```
theory Graph-Lemma  
  imports Combinatorics-Words.Submonoids  
  
begin
```

# Chapter 1

## Graph Lemma

The Graph Lemma is an important tool for gaining information about systems of word equations. It yields an upper bound on the rank of the solution, that is, on the number of factors into all images of unknowns can be factorized. The most straightforward application is showing that a system of equations admits periodic solutions only, which in particular holds for any nontrivial equation over two words.

The name refers to a graph whose vertices are the unknowns of the system, and edges connect front letters of the left- and right- hand sides of equations. The bound mentioned above is then the number of connected components of the graph.

We formalize the algebraic proof from [1]

Let  $C$  be a set of generators, and  $b$  its distinguished element. We define the set of all products that do not start with  $b$ .

```
inductive-set no-head :: 'a list set  $\Rightarrow$  'a list  $\Rightarrow$  'a list set
for  $C\ b$  where
  emp-in-no-head[simp]:  $\varepsilon \in \text{no-head } C\ b$ 
  |  $u \in C \implies u \neq b \implies u \in \text{no-head } C\ b$ 
  |  $u \neq \varepsilon \implies u \in \text{no-head } C\ b \implies v \in \langle C \rangle \implies u \cdot v \in \text{no-head } C\ b$ 
```

The set is a submonoid of  $\langle C \rangle$

**lemma** *no-head-sub*:  $\text{no-head } C\ b \subseteq \langle C \rangle$   
*<proof>*

**lemma** *no-head-closed*:  $\langle \text{no-head } C\ b \rangle = \text{no-head } C\ b$   
*<proof>*

We are interested mainly in the situation when  $C$  is a code.

```
context code
begin
```

We characterize the set *no-head* in terms of the decomposition of its (nonempty) elements: the first factor is not  $b$

**lemma** *no-head-hd*: **assumes**  $u \in \text{no-head } \mathcal{C} \ b$  **and**  $u \neq \varepsilon$  **shows**  $\text{hd } (\text{Dec } \mathcal{C} \ u) \neq b$   
 ⟨*proof*⟩

**lemma** *b-not-in-no-head*: **assumes**  $b \in \mathcal{C}$  **shows**  $b \notin \text{no-head } \mathcal{C} \ b$   
 ⟨*proof*⟩

**lemma** *hd-no-head*: **assumes**  $u \in \langle \mathcal{C} \rangle$  **and**  $\text{hd } (\text{Dec } \mathcal{C} \ u) \neq b$  **shows**  $u \in \text{no-head } \mathcal{C} \ b$   
 ⟨*proof*⟩

**corollary** *no-head*  $\mathcal{C} \ b = \{u \in \langle \mathcal{C} \rangle. u = \varepsilon \vee \text{hd } (\text{Dec } \mathcal{C} \ u) \neq b\}$   
 ⟨*proof*⟩

**end**

The set *no-head* is generated by the following set.

**inductive-set** *no-head-gen* :: 'a list set  $\Rightarrow$  'a list  $\Rightarrow$  'a list set  
**for**  $\mathcal{C} \ b$  **where**  
 $u \in \mathcal{C} \ \Longrightarrow \ u \neq b \ \Longrightarrow \ u \in \text{no-head-gen } \mathcal{C} \ b$   
 $| \ u \in \text{no-head-gen } \mathcal{C} \ b \ \Longrightarrow \ u \cdot b \in \text{no-head-gen } \mathcal{C} \ b$

**lemma** *no-head-gen-set*:  $\text{no-head-gen } \mathcal{C} \ b = \{z \cdot b^{\textcircled{k}} \mid z \ k. z \in \mathcal{C} \wedge z \neq b\}$   
 ⟨*proof*⟩

**lemma** *no-head-genE*: **assumes**  $u \in \text{no-head-gen } \mathcal{C} \ b$   
**obtains**  $z \ k$  **where**  $z \in \mathcal{C}$  **and**  $z \neq b$  **and**  $u = z \cdot b^{\textcircled{k}}$   
 ⟨*proof*⟩

**context** *code*  
**begin**

We show that this indeed is a set of generators

**lemma** *emp-not-in-Cb*:  $\varepsilon \notin \text{no-head-gen } \mathcal{C} \ b$   
 ⟨*proof*⟩

**lemma** *no-head-sub'*:  $b \in \mathcal{C} \ \Longrightarrow \ \text{no-head-gen } \mathcal{C} \ b \subseteq \text{no-head } \mathcal{C} \ b$   
 ⟨*proof*⟩

**lemma** *no-head-generates0*: **assumes**  $v \in \langle \mathcal{C} \rangle$  **shows**  
 $u \neq \varepsilon \ \longrightarrow \ u \in \langle \text{no-head-gen } \mathcal{C} \ b \rangle \ \longrightarrow \ u \cdot v \in \langle \text{no-head-gen } \mathcal{C} \ b \rangle$   
 ⟨*proof*⟩

**theorem** *no-head-generates*: **assumes**  $b \in \mathcal{C}$  **shows**  $\langle \text{no-head-gen } \mathcal{C} \ b \rangle = \text{no-head } \mathcal{C} \ b$

*<proof>*

Moreover, the generating set *no-head-gen* is a code

**lemma** *lists-no-head-sub*:  $b \in \mathcal{C} \implies us \in \text{lists } (\text{no-head-gen } \mathcal{C} \ b) \implies us \in \text{lists } \langle \mathcal{C} \rangle$   
*<proof>*

**lemma** *ref-hd*: **assumes**  $z \in \mathcal{C}$  **and**  $b \in \mathcal{C}$  **and**  $z \neq b$  **and**  $vs \in \text{lists } (\text{no-head-gen } \mathcal{C} \ b)$

**shows**  $\text{refine } \mathcal{C} \ ((z \cdot b^{\textcircled{a}} k) \# vs) = [z] \cdot [b]^{\textcircled{a}} k \cdot \text{refine } \mathcal{C} \ vs$   
*<proof>*

**lemma** *no-head-gen-code-ind-step*:

**assumes**  $us \in \text{lists } (\text{no-head-gen } \mathcal{C} \ b)$   $us \in \text{lists } (\text{no-head-gen } \mathcal{C} \ b)$   $b \in \mathcal{C}$   
**and** *eq*:  $[b]^{\textcircled{a}} ku \cdot (\text{refine } \mathcal{C} \ us) = [b]^{\textcircled{a}} kv \cdot (\text{refine } \mathcal{C} \ vs)$

**shows**  $ku = kv$   
*<proof>*

**lemma** *no-head-gen-code'*:

$b \in \mathcal{C} \implies xs \in \text{lists } (\text{no-head-gen } \mathcal{C} \ b)$   
 $\implies ys \in \text{lists } (\text{no-head-gen } \mathcal{C} \ b) \implies \text{concat } xs = \text{concat } ys \implies xs = ys$   
*<proof>*

**end**

**theorem** *no-head-gen-code*:

**assumes** *code*  $C$  **and**  $b \in C$   
**shows** *code*  $\{z \cdot b^{\textcircled{a}} k \mid z k. z \in C \wedge z \neq b\}$   
*<proof>*

We are now ready to prove the Graph Lemma

**theorem** *graph-lemma*:  $\mathfrak{B}_F X = \{hd (\text{Dec } (\mathfrak{B}_F X) \ x) \mid x. x \in X \wedge x \neq \varepsilon\}$   
*<proof>*

## 1.1 Binary code

We illustrate the use of the Graph Lemma in an alternative proof of the fact that two non-commuting words form a code. See also  $\llbracket u_0 \cdot u_1 \neq u_1 \cdot u_0; us \in \text{lists } \{u_0, u_1\}; vs \in \text{lists } \{u_0, u_1\}; \text{concat } us = \text{concat } vs \rrbracket \implies us = vs$  in *Combinatorics-Words.CoWBasic*.

First, we prove a lemma which is the core of the alternative proof.

**lemma** *non-comm-hds-neq*: **assumes**  $u \cdot v \neq v \cdot u$  **shows**  $hd (\text{Dec } \mathfrak{B}_F \ \{u, v\} \ u) \neq hd (\text{Dec } \mathfrak{B}_F \ \{u, v\} \ v)$   
*<proof>*

**theorem** **assumes**  $u \cdot v \neq v \cdot u$

**shows**  $xs \in \text{lists } \{u, v\} \implies ys \in \text{lists } \{u, v\} \implies \text{concat } xs = \text{concat } ys \implies xs$   
 $= ys$   
(*proof*)

**end**

# References

- [1] J. Berstel, D. Perrin, J. Perrot, and A. Restivo. Sur le théorème du défaut. *Journal of Algebra*, 60(1):169–180, 1979.