# Enumeration of Equivalence Relations

Emin Karayel March 17, 2025

#### Abstract

This entry contains a formalization of an algorithm enumerating all equivalence relations on an initial segment of the natural numbers. The approach follows the method described by Stanton and White [5, §1.5] using restricted growth functions.

The algorithm internally enumerates restricted growth functions (as lists), whose equivalence kernels then form the equivalence relations. This has the advantage that the representation is compact and lookup of the relation reduces to a list lookup operation.

The algorithm can also be used within a proof and an example application is included, where a sequence of variables is split by the possible partitions they can form.

#### 1 Introduction

 $\begin{tabular}{ll} \textbf{theory} & \textit{Equivalence-Relation-Enumeration} \\ \textbf{imports} & \textit{HOL-Library.Sublist HOL-Library.Disjoint-Sets} \\ & \textit{Card-Equiv-Relations.Card-Equiv-Relations} \\ \textbf{begin} \\ \end{tabular}$ 

As mentioned in the abstract the enumeration algorithm relies on the bijection between restricted growth functions (RGFs) of length n and the equivalence relations on  $\{..< n\}$ , where the bijection is the operation that forms the equivalence kernels of an RGF. The method is being dicussed, for example, by [3, 4] or  $[5, \S1.5]$ .

An enumeration algorithm for RGFs is less convoluted than one for equivalence relations or partitions and the representation has the advantage that checking whether a pair of elements are equivalent can be done by performing two list lookup operations.

After a few preliminary results in the following section, Section 3 introduces the enumeration algorithm for RGFs and shows that the function enumerates all of them (for the given length) without repetition. Section 4 shows that the operation of forming the equivalence kernel is a bijection and concludes with the correctness of the entire algorithm. In Section 5 an interesting application is being discussed, where the enumeration of partitions is applied

within a proof. Section 6 contains a few additional results, such as the fact that the length of the enumerated list is a Bell number. The latter result relies on the formalization of the cardinality of equivalence relations by Bulwahn [2].

### 2 Preliminary Results

This section contains a few preliminary results used in the proofs below.

```
lemma length-filter:length (filter p xs) = sum-list (map (\lambda x. of-bool (p x)) xs) by (induct xs, simp-all)
```

```
lemma count-list-expand:count-list xs \ x = length \ (filter \ ((=) \ x) \ xs) by (induct xs, simp-all)
```

An induction schema (similar to *list-induct2* and *rev-induct*) for two lists of equal length, where induction step is shown appending elements at the end.

```
lemma list-induct-2-rev[consumes 1, case-names Nil Cons]:
 assumes length x = length y
 assumes P [][]
 assumes \bigwedge x xs y ys. length xs = length ys \Longrightarrow P xs ys \Longrightarrow P (xs@[x]) (ys@[y])
 shows P x y
 using assms(1)
proof (induct length x arbitrary: x y)
 then show ?case using assms(2) by simp
next
 case (Suc\ n)
 obtain x1 x2 where a:x = x1@[x2] and c:length x1 = n
   by (metis\ Suc(2)\ append-butlast-last-id\ length-append-singleton
      length-greater-0-conv nat.inject zero-less-Suc)
 obtain y1 \ y2 where b:y = y1@[y2] and d:length \ y1 = n
   by (metis Suc(2,3) append-butlast-last-id length-append-singleton
      length-greater-0-conv nat.inject zero-less-Suc)
 have P x1 y1 using c d Suc by simp
 hence P(x1@[x2])(y1@[y2]) using assms(3) \ c \ d by simp
 thus ?case using a b by simp
```

If all but one value of a sum is zero then it can be evaluated on the remaining point:

```
lemma sum\text{-}collapse:

fixes \ f :: 'a \Rightarrow 'b::\{comm\text{-}monoid\text{-}add\}

assumes \ finite \ A

assumes \ z \in A
```

```
assumes \bigwedge y. \ y \in A \Longrightarrow y \neq z \Longrightarrow f \ y = 0
shows sum \ f \ A = f \ z
using sum.union-disjoint[where A=A-\{z\} and B=\{z\} and g=f]
by (simp \ add: \ assms \ sum.insert-if)
```

Number of occurrences of elements in lists is preserved under injective maps.

```
lemma count-list-inj-map:

assumes inj-on f (set x)

assumes y \in set \ x

shows count-list (map f x) (f y) = count-list x y

using assms by (induction x, simp-all, fastforce)
```

A relation cannot be an equivalence relation on two distinct sets.

```
lemma equiv-on-unique:
  assumes equiv A p
  assumes equiv B p
  shows A = B
  by (meson assms equalityI equiv-class-eq-iff subsetI)
```

The restriction of an equivalence relation is itself an equivalence relation.

```
lemma equiv-subset:

assumes B \subseteq A

assumes equiv A p

shows equiv B (Restr p B)

proof —

have refl-on B (Restr p B) using assms by (simp add:refl-on-def equiv-def, blast)

moreover have sym (Restr p B) using assms by (simp add:sym-def equiv-def)

moreover have trans (Restr p B)

using assms by (simp add:trans-def equiv-def, blast)

ultimately show ?thesis by (simp add:equiv-def)

qed
```

## 3 Enumerating Restricted Growth Functions

```
fun rgf-limit :: nat list \Rightarrow nat
where
rgf-limit [] = 0 |
rgf-limit (x\#xs) = max (x+1) (rgf-limit xs)

lemma rgf-limit-snoc: rgf-limit (x@[y]) = max (y+1) (rgf-limit x)
by (induction\ x,\ simp-all)

lemma rgf-limit-ge: y \in set\ xs \implies y < rgf-limit xs
by (induction\ xs,\ simp-all, metis\ lessI\ max-less-iff-conj not-less-eq)

definition rgf :: nat\ list \Rightarrow bool
where rgf\ x = (\forall\ ys\ y.\ prefix\ (ys@[y])\ x \longrightarrow y \le rgf-limit ys)
```

The function rgf-limit returns the smallest natural number larger than all list elements, it is the largest allowed value following xs for restricted growth functions. The definition rgf is the predicate capturing the notion.

```
fun enum-rgfs :: nat \Rightarrow (nat \ list) \ list
 where
   enum-rgfs \theta = [[]]
   enum-rgfs (Suc n) = [(x@[y]). x \leftarrow enum-rgfs n, y \leftarrow [0.. < rgf-limit x+1]]
The function enum-rqfs n returns all RGFs of length n without repetition.
The fact is verified in the three lemmas at the end of this section.
lemma rqf-snoc:
  rgf (xs@[x]) \longleftrightarrow rgf xs \land x < rgf\text{-}limit xs + 1
 unfolding rgf-def by (rule order-antisym, (simp add:less-Suc-eq-le)+)
\textbf{lemma} \ \textit{rgf-imp-initial-segment}:
 rgf xs \Longrightarrow set xs = \{.. < rgf-limit xs\}
proof (induction xs rule:rev-induct)
 case Nil
 then show ?case by simp
next
  case (snoc \ x \ xs)
  have c:rgf \ xs \ using \ snoc(2) \ rgf-snoc \ by \ simp
 hence a:set \ xs = \{.. < rgf-limit \ xs\} \ using \ snoc(1) \ by \ simp
 have b: x \leq rgf-limit xs using snoc(2) rgf-snoc c by simp
 have set (xs@[x]) = insert \ x \{.. < rgf-limit \ xs\}
   using a by simp
 also have \dots = \{ \dots < max (x+1) (rgf-limit xs) \} using b
   by (cases x < rgf-limit xs, simp add:insert-absorb, simp add:lessThan-Suc)
 also have \dots = \{ \dots < rgf\text{-}limit \ (xs@[x]) \}
   using rgf-limit-snoc by simp
 finally show ?case by simp
qed
lemma enum-rgfs-returns-rgfs:
 assumes x \in set \ (enum-rgfs \ n)
 shows rgf x
 using assms
proof (induction n arbitrary: x)
  then show ?case by (simp add:rgf-def)
next
  case (Suc \ n)
 obtain x1 \ x2 where
   x-def:x = x1@[x2] x2 < rgf-limit x1 + 1 x1 \in set (enum-rgfs n)
   using Suc by (simp add:image-iff, force)
 have a:rgf x1 using Suc x-def by blast
 thus ?case using x-def by (simp add:rgf-snoc)
qed
```

```
lemma enum-rqfs-len:
 assumes x \in set (enum-rgfs n)
 shows length x = n
 using assms by (induction n arbitrary: x, simp-all, fastforce)
lemma equiv-rels-enum:
 assumes rgf x
 shows count-list (enum-rgfs (length x)) x = 1
  using assms
proof (induction x rule:rev-induct)
 {\bf case}\ {\it Nil}
  then show ?case by simp
next
  case (snoc \ x \ xs)
 have b:rgf xs using snoc(2) rgf-def by simp
 hence x < rqf-limit xs + 1 using rqf-snoc snoc by blast
 hence a:card (\{0..<rgf-limit\ xs+1\}\cap\{x\}) = 1 by force
  have 1 = count-list (enum-rgfs (length \ xs)) xs using snoc \ b by simp
  also have ... = (\sum r1 \leftarrow enum\text{-}rgfs (length xs). of\text{-}bool (xs = r1) *
     card (\{0.. < rgf-limit \ xs + 1\} \cap \{x\}))
   using a by (simp add:length-concat filter-concat count-list-expand length-filter)
 also have ... = (\sum r1 \leftarrow enum\text{-}rgfs \ (length \ xs). \ of\text{-}bool \ (xs = r1) *
     card (\{0.. < rgf-limit \ r1 + 1\} \cap \{x\}))
   by (metis (mono-tags, opaque-lifting) mult-eq-0-iff of-bool-eq-0-iff)
  also have ... = (\sum r1 \leftarrow enum\text{-}rgfs \ (length \ xs). \ of\text{-}bool \ (xs = r1) *
     (\sum r2 \leftarrow [0.. < rgf-limit\ r1 + 1].\ of-bool\ (x = r2)))
   by (simp add:interv-sum-list-conv-sum-set-nat del:One-nat-def)
  also have ... = length (filter ((=) (xs@[x])) (enum-rgfs (length (xs@[x]))))
   by (simp add:length-concat filter-concat length-filter comp-def
       of-bool-conj sum-list-const-mult del:upt-Suc)
  also have ... = count-list (enum-rgfs (length (xs@[x]))) (xs@[x])
   by (simp add:count-list-expand length-filter del:enum-rgfs.simps)
 finally show ?case by presburger
qed
```

# 4 Enumerating Equivalence Relations

The following definition returns the equivalence relation induced by a list, for example, by a restricted growth function.

```
definition kernel-of :: 'a list \Rightarrow nat rel where kernel-of xs = \{(i,j).\ i < length\ xs \land j < length\ xs \land xs \mid i = xs \mid j\}
```

Using that the enumeration function for equivalence relations on  $\{..< n\}$  is straight-forward to define:

```
definition equiv-rels where equiv-rels n = map \ kernel-of \ (enum-rgfs \ n)
```

The following lemma shows that the image of *kernel-of* is indeed an equivalence relation:

```
lemma kernel-of-equiv: equiv {... < length xs} (kernel-of xs)
proof -
 have kernel\text{-}of\ xs \subseteq \{..< length\ xs\} \times \{..< length\ xs\}
   by (rule subsetI, simp add:kernel-of-def mem-Times-iff case-prod-beta)
 thus ?thesis by (simp add:equiv-def refl-on-def sym-def trans-def kernel-of-def)
qed
lemma kernel-of-eq-len:
 assumes kernel-of x = kernel-of y
 shows length x = length y
proof -
 have \{..< length \ x\} = \{..< length \ y\}
   by (metis kernel-of-equiv equiv-on-unique assms)
 thus ?thesis by simp
qed
lemma kernel-of-eq:
  (kernel-of\ x = kernel-of\ y) \longleftrightarrow
 (length \ x = length \ y \land (\forall j < length \ x. \ \forall i < j. \ (x ! \ i = x ! \ j) = (y ! \ i = y ! \ j)))
proof (cases length x = length y)
 case True
 have (kernel - of \ x = kernel - of \ y) \longleftrightarrow
   (\forall j < length \ x. \ \forall i < length \ x. \ (x ! i = x ! j) = (y ! i = y ! j))
   unfolding set-eq-iff kernel-of-def using True by (simp, blast)
 also have ... \longleftrightarrow (\forall j < length \ x. \ \forall i < j. \ (x ! \ i = x ! \ j) = (y ! \ i = y ! \ j))
   by (metis (no-types, lifting) linorder-cases order.strict-trans)
 finally show ?thesis using True by simp
next
  case False
 then show ?thesis using kernel-of-eq-len by blast
qed
lemma kernel-of-snoc:
 kernel-of(xs) = Restr(kernel-of(xs@[x])) \{..< length(xs)\}
 by (simp add:kernel-of-def nth-append set-eq-iff)
lemma kernel-of-inj-on-rgfs-aux:
 assumes length x = length y
 assumes rgf x
 assumes rgf y
 assumes kernel-of x = kernel-of y
 shows x = y
 using assms
proof (induct x y rule: list-induct-2-rev)
 case Nil
 then show ?case by simp
 case (Cons \ x \ xs \ y \ ys)
 have a:kernel-of\ xs = kernel-of\ ys
```

```
using Cons(1,5) kernel-of-snoc by metis
 have d:rgf xs rgf ys using Cons rgf-def by auto
 hence b:xs = ys using Cons(2) a by auto
 have \bigwedge i. i < length xs \Longrightarrow (xs ! i = x) = (ys ! i = y)
 proof -
   \mathbf{fix} i
   assume i-l:i < length xs
   have (xs ! i = x) \longleftrightarrow (i, length \ xs) \in kernel-of \ (xs@[x]) using i-l
     by (simp add:kernel-of-def less-Suc-eq nth-append)
   also have ... \longleftrightarrow (i,length \ xs) \in kernel-of \ (ys@[y])
     using Cons(5) by simp
   also have ... \longleftrightarrow (ys ! i= y) using i-l Cons(1)
     by (simp add:kernel-of-def less-Suc-eq nth-append)
   finally show (xs ! i = x) = (ys ! i = y) by simp
  qed
 hence c:(x \in set \ xs \longrightarrow x = y) \land (x \notin set \ xs \longrightarrow y \notin set \ ys)
   by (metis b in-set-conv-nth)
 have x-bound:x < rgf-limit xs + 1
   using Cons(3) rgf-snoc d by simp
  have y-bound:y < rqf-limit ys + 1
   using Cons(4) rgf-snoc d by simp
 have x = y using b c d rgf-imp-initial-segment Cons x-bound y-bound
   apply (cases x < rgf-limit xs, simp)
   by (cases\ y < rgf\text{-}limit\ ys,\ simp+)
  then show ?case using b by simp
qed
lemma kernel-of-inj-on-rgfs:
  inj-on kernel-of \{x. rgf x\}
 by (rule inj-onI, simp, metis kernel-of-eq-len kernel-of-inj-on-rgfs-aux)
Applying an injective map to a list preserves the induced relation:
lemma kernel-of-under-inj-map:
 assumes ini-on f (set x)
 shows kernel-of x = kernel-of (map f x)
proof -
 have \bigwedge i j. i < length x \Longrightarrow j < length x
   \implies (map f x) ! i = (map f x) ! j <math>\implies x ! i = x ! j
   using assms by (simp add: inj-on-eq-iff)
 thus ?thesis unfolding kernel-of-def by fastforce
qed
lemma all-rels-are-kernels:
 assumes equiv \{ ... < n \} p
 shows \exists (x :: nat set list). kernel-of x = p \land length x = n
proof -
 define r where r = map(\lambda k. p''\{k\})[\theta...< n]
 have \bigwedge u \ v. \ (u,v) \in kernel-of \ r \longleftrightarrow (u,v) \in p
```

```
proof -
   \mathbf{fix}\ u\ v::\ nat
   have (u,v) \in kernel-of\ r \longleftrightarrow ((u,v) \in \{..< n\} \times \{..< n\} \land p``\{u\} = p``\{v\})
     unfolding kernel-of-def r-def by auto
   also have ... \longleftrightarrow (u,v) \in p by (metis assms equiv-class-eq-iff mem-Sigma-iff)
   finally show (u,v) \in kernel\text{-}of\ r \longleftrightarrow (u,v) \in p\ \text{by }simp
  qed
 hence kernel-of r = p by auto
 moreover have length r = n using r-def by simp
  ultimately show ?thesis by auto
qed
For any list there is always an injective map on its set, such that its image
is an RGF.
lemma map-list-to-rqf:
 \exists f. \ inj\text{-}on \ f \ (set \ x) \land rgf \ (map \ f \ x)
proof (induction length x arbitrary: x)
  case \theta
  then show ?case by (simp add:rgf-def)
next
 case (Suc \ n)
 obtain x1 x2 where x-def: x = x1@[x2] and l-x1: length x1 = n
   by (metis append-butlast-last-id length-append-singleton Suc(2)
       length-greater-0-conv nat.inject zero-less-Suc)
  obtain f where inj-f: inj-on f (set x1) and pc-f: rgf (map f x1)
   using Suc(1) l-x1 by blast
 show ?case
  proof (cases x2 \in set x1)
   case True
   have a:set \ x = set \ x1 using x-def \ True \ by \ auto
   hence b:inj-on\ f\ (set\ x) using inj-f by auto
   have f x2 < rgf-limit (map f x1) using rgf-limit-ge True by auto
   hence rgf(map f x)
     by (simp add:x-def rgf-snoc pc-f)
   then show ?thesis using b by blast
  \mathbf{next}
   case False
   define f' where f' = (\lambda y. \ if \ y \in set \ x1 \ then \ f \ y \ else \ rgf-limit \ (map \ f \ x1))
   have inj-on f' (set x1) using f'-def inj-f by (simp add: inj-on-def)
   moreover have rgf-limit (map f x1) \notin set (map f x1)
     using rgf-limit-ge by blast
   hence f' x2 \notin f' 'set x1 using False by (simp add: f'-def)
   ultimately have inj-on f' (insert x2 (set x1)) using False by simp
   hence a:inj-on\ f'\ (set\ x) using False x-def by simp
   have b:map\ f\ x1=map\ f'\ x1 using f'-def by simp
   have c:f' x2 < Suc (rgf-limit (map f x1)) by (simp add:f'-def False)
```

```
have rgf(map f'x) by (simp add:x-def b[symmetric] rgf-snoc pc-f c)
   then show ?thesis using a by blast
 qed
qed
For any relation there is a corresponding RGF:
lemma rgf-exists:
 assumes equiv \{... < n\} r
 shows \exists x. \ rgf \ x \land length \ x = n \land kernel-of \ x = r
proof -
 obtain y :: nat set list where a:kernel-of <math>y = r length y = n
   using all-rels-are-kernels assms by blast
 then obtain f where b:inj-on\ f\ (set\ y)\ rgf\ (map\ f\ y)
   using map-list-to-rgf by blast
 have kernel-of (map f y) = r
   using kernel-of-under-inj-map a b by blast
 moreover have length (map f y) = n using a by simp
 ultimately show ?thesis
   using b by blast
qed
These are the main result of this entry: The function equiv-rels n enumerates
the equivalence relations on \{..< n\} without repetition.
theorem equiv-rels-set:
 assumes x \in set (equiv-rels n)
 shows equiv \{..< n\} x
 using assms equiv-rels-def kernel-of-equiv enum-rgfs-len by auto
theorem equiv-rels:
 assumes equiv \{... < n\} r
 shows count-list (equiv-rels n) r = 1
proof -
 obtain y where y-def: rgf y length y = n kernel-of y = r
   using rgf-exists assms by blast
 have a: \bigwedge x. \ x \in set \ (enum-rgfs \ n) \Longrightarrow (kernel-of \ y = kernel-of \ x) = (y=x)
  using enum-rgfs-returns-rgfs y-def(1,2) enum-rgfs-len inj-onD[OF kernel-of-inj-on-rgfs]
   by auto
 have count-list (equiv-rels n) r =
   length (filter (\lambda x. r = kernel-of x) (enum-rgfs n))
   by (simp add:equiv-rels-def count-list-expand length-filter comp-def)
 also have ... = length (filter (\lambda x. kernel-of y = kernel-of x) (enum-rgfs n))
   using y-def(3) by simp
 also have ... = length (filter (\lambda x. y = x) (enum-rgfs n))
   using a by (simp cong:filter-cong)
 also have ... = count-list (enum-rgfs n) y
   by (simp add:count-list-expand length-filter)
 also have \dots = 1
```

```
using equiv-rels-enum y-def(1,2) by auto finally show ?thesis by simp qed
```

A corollary of the previous theorem is that the sum of the indicator function for a relation over equiv-rels n is always one.

```
corollary equiv-rels-2: assumes n = length \ xs shows (\sum x \leftarrow equiv\text{-rels } n. \ of\text{-bool} \ (kernel\text{-of} \ xs = x)) = (1 :: 'a :: \{semiring\text{-}1\}) proof - have length \ (filter \ (\lambda x. \ kernel\text{-of} \ xs = x) \ (equiv\text{-rels} \ (length \ xs))) = 1 using equiv\text{-rels}[OF \ kernel\text{-of-equiv}[\mathbf{where} \ xs = xs]] assms by (simp \ add: count\text{-list-expand}) thus ?thesis using assms by (simp \ add: of\text{-bool-def} \ sum\text{-list-map-filter'}[symmetric] \ sum\text{-list-triv}) qed
```

## 5 Example Application

In this section, I wanted to discuss an interesting application within the context of a proof in Isabelle. This is motivated by a real-world example [1, §2.2], where a function in a 4-times iterated sum could only be reduced by splitting it according to the equivalence relation formed by the indices. The notepad below illustrates how this can be done (in the case of 3 index variables).

```
\begin{array}{l} \textbf{notepad} \\ \textbf{begin} \\ \textbf{fix } f :: nat \times nat \times nat \Rightarrow nat \\ \textbf{fix } I :: nat \ set \\ \textbf{assume } a : finite \ I \end{array}
```

To be able to break down such a sum by partitions let us introduce the function P which is defined to be sum of an indicator function over all possible equivalence relations its argument can form:

```
define P :: nat \ list \Rightarrow nat

where P = (\lambda xs. \ (\sum x \leftarrow equiv\text{-rels (length } xs). \ of\text{-bool (kernel-of } xs = x)))
```

Note that its value is always one, hence we can introduce it in an algebraic equation easily:

```
have P-one: \bigwedge xs. P xs = 1
by (simp \ add: P-def \ equiv-rels-2)
note unfold-equiv-rels = P-def equiv-rels-def numeral-eq-Suc kernel-of-eq
neq-commute All-less-Suc comp-def
define r where r = (\sum i \in I. \ (\sum j \in I. \ (\sum k \in I. \ f \ (i,j,k))))
```

As a first step, we just introduce the factor P[i, j, k].

```
have r = (\sum i \in I. (\sum j \in I. (\sum k \in I. f (i,j,k) * P [i,j,k])))
by (simp \ add: P-one \ r-def \ cong: sum. cong)
```

By expanding the definition of P and distributing, the sum can be expanded into 5 sums each representing a distinct equivalence relation formed by the indices.

```
also have ... =  (\sum i \in I. \ f \ (i, \ i, \ i)) + \\ (\sum i \in I. \ \sum j \in I. \ f \ (i, \ i, \ j) * of\text{-}bool\ (i \neq j)) + \\ (\sum i \in I. \ \sum j \in I. \ f \ (i, \ j, \ i) * of\text{-}bool\ (i \neq j)) + \\ (\sum i \in I. \ \sum j \in I. \ f \ (i, \ j, \ j) * of\text{-}bool\ (i \neq j)) + \\ (\sum i \in I. \ \sum j \in I. \ \sum k \in I. \ f \ (i, \ j, \ k) * of\text{-}bool\ (j \neq k \land i \neq k \land i \neq j)) \\ (\mathbf{is} \ - = ?rhs) \\ \mathbf{by}\ (simp\ add:unfold\text{-}equiv\text{-}rels\ sum.distrib\ distrib\text{-}left\ sum\text{-}collapse[OF\ a]) \\ \mathbf{finally\ have}\ r = ?rhs\ \mathbf{by}\ simp \\ \mathbf{end}
```

#### 6 Additional Results

If two lists induce the same equivalence relation, then there is a bijection between the sets that preserves the multiplicities of its elements.

```
lemma kernel-of-eq-imp-bij:
 assumes kernel-of x = kernel-of y
 shows \exists f. \ bij-betw \ f \ (set \ x) \ (set \ y) \ \land
   (\forall z \in set \ x. \ count\text{-list} \ x \ z = count\text{-list} \ y \ (f \ z))
proof -
 obtain x' where x'-def: inj-on x' (set x) rgf (map x' x)
   using map-list-to-rqf by blast
  obtain y' where y'-def: inj-on y' (set y) rgf (map y' y)
   using map-list-to-rgf by blast
  have kernel\text{-}of\ (map\ x'\ x) = kernel\text{-}of\ (map\ y'\ y)
   using assms x'-def(1) y'-def(1)
   by (simp add: kernel-of-under-inj-map[symmetric])
  hence b:map \ x' \ x = map \ y' \ y
  using inj-onD[OF kernel-of-inj-on-rgfs] x'-def(2) y'-def(2) length-map by simp
  hence f: x' 'set x = y' 'set y
   by (metis list.set-map)
  define f where f = the-inv-into (set y) y' \circ x'
  have g: \bigwedge z. z \in set \ x \Longrightarrow count-list x \ z = count-list y \ (f \ z)
  proof -
   \mathbf{fix} \ z
   assume a:z \in set x
   have e: x'z \in y' 'set y
     by (metis a b imageI image-set)
   have c: the-inv-into (set y) y'(x'z) \in set y
     using e the-inv-into-into[OF y'-def(1)] by simp
```

```
have d: (y' (the\text{-}inv\text{-}into (set y) y' (x' z))) = x' z
     using e f-the-inv-into-f y'-def(1) by force
   have count-list x z = count-list (map x' x) (x' z)
     using a x'-def by (simp add: count-list-inj-map)
   also have ... = count-list (map \ y' \ y) \ (x' \ z)
     by (simp \ add:b)
   also have ... = count-list (map y'y) (y' (the-inv-into (set y) y' (x'z)))
     by (simp\ add:d)
   also have ... = count-list y (the-inv-into (set y) y' (x' z))
     using c count-list-inj-map[OF y'-def(1)] by simp
   also have ... = count-list y(f z) by (simp add:f-def)
   finally show count-list x = count-list y (f z) by simp
  qed
  have bij-betw x' (set x) (x' 'set x)
   using x'-def(1) bij-betw-imageI by auto
 moreover have bij-betw (the-inv-into (set y) y') (y' 'set y) (set y)
   using bij-betw-the-inv-into [OF bij-betw-imageI] y'-def(1) by auto
  hence bij-betw (the-inv-into (set y) y') (x' \text{ 'set } x) (set y)
   using f by simp
  ultimately have bij-betw f (set x) (set y)
   using bij-betw-trans f-def by blast
  thus ?thesis using g by blast
qed
As expected the length of equiv-rels n is the n-th Bell number.
lemma len-equiv-rels: length (equiv-rels n) = Bell n
proof -
 have a:finite \{p. \ equiv \{..< n\} \ p\}
   by (simp add: finite-equiv)
 have b: set (equiv-rels n) \subseteq {p. equiv {..<n} p}
   using equiv-rels-set by blast
  have length (equiv-rels n) =
   (\sum x \in \{p. \ equiv \{..< n\} \ p\}. \ count\text{-list (equiv-rels n) } x)
   using a b by (simp add:sum-count-set)
  also have ... = card \{p. \ equiv \{.. < n\} \ p\}
   by (simp add: equiv-rels)
 also have \dots = Bell (card \{..< n\})
   using card-equiv-rel-eq-Bell by blast
 also have \dots = Bell \ n \ by \ simp
 finally show ?thesis by simp
Instead of forming an equivalence relation from a list, it is also possible to
induce a partition from it:
definition induced-par :: 'a \ list \Rightarrow nat \ set \ set \  where
  induced-par xs = (\lambda k. \{i. i < length xs \land xs ! i = k\}) ' (set xs)
```

The following lemma verifies the commutative diagram, i.e., induced-par xs is the same partition as the quotient of  $\{..< length\ xs\}$  over the corresponding equivalence relation.

```
lemma quotient-of-kernel-is-induced-par:  \{... < length \ xs \} \ // \ (kernel-of \ xs) = (induced-par \ xs)  proof (rule \ set-eqI) fix x have x \in \{... < length \ xs \} \ // \ (kernel-of \ xs) \longleftrightarrow   (\exists \ i < length \ xs. \ x = \{j. \ j < length \ xs \land xs \ ! \ i = xs \ ! \ j\})  unfolding quotient-def kernel-of-def by blast also have ... \longleftrightarrow (\exists \ y \in set \ xs. \ x = \{j. \ j < length \ xs \land y = xs \ ! \ j\})  unfolding in\text{-set-conv-nth } Bex\text{-def } by (rule \ order\text{-antisym}, \ force+) also have ... \longleftrightarrow (x \in induced\text{-par } xs) unfolding induced\text{-par-def} by auto finally show x \in \{... < length \ xs\} \ // \ (kernel-of \ xs) \longleftrightarrow (x \in induced\text{-par } xs) by simp qed
```

### References

- [1] N. Alon, Y. Matias, and M. Szegedy. The space complexity of approximating the frequency moments. *Journal of Computer and System Sciences*, 58(1):137–147, 1999.
- [2] L. Bulwahn. Cardinality of equivalence relations. *Archive of Formal Proofs*, May 2016. https://isa-afp.org/entries/Card\_Equiv\_Relations. html, Formal proof development.
- [3] G. Hutchinson. Partioning algorithms for finite sets. Commun. ACM, 6(10):613–614, Oct. 1963.
- [4] S. Milne. Restricted growth functions and incidence relations of the lattice of partitions of an n-set. *Advances in Mathematics*, 26(3):290–305, 1977.
- [5] D. Stanton and D. White. Constructive Combinatorics. Springer, 1986.