

Kleene Algebra

Alasdair Armstrong, Victor B. F. Gomes, Georg Struth and Tjark Weber

March 17, 2025

Abstract

Variants of Dioids and Kleene algebras are formalised together with their most important models in Isabelle/HOL. The Kleene algebras presented include process algebras based on bisimulation equivalence (near Kleene algebras), simulation equivalence (pre-Kleene algebras) and language equivalence (Kleene algebras), as well as algebras with ambiguous finite or infinite iteration (Conway algebras), possibly infinite iteration (demonic refinement algebras), infinite iteration (omega algebras) and residuated variants (action algebras). Models implemented include binary relations, (regular) languages, sets of paths and traces, power series and matrices. Finally, min-plus and max-plus algebras as well as generalised Hoare logics for Kleene algebras and demonic refinement algebras are provided for applications.

Contents

1	Introductory Remarks	3
2	Signatures	4
3	Dioids	4
3.1	Join Semilattices	5
3.2	Join Semilattices with an Additive Unit	6
3.3	Near Semirings	6
3.4	Variants of Dioids	7
3.5	Families of Nearsemirings with a Multiplicative Unit	9
3.6	Families of Nearsemirings with Additive Units	10
3.7	Duality by Opposition	11
3.8	Selective Near Semirings	11
4	Models of Dioids	12
4.1	The Powerset Dioid over a Monoid	12
4.2	Language Dioids	13
4.3	Relation Dioids	14
4.4	Trace Dioids	14

4.5	Sets of Traces	15
4.6	The Path Diod	16
4.7	Path Models with the Empty Path	16
4.8	Path Models without the Empty Path	18
4.9	The Distributive Lattice Diod	19
4.10	The Boolean Diod	19
4.11	The Max-Plus Diod	20
4.12	The Min-Plus Diod	21
5	Matrices	23
5.1	Type Definition	23
5.2	0 and 1	24
5.3	Matrix Addition	24
5.4	Order (via Addition)	26
5.5	Matrix Multiplication	26
5.6	Square-Matrix Model of Dioids	28
5.7	Kleene Star for Matrices	29
6	Conway Algebras	29
6.1	Near Conway Algebras	29
6.2	Pre-Conway Algebras	31
6.3	Conway Algebras	31
6.4	Conway Algebras with Zero	31
6.5	Conway Algebras with Simulation	32
7	Kleene Algebras	34
7.1	Left Near Kleene Algebras	34
7.2	Left Pre-Kleene Algebras	37
7.3	Left Kleene Algebras	41
7.4	Left Kleene Algebras with Zero	42
7.5	Pre-Kleene Algebras	42
7.6	Kleene Algebras	42
8	Models of Kleene Algebras	45
8.1	Preliminary Lemmas	45
8.2	The Powerset Kleene Algebra over a Monoid	45
8.3	Language Kleene Algebras	46
8.4	Regular Languages	46
8.5	Relation Kleene Algebras	47
8.6	Trace Kleene Algebras	48
8.7	Path Kleene Algebras	48
8.8	The Distributive Lattice Kleene Algebra	49
8.9	The Min-Plus Kleene Algebra	49

9	Omega Algebras	50
9.1	Left Omega Algebras	50
9.2	Omega Algebras	55
10	Models of Omega Algebras	55
10.1	Relation Omega Algebras	55
11	Demonic Refinement Algebras	56
12	Propositional Hoare Logic for Conway and Kleene Algebra	60
13	Propositional Hoare Logic for Demonic Refinement Algebra	62
14	Finite Suprema	62
14.1	Auxiliary Lemmas	62
14.2	Finite Suprema in Semilattices	63
14.3	Finite Suprema in Dioids	65
15	Formal Power Series	67
15.1	The Type of Formal Power Series	68
15.2	Definition of the Basic Elements 0 and 1 and the Basic Operations of Addition and Multiplication	68
15.3	The Dioid Model of Formal Power Series	72
15.4	The Kleene Algebra Model of Formal Power Series	72
16	Infinite Matrices	73

1 Introductory Remarks

These theory files are intended as a reference formalisation of variants of Kleene algebras and as a basis for other variants, such as Kleene algebras with tests [2] and modal Kleene algebras [14], which are useful for program correctness and verification. To that end we have aimed at making proof accessible to readers at textbook granularity instead of fully automating them. In that sense, these files can be considered a machine-checked introduction to reasoning in Kleene algebra.

Beyond that, the theories are only sparsely commented. Additional information on the hierarchy of Kleene algebras and its formalisation in Isabelle/HOL can be found in a tutorial paper [13] or an overview article [17]. While these papers focus on the automation of algebraic reasoning, the present formalisation presents readable proofs whenever these are interesting and instructive.

Expansions of the hierarchy to modal Kleene algebras, Kleene algebras with tests and Hoare logics as well as infinitary and higher-order Kleene alge-

bras [16, 3], and an alternative hierarchy of regular algebras and Kleene algebras [11]—orthogonal to the present one—have also been implemented in the Archive of Formal Proofs [12, 14, 2, 1].

2 Signatures

```
theory Signatures
imports Main
begin
```

Default notation in Isabelle/HOL is occasionally different from established notation in the relation/algebra community. We use the latter where possible.

```
notation
  times (infixl  $\langle \cdot \rangle$  70)
```

Some classes in our algebraic hierarchy are most naturally defined as subclasses of two (or more) superclasses that impose different restrictions on the same parameter(s).

Alas, in Isabelle/HOL, a class cannot have multiple superclasses that independently declare the same parameter(s). One workaround, which motivated the following syntactic classes, is to shift the parameter declaration to a common superclass.

```
class star-op =
  fixes star :: 'a  $\Rightarrow$  'a ( $\langle \cdot^* \rangle$  [101] 100)

class omega-op =
  fixes omega :: 'a  $\Rightarrow$  'a ( $\langle \cdot^\omega \rangle$  [101] 100)
```

We define a type class that combines addition and the definition of order in, e.g., semilattices. This class makes the definition of various other type classes more slick.

```
class plus-ord = plus + ord +
  assumes less-eq-def:  $x \leq y \longleftrightarrow x + y = y$ 
  and less-def:  $x < y \longleftrightarrow x \leq y \wedge x \neq y$ 

end
```

3 Dioids

```
theory Dioid
imports Signatures
begin
```

3.1 Join Semilattices

Join semilattices can be axiomatised order-theoretically or algebraically. A join semilattice (or upper semilattice) is either a poset in which every pair of elements has a join (or least upper bound), or a set endowed with an associative, commutative, idempotent binary operation. It is well known that the order-theoretic definition induces the algebraic one and vice versa. We start from the algebraic axiomatisation because it is easily expandable to dioids, using Isabelle's type class mechanism.

In Isabelle/HOL, a type class *semilattice-sup* is available. Alas, we cannot use this type class because we need the symbol $+$ for the join operation in the dioid expansion and subclass proofs in Isabelle/HOL require the two type classes involved to have the same fixed signature.

Using *add_assoc* as a name for the first assumption in class *join_semilattice* would lead to name clashes: we will later define classes that inherit from *semigroup-add*, which provides its own assumption *add_assoc*, and prove that these are subclasses of *join_semilattice*. Hence the primed name.

```
class join-semilattice = plus-ord +
  assumes add-assoc' [ac-simps]:  $(x + y) + z = x + (y + z)$ 
  and add-comm [ac-simps] :  $x + y = y + x$ 
  and add-idem [simp]:  $x + x = x$ 
begin
```

```
lemma add-left-comm [ac-simps]:  $y + (x + z) = x + (y + z)$ 
  <proof>
```

```
lemma add-left-idem [ac-simps]:  $x + (x + y) = x + y$ 
  <proof>
```

The definition $(x \leq y) = (x + y = y)$ of the order is hidden in class *plus-ord*. We show some simple order-based properties of semilattices. The first one states that every semilattice is a partial order.

```
subclass order
  <proof>
```

Next we show that joins are least upper bounds.

```
sublocale join: semilattice-sup (+)
  <proof>
```

Next we prove that joins are isotone (order preserving).

```
lemma add-iso:  $x \leq y \implies x + z \leq y + z$ 
  <proof>
```

The next lemma links the definition of order as $(x \leq y) = (x + y = y)$ with a perhaps more conventional one known, e.g., from arithmetics.

lemma *order-prop*: $x \leq y \longleftrightarrow (\exists z. x + z = y)$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

end

3.2 Join Semilattices with an Additive Unit

We now expand join semilattices by an additive unit 0. Is the least element with respect to the order, and therefore often denoted by \perp . Semilattices with a least element are often called *bounded*.

class *join-semilattice-zero* = *join-semilattice* + *zero* +
assumes *add-zero-l* [*simp*]: $0 + x = x$

begin

subclass *comm-monoid-add*
 $\langle proof \rangle$

sublocale *join*: *bounded-semilattice-sup-bot* (+) (\leq) ($<$) 0
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *no-trivial-inverse*: $x \neq 0 \implies \neg(\exists y. x + y = 0)$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

end

3.3 Near Semirings

Near semirings (also called *seminearrings*) are generalisations of near rings to the semiring case. They have been studied, for instance, in G. Pilz's book [25] on near rings. According to his definition, a near semiring consists of an additive and a multiplicative semigroup that interact via a single distributivity law (left or right). The additive semigroup is not required to be commutative. The definition is influenced by partial transformation semigroups.

We only consider near semirings in which addition is commutative, and in which the right distributivity law holds. We call such near semirings *abelian*.

class *ab-near-semiring* = *ab-semigroup-add* + *semigroup-mult* +
assumes *distrib-right'* [*simp*]: $(x + y) \cdot z = x \cdot z + y \cdot z$

subclass (**in** *semiring*) *ab-near-semiring*
 $\langle proof \rangle$

class *ab-pre-semiring* = *ab-near-semiring* +
assumes *subdistl-eq*: $z \cdot x + z \cdot (x + y) = z \cdot (x + y)$

3.4 Variants of Dioids

A *near dioid* is an abelian near semiring in which addition is idempotent. This generalises the notion of (additively) idempotent semirings by dropping one distributivity law. Near dioids are a starting point for process algebras. By modelling variants of dioids as variants of semirings in which addition is idempotent we follow the tradition of Birkhoff [5], but deviate from the definitions in Gondran and Minoux's book [15].

class *near-dioid* = *ab-near-semiring* + *plus-ord* +
assumes *add-idem'* [*simp*]: $x + x = x$

begin

Since addition is idempotent, the additive (commutative) semigroup reduct of a near dioid is a semilattice. Near dioids are therefore ordered by the semilattice order.

subclass *join-semilattice*
 ⟨*proof*⟩

It follows that multiplication is right-isotone (but not necessarily left-isotone).

lemma *mult-isor*: $x \leq y \implies x \cdot z \leq y \cdot z$
 ⟨*proof*⟩

lemma $x \leq y \implies z \cdot x \leq z \cdot y$

⟨*proof*⟩

The next lemma states that, in every near dioid, left isotonicity and left subdistributivity are equivalent.

lemma *mult-isol-equiv-subdistl*:
 $(\forall x y z. x \leq y \implies z \cdot x \leq z \cdot y) \iff (\forall x y z. z \cdot x \leq z \cdot (x + y))$
 ⟨*proof*⟩

The following lemma is relevant to propositional Hoare logic.

lemma *phl-cons1*: $x \leq w \implies w \cdot y \leq y \cdot z \implies x \cdot y \leq y \cdot z$
 ⟨*proof*⟩

end

We now make multiplication in near dioids left isotone, which is equivalent to left subdistributivity, as we have seen. The corresponding structures form the basis of probabilistic Kleene algebras [24] and game algebras [29]. We are not aware that these structures have a special name, so we baptise them *pre-dioids*.

We do not explicitly define pre-semirings since we have no application for them.

class *pre-dioid* = *near-dioid* +
assumes *subdistl*: $z \cdot x \leq z \cdot (x + y)$

begin

Now, obviously, left isotonicity follows from left subdistributivity.

lemma *subdistl-var*: $z \cdot x + z \cdot y \leq z \cdot (x + y)$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

subclass *ab-pre-semiring*
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *mult-isol*: $x \leq y \implies z \cdot x \leq z \cdot y$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *mult-isol-var*: $u \leq x \implies v \leq y \implies u \cdot v \leq x \cdot y$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *mult-double-iso*: $x \leq y \implies w \cdot x \cdot z \leq w \cdot y \cdot z$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

The following lemmas are relevant to propositional Hoare logic.

lemma *phl-cons2*: $w \leq x \implies z \cdot y \leq y \cdot w \implies z \cdot y \leq y \cdot x$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *phl-seq*:
assumes $p \cdot x \leq x \cdot r$
and $r \cdot y \leq y \cdot q$
shows $p \cdot (x \cdot y) \leq x \cdot y \cdot q$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *phl-cond*:
assumes $u \cdot v \leq v \cdot u \cdot v$ **and** $u \cdot w \leq w \cdot u \cdot w$
and $\bigwedge x y. u \cdot (x + y) \leq u \cdot x + u \cdot y$
and $u \cdot v \cdot x \leq x \cdot z$ **and** $u \cdot w \cdot y \leq y \cdot z$
shows $u \cdot (v \cdot x + w \cdot y) \leq (v \cdot x + w \cdot y) \cdot z$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *phl-export1*:
assumes $x \cdot y \leq y \cdot x \cdot y$
and $(x \cdot y) \cdot z \leq z \cdot w$
shows $x \cdot (y \cdot z) \leq (y \cdot z) \cdot w$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *phl-export2*:
assumes $z \cdot w \leq w \cdot z \cdot w$
and $x \cdot y \leq y \cdot z$
shows $x \cdot (y \cdot w) \leq y \cdot w \cdot (z \cdot w)$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

end

By adding a full left distributivity law we obtain semirings (which are already available in Isabelle/HOL as *semiring*) from near semirings, and dioids from near dioids. Dioids are therefore idempotent semirings.

class *dioid* = *near-dioid* + *semiring*

subclass (in *dioid*) *pre-dioid*
 ⟨*proof*⟩

3.5 Families of Nearsemirings with a Multiplicative Unit

Multiplicative units are important, for instance, for defining an operation of finite iteration or Kleene star on dioids. We do not introduce left and right units separately since we have no application for this.

class *ab-near-semiring-one* = *ab-near-semiring* + *one* +
assumes *mult-onel* [*simp*]: $1 \cdot x = x$
and *mult-oner* [*simp*]: $x \cdot 1 = x$

begin

subclass *monoid-mult*
 ⟨*proof*⟩

end

class *ab-pre-semiring-one* = *ab-near-semiring-one* + *ab-pre-semiring*

class *near-dioid-one* = *near-dioid* + *ab-near-semiring-one*

begin

The following lemma is relevant to propositional Hoare logic.

lemma *phl-skip*: $x \cdot 1 \leq 1 \cdot x$
 ⟨*proof*⟩

end

For near dioids with one, it would be sufficient to require $1 + 1 = 1$. This implies $x + x = x$ for arbitray x (but that would lead to annoying redundant proof obligations in mutual subclasses of *near-dioid-one* and *near-dioid* later).

class *pre-dioid-one* = *pre-dioid* + *near-dioid-one*

class *dioid-one* = *dioid* + *near-dioid-one*

subclass (in *dioid-one*) *pre-dioid-one* ⟨*proof*⟩

3.6 Families of Nearsemirings with Additive Units

We now axiomatise an additive unit 0 for nearsemirings. The zero is usually required to satisfy annihilation properties with respect to multiplication. Due to applications we distinguish a zero which is only a left annihilator from one that is also a right annihilator. More briefly, we call zero either a left unit or a unit.

Semirings and dioids with a right zero only can be obtained from those with a left unit by duality.

```
class ab-near-semiring-one-zero = ab-near-semiring-one + zero +
  assumes add-zero [simp]:  $0 + x = x$ 
  and annil [simp]:  $0 \cdot x = 0$ 
```

begin

Note that we do not require $0 \neq 1$.

```
lemma add-zero [simp]:  $x + 0 = x$ 
  <proof>
```

end

```
class ab-pre-semiring-one-zero = ab-near-semiring-one-zero + ab-pre-semiring
```

begin

The following lemma shows that there is no point defining pre-semirings separately from dioids.

```
lemma  $1 + 1 = 1$ 
  <proof>
```

end

```
class near-dioid-one-zero = near-dioid-one + ab-near-semiring-one-zero
```

```
subclass (in near-dioid-one-zero) join-semilattice-zero
  <proof>
```

```
class pre-dioid-one-zero = pre-dioid-one + ab-near-semiring-one-zero
```

```
subclass (in pre-dioid-one-zero) near-dioid-one-zero <proof>
```

```
class semiring-one-zero = semiring + ab-near-semiring-one-zero
```

```
class dioid-one-zero = dioid-one + ab-near-semiring-one-zero
```

```
subclass (in dioid-one-zero) pre-dioid-one-zero <proof>
```

We now make zero also a right annihilator.

```

class ab-near-semiring-one-zero = ab-near-semiring-one-zero +
  assumes annir [simp]:  $x \cdot 0 = 0$ 

class semiring-one-zero = semiring + ab-near-semiring-one-zero

class near-dioid-one-zero = near-dioid-one-zero + ab-near-semiring-one-zero

class pre-dioid-one-zero = pre-dioid-one-zero + ab-near-semiring-one-zero

subclass (in pre-dioid-one-zero) near-dioid-one-zero ⟨proof⟩

class dioid-one-zero = dioid-one-zero + ab-near-semiring-one-zero

subclass (in dioid-one-zero) pre-dioid-one-zero ⟨proof⟩

subclass (in dioid-one-zero) semiring-one-zero ⟨proof⟩

```

3.7 Duality by Opposition

Swapping the order of multiplication in a semiring (or dioid) gives another semiring (or dioid), called its *dual* or *opposite*.

definition (**in** *times*) *opp-mult* (**infixl** \odot 70)
where $x \odot y \equiv y \cdot x$

lemma (**in** *semiring-1*) *dual-semiring-1*:
class.semiring-1 1 (\odot) (+) 0
 ⟨*proof*⟩

lemma (**in** *dioid-one-zero*) *dual-dioid-one-zero*:
class.dioid-one-zero (+) (\odot) 1 0 (\leq) (<)
 ⟨*proof*⟩

3.8 Selective Near Semirings

In this section we briefly sketch a generalisation of the notion of *dioid*. Some important models, e.g. max-plus and min-plus semirings, have that property.

class *selective-near-semiring* = *ab-near-semiring* + *plus-ord* +
assumes *select*: $x + y = x \vee x + y = y$

begin

lemma *select-alt*: $x + y \in \{x, y\}$
 ⟨*proof*⟩

It follows immediately that every selective near semiring is a near dioid.

subclass *near-dioid*
 ⟨*proof*⟩

Moreover, the order in a selective near semiring is obviously linear.

```

subclass linorder
  <proof>

end

class selective-semiring = selective-near-semiring + semiring-one-zero

begin

subclass dioid-one-zero <proof>

end

end

```

4 Models of Dioids

```

theory Dioid-Models
imports Dioid HOL.Real
begin

```

In this section we consider some well known models of dioids. These so far include the powerset dioid over a monoid, languages, binary relations, sets of traces, sets paths (in a graph), as well as the min-plus and the max-plus semirings. Most of these models are taken from an article about Kleene algebras with domain [9].

The advantage of formally linking these models with the abstract axiomatisations of dioids is that all abstract theorems are automatically available in all models. It therefore makes sense to establish models for the strongest possible axiomatisations (whereas theorems should be proved for the weakest ones).

4.1 The Powerset Dioid over a Monoid

We assume a multiplicative monoid and define the usual complex product on sets of elements. We formalise the well known result that this lifting induces a dioid.

```

instantiation set :: (monoid-mult) monoid-mult
begin

```

```

definition one-set-def:
   $1 = \{1\}$ 

```

```

definition c-prod-def: — the complex product
   $A \cdot B = \{u * v \mid u \in A \wedge v \in B\}$ 

```

```

instance
  ⟨proof⟩

end

instantiation set :: (monoid-mult) dioid-one-zero
begin

  definition zero-set-def:
     $0 = \{\}$ 

  definition plus-set-def:
     $A + B = A \cup B$ 

  instance
    ⟨proof⟩

end

```

4.2 Language Dioids

Language dioids arise as special cases of the monoidal lifting because sets of words form free monoids. Moreover, monoids of words are isomorphic to monoids of lists under append.

To show that languages form dioids it therefore suffices to show that sets of lists closed under append and multiplication with the empty word form a (multiplicative) monoid. Isabelle then does the rest of the work automatically. Infix @ denotes word concatenation.

```

instantiation list :: (type) monoid-mult
begin

```

```

  definition times-list-def:
     $xs * ys \equiv xs @ ys$ 

```

```

  definition one-list-def:
     $1 \equiv []$ 

```

```

  instance ⟨proof⟩

```

```

end

```

Languages as sets of lists have already been formalised in Isabelle in various places. We can now obtain much of their algebra for free.

```

type-synonym 'a lan = 'a list set

```

```

interpretation lan-dioid: dioid-one-zero (+) (·) 1 :: 'a lan 0 (⊆) (⊂) ⟨proof⟩

```

4.3 Relation Dioids

We now show that binary relations under union, relational composition, the identity relation, the empty relation and set inclusion form dioids. Due to the well developed relation library of Isabelle this is entirely trivial.

interpretation *rel-dioid*: *dioid-one-zero* (\cup) (\circ) *Id* $\{\}$ (\subseteq) (\subset)
 $\langle proof \rangle$

interpretation *rel-monoid*: *monoid-mult* *Id* (\circ) $\langle proof \rangle$

4.4 Trace Dioids

Traces have been considered, for instance, by Kozen [22] in the context of Kleene algebras with tests. Intuitively, a trace is an execution sequence of a labelled transition system from some state to some other state, in which state labels and action labels alternate, and which begin and end with a state label.

Traces generalise words: words can be obtained from traces by forgetting state labels. Similarly, sets of traces generalise languages.

In this section we show that sets of traces under union, an appropriately defined notion of complex product, the set of all traces of length zero, the empty set of traces and set inclusion form a dioid.

We first define the notion of trace and the product of traces, which has been called *fusion product* by Kozen.

type-synonym ($'p, 'a$) *trace* = $'p \times ('a \times 'p)$ *list*

definition *first* :: ($'p, 'a$) *trace* \Rightarrow $'p$ **where**
 $first = fst$

lemma *first-conv* [*simp*]: $first (p, xs) = p$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

fun *last* :: ($'p, 'a$) *trace* \Rightarrow $'p$ **where**
 $last (p, []) = p$
 $| last (-, xs) = snd (List.last xs)$

lemma *last-append* [*simp*]: $last (p, xs @ ys) = last (last (p, xs), ys)$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

The fusion product is a partial operation. It is undefined if the last element of the first trace and the first element of the second trace are different. If these elements are the same, then the fusion product removes the first element from the second trace and appends the resulting object to the first trace.

definition *t-fusion* :: ($'p, 'a$) *trace* \Rightarrow ($'p, 'a$) *trace* \Rightarrow ($'p, 'a$) *trace* **where**

$t\text{-fusion } x \ y \equiv \text{if } \text{last } x = \text{first } y \text{ then } (\text{fst } x, \text{snd } x @ \text{snd } y) \text{ else undefined}$

We now show that the first element and the last element of a trace are a left and right unit for that trace and prove some other auxiliary lemmas.

lemma *t-fusion-leftneutral* [simp]: $t\text{-fusion } (\text{first } x, []) \ x = x$
 ⟨proof⟩

lemma *fusion-rightneutral* [simp]: $t\text{-fusion } x \ (\text{last } x, []) = x$
 ⟨proof⟩

lemma *first-t-fusion* [simp]: $\text{last } x = \text{first } y \implies \text{first } (t\text{-fusion } x \ y) = \text{first } x$
 ⟨proof⟩

lemma *last-t-fusion* [simp]: $\text{last } x = \text{first } y \implies \text{last } (t\text{-fusion } x \ y) = \text{last } y$
 ⟨proof⟩

Next we show that fusion of traces is associative.

lemma *t-fusion-assoc* [simp]:
 $\llbracket \text{last } x = \text{first } y; \text{last } y = \text{first } z \rrbracket \implies t\text{-fusion } x \ (t\text{-fusion } y \ z) = t\text{-fusion } (t\text{-fusion } x \ y) \ z$
 ⟨proof⟩

4.5 Sets of Traces

We now lift the fusion product to a complex product on sets of traces. This operation is total.

no-notation
times (infixl $\langle \cdot \rangle$ 70)

definition *t-prod* :: $('p, 'a) \text{ trace set} \Rightarrow ('p, 'a) \text{ trace set} \Rightarrow ('p, 'a) \text{ trace set}$ (infixl $\langle \cdot \rangle$ 70)
where $X \cdot Y = \{t\text{-fusion } u \ v \mid u \ v. \ u \in X \wedge v \in Y \wedge \text{last } u = \text{first } v\}$

Next we define the empty set of traces and the set of traces of length zero as the multiplicative unit of the trace dioid.

definition *t-zero* :: $('p, 'a) \text{ trace set}$ **where**
 $t\text{-zero} \equiv \{\}$

definition *t-one* :: $('p, 'a) \text{ trace set}$ **where**
 $t\text{-one} \equiv \bigcup p. \{(p, [])\}$

We now provide elimination rules for trace products.

lemma *t-prod-iff*:
 $w \in X \cdot Y \iff (\exists u \ v. \ w = t\text{-fusion } u \ v \wedge u \in X \wedge v \in Y \wedge \text{last } u = \text{first } v)$
 ⟨proof⟩

lemma *t-prod-intro* [simp, intro]:

$\llbracket u \in X; v \in Y; \text{last } u = \text{first } v \rrbracket \implies t\text{-fusion } u \ v \in X \cdot Y$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma *t-prod-elim* [elim]:

$w \in X \cdot Y \implies \exists u \ v. w = t\text{-fusion } u \ v \wedge u \in X \wedge v \in Y \wedge \text{last } u = \text{first } v$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

Finally we prove the interpretation statement that sets of traces under union and the complex product based on trace fusion together with the empty set of traces and the set of traces of length one forms a dioid.

interpretation *trace-diod*: *diod-one-zero* (\cup) *t-prod* *t-one* *t-zero* (\subseteq) (\subset)
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

no-notation

t-prod (**infixl** $\langle \cdot \rangle$ 70)

4.6 The Path Diod

The next model we consider are sets of paths in a graph. We consider two variants, one that contains the empty path and one that doesn't. The former leads to more difficult proofs and a more involved specification of the complex product. We start with paths that include the empty path. In this setting, a path is a list of nodes.

4.7 Path Models with the Empty Path

type-synonym *'a path* = *'a list*

Path fusion is defined similarly to trace fusion. Mathematically it should be a partial operation. The fusion of two empty paths yields the empty path; the fusion between a non-empty path and an empty one is undefined; the fusion of two non-empty paths appends the tail of the second path to the first one.

We need to use a total alternative and make sure that undefined paths do not contribute to the complex product.

fun *p-fusion* :: *'a path* \Rightarrow *'a path* \Rightarrow *'a path* **where**

p-fusion [] - = []
| *p-fusion* - [] = []
| *p-fusion* ps (q # qs) = ps @ qs

lemma *p-fusion-assoc*:

p-fusion ps (*p-fusion* qs rs) = *p-fusion* (*p-fusion* ps qs) rs
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

This lemma overapproximates the real situation, but it holds in all cases where path fusion should be defined.

lemma *p-fusion-last*:
assumes $List.last\ ps = hd\ qs$
and $ps \neq []$
and $qs \neq []$
shows $List.last\ (p-fusion\ ps\ qs) = List.last\ qs$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *p-fusion-hd*: $\llbracket ps \neq []; qs \neq [] \rrbracket \implies hd\ (p-fusion\ ps\ qs) = hd\ ps$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *nonempty-p-fusion*: $\llbracket ps \neq []; qs \neq [] \rrbracket \implies p-fusion\ ps\ qs \neq []$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

We now define a condition that filters out undefined paths in the complex product.

abbreviation *p-filter* :: $'a\ path \Rightarrow 'a\ path \Rightarrow bool$ **where**
 $p-filter\ ps\ qs \equiv ((ps = [] \wedge qs = []) \vee (ps \neq [] \wedge qs \neq [] \wedge (List.last\ ps) = hd\ qs))$

no-notation
 $times\ (\mathbf{infixl}\ \langle \cdot \rangle\ 70)$

definition *p-prod* :: $'a\ path\ set \Rightarrow 'a\ path\ set \Rightarrow 'a\ path\ set$ (**infixl** $\langle \cdot \rangle\ 70$)
where $X \cdot Y = \{rs \mid \exists ps \in X. \exists qs \in Y. rs = p-fusion\ ps\ qs \wedge p-filter\ ps\ qs\}$

lemma *p-prod-iff*:
 $ps \in X \cdot Y \iff (\exists qs\ rs. ps = p-fusion\ qs\ rs \wedge qs \in X \wedge rs \in Y \wedge p-filter\ qs\ rs)$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

Due to the complexity of the filter condition, proving properties of complex products can be tedious.

lemma *p-prod-assoc*: $(X \cdot Y) \cdot Z = X \cdot (Y \cdot Z)$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

We now define the multiplicative unit of the path dioid as the set of all paths of length one, including the empty path, and show the unit laws with respect to the path product.

definition *p-one* :: $'a\ path\ set$ **where**
 $p-one \equiv \{p \mid \exists q::'a. p = [q]\} \cup \{[]\}$

lemma *p-prod-onel* [*simp*]: $p-one \cdot X = X$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *p-prod-oner* [*simp*]: $X \cdot p-one = X$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

Next we show distributivity laws at the powerset level.

lemma *p-prod-distl*: $X \cdot (Y \cup Z) = X \cdot Y \cup X \cdot Z$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *p-prod-distr*: $(X \cup Y) \cdot Z = X \cdot Z \cup Y \cdot Z$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

Finally we show that sets of paths under union, the complex product, the unit set and the empty set form a dioid.

interpretation *path-dioid*: *dioid-one-zero* (\cup) (\cdot) *p-one* $\{\}$ (\subseteq) (\subset)
 $\langle proof \rangle$

no-notation

p-prod (**infixl** $\langle \cdot \rangle$ 70)

4.8 Path Models without the Empty Path

We now build a model of paths that does not include the empty path and therefore leads to a simpler complex product.

datatype *'a ppath* = *Node 'a* | *Cons 'a 'a ppath*

primrec *pp-first* :: *'a ppath* \Rightarrow *'a* **where**
pp-first (*Node x*) = *x*
| *pp-first* (*Cons x -*) = *x*

primrec *pp-last* :: *'a ppath* \Rightarrow *'a* **where**
pp-last (*Node x*) = *x*
| *pp-last* (*Cons - xs*) = *pp-last xs*

The path fusion product (although we define it as a total function) should only be applied when the last element of the first argument is equal to the first element of the second argument.

primrec *pp-fusion* :: *'a ppath* \Rightarrow *'a ppath* \Rightarrow *'a ppath* **where**
pp-fusion (*Node x*) *ys* = *ys*
| *pp-fusion* (*Cons x xs*) *ys* = *Cons x (pp-fusion xs ys)*

We now go through the same steps as for traces and paths before, showing that the first and last element of a trace a left or right unit for that trace and that the fusion product on traces is associative.

lemma *pp-fusion-leftneutral* [*simp*]: *pp-fusion* (*Node (pp-first x)*) *x* = *x*
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *pp-fusion-rightneutral* [*simp*]: *pp-fusion x (Node (pp-last x))* = *x*
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *pp-first-pp-fusion* [*simp*]:
pp-last x = *pp-first y* \implies *pp-first (pp-fusion x y)* = *pp-first x*
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *pp-last-pp-fusion* [simp]:

$pp\text{-last } x = pp\text{-first } y \implies pp\text{-last } (pp\text{-fusion } x \ y) = pp\text{-last } y$
 ⟨proof⟩

lemma *pp-fusion-assoc* [simp]:

$\llbracket pp\text{-last } x = pp\text{-first } y; pp\text{-last } y = pp\text{-first } z \rrbracket \implies pp\text{-fusion } x \ (pp\text{-fusion } y \ z)$
 $= pp\text{-fusion } (pp\text{-fusion } x \ y) \ z$
 ⟨proof⟩

We now lift the path fusion product to a complex product on sets of paths. This operation is total.

definition *pp-prod* :: 'a ppath set \Rightarrow 'a ppath set \Rightarrow 'a ppath set (**infixl** $\langle \cdot \rangle$ 70)
 where $X \cdot Y = \{pp\text{-fusion } u \ v \mid u \ v. \ u \in X \wedge v \in Y \wedge pp\text{-last } u = pp\text{-first } v\}$

Next we define the set of paths of length one as the multiplicative unit of the path dioid.

definition *pp-one* :: 'a ppath set where
 $pp\text{-one} \equiv \text{range } \text{Node}$

We again provide an elimination rule.

lemma *pp-prod-iff*:

$w \in X \cdot Y \iff (\exists u \ v. \ w = pp\text{-fusion } u \ v \wedge u \in X \wedge v \in Y \wedge pp\text{-last } u = pp\text{-first } v)$
 ⟨proof⟩

interpretation *ppath-dioid*: dioid-one-zero (\cup) (\cdot) *pp-one* $\{\}$ (\subseteq) (\subset)
 ⟨proof⟩

no-notation

pp-prod (**infixl** $\langle \cdot \rangle$ 70)

4.9 The Distributive Lattice Dioid

A bounded distributive lattice is a distributive lattice with a least and a greatest element. Using Isabelle's lattice theory file we define a bounded distributive lattice as an axiomatic type class and show, using a sublocale statement, that every bounded distributive lattice is a dioid with one and zero.

class *bounded-distributive-lattice* = *bounded-lattice* + *distrib-lattice*

sublocale *bounded-distributive-lattice* \subseteq *dioid-one-zero* *sup inf top bot less-eq*
 ⟨proof⟩

4.10 The Boolean Dioid

In this section we show that the booleans form a dioid, because the booleans form a bounded distributive lattice.

instantiation *bool* :: *bounded-distributive-lattice*
begin

instance $\langle proof \rangle$

end

interpretation *boolean-dioid*: *dioid-one-zero sup inf True False less-eq less*
 $\langle proof \rangle$

4.11 The Max-Plus Dioid

The following dioids have important applications in combinatorial optimisations, control theory, algorithm design and computer networks.

A definition of reals extended with $+\infty$ and $-\infty$ may be found in *HOL/Library/Extended_Real.thy*. Alas, we require separate extensions with either $+\infty$ or $-\infty$.

The carrier set of the max-plus semiring is the set of real numbers extended by minus infinity. The operation of addition is maximum, the operation of multiplication is addition, the additive unit is minus infinity and the multiplicative unit is zero.

datatype *mreal* = *mreal real* | *MInfty* — minus infinity

fun *mreal-max* **where**
 mreal-max (*mreal* *x*) (*mreal* *y*) = *mreal* (*max* *x* *y*)
| *mreal-max* *x* *MInfty* = *x*
| *mreal-max* *MInfty* *y* = *y*

lemma *mreal-max-simp-3* [*simp*]: *mreal-max* *MInfty* *y* = *y*
 $\langle proof \rangle$

fun *mreal-plus* **where**
 mreal-plus (*mreal* *x*) (*mreal* *y*) = *mreal* (*x* + *y*)
| *mreal-plus* - = *MInfty*

We now show that the max plus-semiring satisfies the axioms of selective semirings, from which it follows that it satisfies the dioid axioms.

instantiation *mreal* :: *selective-semiring*
begin

definition *zero-mreal-def*:
 0 \equiv *MInfty*

definition *one-mreal-def*:
 1 \equiv *mreal* 0

definition *plus-mreal-def*:

$x + y \equiv \text{mreal-max } x \ y$

definition *times-mreal-def*:

$x * y \equiv \text{mreal-plus } x \ y$

definition *less-eq-mreal-def*:

$(x::\text{mreal}) \leq y \equiv x + y = y$

definition *less-mreal-def*:

$(x::\text{mreal}) < y \equiv x \leq y \wedge x \neq y$

instance

$\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

end

4.12 The Min-Plus Dioid

The min-plus dioid is also known as *tropical semiring*. Here we need to add a positive infinity to the real numbers. The procedure follows that of max-plus semirings.

datatype *preal* = *preal real* | *PInfty* — plus infinity

fun *preal-min* **where**

$\text{preal-min } (\text{preal } x) (\text{preal } y) = \text{preal } (\min x \ y)$
| $\text{preal-min } x \ \text{PInfty} = x$
| $\text{preal-min } \text{PInfty } y = y$

lemma *preal-min-simp-3* [simp]: $\text{preal-min } \text{PInfty } y = y$

$\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

fun *preal-plus* **where**

$\text{preal-plus } (\text{preal } x) (\text{preal } y) = \text{preal } (x + y)$
| $\text{preal-plus } - - = \text{PInfty}$

instantiation *preal* :: *selective-semiring*

begin

definition *zero-preal-def*:

$0 \equiv \text{PInfty}$

definition *one-preal-def*:

$1 \equiv \text{preal } 0$

definition *plus-preal-def*:

$x + y \equiv \text{preal-min } x \ y$

definition *times-preal-def*:

$x * y \equiv \text{preal-plus } x \ y$

definition *less-eq-preal-def*:
 $(x::\text{preal}) \leq y \equiv x + y = y$

definition *less-preal-def*:
 $(x::\text{preal}) < y \equiv x \leq y \wedge x \neq y$

instance
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

end

Variants of min-plus and max-plus semirings can easily be obtained. Here we formalise the min-plus semiring over the natural numbers as an example.

datatype *pnat* = *pnat nat* | *PInfty* — plus infinity

fun *pnat-min* **where**
 $\text{pnat-min } (\text{pnat } x) (\text{pnat } y) = \text{pnat } (\min x \ y)$
 $| \text{pnat-min } x \ \text{PInfty} = x$
 $| \text{pnat-min } \text{PInfty } x = x$

lemma *pnat-min-simp-3* [*simp*]: $\text{pnat-min } \text{PInfty } y = y$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

fun *pnat-plus* **where**
 $\text{pnat-plus } (\text{pnat } x) (\text{pnat } y) = \text{pnat } (x + y)$
 $| \text{pnat-plus } - = \text{PInfty}$

instantiation *pnat* :: *selective-semiring*
begin

definition *zero-pnat-def*:
 $0 \equiv \text{PInfty}$

definition *one-pnat-def*:
 $1 \equiv \text{pnat } 0$

definition *plus-pnat-def*:
 $x + y \equiv \text{pnat-min } x \ y$

definition *times-pnat-def*:
 $x * y \equiv \text{pnat-plus } x \ y$

definition *less-eq-pnat-def*:
 $(x::\text{pnat}) \leq y \equiv x + y = y$

definition *less-pnat-def*:
 $(x::\text{pnat}) < y \equiv x \leq y \wedge x \neq y$

```

lemma zero-pnat-top:  $(x::pnat) \leq 1$ 
  <proof>

instance
  <proof>

end

end

```

5 Matrices

```

theory Matrix
imports HOL-Library.Word Dioid
begin

```

In this section we formalise a perhaps more natural version of matrices of fixed dimension ($m \times n$ -matrices). It is well known that such matrices over a Kleene algebra form a Kleene algebra [8].

5.1 Type Definition

```

typedef (overloaded) 'a atMost = {..LENGTH('a::len)}
  <proof>

```

```

declare Rep-atMost-inject [simp]

```

```

lemma UNIV-atMost:
  (UNIV::'a atMost set) = Abs-atMost ' {..LENGTH('a::len)}
  <proof>

```

```

lemma finite-UNIV-atMost [simp]: finite (UNIV::('a::len) atMost set)
  <proof>

```

Our matrix type is similar to $'a \sim 'n \sim 'm$ from *HOL/Multivariate_Analysis/Finite_Cartesian_Product.thy*, but (i) we explicitly define a type constructor for matrices and square matrices, and (ii) in the definition of operations, e.g., matrix multiplication, we impose weaker sort requirements on the element type.

```

context notes [[typedef-overloaded]]
begin

```

```

datatype ('a,'m,'n) matrix = Matrix 'm atMost  $\Rightarrow$  'n atMost  $\Rightarrow$  'a

```

```

datatype ('a,'m) sqmatrix = SqMatrix 'm atMost  $\Rightarrow$  'm atMost  $\Rightarrow$  'a

```

```

end

```

```

fun sqmatrix-of-matrix where
  sqmatrix-of-matrix (Matrix A) = SqMatrix A

```

```

fun matrix-of-sqmatrix where
  matrix-of-sqmatrix (SqMatrix A) = Matrix A

```

5.2 0 and 1

```

instantiation matrix :: (zero,type,type) zero
begin
  definition zero-matrix-def:  $0 \equiv \text{Matrix } (\lambda i\ j.\ 0)$ 
  instance  $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$ 
end

```

```

instantiation sqmatrix :: (zero,type) zero
begin
  definition zero-sqmatrix-def:  $0 \equiv \text{SqMatrix } (\lambda i\ j.\ 0)$ 
  instance  $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$ 
end

```

Tricky sort issues: compare *one-matrix* with *one-sqmatrix* ...

```

instantiation matrix :: ({zero,one},len,len) one
begin
  definition one-matrix-def:
     $1 \equiv \text{Matrix } (\lambda i\ j.\ \text{if } \text{Rep-atMost } i = \text{Rep-atMost } j \text{ then } 1 \text{ else } 0)$ 
  instance  $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$ 
end

```

```

instantiation sqmatrix :: ({zero,one},type) one
begin
  definition one-sqmatrix-def:
     $1 \equiv \text{SqMatrix } (\lambda i\ j.\ \text{if } i = j \text{ then } 1 \text{ else } 0)$ 
  instance  $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$ 
end

```

5.3 Matrix Addition

```

fun matrix-plus where
  matrix-plus (Matrix A) (Matrix B) = Matrix ( $\lambda i\ j.\ A\ i\ j + B\ i\ j$ )

```

```

instantiation matrix :: (plus,type,type) plus
begin
  definition plus-matrix-def:  $A + B \equiv \text{matrix-plus } A\ B$ 
  instance  $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$ 
end

```

```

lemma plus-matrix-def' [simp]:
   $\text{Matrix } A + \text{Matrix } B = \text{Matrix } (\lambda i\ j.\ A\ i\ j + B\ i\ j)$ 

```


$\langle proof \rangle$

instantiation *sqmatrix* :: (*plus*,*type*) *plus*

begin

definition *plus-sqmatrix-def*:

$A + B \equiv sqmatrix\text{-of-matrix } (matrix\text{-of-sqmatrix } A + matrix\text{-of-sqmatrix } B)$

instance $\langle proof \rangle$

end

lemma *plus-sqmatrix-def'* [*simp*]:

$SqMatrix\ A + SqMatrix\ B = SqMatrix\ (\lambda i\ j.\ A\ i\ j + B\ i\ j)$

$\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *matrix-add-0-right* [*simp*]:

$A + 0 = (A :: ('a :: monoid\text{-add}, 'm, 'n)\ matrix)$

$\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *matrix-add-0-left* [*simp*]:

$0 + A = (A :: ('a :: monoid\text{-add}, 'm, 'n)\ matrix)$

$\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *matrix-add-commute* [*simp*]:

$(A :: ('a :: ab\text{-semigroup-add}, 'm, 'n)\ matrix) + B = B + A$

$\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *matrix-add-assoc*:

$(A :: ('a :: semigroup\text{-add}, 'm, 'n)\ matrix) + B + C = A + (B + C)$

$\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *matrix-add-left-commute* [*simp*]:

$(A :: ('a :: ab\text{-semigroup-add}, 'm, 'n)\ matrix) + (B + C) = B + (A + C)$

$\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *sqmatrix-add-0-right* [*simp*]:

$A + 0 = (A :: ('a :: monoid\text{-add}, 'm)\ sqmatrix)$

$\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *sqmatrix-add-0-left* [*simp*]:

$0 + A = (A :: ('a :: monoid\text{-add}, 'm)\ sqmatrix)$

$\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *sqmatrix-add-commute* [*simp*]:

$(A :: ('a :: ab\text{-semigroup-add}, 'm)\ sqmatrix) + B = B + A$

$\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *sqmatrix-add-assoc*:

$(A :: ('a :: semigroup\text{-add}, 'm)\ sqmatrix) + B + C = A + (B + C)$

$\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *sqmatrix-add-left-commute* [simp]:
 $(A :: ('a :: ab\text{-semigroup-add}, 'm) \text{sqmatrix}) + (B + C) = B + (A + C)$
 ⟨proof⟩

5.4 Order (via Addition)

instantiation *matrix* :: (*plus,type,type*) *plus-ord*
begin
definition *less-eq-matrix-def*:
 $(A :: ('a, 'b, 'c) \text{matrix}) \leq B \equiv A + B = B$
definition *less-matrix-def*:
 $(A :: ('a, 'b, 'c) \text{matrix}) < B \equiv A \leq B \wedge A \neq B$

instance
 ⟨proof⟩
end

instantiation *sqmatrix* :: (*plus,type*) *plus-ord*
begin
definition *less-eq-sqmatrix-def*:
 $(A :: ('a, 'b) \text{sqmatrix}) \leq B \equiv A + B = B$
definition *less-sqmatrix-def*:
 $(A :: ('a, 'b) \text{sqmatrix}) < B \equiv A \leq B \wedge A \neq B$

instance
 ⟨proof⟩
end

5.5 Matrix Multiplication

fun *matrix-times* :: ('a::({*comm-monoid-add,times*}, 'm, 'k) *matrix* \Rightarrow ('a, 'k, 'n) *matrix* \Rightarrow ('a, 'm, 'n) *matrix* **where**
 $\text{matrix-times } (\text{Matrix } A) (\text{Matrix } B) = \text{Matrix } (\lambda i \ j. \text{sum } (\lambda k. A \ i \ k * B \ k \ j))$
 (UNIV::'k atMost set))

notation *matrix-times* (**infixl** $*_M$ 70)

instantiation *sqmatrix* :: ({*comm-monoid-add,times*},*type*) *times*
begin
definition *times-sqmatrix-def*:
 $A * B = \text{sqmatrix-of-matrix } (\text{matrix-of-sqmatrix } A *_M \text{matrix-of-sqmatrix } B)$
instance ⟨proof⟩
end

lemma *times-sqmatrix-def'* [simp]:
 $\text{SqMatrix } A * \text{SqMatrix } B = \text{SqMatrix } (\lambda i \ j. \text{sum } (\lambda k. A \ i \ k * B \ k \ j))$ (UNIV::'k atMost set))
 ⟨proof⟩

lemma *matrix-mult-0-right* [simp]:

$$(A::('a::\{comm-monoid-add,mult-zero\},'m,'n) \text{ matrix}) *_M 0 = 0$$

<proof>

lemma *matrix-mult-0-left* [simp]:

$$0 *_M (A::('a::\{comm-monoid-add,mult-zero\},'m,'n) \text{ matrix}) = 0$$

<proof>

lemma *sum-delta-r-0* [simp]:

$$\llbracket \text{finite } S; j \notin S \rrbracket \implies (\sum_{k \in S}. f \ k * (\text{if } k = j \text{ then } 1 \text{ else } (0::'b::\{semiring-0,monoid-mult\})))$$

$$= 0$$

<proof>

lemma *sum-delta-r-1* [simp]:

$$\llbracket \text{finite } S; j \in S \rrbracket \implies (\sum_{k \in S}. f \ k * (\text{if } k = j \text{ then } 1 \text{ else } (0::'b::\{semiring-0,monoid-mult\})))$$

$$= f \ j$$

<proof>

lemma *matrix-mult-1-right* [simp]:

$$(A::('a::\{semiring-0,monoid-mult\},'m::len,'n::len) \text{ matrix}) *_M 1 = A$$

<proof>

lemma *sum-delta-l-0* [simp]:

$$\llbracket \text{finite } S; i \notin S \rrbracket \implies (\sum_{k \in S}. (\text{if } i = k \text{ then } 1 \text{ else } (0::'b::\{semiring-0,monoid-mult\})))$$

$$* f \ k \ j = 0$$

<proof>

lemma *sum-delta-l-1* [simp]:

$$\llbracket \text{finite } S; i \in S \rrbracket \implies (\sum_{k \in S}. (\text{if } i = k \text{ then } 1 \text{ else } (0::'b::\{semiring-0,monoid-mult\})))$$

$$* f \ k \ j = f \ i \ j$$

<proof>

lemma *matrix-mult-1-left* [simp]:

$$1 *_M (A::('a::\{semiring-0,monoid-mult\},'m::len,'n::len) \text{ matrix}) = A$$

<proof>

lemma *matrix-mult-assoc*:

$$(A::('a::\{semiring-0,'m,'n\} \text{ matrix}) *_M B *_M C = A *_M (B *_M C)$$

<proof>

lemma *matrix-mult-distrib-left*:

$$(A::('a::\{comm-monoid-add,semiring\},'m,'n::len) \text{ matrix}) *_M (B + C) = A *_M$$

$$B + A *_M C$$

<proof>

lemma *matrix-mult-distrib-right*:

$$((A::('a::\{comm-monoid-add,semiring\},'m,'n::len) \text{ matrix}) + B) *_M C = A *_M$$

$$C + B *_M C$$

<proof>

lemma *sqmatrix-mult-0-right* [simp]:

$(A :: ('a :: \{comm-monoid-add, mult-zero\}, 'm) \text{ sqmatrix}) * 0 = 0$
 <proof>

lemma *sqmatrix-mult-0-left* [simp]:

$0 * (A :: ('a :: \{comm-monoid-add, mult-zero\}, 'm) \text{ sqmatrix}) = 0$
 <proof>

lemma *sqmatrix-mult-1-right* [simp]:

$(A :: ('a :: \{semiring-0, monoid-mult\}, 'm :: len) \text{ sqmatrix}) * 1 = A$
 <proof>

lemma *sqmatrix-mult-1-left* [simp]:

$1 * (A :: ('a :: \{semiring-0, monoid-mult\}, 'm :: len) \text{ sqmatrix}) = A$
 <proof>

lemma *sqmatrix-mult-assoc*:

$(A :: ('a :: \{semiring-0, monoid-mult\}, 'm) \text{ sqmatrix}) * B * C = A * (B * C)$
 <proof>

lemma *sqmatrix-mult-distrib-left*:

$(A :: ('a :: \{comm-monoid-add, semiring\}, 'm :: len) \text{ sqmatrix}) * (B + C) = A * B + A * C$
 <proof>

lemma *sqmatrix-mult-distrib-right*:

$((A :: ('a :: \{comm-monoid-add, semiring\}, 'm :: len) \text{ sqmatrix}) + B) * C = A * C + B * C$
 <proof>

5.6 Square-Matrix Model of Dioids

The following subclass proofs are necessary to connect parts of our algebraic hierarchy to the hierarchy found in the Isabelle/HOL library.

subclass (in *ab-near-semiring-one-zero*) *comm-monoid-add*
 <proof>

subclass (in *semiring-one-zero*) *semiring-0*
 <proof>

subclass (in *ab-near-semiring-one*) *monoid-mult* <proof>

instantiation *sqmatrix* :: (*dioid-one-zero*, *len*) *dioid-one-zero*
begin
instance
 <proof>
end

5.7 Kleene Star for Matrices

We currently do not implement the Kleene star of matrices, since this is complicated.

end

6 Conway Algebras

```
theory Conway
  imports Dioid
begin
```

We define a weak regular algebra which can serve as a common basis for Kleene algebra and demonic regiment algebra. It is closely related to an axiomatisation given by Conway [8].

```
class dagger-op =
  fixes dagger :: 'a  $\Rightarrow$  'a ( $\langle \cdot^\dagger \rangle$  [101] 100)
```

6.1 Near Conway Algebras

```
class near-conway-base = near-dioid-one + dagger-op +
  assumes dagger-denest:  $(x + y)^\dagger = (x^\dagger \cdot y)^\dagger \cdot x^\dagger$ 
  and dagger-prod-unfold [simp]:  $1 + x \cdot (y \cdot x)^\dagger \cdot y = (x \cdot y)^\dagger$ 
```

begin

```
lemma dagger-unfoldl-eq [simp]:  $1 + x \cdot x^\dagger = x^\dagger$ 
  <proof>
```

```
lemma dagger-unfoldl:  $1 + x \cdot x^\dagger \leq x^\dagger$ 
  <proof>
```

```
lemma dagger-unfoldr-eq [simp]:  $1 + x^\dagger \cdot x = x^\dagger$ 
  <proof>
```

```
lemma dagger-unfoldr:  $1 + x^\dagger \cdot x \leq x^\dagger$ 
  <proof>
```

```
lemma dagger-unfoldl-distr [simp]:  $y + x \cdot x^\dagger \cdot y = x^\dagger \cdot y$ 
  <proof>
```

```
lemma dagger-unfoldr-distr [simp]:  $y + x^\dagger \cdot x \cdot y = x^\dagger \cdot y$ 
  <proof>
```

```
lemma dagger-refl:  $1 \leq x^\dagger$ 
  <proof>
```

```
lemma dagger-plus-one [simp]:  $1 + x^\dagger = x^\dagger$ 
```

$\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *star-1l*: $x \cdot x^\dagger \leq x^\dagger$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *star-1r*: $x^\dagger \cdot x \leq x^\dagger$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *dagger-ext*: $x \leq x^\dagger$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *dagger-trans-eq* [*simp*]: $x^\dagger \cdot x^\dagger = x^\dagger$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *dagger-subdist*: $x^\dagger \leq (x + y)^\dagger$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *dagger-subdist-var*: $x^\dagger + y^\dagger \leq (x + y)^\dagger$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *dagger-iso* [*intro*]: $x \leq y \implies x^\dagger \leq y^\dagger$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *star-square*: $(x \cdot x)^\dagger \leq x^\dagger$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *dagger-rtc1-eq* [*simp*]: $1 + x + x^\dagger \cdot x^\dagger = x^\dagger$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

Nitpick refutes the next lemmas.

lemma $y + y \cdot x^\dagger \cdot x = y \cdot x^\dagger$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma $y \cdot x^\dagger = y + y \cdot x \cdot x^\dagger$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma $(x + y)^\dagger = x^\dagger \cdot (y \cdot x^\dagger)^\dagger$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma $(x^\dagger)^\dagger = x^\dagger$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma $(1 + x)^\star = x^\star$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma $x^\dagger \cdot x = x \cdot x^\dagger$

$\langle proof \rangle$

end

6.2 Pre-Conway Algebras

class *pre-conway-base* = *near-conway-base* + *pre-dioid-one*

begin

lemma *dagger-subdist-var-3*: $x^\dagger \cdot y^\dagger \leq (x + y)^\dagger$

$\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *dagger-subdist-var-2*: $x \cdot y \leq (x + y)^\dagger$

$\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *dagger-sum-unfold* [*simp*]: $x^\dagger + x^\dagger \cdot y \cdot (x + y)^\dagger = (x + y)^\dagger$

$\langle proof \rangle$

end

6.3 Conway Algebras

class *conway-base* = *pre-conway-base* + *dioid-one*

begin

lemma *troeger*: $(x + y)^\dagger \cdot z = x^\dagger \cdot (y \cdot (x + y)^\dagger \cdot z + z)$

$\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *dagger-slide-var1*: $x^\dagger \cdot x \leq x \cdot x^\dagger$

$\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *dagger-slide-var1-eq*: $x^\dagger \cdot x = x \cdot x^\dagger$

$\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *dagger-slide-eq*: $(x \cdot y)^\dagger \cdot x = x \cdot (y \cdot x)^\dagger$

$\langle proof \rangle$

end

6.4 Conway Algebras with Zero

class *near-conway-base-zero* = *near-conway-base* + *near-dioid-one-zero*

begin

```

lemma dagger-annul [simp]:  $1 + x \cdot 0 = (x \cdot 0)^\dagger$ 
   $\langle proof \rangle$ 

lemma zero-dagger [simp]:  $0^\dagger = 1$ 
   $\langle proof \rangle$ 

end

class pre-conway-base-zero1 = near-conway-base-zero1 + pre-dioid

class conway-base-zero1 = pre-conway-base-zero1 + dioid

subclass (in pre-conway-base-zero1) pre-conway-base  $\langle proof \rangle$ 

subclass (in conway-base-zero1) conway-base  $\langle proof \rangle$ 

context conway-base-zero1
begin

lemma  $z \cdot x \leq y \cdot z \implies z \cdot x^\dagger \leq y^\dagger \cdot z$ 
   $\langle proof \rangle$ 

end

```

6.5 Conway Algebras with Simulation

```

class near-conway = near-conway-base +
  assumes dagger-simr:  $z \cdot x \leq y \cdot z \implies z \cdot x^\dagger \leq y^\dagger \cdot z$ 

begin

lemma dagger-slide-var:  $x \cdot (y \cdot x)^\dagger \leq (x \cdot y)^\dagger \cdot x$ 
   $\langle proof \rangle$ 

```

Nitpick refutes the next lemma.

```

lemma dagger-slide:  $x \cdot (y \cdot x)^\dagger = (x \cdot y)^\dagger \cdot x$ 
   $\langle proof \rangle$ 

```

We say that y preserves x if $x \cdot y \cdot x = x \cdot y$ and $!x \cdot y \cdot !x = !x \cdot y$. This definition is taken from Solin [26]. It is useful for program transformation.

```

lemma preservation1:  $x \cdot y \leq x \cdot y \cdot x \implies x \cdot y^\dagger \leq (x \cdot y + z)^\dagger \cdot x$ 
   $\langle proof \rangle$ 

```

end

```

class near-conway-zero1 = near-conway + near-dioid-one-zero1

```



```

class pre-conway = near-conway + pre-diod-one

begin

subclass pre-conway-base  $\langle proof \rangle$ 

lemma dagger-slide:  $x \cdot (y \cdot x)^\dagger = (x \cdot y)^\dagger \cdot x$ 
 $\langle proof \rangle$ 

lemma dagger-denest2:  $(x + y)^\dagger = x^\dagger \cdot (y \cdot x^\dagger)^\dagger$ 
 $\langle proof \rangle$ 

lemma preservation2:  $y \cdot x \leq y \implies (x \cdot y)^\dagger \cdot x \leq x \cdot y^\dagger$ 
 $\langle proof \rangle$ 

lemma preservation1-eq:  $x \cdot y \leq x \cdot y \cdot x \implies y \cdot x \leq y \implies (x \cdot y)^\dagger \cdot x = x \cdot y^\dagger$ 
 $\langle proof \rangle$ 

end

class pre-conway-zero = near-conway-zero + pre-diod-one-zero

begin

subclass pre-conway  $\langle proof \rangle$ 

end

class conway = pre-conway + diod-one

class conway-zero = pre-conway + diod-one-zero

begin

subclass conway-base  $\langle proof \rangle$ 

Nitpick refutes the next lemmas.

lemma  $1 = 1^\dagger$ 
 $\langle proof \rangle$ 

lemma  $(x^\dagger)^\dagger = x^\dagger$ 
 $\langle proof \rangle$ 

lemma dagger-denest-var [simp]:  $(x + y)^\dagger = (x^\dagger \cdot y^\dagger)^\dagger$ 
 $\langle proof \rangle$ 

```

lemma *star2* [*simp*]: $(1 + x)^\dagger = x^\dagger$

$\langle proof \rangle$

end

end

7 Kleene Algebras

theory *Kleene-Algebra*

imports *Conway*

begin

7.1 Left Near Kleene Algebras

Extending the hierarchy developed in *Kleene-Algebra.Diod* we now add an operation of Kleene star, finite iteration, or reflexive transitive closure to variants of Dioids. Since a multiplicative unit is needed for defining the star we only consider variants with 1; 0 can be added separately. We consider the left star induction axiom and the right star induction axiom independently since in some applications, e.g., Salomaa's axioms, probabilistic Kleene algebras, or completeness proofs with respect to the equational theory of regular expressions and regular languages, the right star induction axiom is not needed or not valid.

We start with near dioids, then consider pre-dioids and finally dioids. It turns out that many of the known laws of Kleene algebras hold already in these more general settings. In fact, all our equational theorems have been proved within left Kleene algebras, as expected.

Although most of the proofs in this file could be fully automated by Sledgehammer and Metis, we display step-wise proofs as they would appear in a text book. First, this file may then be useful as a reference manual on Kleene algebra. Second, it is better protected against changes in the underlying theories and supports easy translation of proofs into other settings.

class *left-near-kleene-algebra* = *near-diod-one* + *star-op* +

assumes *star-unfoldl*: $1 + x \cdot x^\star \leq x^\star$

and *star-inductl*: $z + x \cdot y \leq y \implies x^\star \cdot z \leq y$

begin

First we prove two immediate consequences of the unfold axiom. The first one states that starred elements are reflexive.

lemma *star-ref* [*simp*]: $1 \leq x^\star$

$\langle proof \rangle$

Reflexivity of starred elements implies, by definition of the order, that 1 is an additive unit for starred elements.

lemma *star-plus-one* [simp]: $1 + x^\star = x^\star$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *star-1l* [simp]: $x \cdot x^\star \leq x^\star$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma $x^\star \cdot x \leq x^\star$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma $x \cdot x^\star = x^\star$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

Next we show that starred elements are transitive.

lemma *star-trans-eq* [simp]: $x^\star \cdot x^\star = x^\star$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *star-trans*: $x^\star \cdot x^\star \leq x^\star$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

We now derive variants of the star induction axiom.

lemma *star-inductl-var*: $x \cdot y \leq y \implies x^\star \cdot y \leq y$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *star-inductl-var-equiv* [simp]: $x^\star \cdot y \leq y \longleftrightarrow x \cdot y \leq y$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *star-inductl-var-eq*: $x \cdot y = y \implies x^\star \cdot y \leq y$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *star-inductl-var-eq2*: $y = x \cdot y \implies y = x^\star \cdot y$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma $y = x \cdot y \longleftrightarrow y = x^\star \cdot y$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma $x^\star \cdot z \leq y \implies z + x \cdot y \leq y$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *star-inductl-one*: $1 + x \cdot y \leq y \implies x^\star \leq y$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *star-inductl-star*: $x \cdot y^\star \leq y^\star \implies x^\star \leq y^\star$

$\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *star-inductl-eq*: $z + x \cdot y = y \implies x^* \cdot z \leq y$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

We now prove two facts related to 1.

lemma *star-subid*: $x \leq 1 \implies x^* = 1$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *star-one* [simp]: $1^* = 1$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

We now prove a subdistributivity property for the star (which is equivalent to isotonicity of star).

lemma *star-subdist*: $x^* \leq (x + y)^*$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *star-subdist-var*: $x^* + y^* \leq (x + y)^*$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *star-iso* [intro]: $x \leq y \implies x^* \leq y^*$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

We now prove some more simple properties.

lemma *star-invol* [simp]: $(x^*)^* = x^*$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *star2* [simp]: $(1 + x)^* = x^*$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma $1 + x^* \cdot x \leq x^*$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma $x \leq x^*$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma $x^* \cdot x \leq x^*$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma $1 + x \cdot x^* = x^*$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma $x \cdot z \leq z \cdot y \implies x^* \cdot z \leq z \cdot y^*$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

The following facts express inductive conditions that are used to show that $(x + y)^*$ is the greatest term that can be built from x and y .

lemma *prod-star-closure*: $x \leq z^* \implies y \leq z^* \implies x \cdot y \leq z^*$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *star-star-closure*: $x^* \leq z^* \implies (x^*)^* \leq z^*$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *star-closed-unfold*: $x^* = x \implies x = 1 + x \cdot x$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma $x^* = x \longleftrightarrow x = 1 + x \cdot x$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

end

7.2 Left Pre-Kleene Algebras

class *left-pre-kleene-algebra* = *left-near-kleene-algebra* + *pre-dioid-one*

begin

We first prove that the star operation is extensive.

lemma *star-ext* [*simp*]: $x \leq x^*$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

We now prove a right star unfold law.

lemma *star-1r* [*simp*]: $x^* \cdot x \leq x^*$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *star-unfoldr*: $1 + x^* \cdot x \leq x^*$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma $1 + x^* \cdot x = x^*$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

Next we prove a simulation law for the star. It is instrumental in proving further properties.

lemma *star-sim1*: $x \cdot z \leq z \cdot y \implies x^* \cdot z \leq z \cdot y^*$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

The next lemma is used in omega algebras to prove, for instance, Bachmair and Dershowitz's separation of termination theorem [4]. The property at the left-hand side of the equivalence is known as *quasicommutation*.

lemma *quasicom-comm-var*: $y \cdot x \leq x \cdot (x + y)^* \longleftrightarrow y^* \cdot x \leq x \cdot (x + y)^*$

$\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *star-slide1*: $(x \cdot y)^* \cdot x \leq x \cdot (y \cdot x)^*$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma $(x \cdot y)^* \cdot x = x \cdot (y \cdot x)^*$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *star-slide-var1*: $x^* \cdot x \leq x \cdot x^*$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

We now show that the (left) star unfold axiom can be strengthened to an equality.

lemma *star-unfoldl-eq* [*simp*]: $1 + x \cdot x^* = x^*$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma $1 + x^* \cdot x = x^*$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

Next we relate the star and the reflexive transitive closure operation.

lemma *star-rtc1-eq* [*simp*]: $1 + x + x^* \cdot x^* = x^*$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *star-rtc1*: $1 + x + x^* \cdot x^* \leq x^*$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *star-rtc2*: $1 + x \cdot x \leq x \longleftrightarrow x = x^*$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *star-rtc3*: $1 + x \cdot x = x \longleftrightarrow x = x^*$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *star-rtc-least*: $1 + x + y \cdot y \leq y \implies x^* \leq y$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *star-rtc-least-eq*: $1 + x + y \cdot y = y \implies x^* \leq y$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma $1 + x + y \cdot y \leq y \longleftrightarrow x^* \leq y$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

The next lemmas are again related to closure conditions

lemma *star-subdist-var-1*: $x \leq (x + y)^*$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *star-subdist-var-2*: $x \cdot y \leq (x + y)^*$

$\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *star-subdist-var-3*: $x^* \cdot y^* \leq (x + y)^*$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

We now prove variants of sum-elimination laws under a star. These are also known as denesting laws or as sum-star laws.

lemma *star-denest* [*simp*]: $(x + y)^* = (x^* \cdot y^*)^*$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *star-sum-var* [*simp*]: $(x^* + y^*)^* = (x + y)^*$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *star-denest-var* [*simp*]: $x^* \cdot (y \cdot x^*)^* = (x + y)^*$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *star-denest-var-2* [*simp*]: $x^* \cdot (y \cdot x^*)^* = (x^* \cdot y^*)^*$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *star-denest-var-3* [*simp*]: $x^* \cdot (y^* \cdot x^*)^* = (x^* \cdot y^*)^*$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *star-denest-var-4* [*ac-simps*]: $(y^* \cdot x^*)^* = (x^* \cdot y^*)^*$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *star-denest-var-5* [*ac-simps*]: $x^* \cdot (y \cdot x^*)^* = y^* \cdot (x \cdot y^*)^*$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma $x^* \cdot (y \cdot x^*)^* = (x^* \cdot y)^* \cdot x^*$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *star-denest-var-6* [*simp*]: $x^* \cdot y^* \cdot (x + y)^* = (x + y)^*$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *star-denest-var-7* [*simp*]: $(x + y)^* \cdot x^* \cdot y^* = (x + y)^*$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *star-denest-var-8* [*simp*]: $x^* \cdot y^* \cdot (x^* \cdot y^*)^* = (x^* \cdot y^*)^*$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *star-denest-var-9* [*simp*]: $(x^* \cdot y^*)^* \cdot x^* \cdot y^* = (x^* \cdot y^*)^*$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

The following statements are well known from term rewriting. They are all variants of the Church-Rosser theorem in Kleene algebra [27]. But first we prove a law relating two confluence properties.

lemma *confluence-var* [*iff*]: $y \cdot x^* \leq x^* \cdot y^* \iff y^* \cdot x^* \leq x^* \cdot y^*$

$\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *church-rosser* [intro]: $y^* \cdot x^* \leq x^* \cdot y^* \implies (x + y)^* = x^* \cdot y^*$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *church-rosser-var*: $y \cdot x^* \leq x^* \cdot y^* \implies (x + y)^* = x^* \cdot y^*$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *church-rosser-to-confluence*: $(x + y)^* \leq x^* \cdot y^* \implies y^* \cdot x^* \leq x^* \cdot y^*$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *church-rosser-equiv*: $y^* \cdot x^* \leq x^* \cdot y^* \iff (x + y)^* = x^* \cdot y^*$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *confluence-to-local-confluence*: $y^* \cdot x^* \leq x^* \cdot y^* \implies y \cdot x \leq x^* \cdot y^*$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma $y \cdot x \leq x^* \cdot y^* \implies y^* \cdot x^* \leq x^* \cdot y^*$

$\langle proof \rangle$

lemma $y \cdot x \leq x^* \cdot y^* \implies (x + y)^* \leq x^* \cdot y^*$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

More variations could easily be proved. The last counterexample shows that Newman's lemma needs a wellfoundedness assumption. This is well known.

The next lemmas relate the reflexive transitive closure and the transitive closure.

lemma *sup-id-star1*: $1 \leq x \implies x \cdot x^* = x^*$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *sup-id-star2*: $1 \leq x \implies x^* \cdot x = x^*$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma $1 + x^* \cdot x = x^*$

$\langle proof \rangle$

lemma $(x \cdot y)^* \cdot x = x \cdot (y \cdot x)^*$

$\langle proof \rangle$

lemma $x \cdot x = x \implies x^* = 1 + x$

$\langle proof \rangle$

end

7.3 Left Kleene Algebras

class *left-kleene-algebra* = *left-pre-kleene-algebra* + *dioid-one*

begin

In left Kleene algebras the non-fact $z + y \cdot x \leq y \implies z \cdot x^* \leq y$ is a good challenge for counterexample generators. A model of left Kleene algebras in which the right star induction law does not hold has been given by Kozen [20].

We now show that the right unfold law becomes an equality.

lemma *star-unfoldr-eq* [*simp*]: $1 + x^* \cdot x = x^*$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

The following more complex unfold law has been used as an axiom, called *prodstar*, by Conway [8].

lemma *star-prod-unfold* [*simp*]: $1 + x \cdot (y \cdot x)^* \cdot y = (x \cdot y)^*$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

The slide laws, which have previously been inequalities, now become equations.

lemma *star-slide* [*ac-simps*]: $(x \cdot y)^* \cdot x = x \cdot (y \cdot x)^*$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *star-slide-var* [*ac-simps*]: $x^* \cdot x = x \cdot x^*$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *star-sum-unfold-var* [*simp*]: $1 + x^* \cdot (x + y)^* \cdot y^* = (x + y)^*$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

The following law shows how starred sums can be unfolded.

lemma *star-sum-unfold* [*simp*]: $x^* + x^* \cdot y \cdot (x + y)^* = (x + y)^*$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

The following property appears in process algebra.

lemma *troeger*: $(x + y)^* \cdot z = x^* \cdot (y \cdot (x + y)^* \cdot z + z)$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

The following properties are related to a property from propositional dynamic logic which has been attributed to Albert Meyer [18]. Here we prove it as a theorem of Kleene algebra.

lemma *star-square*: $(x \cdot x)^* \leq x^*$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *meyer-1* [*simp*]: $(1 + x) \cdot (x \cdot x)^* = x^*$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

The following lemma says that transitive elements are equal to their transitive closure.

lemma *tc*: $x \cdot x \leq x \implies x^* \cdot x = x$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *tc-eq*: $x \cdot x = x \implies x^* \cdot x = x$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

The next fact has been used by Boffa [6] to axiomatise the equational theory of regular expressions.

lemma *boffa-var*: $x \cdot x \leq x \implies x^* = 1 + x$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *boffa*: $x \cdot x = x \implies x^* = 1 + x$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

end

7.4 Left Kleene Algebras with Zero

There are applications where only a left zero is assumed, for instance in the context of total correctness and for demonic refinement algebras [31].

class *left-kleene-algebra-zero* = *left-kleene-algebra* + *dioid-one-zero*
begin

sublocale *conway*: *near-conway-base-zero* *star*
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *star-zero* [*simp*]: $0^* = 1$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

In principle, 1 could therefore be defined from 0 in this setting.

end

class *left-kleene-algebra-zero* = *left-kleene-algebra-zero* + *dioid-one-zero*

7.5 Pre-Kleene Algebras

Pre-Kleene algebras are essentially probabilistic Kleene algebras [24]. They have a weaker right star unfold axiom. We are still looking for theorems that could be proved in this setting.

class *pre-kleene-algebra* = *left-pre-kleene-algebra* +
assumes *weak-star-unfoldr*: $z + y \cdot (x + 1) \leq y \implies z \cdot x^* \leq y$

7.6 Kleene Algebras

class *kleene-algebra-zerol* = *left-kleene-algebra-zerol* +
assumes *star-inductr*: $z + y \cdot x \leq y \implies z \cdot x^* \leq y$

begin

lemma *star-sim2*: $z \cdot x \leq y \cdot z \implies z \cdot x^* \leq y^* \cdot z$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

sublocale *conway*: *pre-conway star*
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma *star-inductr-var*: $y \cdot x \leq y \implies y \cdot x^* \leq y$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma *star-inductr-var-equiv*: $y \cdot x \leq y \iff y \cdot x^* \leq y$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma *star-sim3*: $z \cdot x = y \cdot z \implies z \cdot x^* = y^* \cdot z$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma *star-sim4*: $x \cdot y \leq y \cdot x \implies x^* \cdot y^* \leq y^* \cdot x^*$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma *star-inductr-eq*: $z + y \cdot x = y \implies z \cdot x^* \leq y$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma *star-inductr-var-eq*: $y \cdot x = y \implies y \cdot x^* \leq y$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma *star-inductr-var-eq2*: $y \cdot x = y \implies y \cdot x^* = y$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma *bubble-sort*: $y \cdot x \leq x \cdot y \implies (x + y)^* = x^* \cdot y^*$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma *independence1*: $x \cdot y = 0 \implies x^* \cdot y = y$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma *independence2*: $x \cdot y = 0 \implies x \cdot y^* = x$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma *lazycomm-var*: $y \cdot x \leq x \cdot (x + y)^* + y \iff y \cdot x^* \leq x \cdot (x + y)^* + y$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma *arden-var*: $(\forall y \ v. y \leq x \cdot y + v \longrightarrow y \leq x^* \cdot v) \implies z = x \cdot z + w \implies z = x^* \cdot w$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma $(\forall x y. y \leq x \cdot y \longrightarrow y = 0) \Longrightarrow y \leq x \cdot y + z \Longrightarrow y \leq x^* \cdot z$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

end

Finally, here come the Kleene algebras à la Kozen [21]. We only prove quasi-identities in this section. Since left Kleene algebras are complete with respect to the equational theory of regular expressions and regular languages, all identities hold already without the right star induction axiom.

class *kleene-algebra* = *left-kleene-algebra-zero* +
assumes *star-inductr'*: $z + y \cdot x \leq y \Longrightarrow z \cdot x^* \leq y$
begin

subclass *kleene-algebra-zero1*
 $\langle proof \rangle$

sublocale *conway-zero1*: *conway star* $\langle proof \rangle$

The next lemma shows that opposites of Kleene algebras (i.e., Kleene algebras with the order of multiplication swapped) are again Kleene algebras.

lemma *dual-kleene-algebra*:
class.kleene-algebra $(+)$ (\odot) 1 0 (\leq) $(<)$ *star*
 $\langle proof \rangle$

end

We finish with some properties on (multiplicatively) commutative Kleene algebras. A chapter in Conway's book [8] is devoted to this topic.

class *commutative-kleene-algebra* = *kleene-algebra* +
assumes *mult-comm* [*ac-simps*]: $x \cdot y = y \cdot x$

begin

lemma *conway-c3* [*simp*]: $(x + y)^* = x^* \cdot y^*$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *conway-c4*: $(x^* \cdot y)^* = 1 + x^* \cdot y^* \cdot y$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *cka-1*: $(x \cdot y)^* \leq x^* \cdot y^*$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *cka-2* [*simp*]: $x^* \cdot (x^* \cdot y)^* = x^* \cdot y^*$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *conway-c4-var* [*simp*]: $(x^* \cdot y^*)^* = x^* \cdot y^*$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *conway-c2-var*: $(x \cdot y)^* \cdot x \cdot y \cdot y^* \leq (x \cdot y)^* \cdot y^*$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma *conway-c2 [simp]*: $(x \cdot y)^* \cdot (x^* + y^*) = x^* \cdot y^*$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

end

end

8 Models of Kleene Algebras

theory *Kleene-Algebra-Models*
imports *Kleene-Algebra Dioid-Models*
begin

We now show that most of the models considered for dioids are also Kleene algebras. Some of the dioid models cannot be expanded, for instance max-plus and min-plus semirings, but we do not formalise this fact. We also currently do not show that formal powerseries and matrices form Kleene algebras.

The interpretation proofs for some of the following models are quite similar. One could, perhaps, abstract out common reasoning in the future.

8.1 Preliminary Lemmas

We first prove two induction-style statements for dioids that are useful for establishing the full induction laws. In the future these will live in a theory file on finite sums for Kleene algebras.

context *dioid-one-zero*
begin

lemma *power-inductl*: $z + x \cdot y \leq y \implies (x \wedge n) \cdot z \leq y$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma *power-inductr*: $z + y \cdot x \leq y \implies z \cdot (x \wedge n) \leq y$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

end

8.2 The Powerset Kleene Algebra over a Monoid

We now show that the powerset dioid forms a Kleene algebra. The Kleene star is defined as in language theory.

lemma *Un-0-Suc*: $(\bigcup n. f\ n) = f\ 0 \cup (\bigcup n. f\ (Suc\ n))$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

instantiation *set* :: (*monoid-mult*) *kleene-algebra*
begin

definition *star-def*: $X^* = (\bigcup n. X \wedge n)$

lemma *star-elim*: $x \in X^* \longleftrightarrow (\exists k. x \in X \wedge k)$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma *star-contl*: $X \cdot Y^* = (\bigcup n. X \cdot Y \wedge n)$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma *star-contr*: $X^* \cdot Y = (\bigcup n. X \wedge n \cdot Y)$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

instance
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

end

8.3 Language Kleene Algebras

We now specialise this fact to languages.

interpretation *lan-kleene-algebra*: *kleene-algebra* (+) (\cdot) $1 :: 'a \text{ lan } 0 (\subseteq) (\subset) \text{ star}$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

8.4 Regular Languages

... and further to regular languages. For the sake of simplicity we just copy in the axiomatisation of regular expressions by Krauss and Nipkow [23].

datatype *'a rexp* =
Zero
| *One*
| *Atom* *'a*
| *Plus* *'a rexp* *'a rexp*
| *Times* *'a rexp* *'a rexp*
| *Star* *'a rexp*

The interpretation map that induces regular languages as the images of regular expressions in the set of languages has also been adapted from there.

fun *lang* :: *'a rexp* \Rightarrow *'a lan* **where**
lang Zero = 0 —
| *lang One* = 1 — \square
| *lang (Atom a)* = $\{[a]\}$
| *lang (Plus x y)* = *lang x* + *lang y*
| *lang (Times x y)* = *lang x* \cdot *lang y*
| *lang (Star x)* = (*lang x*)^{*}

```

typedef 'a reg-lan = range lang :: 'a lan set
  <proof>

setup-lifting type-definition-reg-lan

instantiation reg-lan :: (type) kleene-algebra
begin

  lift-definition star-reg-lan :: 'a reg-lan  $\Rightarrow$  'a reg-lan
    is star
    <proof>

  lift-definition zero-reg-lan :: 'a reg-lan
    is 0
    <proof>

  lift-definition one-reg-lan :: 'a reg-lan
    is 1
    <proof>

  lift-definition less-eq-reg-lan :: 'a reg-lan  $\Rightarrow$  'a reg-lan  $\Rightarrow$  bool
    is less-eq <proof>

  lift-definition less-reg-lan :: 'a reg-lan  $\Rightarrow$  'a reg-lan  $\Rightarrow$  bool
    is less <proof>

  lift-definition plus-reg-lan :: 'a reg-lan  $\Rightarrow$  'a reg-lan  $\Rightarrow$  'a reg-lan
    is plus
    <proof>

  lift-definition times-reg-lan :: 'a reg-lan  $\Rightarrow$  'a reg-lan  $\Rightarrow$  'a reg-lan
    is times
    <proof>

  instance
    <proof>

end

interpretation reg-lan-kleene-algebra: kleene-algebra (+) ( $\cdot$ ) 1::'a reg-lan 0 ( $\leq$ )
  (<) star <proof>

```

8.5 Relation Kleene Algebras

We now show that binary relations form Kleene algebras. While we could have used the reflexive transitive closure operation as the Kleene star, we prefer the equivalent definition of the star as the sum of powers. This essentially allows us to copy previous proofs.

lemma *power-is-relpow*: $\text{rel-diod}.power\ X\ n = X \hat{\sim} n$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *rel-star-def*: $X \hat{*} = (\bigcup n. \text{rel-diod}.power\ X\ n)$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *rel-star-contl*: $X\ O\ Y \hat{*} = (\bigcup n. X\ O\ \text{rel-diod}.power\ Y\ n)$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *rel-star-contr*: $X \hat{*}\ O\ Y = (\bigcup n. (\text{rel-diod}.power\ X\ n)\ O\ Y)$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

interpretation *rel-kleene-algebra*: $\text{kleene-algebra}\ (\cup)\ (O)\ Id\ \{\}\ (\subseteq)\ (\subset)\ \text{rtranc1}$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

8.6 Trace Kleene Algebras

Again, the proof that sets of traces form Kleene algebras follows the same schema.

definition *t-star* :: $('p, 'a)\ \text{trace set} \Rightarrow ('p, 'a)\ \text{trace set}$ **where**
 $t\text{-star}\ X \equiv \bigcup n. \text{trace-diod}.power\ X\ n$

lemma *t-star-elim*: $x \in t\text{-star}\ X \longleftrightarrow (\exists n. x \in \text{trace-diod}.power\ X\ n)$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *t-star-contl*: $t\text{-prod}\ X\ (t\text{-star}\ Y) = (\bigcup n. t\text{-prod}\ X\ (\text{trace-diod}.power\ Y\ n))$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *t-star-contr*: $t\text{-prod}\ (t\text{-star}\ X)\ Y = (\bigcup n. t\text{-prod}\ (\text{trace-diod}.power\ X\ n)\ Y)$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

interpretation *trace-kleene-algebra*: $\text{kleene-algebra}\ (\cup)\ t\text{-prod}\ t\text{-one}\ t\text{-zero}\ (\subseteq)\ (\subset)$
 $t\text{-star}$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

8.7 Path Kleene Algebras

We start with paths that include the empty path.

definition *p-star* :: $'a\ \text{path set} \Rightarrow 'a\ \text{path set}$ **where**
 $p\text{-star}\ X \equiv \bigcup n. \text{path-diod}.power\ X\ n$

lemma *p-star-elim*: $x \in p\text{-star}\ X \longleftrightarrow (\exists n. x \in \text{path-diod}.power\ X\ n)$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *p-star-contl*: $p\text{-prod}\ X\ (p\text{-star}\ Y) = (\bigcup n. p\text{-prod}\ X\ (\text{path-diod}.power\ Y\ n))$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *p-star-contr*: $p\text{-prod } (p\text{-star } X) \ Y = (\bigcup n. p\text{-prod } (path\text{-diod}.power \ X \ n) \ Y)$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

interpretation *path-kleene-algebra*: $kleene\text{-algebra } (\cup) \ p\text{-prod } p\text{-one } \{ \} \ (\subseteq) \ (\subset)$
 $p\text{-star}$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

We now consider a notion of paths that does not include the empty path.

definition *pp-star* :: $'a \ ppath \ set \Rightarrow 'a \ ppath \ set$ **where**
 $pp\text{-star } X \equiv \bigcup n. ppath\text{-diod}.power \ X \ n$

lemma *pp-star-elim*: $x \in pp\text{-star } X \iff (\exists n. x \in ppath\text{-diod}.power \ X \ n)$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *pp-star-contl*: $pp\text{-prod } X \ (pp\text{-star } Y) = (\bigcup n. pp\text{-prod } X \ (ppath\text{-diod}.power \ Y \ n))$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *pp-star-contr*: $pp\text{-prod } (pp\text{-star } X) \ Y = (\bigcup n. pp\text{-prod } (ppath\text{-diod}.power \ X \ n) \ Y)$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

interpretation *ppath-kleene-algebra*: $kleene\text{-algebra } (\cup) \ pp\text{-prod } pp\text{-one } \{ \} \ (\subseteq) \ (\subset)$
 $pp\text{-star}$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

8.8 The Distributive Lattice Kleene Algebra

In the case of bounded distributive lattices, the star maps all elements to the maximal element.

definition (*in bounded-distributive-lattice*) *bdl-star* :: $'a \Rightarrow 'a$ **where**
 $bdl\text{-star } x = top$

sublocale *bounded-distributive-lattice* \subseteq *kleene-algebra* *sup inf top bot less-eq less*
 $bdl\text{-star}$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

8.9 The Min-Plus Kleene Algebra

One cannot define a Kleene star for max-plus and min-plus algebras that range over the real numbers. Here we define the star for a min-plus algebra restricted to natural numbers and $+\infty$. The resulting Kleene algebra is commutative. Similar variants can be obtained for max-plus algebras and other algebras ranging over the positive or negative integers.

instantiation *pnat* :: *commutative-kleene-algebra*

```

begin

  definition star-pnat where
     $x^* \equiv (1::pnat)$ 

  instance
    <proof>

end

end

```

9 Omega Algebras

```

theory Omega-Algebra
imports Kleene-Algebra
begin

```

Omega algebras [7] extend Kleene algebras by an ω -operation that axiomatizes infinite iteration (just like the Kleene star axiomatizes finite iteration).

9.1 Left Omega Algebras

In this section we consider *left omega algebras*, i.e., omega algebras based on left Kleene algebras. Surprisingly, we are still looking for statements mentioning ω that are true in omega algebras, but do not already hold in left omega algebras.

```

class left-omega-algebra = left-kleene-algebra-zero + omega-op +
  assumes omega-unfold:  $x^\omega \leq x \cdot x^\omega$ 
  and omega-coinduct:  $y \leq z + x \cdot y \implies y \leq x^\omega + x^* \cdot z$ 
begin

```

First we prove some variants of the coinduction axiom.

```

lemma omega-coinduct-var1:  $y \leq 1 + x \cdot y \implies y \leq x^\omega + x^*$ 
  <proof>

```

```

lemma omega-coinduct-var2:  $y \leq x \cdot y \implies y \leq x^\omega$ 
  <proof>

```

```

lemma omega-coinduct-eq:  $y = z + x \cdot y \implies y \leq x^\omega + x^* \cdot z$ 
  <proof>

```

```

lemma omega-coinduct-eq-var1:  $y = 1 + x \cdot y \implies y \leq x^\omega + x^*$ 
  <proof>

```

```

lemma omega-coinduct-eq-var2:  $y = x \cdot y \implies y \leq x^\omega$ 
  <proof>

```

lemma $y = x \cdot y + z \implies y = x^\star \cdot z + x^\omega$

$\langle proof \rangle$

lemma $y = 1 + x \cdot y \implies y = x^\omega + x^\star$

$\langle proof \rangle$

lemma $y = x \cdot y \implies y = x^\omega$

$\langle proof \rangle$

Next we strengthen the unfold law to an equation.

lemma *omega-unfold-eq* [simp]: $x \cdot x^\omega = x^\omega$

$\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *omega-unfold-var*: $z + x \cdot x^\omega \leq x^\omega + x^\star \cdot z$

$\langle proof \rangle$

lemma $z + x \cdot x^\omega = x^\omega + x^\star \cdot z$

$\langle proof \rangle$

We now prove subdistributivity and isotonicity of omega.

lemma *omega-subdist*: $x^\omega \leq (x + y)^\omega$

$\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *omega-iso*: $x \leq y \implies x^\omega \leq y^\omega$

$\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *omega-subdist-var*: $x^\omega + y^\omega \leq (x + y)^\omega$

$\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *zero-omega* [simp]: $0^\omega = 0$

$\langle proof \rangle$

The next lemma is another variant of omega unfold

lemma *star-omega-1* [simp]: $x^\star \cdot x^\omega = x^\omega$

$\langle proof \rangle$

The next lemma says that 1^ω is the maximal element of omega algebra. We therefore baptise it \top .

lemma *max-element*: $x \leq 1^\omega$

$\langle proof \rangle$

definition *top* (\top)

where $\top = 1^\omega$

lemma *star-omega-3* [*simp*]: $(x^*)^\omega = \top$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

The following lemma is strange since it is counterintuitive that one should be able to append something after an infinite iteration.

lemma *omega-1*: $x^\omega \cdot y \leq x^\omega$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma $x^\omega \cdot y = x^\omega$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *omega-sup-id*: $1 \leq y \implies x^\omega \cdot y = x^\omega$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *omega-top* [*simp*]: $x^\omega \cdot \top = x^\omega$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *supid-omega*: $1 \leq x \implies x^\omega = \top$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma $x^\omega = \top \implies 1 \leq x$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

Next we prove a simulation law for the omega operation

lemma *omega-simulation*: $z \cdot x \leq y \cdot z \implies z \cdot x^\omega \leq y^\omega$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma $z \cdot x \leq y \cdot z \implies z \cdot x^\omega \leq y^\omega \cdot z$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma $y \cdot z \leq z \cdot x \implies y^\omega \leq z \cdot x^\omega$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma $y \cdot z \leq z \cdot x \implies y^\omega \cdot z \leq x^\omega$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

Next we prove transitivity of omega elements.

lemma *omega-omega*: $(x^\omega)^\omega \leq x^\omega$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

The next lemmas are axioms of Wagner's complete axiomatisation for omega-regular languages [32], but in a slightly different setting.

lemma *wagner-1* [*simp*]: $(x \cdot x^\star)^\omega = x^\omega$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *wagner-2-var*: $x \cdot (y \cdot x)^\omega \leq (x \cdot y)^\omega$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *wagner-2* [*simp*]: $x \cdot (y \cdot x)^\omega = (x \cdot y)^\omega$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

This identity is called (A8) in Wagner's paper.

lemma *wagner-3*:
assumes $x \cdot (x + y)^\omega + z = (x + y)^\omega$
shows $(x + y)^\omega = x^\omega + x^\star \cdot z$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

This identity is called (R4) in Wagner's paper.

lemma *wagner-1-var* [*simp*]: $(x^\star \cdot x)^\omega = x^\omega$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *star-omega-4* [*simp*]: $(x^\omega)^\star = 1 + x^\omega$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *star-omega-5* [*simp*]: $x^\omega \cdot (x^\omega)^\star = x^\omega$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

The next law shows how omegas below a sum can be unfolded.

lemma *omega-sum-unfold*: $x^\omega + x^\star \cdot y \cdot (x + y)^\omega = (x + y)^\omega$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

The next two lemmas apply induction and coinduction to this law.

lemma *omega-sum-unfold-coind*: $(x + y)^\omega \leq (x^\star \cdot y)^\omega + (x^\star \cdot y)^\star \cdot x^\omega$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *omega-sum-unfold-ind*: $(x^\star \cdot y)^\star \cdot x^\omega \leq (x + y)^\omega$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *wagner-1-gen*: $(x \cdot y^\star)^\omega \leq (x + y)^\omega$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *wagner-1-var-gen*: $(x^\star \cdot y)^\omega \leq (x + y)^\omega$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

The next lemma is a variant of the denest law for the star at the level of omega.

lemma *omega-denest* [*simp*]: $(x + y)^\omega = (x^\star \cdot y)^\omega + (x^\star \cdot y)^\star \cdot x^\omega$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

The next lemma yields a separation theorem for infinite iteration in the

presence of a quasicommutation property. A nondeterministic loop over x and y can be refined into separate infinite loops over x and y .

lemma *omega-sum-refine*:

assumes $y \cdot x \leq x \cdot (x + y)^*$
shows $(x + y)^\omega = x^\omega + x^* \cdot y^\omega$

<proof>

The following theorem by Bachmair and Dershowitz [4] is a corollary.

lemma *bachmair-dershowitz*:

assumes $y \cdot x \leq x \cdot (x + y)^*$
shows $(x + y)^\omega = 0 \iff x^\omega + y^\omega = 0$

<proof>

The next lemmas consider an abstract variant of the empty word property from language theory and match it with the absence of infinite iteration [28].

definition (*in dioid-one-zero*) *ewp*

where $\text{ewp } x \equiv \neg(\forall y. y \leq x \cdot y \longrightarrow y = 0)$

lemma *ewp-super-id1*: $0 \neq 1 \implies 1 \leq x \implies \text{ewp } x$

<proof>

lemma $0 \neq 1 \implies 1 \leq x \iff \text{ewp } x$

<proof>

The next facts relate the absence of the empty word property with the absence of infinite iteration.

lemma *ewp-neg-and-omega*: $\neg \text{ewp } x \iff x^\omega = 0$

<proof>

lemma *ewp-alt1*: $(\forall z. x^\omega \leq x^* \cdot z) \iff (\forall y z. y \leq x \cdot y + z \longrightarrow y \leq x^* \cdot z)$

<proof>

lemma *ewp-alt*: $x^\omega = 0 \iff (\forall y z. y \leq x \cdot y + z \longrightarrow y \leq x^* \cdot z)$

<proof>

So we have obtained a condition for Arden's lemma in omega algebra.

lemma *omega-super-id1*: $0 \neq 1 \implies 1 \leq x \implies x^\omega \neq 0$

<proof>

lemma *omega-super-id2*: $0 \neq 1 \implies x^\omega = 0 \implies \neg(1 \leq x)$

<proof>

The next lemmas are abstract versions of Arden's lemma from language theory.

lemma *ardens-lemma-var*:

assumes $x^\omega = 0$

and $z + x \cdot y = y$
shows $x^* \cdot z = y$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma *ardens-lemma*: $\neg \text{ewp } x \implies z + x \cdot y = y \implies x^* \cdot z = y$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma *ardens-lemma-equiv*:
assumes $\neg \text{ewp } x$
shows $z + x \cdot y = y \longleftrightarrow x^* \cdot z = y$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma *ardens-lemma-var-equiv*: $x^\omega = 0 \implies (z + x \cdot y = y \longleftrightarrow x^* \cdot z = y)$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma *arden-conv1*: $(\forall y z. z + x \cdot y = y \longrightarrow x^* \cdot z = y) \implies \neg \text{ewp } x$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma *arden-conv2*: $(\forall y z. z + x \cdot y = y \longrightarrow x^* \cdot z = y) \implies x^\omega = 0$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma *arden-var3*: $(\forall y z. z + x \cdot y = y \longrightarrow x^* \cdot z = y) \longleftrightarrow x^\omega = 0$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

end

9.2 Omega Algebras

class *omega-algebra* = *kleene-algebra* + *left-omega-algebra*

end

10 Models of Omega Algebras

theory *Omega-Algebra-Models*
imports *Omega-Algebra Kleene-Algebra-Models*
begin

The trace, path and language model are not really interesting in this setting.

10.1 Relation Omega Algebras

In the relational model, the omega of a relation relates all those elements in the domain of the relation, from which an infinite chain starts, with all other elements; all other elements are not related to anything [19]. Thus, the omega of a relation is most naturally defined coinductively.

coinductive-set *omega* :: $('a \times 'a) \text{ set} \Rightarrow ('a \times 'a) \text{ set}$ **for** *R* **where**
 $\llbracket (x, y) \in R; (y, z) \in \text{omega } R \rrbracket \implies (x, z) \in \text{omega } R$

Isabelle automatically derives a case rule and a coinduction theorem for *Omega-Algebra-Models.omega*. We prove slightly more elegant variants.

lemma *omega-cases*: $(x, z) \in \text{omega } R \implies$
 $(\bigwedge y. (x, y) \in R \implies (y, z) \in \text{omega } R \implies P) \implies P$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma *omega-coinduct*: $X \ x \ z \implies$
 $(\bigwedge x \ z. X \ x \ z \implies \exists y. (x, y) \in R \wedge (X \ y \ z \vee (y, z) \in \text{omega } R)) \implies$
 $(x, z) \in \text{omega } R$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma *omega-weak-coinduct*: $X \ x \ z \implies$
 $(\bigwedge x \ z. X \ x \ z \implies \exists y. (x, y) \in R \wedge X \ y \ z) \implies$
 $(x, z) \in \text{omega } R$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

interpretation *rel-omega-algebra*: *omega-algebra* $(\cup) \ (O) \ Id \ \{\} \ (\subseteq) \ (\subset) \ rtranc1$
 omega
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

end

11 Demonic Refinement Algebras

theory *DRA*
imports *Kleene-Algebra*
begin

A demonic refinement algebra **DRA*) [31] is a Kleene algebra without right annihilation plus an operation for possibly infinite iteration.

class *dra* = *kleene-algebra-zero1* +
fixes *strong-iteration* :: $'a \Rightarrow 'a \ (\langle -^\infty \rangle \ [101] \ 100)$
assumes *iteration-unfoldl* [*simp*] : $1 + x \cdot x^\infty = x^\infty$
and *coinduction*: $y \leq z + x \cdot y \longrightarrow y \leq x^\infty \cdot z$
and *isolation* [*simp*]: $x^* + x^\infty \cdot 0 = x^\infty$
begin

\top is an abort statement, defined as an infinite skip. It is the maximal element of any DRA.

abbreviation *top-elem* :: $'a \ (\langle \top \rangle)$ **where** $\top \equiv 1^\infty$

Simple/basic lemmas about the iteration operator

lemma *iteration-refl*: $1 \leq x^\infty$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma *iteration-1l*: $x \cdot x^\infty \leq x^\infty$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma *top-ref*: $x \leq \top$

<proof>

lemma *it-ext*: $x \leq x^\infty$

<proof>

lemma *it-idem* [*simp*]: $(x^\infty)^\infty = x^\infty$

<proof>

lemma *top-mult-annil* [*simp*]: $\top \cdot x = \top$

<proof>

lemma *top-add-annil* [*simp*]: $\top + x = \top$

<proof>

lemma *top-elim*: $x \cdot y \leq x \cdot \top$

<proof>

lemma *iteration-unfoldl-distl* [*simp*]: $y + y \cdot x \cdot x^\infty = y \cdot x^\infty$

<proof>

lemma *iteration-unfoldl-distr* [*simp*]: $y + x \cdot x^\infty \cdot y = x^\infty \cdot y$

<proof>

lemma *iteration-unfoldl'* [*simp*]: $z \cdot y + z \cdot x \cdot x^\infty \cdot y = z \cdot x^\infty \cdot y$

<proof>

lemma *iteration-idem* [*simp*]: $x^\infty \cdot x^\infty = x^\infty$

<proof>

lemma *iteration-induct*: $x \cdot x^\infty \leq x^\infty \cdot x$

<proof>

lemma *iteration-ref-star*: $x^* \leq x^\infty$

<proof>

lemma *iteration-subdist*: $x^\infty \leq (x + y)^\infty$

<proof>

lemma *iteration-iso*: $x \leq y \implies x^\infty \leq y^\infty$

<proof>

lemma *iteration-unfoldr* [*simp*]: $1 + x^\infty \cdot x = x^\infty$

<proof>

lemma *iteration-unfoldr-distl* [*simp*]: $y + y \cdot x^\infty \cdot x = y \cdot x^\infty$

<proof>

lemma *iteration-unfoldr-distr* [simp]: $y + x^\infty \cdot x \cdot y = x^\infty \cdot y$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *iteration-unfold-eq*: $x^\infty \cdot x = x \cdot x^\infty$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *iteration-unfoldr'* [simp]: $z \cdot y + z \cdot x^\infty \cdot x \cdot y = z \cdot x^\infty \cdot y$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *iteration-double* [simp]: $(x^\infty)^\infty = \top$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *star-iteration* [simp]: $(x^*)^\infty = \top$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *iteration-star* [simp]: $(x^\infty)^* = x^\infty$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *iteration-star2* [simp]: $x^* \cdot x^\infty = x^\infty$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *iteration-zero* [simp]: $0^\infty = 1$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *iteration-annil* [simp]: $(x \cdot 0)^\infty = 1 + x \cdot 0$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *iteration-subdenest*: $x^\infty \cdot y^\infty \leq (x + y)^\infty$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *sup-id-top*: $1 \leq y \implies y \cdot \top = \top$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *iteration-top* [simp]: $x^\infty \cdot \top = \top$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

Next, we prove some simulation laws for data refinement.

lemma *iteration-sim*: $z \cdot y \leq x \cdot z \implies z \cdot y^\infty \leq x^\infty \cdot z$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

Nitpick gives a counterexample to the dual simulation law.

lemma $y \cdot z \leq z \cdot x \implies y^\infty \cdot z \leq z \cdot x^\infty$

$\langle proof \rangle$

Next, we prove some sliding laws.

lemma *iteration-slide-var*: $x \cdot (y \cdot x)^\infty \leq (x \cdot y)^\infty \cdot x$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *iteration-prod-unfold* [simp]: $1 + y \cdot (x \cdot y)^\infty \cdot x = (y \cdot x)^\infty$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *iteration-slide*: $x \cdot (y \cdot x)^\infty = (x \cdot y)^\infty \cdot x$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *star-iteration-slide* [simp]: $y^\star \cdot (x^\star \cdot y)^\infty = (x^\star \cdot y)^\infty$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

The following laws are called denesting laws.

lemma *iteration-sub-denest*: $(x + y)^\infty \leq x^\infty \cdot (y \cdot x^\infty)^\infty$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *iteration-denest*: $(x + y)^\infty = x^\infty \cdot (y \cdot x^\infty)^\infty$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *iteration-denest2* [simp]: $y^\star \cdot x \cdot (x + y)^\infty + y^\infty = (x + y)^\infty$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *iteration-denest3*: $(y^\star \cdot x)^\infty \cdot y^\infty = (x + y)^\infty$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

Now we prove separation laws for reasoning about distributed systems in the context of action systems.

lemma *iteration-sep*: $y \cdot x \leq x \cdot y \implies (x + y)^\infty = x^\infty \cdot y^\infty$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *iteration-sim2*: $y \cdot x \leq x \cdot y \implies y^\infty \cdot x^\infty \leq x^\infty \cdot y^\infty$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *iteration-sep2*: $y \cdot x \leq x \cdot y^\star \implies (x + y)^\infty = x^\infty \cdot y^\infty$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *iteration-sep3*: $y \cdot x \leq x \cdot (x + y) \implies (x + y)^\infty = x^\infty \cdot y^\infty$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *iteration-sep4*: $y \cdot 0 = 0 \implies z \cdot x = 0 \implies y \cdot x \leq (x + z) \cdot y^\star \implies (x + y + z)^\infty = x^\infty \cdot (y + z)^\infty$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

Finally, we prove some blocking laws.

Nitpick refutes the next lemma.

lemma $x \cdot y = 0 \implies x^\infty \cdot y = y$

$\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *iteration-idep*: $x \cdot y = 0 \implies x \cdot y^\infty = x$

<proof>

Nitpick refutes the next lemma.

lemma $y \cdot w \leq x \cdot y + z \implies y \cdot w^\infty \leq x^\infty \cdot z$

<proof>

At the end of this file, we consider a data refinement example from von Wright [30].

lemma *data-refinement*:

assumes $s' \leq s \cdot z$ **and** $z \cdot e' \leq e$ **and** $z \cdot a' \leq a \cdot z$ **and** $z \cdot b \leq z$ **and** $b^\infty = b^*$

shows $s' \cdot (a' + b)^\infty \cdot e' \leq s \cdot a^\infty \cdot e$

<proof>

end

end

12 Propositional Hoare Logic for Conway and Kleene Algebra

theory *PHL-KA*

imports *Kleene-Algebra*

begin

This is a minimalist Hoare logic developed in the context of pre-dioids. In near-dioids, the sequencing rule would not be derivable. Iteration is modelled by a function that needs to satisfy a simulation law.

The main assumptions on pre-dioid elements needed to derive the Hoare rules are preservation properties; an additional distributivity property is needed for the conditional rule.

This Hoare logic can be instantiated in various ways. It covers notions of finite and possibly infinite iteration. In this theory, it is specialised to Conway and Kleene algebras.

class *it-pre-dioid* = *pre-dioid-one* +

fixes $it :: 'a \Rightarrow 'a$

assumes *it-simr*: $y \cdot x \leq x \cdot y \implies y \cdot it\ x \leq it\ x \cdot y$

begin

lemma *phl-while*:

assumes $p \cdot s \leq s \cdot p \cdot s$ **and** $p \cdot w \leq w \cdot p \cdot w$

and $(p \cdot s) \cdot x \leq x \cdot p$

shows $p \cdot (it\ (s \cdot x) \cdot w) \leq it\ (s \cdot x) \cdot w \cdot (p \cdot w)$

$\langle proof \rangle$

end

Next we define a Hoare triple to make the format of the rules more explicit.

context *pre-dioid-one*

begin

abbreviation (in *near-dioid*) $ht :: 'a \Rightarrow 'a \Rightarrow 'a \Rightarrow bool$ ($\langle \{ \cdot \} - \{ \cdot \} \rangle$) **where**

$\{x\} y \{z\} \equiv x \cdot y \leq y \cdot z$

lemma *ht-phl-skip*: $\{x\} 1 \{x\}$

$\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *ht-phl-cons1*: $x \leq w \implies \{w\} y \{z\} \implies \{x\} y \{z\}$

$\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *ht-phl-cons2*: $w \leq x \implies \{z\} y \{w\} \implies \{z\} y \{x\}$

$\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *ht-phl-seq*: $\{p\} x \{r\} \implies \{r\} y \{q\} \implies \{p\} x \cdot y \{q\}$

$\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *ht-phl-cond*:

assumes $u \cdot v \leq v \cdot u \cdot v$ **and** $u \cdot w \leq w \cdot u \cdot w$

and $\bigwedge x y. u \cdot (x + y) \leq u \cdot x + u \cdot y$

and $\{u \cdot v\} x \{z\}$ **and** $\{u \cdot w\} y \{z\}$

shows $\{u\} (v \cdot x + w \cdot y) \{z\}$

$\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *ht-phl-export1*:

assumes $x \cdot y \leq y \cdot x \cdot y$

and $\{x \cdot y\} z \{w\}$

shows $\{x\} y \cdot z \{w\}$

$\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *ht-phl-export2*:

assumes $z \cdot w \leq w \cdot z \cdot w$

and $\{x\} y \{z\}$

shows $\{x\} y \cdot w \{z \cdot w\}$

$\langle proof \rangle$

end

context *it-pre-dioid* **begin**

lemma *ht-phl-while*:

assumes $p \cdot s \leq s \cdot p \cdot s$ **and** $p \cdot w \leq w \cdot p \cdot w$

and $\{p \cdot s\} x \{p\}$

shows $\{p\} \text{ it } (s \cdot x) \cdot w \{p \cdot w\}$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

end

sublocale *pre-conway* < *phl: it-pre-diod* **where** *it = dagger*
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

sublocale *kleene-algebra* < *phl: it-pre-diod* **where** *it = star* $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

end

13 Propositional Hoare Logic for Demonic Refinement Algebra

In this section the generic iteration operator is instantiated to the strong iteration operator of demonic refinement algebra that models possibly infinite iteration.

theory *PHL-DRA*
imports *DRA PHL-KA*
begin

sublocale *dra* < *total-phl: it-pre-diod* **where** *it = strong-iteration*
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

end

14 Finite Suprema

theory *Finite-Suprema*
imports *Diod*
begin

This file contains an adaptation of Isabelle’s library for finite sums to the case of (join) semilattices and dioids. In this setting, addition is idempotent; finite sums are finite suprema.

We add some basic properties of finite suprema for (join) semilattices and dioids.

14.1 Auxiliary Lemmas

lemma *fun-im*: $\{f \ a \mid a. \ a \in A\} = \{b. \ b \in f \ ' \ A\}$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma *fset-to-im*: $\{f \ x \mid x. \ x \in X\} = f \ ' \ X$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma *cart-flip-aux*: $\{f \text{ (snd } p) \text{ (fst } p) \mid p. p \in (B \times A)\} = \{f \text{ (fst } p) \text{ (snd } p) \mid p. p \in (A \times B)\}$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma *cart-flip*: $(\lambda p. f \text{ (snd } p) \text{ (fst } p)) \text{ ` } (B \times A) = (\lambda p. f \text{ (fst } p) \text{ (snd } p)) \text{ ` } (A \times B)$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma *fprod-aux*: $\{x \cdot y \mid x \ y. x \in (f \text{ ` } A) \wedge y \in (g \text{ ` } B)\} = \{f \ x \cdot g \ y \mid x \ y. x \in A \wedge y \in B\}$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

14.2 Finite Suprema in Semilattices

The first lemma shows that, in the context of semilattices, finite sums satisfy the defining property of finite suprema.

lemma *sum-sup*:
assumes *finite* ($A :: 'a::\text{join-semilattice-zero set}$)
shows $\sum A \leq z \longleftrightarrow (\forall a \in A. a \leq z)$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

This immediately implies some variants.

lemma *sum-less-eqI*:
 $(\bigwedge x. x \in A \implies f \ x \leq y) \implies \text{sum } f \ A \leq (y::'a::\text{join-semilattice-zero})$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma *sum-less-eqE*:
 $\llbracket \text{sum } f \ A \leq y; x \in A; \text{finite } A \rrbracket \implies f \ x \leq (y::'a::\text{join-semilattice-zero})$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma *sum-fun-image-sup*:
fixes $f :: 'a \Rightarrow 'b::\text{join-semilattice-zero}$
assumes *finite* ($A :: 'a \text{ set}$)
shows $\sum (f \text{ ` } A) \leq z \longleftrightarrow (\forall a \in A. f \ a \leq z)$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma *sum-fun-sup*:
fixes $f :: 'a \Rightarrow 'b::\text{join-semilattice-zero}$
assumes *finite* ($A :: 'a \text{ set}$)
shows $\sum \{f \ a \mid a. a \in A\} \leq z \longleftrightarrow (\forall a \in A. f \ a \leq z)$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma *sum-intro*:
assumes *finite* ($A :: 'a::\text{join-semilattice-zero set}$) **and** *finite* B
shows $(\forall a \in A. \exists b \in B. a \leq b) \longrightarrow (\sum A \leq \sum B)$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

Next we prove an additivity property for suprema.

lemma *sum-union*:
assumes *finite* ($A :: 'a::\text{join-semilattice-zero set}$)
and *finite* ($B :: 'a::\text{join-semilattice-zero set}$)
shows $\sum (A \cup B) = \sum A + \sum B$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

It follows that the sum (supremum) of a two-element set is the join of its elements.

lemma *sum-bin[simp]*: $\sum \{(x :: 'a::\text{join-semilattice-zero}), y\} = x + y$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

Next we show that finite suprema are order preserving.

lemma *sum-iso*:
assumes *finite* ($B :: 'a::\text{join-semilattice-zero set}$)
shows $A \subseteq B \longrightarrow \sum A \leq \sum B$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

The following lemmas state unfold properties for suprema and finite sets. They are subtly different from the non-idempotent case, where additional side conditions are required.

lemma *sum-insert [simp]*:
assumes *finite* ($A :: 'a::\text{join-semilattice-zero set}$)
shows $\sum (\text{insert } x \ A) = x + \sum A$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma *sum-fun-insert*:
fixes $f :: 'a \Rightarrow 'b::\text{join-semilattice-zero}$
assumes *finite* ($A :: 'a \text{ set}$)
shows $\sum (f \ ` (\text{insert } x \ A)) = f \ x + \sum (f \ ` A)$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

Now we show that set comprehensions with nested suprema can be flattened.

lemma *flatten1-im*:
fixes $f :: 'a \Rightarrow 'a \Rightarrow 'b::\text{join-semilattice-zero}$
assumes *finite* ($A :: 'a \text{ set}$)
and *finite* ($B :: 'a \text{ set}$)
shows $\sum ((\lambda x. \sum (f \ x \ ` B)) \ ` A) = \sum ((\lambda p. f \ (\text{fst } p) \ (\text{snd } p)) \ ` (A \times B))$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma *flatten2-im*:
fixes $f :: 'a \Rightarrow 'a \Rightarrow 'b::\text{join-semilattice-zero}$
assumes *finite* ($A :: 'a \text{ set}$)
and *finite* ($B :: 'a \text{ set}$)
shows $\sum ((\lambda y. \sum ((\lambda x. f \ x \ y) \ ` A)) \ ` B) = \sum ((\lambda p. f \ (\text{fst } p) \ (\text{snd } p)) \ ` (A \times B))$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma *sum-flatten1*:

fixes $f :: 'a \Rightarrow 'a \Rightarrow 'b::\text{join-semilattice-zero}$
assumes $\text{finite } (A :: 'a \text{ set})$
and $\text{finite } (B :: 'a \text{ set})$
shows $\sum \{\sum \{f \ x \ y \mid y. y \in B\} \mid x. x \in A\} = \sum \{f \ x \ y \mid x \ y. x \in A \wedge y \in B\}$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma *sum-flatten2*:
fixes $f :: 'a \Rightarrow 'a \Rightarrow 'b::\text{join-semilattice-zero}$
assumes $\text{finite } A$
and $\text{finite } B$
shows $\sum \{\sum \{f \ x \ y \mid x. x \in A\} \mid y. y \in B\} = \sum \{f \ x \ y \mid x \ y. x \in A \wedge y \in B\}$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

Next we show another additivity property for suprema.

lemma *sum-fun-sum*:
fixes $f \ g :: 'a \Rightarrow 'b::\text{join-semilattice-zero}$
assumes $\text{finite } (A :: 'a \text{ set})$
shows $\sum ((\lambda x. f \ x + g \ x) \ 'A) = \sum (f \ 'A) + \sum (g \ 'A)$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

The last lemma of this section prepares the distributivity laws that hold for dioids. It states that a strict additive function distributes over finite suprema, which is a continuity property in the finite.

lemma *sum-fun-add*:
fixes $f :: 'a::\text{join-semilattice-zero} \Rightarrow 'b::\text{join-semilattice-zero}$
assumes $\text{finite } (X :: 'a \text{ set})$
and $fstrict: f \ 0 = 0$
and $fadd: \bigwedge x \ y. f \ (x + y) = f \ x + f \ y$
shows $f \ (\sum X) = \sum (f \ 'X)$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

14.3 Finite Suprema in Dioids

In this section we mainly prove variants of distributivity laws.

lemma *sum-distl*:
assumes $\text{finite } Y$
shows $(x :: 'a::\text{dioid-one-zero}) \cdot (\sum Y) = \sum \{x \cdot y \mid y. y \in Y\}$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma *sum-distr*:
assumes $\text{finite } X$
shows $(\sum X) \cdot (y :: 'a::\text{dioid-one-zero}) = \sum \{x \cdot y \mid x. x \in X\}$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma *sum-fun-distl*:
fixes $f :: 'a \Rightarrow 'b::\text{dioid-one-zero}$
assumes $\text{finite } (Y :: 'a \text{ set})$
shows $x \cdot \sum (f \ 'Y) = \sum \{x \cdot f \ y \mid y. y \in Y\}$

$\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma *sum-fun-distr*:

fixes $f :: 'a \Rightarrow 'b :: \text{dioid-one-zero}$

assumes $\text{finite } (X :: 'a \text{ set})$

shows $\sum (f \text{ ` } X) \cdot y = \sum \{f x \cdot y \mid x. x \in X\}$

$\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma *sum-distl-flat*:

assumes $\text{finite } (X :: 'a :: \text{dioid-one-zero set})$

and $\text{finite } Y$

shows $\sum \{x \cdot \sum Y \mid x. x \in X\} = \sum \{x \cdot y \mid x y. x \in X \wedge y \in Y\}$

$\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma *sum-distr-flat*:

assumes $\text{finite } X$

and $\text{finite } (Y :: 'a :: \text{dioid-one-zero set})$

shows $\sum \{(\sum X) \cdot y \mid y. y \in Y\} = \sum \{x \cdot y \mid x y. x \in X \wedge y \in Y\}$

$\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma *sum-sum-distl*:

assumes $\text{finite } (X :: 'a :: \text{dioid-one-zero set})$

and $\text{finite } Y$

shows $\sum ((\lambda x. x \cdot (\sum Y)) \text{ ` } X) = \sum \{x \cdot y \mid x y. x \in X \wedge y \in Y\}$

$\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma *sum-sum-distr*:

assumes $\text{finite } X$

and $\text{finite } Y$

shows $\sum ((\lambda y. (\sum X) \cdot (y :: 'a :: \text{dioid-one-zero})) \text{ ` } Y) = \sum \{x \cdot y \mid x y. x \in X \wedge y \in Y\}$

$\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma *sum-sum-distl-fun*:

fixes $f g :: 'a \Rightarrow 'b :: \text{dioid-one-zero}$

fixes $h :: 'a \Rightarrow 'a \text{ set}$

assumes $\bigwedge x. \text{finite } (h x)$

and $\text{finite } X$

shows $\sum ((\lambda x. f x \cdot \sum (g \text{ ` } h x)) \text{ ` } X) = \sum \{\sum \{f x \cdot g y \mid y. y \in h x\} \mid x. x \in X\}$

$\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma *sum-sum-distr-fun*:

fixes $f g :: 'a \Rightarrow 'b :: \text{dioid-one-zero}$

fixes $h :: 'a \Rightarrow 'a \text{ set}$

assumes $\text{finite } Y$

and $\bigwedge y. \text{finite } (h y)$

shows $\sum ((\lambda y. \sum (f \text{ ` } h y) \cdot g y) \text{ ` } Y) = \sum \{\sum \{f x \cdot g y \mid x. x \in (h y)\} \mid y. y \in Y\}$

$\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma *sum-dist*:

assumes *finite* ($A :: 'a::\text{dioid-one-zero set}$)

and *finite* B

shows $(\sum A) \cdot (\sum B) = \sum \{x \cdot y \mid x \in A \wedge y \in B\}$

$\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma *dioid-sum-prod-var*:

fixes $f\ g :: 'a \Rightarrow 'b::\text{dioid-one-zero}$

assumes *finite* ($A :: 'a \text{ set}$)

shows $(\sum (f \text{ ` } A)) \cdot (\sum (g \text{ ` } A)) = \sum \{f\ x \cdot g\ y \mid x \in A \wedge y \in A\}$

$\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma *dioid-sum-prod*:

fixes $f\ g :: 'a \Rightarrow 'b::\text{dioid-one-zero}$

assumes *finite* ($A :: 'a \text{ set}$)

shows $(\sum \{f\ x \mid x \in A\}) \cdot (\sum \{g\ x \mid x \in A\}) = \sum \{f\ x \cdot g\ y \mid x \in A \wedge y \in A\}$

$\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma *sum-image*:

fixes $f :: 'a \Rightarrow 'b::\text{join-semilattice-zero}$

assumes *finite* X

shows $\text{sum } f\ X = \sum (f \text{ ` } X)$

$\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma *sum-interval-cong*:

$\llbracket \bigwedge i. \llbracket m \leq i; i \leq n \rrbracket \implies P(i) = Q(i) \rrbracket \implies (\sum_{i=m..n} P(i)) = (\sum_{i=m..n} Q(i))$

$\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma *sum-interval-distl*:

fixes $f :: \text{nat} \Rightarrow 'a::\text{dioid-one-zero}$

assumes $m \leq n$

shows $x \cdot (\sum_{i=m..n} f(i)) = (\sum_{i=m..n} (x \cdot f(i)))$

$\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma *sum-interval-distr*:

fixes $f :: \text{nat} \Rightarrow 'a::\text{dioid-one-zero}$

assumes $m \leq n$

shows $(\sum_{i=m..n} f(i)) \cdot y = (\sum_{i=m..n} (f(i) \cdot y))$

$\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

There are interesting theorems for finite sums in Kleene algebras; we leave them for future consideration.

end

15 Formal Power Series

```
theory Formal-Power-Series
imports Finite-Suprema Kleene-Algebra
begin
```

15.1 The Type of Formal Power Series

Formal powerseries are functions from a free monoid into a dioid. They have applications in formal language theory, e.g., weighted automata. As usual, we represent elements of a free monoid by lists.

This theory generalises Amine Chaieb’s development of formal power series as functions from natural numbers, which may be found in *HOL/Library/Formal_Power_Series.thy*.

```
typedef ('a, 'b) fps = {f::'a list  $\Rightarrow$  'b. True}
morphisms fps-nth Abs-fps
 $\langle$ proof $\rangle$ 
```

It is often convenient to reason about functions, and transfer results to formal power series.

```
setup-lifting type-definition-fps
```

```
declare fps-nth-inverse [simp]
```

```
notation fps-nth (infixl <$> 75)
```

```
lemma expand-fps-eq:  $p = q \longleftrightarrow (\forall n. p \$ n = q \$ n)$ 
 $\langle$ proof $\rangle$ 
```

```
lemma fps-ext:  $(\bigwedge n. p \$ n = q \$ n) \implies p = q$ 
 $\langle$ proof $\rangle$ 
```

```
lemma fps-nth-Abs-fps [simp]:  $Abs-fps\ f\ \$\ n = f\ n$ 
 $\langle$ proof $\rangle$ 
```

15.2 Definition of the Basic Elements 0 and 1 and the Basic Operations of Addition and Multiplication

The zero formal power series maps all elements of the monoid (all lists) to zero.

```
instantiation fps :: (type,zero) zero
begin
  definition zero-fps where
     $0 = Abs-fps\ (\lambda n. 0)$ 
  instance  $\langle$ proof $\rangle$ 
end
```

lemma *fps-zero-nth* [simp]: $0 \$ n = 0$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

The unit formal power series maps the monoidal unit (the empty list) to one and all other elements to zero.

instantiation *fps* :: (type, {one, zero}) one
begin
 definition *one-fps* **where**
 $1 = \text{Abs-fps } (\lambda n. \text{ if } n = [] \text{ then } 1 \text{ else } 0)$
 instance $\langle proof \rangle$
end

lemma *fps-one-nth-Nil* [simp]: $1 \$ [] = 1$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *fps-one-nth-Cons* [simp]: $1 \$ (x \# xs) = 0$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

Addition of formal power series is the usual pointwise addition of functions.

instantiation *fps* :: (type, plus) plus
begin
 definition *plus-fps* **where**
 $f + g = \text{Abs-fps } (\lambda n. f \$ n + g \$ n)$
 instance $\langle proof \rangle$
end

lemma *fps-add-nth* [simp]: $(f + g) \$ n = f \$ n + g \$ n$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

This directly shows that formal power series form a semilattice with zero.

lemma *fps-add-assoc*: $((f :: ('a, 'b :: \text{semigroup-add}) \text{fps}) + g) + h = f + (g + h)$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *fps-add-comm* [simp]: $(f :: ('a, 'b :: \text{ab-semigroup-add}) \text{fps}) + g = g + f$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *fps-add-idem* [simp]: $(f :: ('a, 'b :: \text{join-semilattice}) \text{fps}) + f = f$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *fps-zero1* [simp]: $(f :: ('a, 'b :: \text{monoid-add}) \text{fps}) + 0 = f$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *fps-zero2* [simp]: $0 + (f :: ('a, 'b :: \text{monoid-add}) \text{fps}) = f$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

The product of formal power series is convolution. The product of two formal powerseries at a list is obtained by splitting the list into all possible prefix/suffix pairs, taking the product of the first series applied to the first

coordinate and the second series applied to the second coordinate of each pair, and then adding the results.

```
instantiation fps :: (type, {comm-monoid-add, times}) times
begin
  definition times-fps where
    f * g = Abs-fps (λn. ∑ {f $ y * g $ z | y z. n = y @ z})
  instance ⟨proof⟩
end
```

We call the set of all prefix/suffix splittings of a list *xs* the *splitset* of *xs*.

```
definition splitset where
  splitset xs ≡ {(p, q). xs = p @ q}
```

Alternatively, splitsets can be defined recursively, which yields convenient simplification rules in Isabelle.

```
fun splitset-fun where
  splitset-fun [] = {( [], [] )}
| splitset-fun (x # xs) = insert ( [], x # xs ) (apfst (Cons x) ‘ splitset-fun xs)
```

```
lemma splitset-cons!:
  splitset (x # xs) = insert ( [], x # xs ) (apfst (Cons x) ‘ splitset xs)
⟨proof⟩
```

```
lemma splitset-eq-splitset-fun: splitset xs = splitset-fun xs
⟨proof⟩
```

The definition of multiplication is now more precise.

```
lemma fps-mult-var:
  (f * g) $ n = ∑ {f $ (fst p) * g $ (snd p) | p. p ∈ splitset n}
⟨proof⟩
```

```
lemma fps-mult-image:
  (f * g) $ n = ∑ ((λp. f $ (fst p) * g $ (snd p)) ‘ splitset n)
⟨proof⟩
```

Next we show that splitsets are finite and non-empty.

```
lemma splitset-fun-finite [simp]: finite (splitset-fun xs)
⟨proof⟩
```

```
lemma splitset-finite [simp]: finite (splitset xs)
⟨proof⟩
```

```
lemma split-append-finite [simp]: finite {(p, q). xs = p @ q}
⟨proof⟩
```

```
lemma splitset-fun-nonempty [simp]: splitset-fun xs ≠ {}
⟨proof⟩
```

lemma *splitset-nonempty* [simp]: *splitset xs* $\neq \{\}$
 <proof>

We now proceed with proving algebraic properties of formal power series.

lemma *fps-annil* [simp]:
 $0 * (f :: ('a :: type, 'b :: \{comm-monoid-add, mult-zero\}) \text{fps}) = 0$
 <proof>

lemma *fps-annir* [simp]:
 $(f :: ('a :: type, 'b :: \{comm-monoid-add, mult-zero\}) \text{fps}) * 0 = 0$
 <proof>

lemma *fps-distl*:
 $(f :: ('a :: type, 'b :: \{join-semilattice-zero, semiring\}) \text{fps}) * (g + h) = (f * g) + (f * h)$
 <proof>

lemma *fps-distr*:
 $((f :: ('a :: type, 'b :: \{join-semilattice-zero, semiring\}) \text{fps}) + g) * h = (f * h) + (g * h)$
 <proof>

The multiplicative unit laws are surprisingly tedious. For the proof of the left unit law we use the recursive definition, which we could as well have based on splitlists instead of splitsets.

However, a right unit law cannot simply be obtained along the lines of this proofs. The reason is that an alternative recursive definition that produces a unit with coordinates flipped would be needed. But this is difficult to obtain without snoc lists. We therefore prove the right unit law more directly by using properties of suprema.

lemma *fps-onel* [simp]:
 $1 * (f :: ('a :: type, 'b :: \{join-semilattice-zero, monoid-mult, mult-zero\}) \text{fps}) = f$
 <proof>

lemma *fps-oner* [simp]:
 $(f :: ('a :: type, 'b :: \{join-semilattice-zero, monoid-mult, mult-zero\}) \text{fps}) * 1 = f$
 <proof>

Finally we prove associativity of convolution. This requires splitting lists into three parts and rearranging these parts in two different ways into splitsets. This rearrangement is captured by the following technical lemma.

lemma *splitset-rearrange*:
fixes $F :: 'a \text{ list} \Rightarrow 'a \text{ list} \Rightarrow 'a \text{ list} \Rightarrow 'b :: \text{join-semilattice-zero}$
shows $\sum \{ \sum \{ F (fst p) (fst q) (snd q) \mid q. q \in \text{splitset } (snd p) \} \mid p. p \in \text{splitset } x \} =$
 $\sum \{ \sum \{ F (fst q) (snd q) (snd p) \mid q. q \in \text{splitset } (fst p) \} \mid p. p \in \text{splitset } x \}$
(is ?lhs = ?rhs)

$\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *fps-mult-assoc*: $(f :: ('a :: type, 'b :: dioid-one-zero) \text{fps}) * (g * h) = (f * g) * h$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

15.3 The Dioid Model of Formal Power Series

We can now show that formal power series with suitably defined operations form a dioid. Many of the underlying properties already hold in weaker settings, where the target algebra is a semilattice or semiring. We currently ignore this fact.

subclass (in *dioid-one-zero*) *mult-zero*
 $\langle proof \rangle$

instantiation *fps* :: (*type*, *dioid-one-zero*) *dioid-one-zero*
begin

definition *less-eq-fps* **where**
 $(f :: ('a, 'b) \text{fps}) \leq g \iff f + g = g$

definition *less-fps* **where**
 $(f :: ('a, 'b) \text{fps}) < g \iff f \leq g \wedge f \neq g$

instance
 $\langle proof \rangle$

end

lemma *expand-fps-less-eq*: $(f :: ('a, 'b :: dioid-one-zero) \text{fps}) \leq g \iff (\forall n. f \$ n \leq g \$ n)$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

15.4 The Kleene Algebra Model of Formal Power Series

There are two approaches to define the Kleene star. The first one defines the star for a certain kind of (so-called proper) formal power series into a semiring or dioid. The second one, which is more interesting in the context of our algebraic hierarchy, shows that formal power series into a Kleene algebra form a Kleene algebra. We have only formalised the latter approach.

lemma *Sum-splitlist-nonempty*:
 $\sum \{f \text{ } ys \text{ } zs \mid ys \text{ } zs. xs = ys @ zs\} = ((f [] xs) :: 'a :: join-semilattice-zero) + \sum \{f \text{ } ys \text{ } zs \mid ys \text{ } zs. xs = ys @ zs \wedge ys \neq []\}$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma (in *left-kleene-algebra*) *add-star-eq*:
 $x + y \cdot y^* \cdot x = y^* \cdot x$
 $\langle proof \rangle$


```

declare rev-conj-cong[fundef-cong]
  — required for the function package to prove termination of star-fps-rep

fun star-fps-rep where
  star-fps-rep-Nil: star-fps-rep f [] = (f [])*
  | star-fps-rep-Cons: star-fps-rep f n = (f [])* ·  $\sum \{f\ y \cdot \textit{star-fps-rep}\ f\ z \mid y\ z. n = y$ 
  @ z ∧ y ≠ []}

instantiation fps :: (type, kleene-algebra) kleene-algebra
begin

We first define the star on functions, where we can use Isabelle’s package for
recursive functions, before lifting the definition to the type of formal power
series.

This definition of the star is from an unpublished manuscript by Esik and
Kuich.

lift-definition star-fps :: ('a, 'b) fps ⇒ ('a, 'b) fps is star-fps-rep <proof>

lemma star-fps-Nil [simp]:  $f^* \$ [] = (f \$ [])^*$ 
  <proof>

lemma star-fps-Cons [simp]:  $f^* \$ (x \# xs) = (f \$ [])^* \cdot \sum \{f \$ y \cdot f^* \$ z \mid y\ z. x \# xs = y @ z \wedge y \neq []\}$ 
  <proof>

instance
  <proof>

end

end

```

16 Infinite Matrices

```

theory Inf-Matrix
imports Finite-Suprema
begin

```

Matrices are functions from two index sets into some suitable algebra. We consider arbitrary index sets, not necessarily the positive natural numbers up to some bounds; our coefficient algebra is a dioid. Our only restriction is that summation in the product of matrices is over a finite index set. This follows essentially Droste and Kuich’s introductory article in the Handbook of Weighted Automata [10].

Under these assumptions we show that dioids are closed under matrix formation. Our proofs are similar to those for formal power series, but simpler.

type-synonym ('a, 'b, 'c) *matrix* = 'a \Rightarrow 'b \Rightarrow 'c

definition *mat-one* :: ('a, 'a, 'c::*diod-one-zero*) *matrix* ($\langle \varepsilon \rangle$) **where**
 $\varepsilon \ i \ j \equiv (\text{if } (i = j) \text{ then } 1 \text{ else } 0)$

definition *mat-zero* :: ('a, 'b, 'c::*diod-one-zero*) *matrix* ($\langle \delta \rangle$) **where**
 $\delta \equiv \lambda j \ i. \ 0$

definition *mat-add* :: ('a, 'b, 'c::*diod-one-zero*) *matrix* \Rightarrow ('a, 'b, 'c) *matrix* \Rightarrow
('a, 'b, 'c) *matrix* (**infixl** $\langle \oplus \rangle$ 70) **where**
 $(f \oplus g) \equiv \lambda i \ j. (f \ i \ j) + (g \ i \ j)$

lemma *mat-add-assoc*: $(f \oplus g) \oplus h = f \oplus (g \oplus h)$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma *mat-add-comm*: $f \oplus g = g \oplus f$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma *mat-add-idem[simp]*: $f \oplus f = f$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma *mat-zero1[simp]*: $f \oplus \delta = f$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma *mat-zero2[simp]*: $\delta \oplus f = f$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

definition *mat-mult* :: ('a, 'k::*finite*, 'c::*diod-one-zero*) *matrix* \Rightarrow ('k, 'b, 'c) *matrix*
 \Rightarrow ('a, 'b, 'c) *matrix* (**infixl** $\langle \otimes \rangle$ 60) **where**
 $(f \otimes g) \ i \ j \equiv \sum \{(f \ i \ k) \cdot (g \ k \ j) \mid k. k \in UNIV\}$

lemma *mat-ann1[simp]*: $\delta \otimes f = \delta$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma *mat-ann2[simp]*: $f \otimes \delta = \delta$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma *mat-dist1*: $f \otimes (g \oplus h) = (f \otimes g) \oplus (f \otimes h)$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma *mat-dist2*: $(f \oplus g) \otimes h = (f \otimes h) \oplus (g \otimes h)$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma *logic-aux1*: $(\exists k. (i = k \longrightarrow x = f \ i \ j) \wedge (i \neq k \longrightarrow x = 0)) \longleftrightarrow (\exists k. i = k \wedge x = f \ i \ j) \vee (\exists k. i \neq k \wedge x = 0)$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma *logic-aux2*: $(\exists k. (k = j \longrightarrow x = f \ i \ j) \wedge (k \neq j \longrightarrow x = 0)) \longleftrightarrow (\exists k. k = j \wedge x = f \ i \ j) \vee (\exists k. k \neq j \wedge x = 0)$

$\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma *mat-one1*[simp]: $\varepsilon \otimes f = f$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma *mat-one2*[simp]: $f \otimes \varepsilon = f$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma *mat-rearrange*:

fixes $F :: 'a \Rightarrow 'k1 \Rightarrow 'k2 \Rightarrow 'b \Rightarrow 'c :: \text{dioid-one-zero}$
assumes $fUNk1: \text{finite } (UNIV :: 'k1 \text{ set})$
assumes $fUNk2: \text{finite } (UNIV :: 'k2 \text{ set})$
shows $\sum \{ \sum \{ F \ i \ k1 \ k2 \ j \mid k2. k2 \in (UNIV :: 'k2 \text{ set}) \} \mid k1. k1 \in (UNIV :: 'k1 \text{ set}) \}$
 $= \sum \{ \sum \{ F \ i \ k1 \ k2 \ j \mid k1. k1 \in UNIV \} \mid k2. k2 \in UNIV \}$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma *mat-mult-assoc*: $f \otimes (g \otimes h) = (f \otimes g) \otimes h$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

definition *mat-less-eq* :: $('a, 'b, 'c :: \text{dioid-one-zero}) \text{ matrix} \Rightarrow ('a, 'b, 'c) \text{ matrix} \Rightarrow \text{bool}$ **where**
 $\text{mat-less-eq } f \ g = (f \oplus g = g)$

definition *mat-less* :: $('a, 'b, 'c :: \text{dioid-one-zero}) \text{ matrix} \Rightarrow ('a, 'b, 'c) \text{ matrix} \Rightarrow \text{bool}$ **where**
 $\text{mat-less } f \ g = (\text{mat-less-eq } f \ g \wedge f \neq g)$

interpretation *matrix-dioid*: *dioid-one-zero mat-add mat-mult mat-one mat-zero*
mat-less-eq mat-less
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

As in the case of formal power series we currently do not implement the Kleene star of matrices, since this is complicated.

end

References

- [1] A. Armstrong, S. Foster, W. Guttman, G. Struth, and T. Weber. Relation algebra. *Archive of Formal Proofs*, 2014.
- [2] A. Armstrong, V. B. F. Gomes, and G. Struth. Kleene algebra with tests. *Archive of Formal Proofs*, 2014.
- [3] A. Armstrong and G. Struth. Automated reasoning in higher-order regular algebra. In W. Kahl and T. G. Griffin, editors, *RAMICS 2012*, volume 7560 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 66–81. Springer, 2012.

- [4] L. Bachmair and N. Dershowitz. Commutation, transformation, and termination. In J. H. Siekmann, editor, *Conference on Automated Deduction*, volume 230 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 5–20. Springer, 1986.
- [5] G. Birkhoff. *Lattice Theory*. American Mathematical Society Colloquium Publications, 1967.
- [6] M. Boffa. Une remarque sur les systèmes complets d’identités rationnelles. *Informatique Théorique et Applications*, 24(4):419–423, 1990.
- [7] E. Cohen. Separation and reduction. In R. C. Backhouse and J. N. Oliveira, editors, *MPC*, volume 1837 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 45–59. Springer, 2000.
- [8] J. H. Conway. *Regular Algebra and Finite Machines*. Chapman and Hall, 1971.
- [9] J. Desharnais, B. Möller, and G. Struth. Kleene algebra with domain. *ACM Trans. Comput. Log.*, 7(4):798–833, 2006.
- [10] M. Droste, W. Kuich, and H. Vogler, editors. *Handbook of Weighted Automata*. Springer, 2009.
- [11] S. Foster and G. Struth. Automated analysis of regular algebra. In B. Gramlich, D. Miller, and U. Sattler, editors, *IJCAR 2012*, volume 7364 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 271–285. Springer, 2012.
- [12] S. Foster and G. Struth. Regular algebras. *Archive of Formal Proofs*, 2014.
- [13] S. Foster, G. Struth, and T. Weber. Automated engineering of relational and algebraic methods in Isabelle/HOL – (invited tutorial). In H. C. M. de Swart, editor, *RAMICS*, volume 6663 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 52–67. Springer, 2011.
- [14] V. B. F. Gomes, W. Guttman, P. Höfner, G. Struth, and T. Weber. Kleene algebra with domain. *Archive of Formal Proofs*, 2016.
- [15] M. Gondran and M. Minoux. *Graphs, Dioids and Semirings: New Models and Algorithms*, volume 41 of *Operations Research/Computer Science Interfaces*. Springer, 2010.
- [16] W. Guttman, G. Struth, and T. Weber. Automating algebraic methods in Isabelle. In S. Qin and Z. Qiu, editors, *ICFEM 2011*, volume 6991 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 617–632. Springer, 2011.

- [17] W. Guttman, G. Struth, and T. Weber. A repository for Tarski-Kleene algebras. In P. Höfner, A. McIver, and G. Struth, editors, *ATE 2011*, volume 760 of *CEUR Workshop Proceedings*, pages 30–39. CEUR-WS.org, 2011.
- [18] D. Haren, D. Kozen, and J. Tiuryn. *Dynamic Logic*. MIT Press, 2000.
- [19] P. Höfner and G. Struth. Algebraic notions of nontermination: Omega and divergence in idempotent semirings. *J. Log. Algebr. Program.*, 79(8):794–811, 2010.
- [20] D. Kozen. On Kleene algebras and closed semirings. In B. Rovan, editor, *Mathematical Foundations of Computer Science*, volume 452 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 26–47. Springer, 1990.
- [21] D. Kozen. A completeness theorem for Kleene algebras and the algebra of regular events. *Inf. Comput.*, 110(2):366–390, 1994.
- [22] D. Kozen. On Hoare logic and Kleene algebra with tests. *ACM Trans. Comput. Log.*, 1(1):60–76, 2000.
- [23] A. Krauss and T. Nipkow. Proof pearl: Regular expression equivalence and relation algebra. *J. Autom. Reasoning*, 49(1):95–106, 2012.
- [24] A. McIver and T. Weber. Towards automated proof support for probabilistic distributed systems. In G. Sutcliffe and A. Voronkov, editors, *LPAR*, volume 3835 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 534–548, 2005.
- [25] G. Pilz. *Near-rings*. North-Holland, Amsterdam, second edition, 1983.
- [26] K. Solin. Normal forms in total correctness for while programs and action systems. *J. Logic and Algebraic Programming*, 80(6):362–375, 2011.
- [27] G. Struth. Abstract abstract reduction. *J. Log. Algebr. Program.*, 66(2):239–270, 2006.
- [28] G. Struth. Left omega algebras and regular equations. *J. Log. Algebr. Program.*, 81(6):705–717, 2012.
- [29] Y. Venema. Representation of game algebras. *Studia Logica*, 75(2):239–256, 2003.
- [30] J. von Wright. From Kleene algebra to refinement algebra. In E. A. Boiten and B. Möller, editors, *MPC*, volume 2386 of *LNCS*, pages 233–262. Springer, 2002.

- [31] J. von Wright. Towards a refinement algebra. *Science of Computer Programming*, 51(1–2):23–45, 2004.
- [32] K. W. Wagner. Eine topologische Charakterisierung einiger Klassen regulärer Folgenmengen. *Elektronische Informationsverarbeitung und Kybernetik*, 13(9):473–487, 1977.