

# Stochastic Matrices and the Perron–Frobenius Theorem\*

René Thiemann

December 14, 2021

## Abstract

Stochastic matrices are a convenient way to model discrete-time and finite state Markov chains. The Perron–Frobenius theorem tells us something about the existence and uniqueness of non-negative eigenvectors of a stochastic matrix.

In this entry, we formalize stochastic matrices, link the formalization to the existing AFP-entry on Markov chains, and apply the Perron–Frobenius theorem to prove that stationary distributions always exist, and they are unique if the stochastic matrix is irreducible.

## Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>Stochastic Matrices</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>3</b>	<b>Stochastic Vectors and Probability Mass Functions</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>4</b>	<b>Stochastic Matrices and Markov Models</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>5</b>	<b>Eigenspaces</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>6</b>	<b>Stochastic Matrices and the Perron–Frobenius Theorem</b>	<b>11</b>

## 1 Introduction

In their AFP entry Markov Models [2], Hölzl and Nipkow provide a framework for specifying discrete- and continuous-time Markov chains.

In the following, we instantiate their framework by formalizing right-stochastic matrices and stochastic vectors. These vectors encode probability

---

\*Supported by FWF (Austrian Science Fund) project Y757.

mass functions over a finite set of states, whereas stochastic matrices can be utilized to model discrete-time and finite space Markov chains.

The formulation of Markov chains as matrices has the advantage that certain concepts can easily be expressed via matrices. For instance, a stationary distribution is nothing else than a non-negative real eigenvector of the transition matrix for eigenvalue 1. As a consequence, we can derive certain properties on Markov chains using results on matrices. To be more precise, we utilize the formalization of the Perron–Frobenius theorem [1] to prove that a stationary distribution always exists, and that it is unique if the transition matrix is irreducible.

## 2 Stochastic Matrices

We define a type for stochastic vectors and right-stochastic matrices, i.e., non-negative real vectors and matrices where the sum of each column is 1. For this type we define a matrix-vector multiplication, i.e., we show that  $A*v$  is a stochastic vector, if  $A$  is a right-stochastic matrix and  $v$  a stochastic vector.

**theory** *Stochastic-Matrix*

**imports** *Perron-Frobenius.Perron-Frobenius-Aux*

**begin**

**definition** *non-neg-vec* :: 'a :: linordered-idom ^ 'n ⇒ bool **where**  
*non-neg-vec* A ≡ (∀ i. A \$ i ≥ 0)

**definition** *stoch-vec* :: 'a :: comm-ring-1 ^ 'n ⇒ bool **where**  
*stoch-vec* v = (sum (λ i. v \$ i) UNIV = 1)

**definition** *right-stoch-mat* :: 'a :: comm-ring-1 ^ 'n ^ 'm ⇒ bool **where**  
*right-stoch-mat* a = (∀ j. *stoch-vec* (column j a))

**typedef** 'i st-mat = { a :: real ^ 'i ^ 'i. *non-neg-mat* a ∧ *right-stoch-mat* a }  
**morphisms** *st-mat* *Abs-st-mat*  
**by** (rule exI[of - χ i j. if i = undefined then 1 else 0],  
auto simp: *non-neg-mat-def* *elements-mat-h-def* *right-stoch-mat-def* *stoch-vec-def* *column-def*)

**setup-lifting** *type-definition-st-mat*

**typedef** 'i st-vec = { v :: real ^ 'i. *non-neg-vec* v ∧ *stoch-vec* v }  
**morphisms** *st-vec* *Abs-st-vec*  
**by** (rule exI[of - χ i. if i = undefined then 1 else 0],  
auto simp: *non-neg-vec-def* *stoch-vec-def*)

**setup-lifting** *type-definition-st-vec*

**lift-definition** *transition-vec-of-st-mat* :: 'i :: finite st-mat ⇒ 'i ⇒ 'i st-vec

**is**  $\lambda a i. \text{column } i a$   
**by** (*auto simp: right-stoch-mat-def non-neg-mat-def stoch-vec-def elements-mat-h-def non-neg-vec-def column-def*)

**lemma** *non-neg-vec-st-vec: non-neg-vec (st-vec v)*  
**by** (*transfer, auto*)

**lemma** *non-neg-mat-mult-non-neg-vec: non-neg-mat a  $\implies$  non-neg-vec v  $\implies$  non-neg-vec (a \* v v)*  
**unfolding** *non-neg-mat-def non-neg-vec-def elements-mat-h-def*  
**by** (*auto simp: matrix-vector-mult-def intro!: sum-nonneg*)

**lemma** *right-stoch-mat-mult-stoch-vec: assumes right-stoch-mat a and stoch-vec v*  
**shows** *stoch-vec (a \* v v)*  
**proof** –  
**note**  $*$  = *assms[unfolded right-stoch-mat-def column-def stoch-vec-def, simplified]*  
**have** *stoch-vec (a \* v v) = (( $\sum_{i \in UNIV}. \sum_{j \in UNIV}. a \ \$ \ i \ \$ \ j * v \ \$ \ j$ ) = 1)*  
*(is - = (?sum = 1))*  
**unfolding** *stoch-vec-def matrix-vector-mult-def by auto*  
**also have**  $?sum = (\sum_{j \in UNIV}. \sum_{i \in UNIV}. a \ \$ \ i \ \$ \ j * v \ \$ \ j)$   
**by** (*rule sum.swap*)  
**also have**  $\dots = (\sum_{j \in UNIV}. v \ \$ \ j)$   
**by** (*rule sum.cong[OF refl], insert \*, auto simp: sum-distrib-right[symmetric]*)  
**also have**  $\dots = 1$  **using**  $*$  **by** *auto*  
**finally show** *?thesis by simp*  
**qed**

**lift-definition** *st-mat-times-st-vec :: 'i :: finite st-mat  $\Rightarrow$  'i st-vec  $\Rightarrow$  'i st-vec*  
*(infixl \*st 70) is (\*v)*  
**using** *right-stoch-mat-mult-stoch-vec non-neg-mat-mult-non-neg-vec by auto*

**lift-definition** *to-st-vec :: real  $\wedge$  'i  $\Rightarrow$  'i st-vec is*  
 $\lambda x. \text{if stoch-vec } x \wedge \text{non-neg-vec } x \text{ then } x \text{ else } (\chi \ i. \text{if } i = \text{undefined then } 1 \text{ else } 0)$   
**by** (*auto simp: non-neg-vec-def stoch-vec-def*)

**lemma** *right-stoch-mat-st-mat: right-stoch-mat (st-mat A)*  
**by** *transfer auto*

**lemma** *non-neg-mat-st-mat: non-neg-mat (st-mat A)*  
**by** (*transfer, auto simp: non-neg-mat-def elements-mat-h-def*)

**lemma** *st-mat-mult-st-vec: st-mat A \*v st-vec X = st-vec (A \*st X) by (transfer, auto)*

**lemma** *st-vec-nonneg[simp]: st-vec x  $\ \$ \ i \geq 0$*   
**using** *non-neg-vec-st-vec[of x] by (auto simp: non-neg-vec-def)*

```

lemma st-mat-nonneg[simp]: st-mat  $x$   $\$ i$   $\$ h$   $j \geq 0$ 
  using non-neg-mat-st-mat[of  $x$ ] by (auto simp: non-neg-mat-def elements-mat-h-def)

end

```

### 3 Stochastic Vectors and Probability Mass Functions

We prove that over a finite type, stochastic vectors and probability mass functions are essentially the same thing: one can convert between both representations.

```

theory Stochastic-Vector-PMF
  imports Stochastic-Matrix
  HOL-Probability.Probability-Mass-Function
begin

```

```

lemma sigma-algebra-UNIV-finite[simp]: sigma-algebra (UNIV :: 'a :: finite set)
  UNIV
proof (unfold-locales, goal-cases)
  case ( $\lambda a$   $b$ )
  show ?case by (intro exI[of - { $a-b$ }], auto)
qed auto

```

```

definition measure-of-st-vec' :: 'a st-vec  $\Rightarrow$  'a :: finite set  $\Rightarrow$  ennreal where
  measure-of-st-vec'  $x$   $I = \text{sum } (\lambda i. \text{st-vec } x \ \$ i) I$ 

```

```

lemma positive-measure-of-st-vec'[simp]: positive  $A$  (measure-of-st-vec'  $x$ )
  unfolding measure-of-st-vec'-def positive-def by auto

```

```

lemma measure-space-measure-of-st-vec': measure-space UNIV UNIV (measure-of-st-vec'
 $x$ )

```

```

  unfolding measure-space-def
proof (simp, simp add: countably-additive-def measure-of-st-vec'-def disjoint-family-on-def,
clarify, goal-cases)
  case ( $1 A$ )
  let ? $x = \text{st-vec } x$ 
  define  $N$  where  $N = \{i. A \ i \neq \{\}\}$ 
  let ? $A = \bigcup (A \ ' N)$ 
  have finite  $B \Longrightarrow B \subseteq ?A \Longrightarrow \exists K. \text{finite } K \wedge K \subseteq N \wedge B \subseteq \bigcup (A \ ' K)$  for  $B$ 
proof (induct rule: finite-induct)
  case (insert  $b B$ )
  from insert( $3-4$ ) obtain  $K$  where  $K: \text{finite } K \ K \subseteq N \ B \subseteq \bigcup (A \ ' K)$  by
auto
  from insert( $4$ ) obtain  $a$  where  $a \in N \ b \in A \ a$  by auto
  show ?case by (intro exI[of - insert  $a K$ ], insert  $a K$ , auto)
qed auto
from this[OF - subset-refl] obtain  $K$  where *: finite  $K \ K \subseteq N \ \bigcup (A \ ' K) = ?A$ 

```

```

by auto
{
  assume  $K \subset N$ 
  then obtain  $n$  where **:  $n \in N$   $n \notin K$  by auto
  from this[unfolded  $N$ -def] obtain  $a$  where  $a: a \in A$   $n$  by auto
  with ** * obtain  $k$  where ***:  $k \in K$   $a \in A$   $k$  by force
  from ** *** have  $n \neq k$  by auto
  from 1[rule-format, OF this] have  $A \cap n \cap A \cap k = \{\}$  by auto
  with ***  $a$  have False by auto
}
with * have  $fin$ : finite  $N$  by auto
have  $id$ :  $\bigcup (A \text{ ' } UNIV) = ?A$  unfolding  $N$ -def by auto
show  $(\sum i. \text{ennreal } (sum ((\$h) ?x) (A \ i))) =$ 
   $\text{ennreal } (sum ((\$h) ?x) (\bigcup (A \text{ ' } UNIV)))$  unfolding  $id$ 
  apply (subst  $suminf$ -finite[OF  $fin$ ], (auto simp:  $N$ -def)[1])
  apply (subst  $sum$ -ennreal, (insert non-neg-vec-st-vec[of  $x$ ], auto simp: non-neg-vec-def
intro!:  $sum$ -nonneg)[1])
  apply (rule  $arg$ -cong[of - - ennreal])
  apply (subst  $sum$ .UNION-disjoint[OF  $fin$ ], insert 1, auto)
done
qed

```

context begin  
setup-lifting type-definition-measure

lift-definition  $measure$ -of-st-vec :: ' $a$  st-vec  $\Rightarrow$  ' $a$  :: finite measure is  
 $\lambda x. (UNIV, UNIV, measure$ -of-st-vec'  $x)$   
by (auto simp:  $measure$ -space- $measure$ -of-st-vec')

lemma  $sets$ - $measure$ -of-st-vec[simp]:  $sets (measure$ -of-st-vec  $x) = UNIV$   
unfolding  $sets$ -def by (transfer, auto)

lemma  $space$ - $measure$ -of-st-vec[simp]:  $space (measure$ -of-st-vec  $x) = UNIV$   
unfolding  $space$ -def by (transfer, auto)

lemma  $emeasure$ - $measure$ -of-st-vec[simp]:  $emeasure (measure$ -of-st-vec  $x) I =$   
 $sum (\lambda i. \text{st-vec } x \ \$ i) I$   
unfolding  $emeasure$ -def by (transfer', auto simp:  $measure$ -of-st-vec'-def)

lemma  $prob$ - $space$ - $measure$ -of-st-vec:  $prob$ -space ( $measure$ -of-st-vec  $x$ )  
by (unfold-locale, intro  $exI$ [of -  $UNIV$ ], auto, transfer, auto simp:  $stoch$ -vec-def)  
end

lift-definition  $st$ -vec-of-pmf :: ' $i$  :: finite pmf  $\Rightarrow$  ' $i$  st-vec is  
 $\lambda pmf. \text{vec-lambda } (pmf \ pmf)$   
proof (intro conjI, goal-cases)  
case (2  $pmf$ )  
show  $stoch$ -vec ( $vec$ -lambda ( $pmf \ pmf$ ))  
unfolding  $stoch$ -vec-def

```

    apply auto
    apply (unfold measure-pmf-UNIV[of pmF, symmetric])
    by (simp add: measure-pmf-conv-infsetsum)
qed (auto simp: non-neg-vec-def stoch-vec-def)

context pmf-as-measure
begin
lift-definition pmf-of-st-vec :: 'a :: finite st-vec  $\Rightarrow$  'a pmf is measure-of-st-vec
proof (goal-cases)
  case (1 x)
  show ?case
    by (auto simp: prob-space-measure-of-st-vec measure-def)
      (rule AE-I[where N = {i. st-vec x $ i = 0}], auto)
qed

lemma st-vec-st-vec-of-pmf[simp]:
  st-vec (st-vec-of-pmf x) $ i = pmf x i
  by (simp add: st-vec-of-pmf.rep-eq)

lemma pmf-pmf-of-st-vec[simp]: pmf (pmf-of-st-vec x) i = st-vec x $ i
  by (transfer, auto simp: measure-def)

lemma st-vec-of-pmf-pmf-of-st-vec[simp]: st-vec-of-pmf (pmf-of-st-vec x) = x
proof -
  have st-vec (st-vec-of-pmf (pmf-of-st-vec x)) = st-vec x
    unfolding vec-eq-iff by auto
  thus ?thesis using st-vec-inject by blast
qed

lemma pmf-of-st-vec-inj: (pmf-of-st-vec x = pmf-of-st-vec y) = (x = y)
  by (metis st-vec-of-pmf-pmf-of-st-vec)
end
end

```

## 4 Stochastic Matrices and Markov Models

We interpret stochastic matrices as Markov chain with discrete time and finite state and prove that the bind-operation on probability mass functions is precisely matrix-vector multiplication. As a consequence, the notion of stationary distribution is equivalent to being an eigenvector with eigenvalue 1.

**theory** *Stochastic-Matrix-Markov-Models*

**imports**

*Markov-Models.Classifying-Markov-Chain-States*

*Stochastic-Vector-PMF*

**begin**

**definition** *transition-of-st-mat* :: 'i st-mat  $\Rightarrow$  'i :: finite  $\Rightarrow$  'i pmf **where**

$transition\text{-of}\text{-st}\text{-mat } a \ i = pmf\text{-as}\text{-measure}.pmf\text{-of}\text{-st}\text{-vec } (transition\text{-vec}\text{-of}\text{-st}\text{-mat } a \ i)$

**lemma**  $st\text{-vec}\text{-transition}\text{-vec}\text{-of}\text{-st}\text{-mat}[simp]$ :  
 $st\text{-vec } (transition\text{-vec}\text{-of}\text{-st}\text{-mat } A \ a) \ \$ \ i = st\text{-mat } A \ \$ \ i \ \$ \ a$   
**by** ( $transfer$ ,  $auto$   $simp$ :  $column\text{-def}$ )

**locale**  $transition\text{-matrix} = pmf\text{-as}\text{-measure} +$   
**fixes**  $A :: 'i :: finite\ st\text{-mat}$   
**begin**  
**sublocale**  $MC\text{-syntax } transition\text{-of}\text{-st}\text{-mat } A .$

**lemma**  $measure\text{-pmf}\text{-of}\text{-st}\text{-vec}[simp]$ :  $measure\text{-pmf } (pmf\text{-of}\text{-st}\text{-vec } x) = measure\text{-of}\text{-st}\text{-vec } x$   
**by** ( $rule\ pmf\text{-as}\text{-measure}.pmf\text{-of}\text{-st}\text{-vec}.rep\text{-eq}$ )

**lemma**  $pmf\text{-transition}\text{-of}\text{-st}\text{-mat}[simp]$ :  $pmf } (transition\text{-of}\text{-st}\text{-mat } A \ a) \ i = st\text{-mat } A \ \$ \ i \ \$ \ a$   
**unfolding**  $transition\text{-of}\text{-st}\text{-mat}\text{-def}$   
**by** ( $transfer$ ,  $auto$   $simp$ :  $measure\text{-def}$ )

**lemma**  $bind\text{-is}\text{-matrix}\text{-vector}\text{-mult}$ :  $(bind\text{-pmf } x \ (transition\text{-of}\text{-st}\text{-mat } A)) = pmf\text{-as}\text{-measure}.pmf\text{-of}\text{-st}\text{-vec } (A \ *st \ st\text{-vec}\text{-of}\text{-pmf } x)$   
**proof** ( $rule\ pmf\text{-eqI}$ ,  $goal\text{-cases}$ )  
**case** ( $1 \ i$ )  
**define**  $X$  **where**  $X = st\text{-vec}\text{-of}\text{-pmf } x$   
**have**  $pmf } (bind\text{-pmf } x \ (transition\text{-of}\text{-st}\text{-mat } A)) \ i =$   
 $(\sum a \in UNIV. pmf \ x \ a \ *_R \ pmf } (transition\text{-of}\text{-st}\text{-mat } A \ a) \ i)$   
**unfolding**  $pmf\text{-bind}$  **by** ( $subst\ integral\text{-measure}\text{-pmf}[of \ UNIV]$ ,  $auto$ )  
**also have**  $\dots = (\sum a \in UNIV. st\text{-mat } A \ \$ \ i \ \$ \ a \ * \ st\text{-vec } X \ \$ \ a)$   
**by** ( $rule\ sum.cong[OF \ refl]$ ,  $auto$   $simp$ :  $X\text{-def}$ )  
**also have**  $\dots = (st\text{-mat } A \ *_v \ st\text{-vec } X) \ \$ \ i$   
**unfolding**  $matrix\text{-vector}\text{-mult}\text{-def}$  **by**  $auto$   
**also have**  $\dots = st\text{-vec } (A \ *st \ X) \ \$ \ i$  **unfolding**  $st\text{-mat}\text{-mult}\text{-st}\text{-vec}$  **by**  $simp$   
**also have**  $\dots = pmf } (pmf\text{-of}\text{-st}\text{-vec } (A \ *st \ X)) \ i$  **by**  $simp$   
**finally show**  $?case$  **by** ( $simp\ add$ :  $X\text{-def}$ )  
**qed**

**lemmas**  $stationary\text{-distribution}\text{-alt}\text{-def} =$   
 $stationary\text{-distribution}\text{-def}[unfolded \ bind\text{-is}\text{-matrix}\text{-vector}\text{-mult}]$

**lemma**  $stationary\text{-distribution}\text{-implies}\text{-pmf}\text{-of}\text{-st}\text{-vec}$ :  
**assumes**  $stationary\text{-distribution } N$   
**shows**  $\exists \ x. N = pmf\text{-of}\text{-st}\text{-vec } x$   
**proof** –  
**from**  $assms[unfolded \ stationary\text{-distribution}\text{-alt}\text{-def}]$  **show**  $?thesis$  **by**  $auto$   
**qed**

**lemma**  $stationary\text{-distribution}\text{-pmf}\text{-of}\text{-st}\text{-vec}$ :

```

    stationary-distribution (pmf-of-st-vec x) = (A *st x = x)
  unfolding stationary-distribution-alt-def pmf-of-st-vec-inj by auto
end
end

```

## 5 Eigenspaces

Using results on Jordan-Normal forms, we prove that the geometric multiplicity of an eigenvalue (i.e., the dimension of the eigenspace) is bounded by the algebraic multiplicity of an eigenvalue (i.e., the multiplicity as root of the characteristic polynomial). As a consequence we derive that any two eigenvectors of some eigenvalue with multiplicity 1 must be scalar multiples of each other.

```

theory Eigenspace
imports
  Jordan-Normal-Form.Jordan-Normal-Form-Uniqueness
  Perron-Frobenius.Perron-Frobenius-Aux
begin
hide-const (open) Coset.order

```

The dimension of every generalized eigenspace is bounded by the algebraic multiplicity of an eigenvalue. Hence, in particular the geometric multiplicity is smaller than the algebraic multiplicity.

```

lemma dim-gen-eigenspace-order-char-poly: assumes jnf: jordan-nf A n-as
  shows dim-gen-eigenspace A lam k ≤ order lam (char-poly A)
  unfolding jordan-nf-order[OF jnf] dim-gen-eigenspace[OF jnf]
  by (induct n-as, auto)

```

Every eigenvector is contained in the eigenspace.

```

lemma eigenvector-mat-kernel-char-matrix: assumes A: A ∈ carrier-mat n n
  and ev: eigenvector A v lam
shows v ∈ mat-kernel (char-matrix A lam)
  using ev[unfolded eigenvector-char-matrix[OF A]] A
  unfolding mat-kernel-def by (auto simp: char-matrix-def)

```

If the algebraic multiplicity is one, then every two eigenvectors are scalar multiples of each other.

```

lemma unique-eigenvector-jnf: assumes jnf: jordan-nf (A :: 'a :: field mat) n-as
  and ord: order lam (char-poly A) = 1
  and ev: eigenvector A v lam eigenvector A w lam
shows ∃ a. v = a · w
proof -
  let ?cA = char-matrix A lam
  from similar-matD jnf[unfolded jordan-nf-def] obtain n where
    A: A ∈ carrier-mat n n by auto
  from dim-gen-eigenspace-order-char-poly[OF jnf, of lam 1, unfolded ord]
  have dim: kernel-dim ?cA ≤ 1

```



```

  unfolding dim-gen-eigenspace-def by auto
from eigenvector-mat-kernel-char-matrix[OF A ev(1)]
have vk:  $v \in \text{mat-kernel } ?cA$  .
from eigenvector-mat-kernel-char-matrix[OF A ev(2)]
have wk:  $w \in \text{mat-kernel } ?cA$  .
from ev[unfolded eigenvector-def] A have
  v:  $v \in \text{carrier-vec } n \ v \neq 0_v \ n$  and
  w:  $w \in \text{carrier-vec } n \ w \neq 0_v \ n$  by auto
have cA:  $?cA \in \text{carrier-mat } n \ n$  using A
  unfolding char-matrix-def by auto
interpret kernel  $n \ n \ ?cA$ 
  by (unfold-locales, rule cA)
from kernel-basis-exists[OF A] obtain B where B: finite B basis B by auto
from this[unfolded Ker.basis-def] have basis:  $\text{mat-kernel } ?cA = \text{span } B$  by auto
{
  assume card B = 0
  with B basis have bas:  $\text{mat-kernel } ?cA = \text{local.span } \{\}$  by auto
  also have ... =  $\{0_v \ n\}$  unfolding Ker.span-def by auto
  finally have False using v vk by auto
}
with Ker.dim-basis[OF B] dim have card B = Suc 0 by (cases card B, auto)
hence  $\exists b. B = \{b\}$  using card-eq-SucD by blast
then obtain b where Bb:  $B = \{b\}$  by blast
from B(2)[unfolded Bb Ker.basis-def] have bk:  $b \in \text{mat-kernel } ?cA$  by auto
hence b:  $b \in \text{carrier-vec } n$  using cA mat-kernelD(1) by blast
from Bb basis have  $\text{mat-kernel } ?cA = \text{span } \{b\}$  by auto
also have ... =  $NC.\text{span } \{b\}$ 
  by (rule span-same, insert bk, auto)
also have ...  $\subseteq \{a \cdot_v b \mid a. \text{True}\}$ 
proof -
{
  fix x
  assume  $x \in NC.\text{span } \{b\}$ 
  from this[unfolded NC.span-def] obtain a A
    where x:  $x = NC.\text{lincomb } a \ A$  and A:  $A \subseteq \{b\}$  by auto
  hence  $A = \{\}$   $\vee A = \{b\}$  by auto
  hence  $\exists a. x = a \cdot_v b$ 
  proof
    assume  $A = \{\}$  thus ?thesis unfolding x using b by (intro exI[of - 0],
auto)
  next
    assume  $A = \{b\}$  thus ?thesis unfolding x using b
      by (intro exI[of - a b], auto simp: NC.lincomb-def)
  qed
}
thus ?thesis by auto
qed
finally obtain vv ww where vb:  $v = vv \cdot_v b$  and wb:  $w = ww \cdot_v b$  using vk wk
by force+

```

```

from  $w b w b$  have  $w w \neq 0$  by auto
from arg-cong[OF  $w b$ , of  $\lambda x. \text{inverse } w w \cdot_v x$ ]  $w w b$  have  $b = \text{inverse } w w \cdot_v w$ 
by (auto simp: smult-smult-assoc)
from vb[unfolded this smult-smult-assoc] show ?thesis by auto
qed

```

Getting rid of the JNF-assumption for complex matrices.

```

lemma unique-eigenvector-complex: assumes  $A: A \in \text{carrier-mat } n \ n$ 
and  $\text{ord}: \text{order } \text{lam } (\text{char-poly } A :: \text{complex poly}) = 1$ 
and  $\text{ev}: \text{eigenvector } A \ v \ \text{lam } \text{eigenvector } A \ w \ \text{lam}$ 
shows  $\exists a. v = a \cdot_v w$ 
proof -
from jordan-nf-exists[OF  $A$ ] char-poly-factorized[OF  $A$ ] obtain  $n\text{-as}$ 
where jordan-nf  $A \ n\text{-as}$  by auto
from unique-eigenvector-jnf[OF this ord ev] show ?thesis .
qed

```

Convert the result to real matrices via homomorphisms.

```

lemma unique-eigenvector-real: assumes  $A: A \in \text{carrier-mat } n \ n$ 
and  $\text{ord}: \text{order } \text{lam } (\text{char-poly } A :: \text{real poly}) = 1$ 
and  $\text{ev}: \text{eigenvector } A \ v \ \text{lam } \text{eigenvector } A \ w \ \text{lam}$ 
shows  $\exists a. v = a \cdot_v w$ 
proof -
let  $?c = \text{complex-of-real}$ 
let  $?A = \text{map-mat } ?c \ A$ 
from  $A$  have  $cA: ?A \in \text{carrier-mat } n \ n$  by auto
have  $\text{ord}: \text{order } (?c \ \text{lam}) (\text{char-poly } ?A) = 1$ 
unfolding of-real-hom.char-poly-hom[OF  $A$ ]
by (subst map-poly-inj-idom-divide-hom.order-hom, unfold-locales, rule ord)
note  $\text{evc} = \text{of-real-hom.eigenvector-hom}$ [OF  $A$ ]
from unique-eigenvector-complex[OF  $cA \ \text{ord} \ \text{evc} \ \text{evc}$ , OF  $\text{ev}$ ] obtain  $a :: \text{complex}$ 
where  $\text{id}: \text{map-vec } ?c \ v = a \cdot_v \ \text{map-vec } ?c \ w$  by auto

```

```

from ev[unfolded eigenvector-def]  $A$  have  $\text{carr}: v \in \text{carrier-vec } n \ w \in \text{carrier-vec } n$ 
and  $v \neq 0_v \ n$  by auto
then obtain  $i$  where  $i: i < n \ v \ \$ \ i \neq 0$  unfolding Matrix.vec-eq-iff by auto
from arg-cong[OF  $\text{id}$ , of  $\lambda x. x \ \$ \ i$ ]  $\text{carr } i$ 
have  $?c \ (v \ \$ \ i) = a * ?c \ (w \ \$ \ i)$ 
by auto
with  $i(2)$  have  $a \in \text{Reals}$ 
by (metis Reals-cnj-iff complex-cnj-complex-of-real complex-cnj-mult mult-cancel-right
mult-eq-0-iff of-real-hom.hom-zero of-real-hom.injectivity)
then obtain  $b$  where  $a: a = ?c \ b$  by (rule Reals-cases)
from  $\text{id}$ [unfolded a] have  $\text{map-vec } ?c \ v = \text{map-vec } ?c \ (b \cdot_v w)$  by auto
hence  $v = b \cdot_v w$  by (rule of-real-hom.vec-hom-inj)
thus ?thesis by auto

```

**qed**

Finally, the statement converted to HMA-world.

**lemma** *unique-eigen-vector-real*: **assumes** *ord*: *order lam (charpoly A :: real poly)*  
*= 1*

**and** *ev*: *eigen-vector A v lam eigen-vector A w lam*

**shows**  $\exists a. v = a * s w$  **using** *assms*

**proof** (*transfer, goal-cases*)

**case** (*1 lam A v w*)

**show** *?case*

**by** (*rule unique-eigenvector-real[OF 1(1-2,4,6)]*)

**qed**

**end**

## 6 Stochastic Matrices and the Perron–Frobenius Theorem

Since a stationary distribution corresponds to a non-negative real eigenvector of the stochastic matrix, we can apply the Perron–Frobenius theorem. In this way we easily derive that every stochastic matrix has a stationary distribution, and moreover that this distribution is unique, if the matrix is irreducible, i.e., if the graph of the matrix is strongly connected.

**theory** *Stochastic-Matrix-Perron-Frobenius*

**imports**

*Perron-Frobenius.Perron-Frobenius-Irreducible*

*Stochastic-Matrix-Markov-Models*

*Eigenspace*

**begin**

**hide-const** (**open**) *Coset.order*

**lemma** *pf-nonneg-mat-st-mat*: *pf-nonneg-mat (st-mat A)*

**by** (*unfold-locales, auto simp: non-neg-mat-st-mat*)

**lemma** *stoch-non-neg-vec-norm1*: **assumes** *stoch-vec (v :: real ^ 'n) non-neg-vec v*

**shows** *norm1 v = 1*

**unfolding** *assms(1)[unfolded stoch-vec-def, symmetric] norm1-def*

**by** (*rule sum.cong, insert assms(2)[unfolded non-neg-vec-def], auto*)

**lemma** *stationary-distribution-exists*:  $\exists v. A *st v = v$

**proof** –

**let** *?A = st-mat A*

**let** *?c = complex-of-real*

**let** *?B =  $\chi$  i j. ?c (?A \$ i \$ j)*

**have** *real-non-neg-mat ?B using non-neg-mat-st-mat[of A]*

```

    unfolding real-non-neg-mat-def elements-mat-h-def non-neg-mat-def
  by auto
  from Perron-Frobenius.perron-frobenius-both[OF this] obtain v a where
    ev: eigen-vector ?B v (?c a) and nn: real-non-neg-vec v
    and a: a = HMA-Connect.spectral-radius ?B by auto
  from spectral-radius-ev[of ?B, folded a] have a0: a ≥ 0 by auto
  define w where w = (χ i. Re (v $ i))
  from nn have vw: v = (χ i. ?c (w $ i)) unfolding real-non-neg-vec-def w-def
    by (auto simp: vec-elements-h-def)
  from ev[unfolded eigen-vector-def] have v0: v ≠ 0 and ev: ?B * v = ?c a * s
v by auto
  from v0 have w0: w ≠ 0 unfolding vw by (auto simp: Finite-Cartesian-Product.vec-eq-iff)
  {
    fix i
    from ev have Re ((?B * v v) $ i) = Re ((?c a * s v) $ i) by simp
    also have Re ((?c a * s v) $ i) = (a * s w) $ i unfolding vw by simp
    also have Re ((?B * v v) $ i) = (?A * v w) $ i unfolding vw
      by (simp add: matrix-vector-mult-def)
    also note calculation
  }
  hence ev: ?A * v w = a * s w by (auto simp: Finite-Cartesian-Product.vec-eq-iff)
  from nn have nn: non-neg-vec w
    unfolding vw by (auto simp: real-non-neg-vec-def non-neg-vec-def vec-elements-h-def)

  let ?n = norm1 w
  from w0 have n0: ?n ≠ 0 by auto
  hence n-pos: ?n > 0 using norm1-ge-0[of w] by linarith
  define u where u = inverse ?n * s w
  have nn: non-neg-vec u using nn n-pos unfolding u-def non-neg-vec-def by
auto
  have nu: norm1 u = 1 unfolding u-def scalar-mult-eq-scaleR norm1-scaleR
using n-pos
  by (auto simp: field-simps)
  have 1: stoch-vec u unfolding stoch-vec-def nu[symmetric] norm1-def
  by (rule sum.cong, insert nn[unfolded non-neg-vec-def], auto)
  from arg-cong[OF ev, of λ x. inverse ?n * s x]
  have ev: ?A * v u = a * s u unfolding u-def
  by (auto simp: ac-simps vector-smult-distrib matrix-vec-scaleR)
  from right-stoch-mat-mult-stoch-vec[OF right-stoch-mat-st-mat[of A] 1, unfolded
ev]
  have st: stoch-vec (a * s u) .
  from non-neg-mat-mult-non-neg-vec[OF non-neg-mat-st-mat[of A] nn, unfolded
ev]
  have nn': non-neg-vec (a * s u) .
  from stoch-non-neg-vec-norm1[OF st nn', unfolded scalar-mult-eq-scaleR norm1-scaleR
nu] a0
  have a = 1 by auto
  with ev st have ev: ?A * v u = u and st: stoch-vec u by auto
  show ?thesis using ev st nn

```

by (intro exI[of - to-st-vec u], transfer, auto)  
 qed

**lemma stationary-distribution-unique:**

assumes fixed-mat.irreducible (st-mat A)

shows  $\exists! v. A *st v = v$

**proof** –

from stationary-distribution-exists obtain v where ev:  $A *st v = v$  by auto

show ?thesis

**proof** (intro ex1I, rule ev)

fix w

assume  $A *st w = w$

thus  $w = v$  using ev assms

**proof** (transfer, goal-cases)

case (1 A w v)

**interpret** perron-frobenius A

by (unfold-locales, insert 1, auto)

from 1 have \*: eigen-vector A v 1 le-vec 0 v eigen-vector A w 1

by (auto simp: eigen-vector-def stoch-vec-def non-neg-vec-def)

from nonnegative-eigenvector-has-ev-sr[OF \*(1-2)] have sr1:  $sr = 1$  by

auto

from multiplicity-sr-1[unfolded sr1] have order 1 (charpoly A) = 1 .

from unique-eigen-vector-real[OF this \*(1,3)] obtain a where

$vw: v = a *s w$  by auto

from 1(2,4)[unfolded stoch-vec-def] have  $sum ((\$h) v) UNIV = sum ((\$h)$

w) UNIV by auto

also have  $sum ((\$h) v) UNIV = a * sum ((\$h) w) UNIV$  unfolding vw

by (auto simp: sum-distrib-left)

finally have  $a = 1$  using 1(2)[unfolded stoch-vec-def] by auto

with vw show  $v = w$  by auto

qed

qed

qed

Let us now convert the stationary distribution results from matrices to Markov chains.

**context** transition-matrix

**begin**

**lemma stationary-distribution-exists:**

$\exists x. stationary-distribution (pmf-of-st-vec x)$

**proof** –

from stationary-distribution-exists obtain x where ev:  $A *st x = x$  by auto

show ?thesis

by (intro exI[of - x], unfold stationary-distribution-pmf-of-st-vec,

simp add: ev)

qed

**lemma stationary-distribution-unique:** assumes fixed-mat.irreducible (st-mat A)

```

shows  $\exists! N$ . stationary-distribution  $N$ 
proof –
from stationary-distribution-exists obtain  $x$  where
   $st$ : stationary-distribution (pmf-of-st-vec  $x$ ) by blast
show ?thesis
proof (rule ex1I, rule st)
  fix  $N$ 
  assume  $st'$ : stationary-distribution  $N$ 
  from stationary-distribution-implies-pmf-of-st-vec[OF this] obtain  $y$  where
     $N$ :  $N = \text{pmf-of-st-vec } y$  by auto
  from  $st'$ [unfolded N]  $st$ 
  have  $A * st\ x = x\ A * st\ y = y$  unfolding stationary-distribution-pmf-of-st-vec
by auto
  from stationary-distribution-unique[OF assms] this have  $x = y$  by auto
  with  $N$  show  $N = \text{pmf-of-st-vec } x$  by auto
qed
qed
end
end

```

## References

- [1] J. Divasón, O. Kunar, R. Thiemann, and A. Yamada. Perron-frobenius theorem for spectral radius analysis. *Archive of Formal Proofs*, May 2016. [http://isa-afp.org/entries/Perron\\_Frobenius.html](http://isa-afp.org/entries/Perron_Frobenius.html), Formal proof development.
- [2] J. Hölzl and T. Nipkow. Markov models. *Archive of Formal Proofs*, Jan. 2012. [http://isa-afp.org/entries/Markov\\_Models.html](http://isa-afp.org/entries/Markov_Models.html), Formal proof development.