

# Undirected Graph Theory

Chelsea Edmonds

March 17, 2025

## Abstract

This entry presents a general library for undirected graph theory - enabling reasoning on simple graphs and undirected graphs with loops. It primarily builds off Noschinski's basic ugraph definition [4], however generalises it in a number of ways and significantly expands on the range of basic graph theory definitions formalised. Notably, this library removes the constraint of vertices being a type synonym with the natural numbers which causes issues in more complex mathematical reasoning using graphs, such as the Balog Szemerédi Gowers theorem which this library is used for. Secondly this library also presents a locale-centric approach, enabling more concise, flexible, and reusable modelling of different types of graphs. Using this approach enables easy links to be made with more expansive formalisations of other combinatorial structures, such as incidence systems, as well as various types of formal representations of graphs. Further inspiration is also taken from Noschinski's [5] Directed Graph library for some proofs and definitions on walks, paths and cycles, however these are much simplified using the set based representation of graphs, and also extended on in this formalisation.

## Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Undirected Graph Theory Basics</b>	<b>3</b>
1.1	Miscellaneous Extras . . . . .	3
1.2	Initial Set up . . . . .	3
1.3	Graph System Locale . . . . .	5
1.4	Undirected Graph with Loops . . . . .	7
1.5	Edge Density . . . . .	13
1.6	Simple Graphs . . . . .	14
1.7	Subgraph Basics . . . . .	16
<b>2</b>	<b>Walks, Paths and Cycles</b>	<b>18</b>
2.1	Walks . . . . .	18
2.2	Paths . . . . .	21
2.3	Cycles . . . . .	22

<b>3</b>	<b>Connectivity</b>	<b>24</b>
3.1	Connecting Walks and Paths . . . . .	24
3.2	Vertex Connectivity . . . . .	26
3.3	Graph Properties on Connectivity . . . . .	27
3.4	We define a connected graph as a non-empty graph (the empty set is not usually considered connected by convention), where the vertex set is connected . . . . .	30
<b>4</b>	<b>Girth and Independence</b>	<b>32</b>
<b>5</b>	<b>Triangles in Graph</b>	<b>34</b>
5.1	Preliminaries on Triangles in Graphs . . . . .	35
<b>6</b>	<b>Bipartite Graphs</b>	<b>37</b>
6.1	Bipartite Set Up . . . . .	37
6.2	Bipartite Graph Locale . . . . .	38
<b>7</b>	<b>Graph Theory Inheritance</b>	<b>42</b>
7.1	Design Inheritance . . . . .	42
7.2	Adjacency Relation Definition . . . . .	43

## Acknowledgements

Chelsea Edmonds is jointly funded by the Cambridge Trust (Cambridge Australia Scholarship) and a Cambridge Department of Computer Science and Technology Premium Research Studentship. The ALEXANDRIA project is funded by the European Research Council, Advanced Grant GA 742178.

This library aims to present a general theory for undirected graphs. The formalisation approach models edges as sets with two elements, and is inspired in part by the graph theory basics defined by Lars Noschinski in [4] which are used in [2, 1]. Crucially this library makes the definition more flexible by removing the type synonym from vertices to natural numbers. This is limiting in more advanced mathematical applications, where it is common for vertices to represent elements of some other set. It additionally extends significantly on basic graph definitions.

The approach taken in this formalisation is the "locale-centric" approach for modelling different graph properties, which has been successfully used in other combinatorial structure formalisations.

## 1 Undirected Graph Theory Basics

This first theory focuses on the basics of graph theory (vertices, edges, degree, incidence, neighbours etc), as well as defining a number of different types of basic graphs. This theory draws inspiration from [4, 2, 1]

**theory** *Undirected-Graph-Basics* **imports** *Main HOL-Library.Multiset HOL-Library.Disjoint-Sets*

*HOL-Library.Extended-Real Girth-Chromatic.Girth-Chromatic-Misc*

**begin**

### 1.1 Miscellaneous Extras

Useful concepts on lists and sets

**lemma** *distinct-tl-rev*:

**assumes**  $hd\ xs = last\ xs$

**shows**  $distinct\ (tl\ xs) \longleftrightarrow distinct\ (tl\ (rev\ xs))$

*<proof>*

**lemma** *last-in-list-set*:  $length\ xs \geq 1 \implies last\ xs \in set\ (xs)$

*<proof>*

**lemma** *last-in-list-tl-set*:

**assumes**  $length\ xs \geq 2$

**shows**  $last\ xs \in set\ (tl\ xs)$

*<proof>*

**lemma** *length-list-decomp-lt*:  $ys \neq [] \implies length\ (xs\ @\ zs) < length\ (xs@ys@zs)$

*<proof>*

### 1.2 Initial Set up

For convenience and readability, some functions and type synonyms are defined outside locale context

**fun** *mk-triangle-set* :: ('a × 'a × 'a) ⇒ 'a set  
**where** *mk-triangle-set* (x, y, z) = {x,y,z}

**type-synonym** 'a edge = 'a set

**type-synonym** 'a pregraph = ('a set) × ('a edge set)

**abbreviation** *gverts* :: 'a pregraph ⇒ 'a set **where**  
*gverts* H ≡ fst H

**abbreviation** *gedges* :: 'a pregraph ⇒ 'a edge set **where**  
*gedges* H ≡ snd H

**fun** *mk-edge* :: 'a × 'a ⇒ 'a edge **where**  
*mk-edge* (u,v) = {u,v}

All edges is simply the set of subsets of a set S of size 2

**definition** *all-edges* S ≡ {e . e ⊆ S ∧ card e = 2}

Note, this is a different definition to Noschinski's [4] ugraph which uses the *mk-edge* function unnecessarily

Basic properties of these functions

**lemma** *all-edges-mono*:  
 vs ⊆ ws ⇒ *all-edges* vs ⊆ *all-edges* ws  
 ⟨proof⟩

**lemma** *all-edges-alt*: *all-edges* S = {{x, y} | x y . x ∈ S ∧ y ∈ S ∧ x ≠ y}  
 ⟨proof⟩

**lemma** *all-edges-alt-pairs*: *all-edges* S = *mk-edge* ' {uv ∈ S × S. fst uv ≠ snd uv}  
 ⟨proof⟩

**lemma** *all-edges-subset-Pow*: *all-edges* A ⊆ Pow A  
 ⟨proof⟩

**lemma** *all-edges-disjoint*: S ∩ T = {} ⇒ *all-edges* S ∩ *all-edges* T = {}  
 ⟨proof⟩

**lemma** *card-all-edges*: finite A ⇒ card (*all-edges* A) = card A choose 2  
 ⟨proof⟩

**lemma** *finite-all-edges*: finite S ⇒ finite (*all-edges* S)  
 ⟨proof⟩

**lemma** *in-mk-edge-img*: (a,b) ∈ A ∨ (b,a) ∈ A ⇒ {a,b} ∈ *mk-edge* ' A  
 ⟨proof⟩

**thm** *in-mk-edge-imp*

**lemma** *in-mk-uedge-imp-iff*:  $\{a,b\} \in \text{mk-edge} \iff (a,b) \in A \vee (b,a) \in A$   
*<proof>*

**lemma** *inj-on-mk-edge*:  $X \cap Y = \{\} \implies \text{inj-on mk-edge } (X \times Y)$   
*<proof>*

**definition** *complete-graph* :: 'a set  $\implies$  'a pregraph **where**  
*complete-graph*  $S \equiv (S, \text{all-edges } S)$

**definition** *all-edges-loops*:: 'a set  $\implies$  'a edge set **where**  
*all-edges-loops*  $S \equiv \text{all-edges } S \cup \{\{v\} \mid v. v \in S\}$

**lemma** *all-edges-loops-alt*:  $\text{all-edges-loops } S = \{e. e \subseteq S \wedge (\text{card } e = 2 \vee \text{card } e = 1)\}$   
*<proof>*

**lemma** *loops-disjoint*:  $\text{all-edges } S \cap \{\{v\} \mid v. v \in S\} = \{\}$   
*<proof>*

**lemma** *all-edges-loops-ss*:  $\text{all-edges } S \subseteq \text{all-edges-loops } S$   $\{\{v\} \mid v. v \in S\} \subseteq \text{all-edges-loops } S$   
*<proof>*

**lemma** *finite-singletons*:  $\text{finite } S \implies \text{finite } (\{\{v\} \mid v. v \in S\})$   
*<proof>*

**lemma** *card-singletons*:  
**assumes** *finite*  $S$  **shows**  $\text{card } \{\{v\} \mid v. v \in S\} = \text{card } S$   
*<proof>*

**lemma** *finite-all-edges-loops*:  $\text{finite } S \implies \text{finite } (\text{all-edges-loops } S)$   
*<proof>*

**lemma** *card-all-edges-loops*:  
**assumes** *finite*  $S$   
**shows**  $\text{card } (\text{all-edges-loops } S) = (\text{card } S \text{ choose } 2) + \text{card } S$   
*<proof>*

### 1.3 Graph System Locale

A generic incidence set system re-labeled to graph notation, where repeated edges are not allowed. All the definitions here do not need the "edge" size to be constrained to make sense.

**locale** *graph-system* =  
**fixes** *vertices* :: 'a set ( $\langle V \rangle$ )  
**fixes** *edges* :: 'a edge set ( $\langle E \rangle$ )  
**assumes** *wellformed*:  $e \in E \implies e \subseteq V$   
**begin**

**abbreviation** *gorder* :: nat **where**  
*gorder*  $\equiv$  card (*V*)

**abbreviation** *graph-size* :: nat **where**  
*graph-size*  $\equiv$  card *E*

**definition** *vincident* :: 'a  $\Rightarrow$  'a edge  $\Rightarrow$  bool **where**  
*vincident* *v e*  $\equiv$  *v*  $\in$  *e*

**lemma** *incident-edge-in-wf*: *e*  $\in$  *E*  $\Longrightarrow$  *vincident* *v e*  $\Longrightarrow$  *v*  $\in$  *V*  
*<proof>*

**definition** *incident-edges* :: 'a  $\Rightarrow$  'a edge set **where**  
*incident-edges* *v*  $\equiv$  {*e* . *e*  $\in$  *E*  $\wedge$  *vincident* *v e*}

**lemma** *incident-edges-empty*:  $\neg$  (*v*  $\in$  *V*)  $\Longrightarrow$  *incident-edges* *v* = {}  
*<proof>*

**lemma** *finite-incident-edges*: *finite* *E*  $\Longrightarrow$  *finite* (*incident-edges* *v*)  
*<proof>*

**definition** *edge-adj* :: 'a edge  $\Rightarrow$  'a edge  $\Rightarrow$  bool **where**  
*edge-adj* *e1 e2*  $\equiv$  *e1*  $\cap$  *e2*  $\neq$  {}  $\wedge$  *e1*  $\in$  *E*  $\wedge$  *e2*  $\in$  *E*

**lemma** *edge-adj-inE*: *edge-adj* *e1 e2*  $\Longrightarrow$  *e1*  $\in$  *E*  $\wedge$  *e2*  $\in$  *E*  
*<proof>*

**lemma** *edge-adjacent-alt-def*: *e1*  $\in$  *E*  $\Longrightarrow$  *e2*  $\in$  *E*  $\Longrightarrow$   $\exists$  *x* . *x*  $\in$  *V*  $\wedge$  *x*  $\in$  *e1*  $\wedge$  *x*  $\in$  *e2*  $\Longrightarrow$  *edge-adj* *e1 e2*  
*<proof>*

**lemma** *wellformed-alt-fst*: {*x, y*}  $\in$  *E*  $\Longrightarrow$  *x*  $\in$  *V*  
*<proof>*

**lemma** *wellformed-alt-snd*: {*x, y*}  $\in$  *E*  $\Longrightarrow$  *y*  $\in$  *V*  
*<proof>*

**end**

Simple constraints on a graph system may include finite and non-empty constraints

**locale** *fin-graph-system* = *graph-system* +  
**assumes** *finV*: *finite* *V*  
**begin**

**lemma** *fin-edges*: *finite* *E*  
*<proof>*

**end**

**locale** *ne-graph-system* = *graph-system* +  
**assumes** *not-empty*:  $V \neq \{\}$

## 1.4 Undirected Graph with Loops

This formalisation models a loop by a singleton set. In this case a graph has the edge size criteria if it has edges of size 1 or 2. Notably this removes the option for an edge to be empty

**locale** *ulgraph* = *graph-system* +  
**assumes** *edge-size*:  $e \in E \implies \text{card } e > 0 \wedge \text{card } e \leq 2$

**begin**

**lemma** *alt-edge-size*:  $e \in E \implies \text{card } e = 1 \vee \text{card } e = 2$   
*<proof>*

**definition** *is-loop*:: 'a edge  $\Rightarrow$  bool **where**  
*is-loop* e  $\equiv \text{card } e = 1$

**definition** *is-sedge* :: 'a edge  $\Rightarrow$  bool **where**  
*is-sedge* e  $\equiv \text{card } e = 2$

**lemma** *is-edge-or-loop*:  $e \in E \implies \text{is-loop } e \vee \text{is-sedge } e$   
*<proof>*

**lemma** *edges-split-loop*:  $E = \{e \in E . \text{is-loop } e\} \cup \{e \in E . \text{is-sedge } e\}$   
*<proof>*

**lemma** *edges-split-loop-inter-empty*:  $\{\} = \{e \in E . \text{is-loop } e\} \cap \{e \in E . \text{is-sedge } e\}$   
*<proof>*

**definition** *vert-adj* :: 'a  $\Rightarrow$  'a  $\Rightarrow$  bool **where** — Neighbor in graph from Roth [1]  
*vert-adj* v1 v2  $\equiv \{v1, v2\} \in E$

**lemma** *vert-adj-sym*: *vert-adj* v1 v2  $\longleftrightarrow$  *vert-adj* v2 v1  
*<proof>*

**lemma** *vert-adj-imp-inV*: *vert-adj* v1 v2  $\implies v1 \in V \wedge v2 \in V$   
*<proof>*

**lemma** *vert-adj-inc-edge-iff*: *vert-adj* v1 v2  $\longleftrightarrow \text{vincident } v1 \{v1, v2\} \wedge \text{vincident } v2 \{v1, v2\} \wedge \{v1, v2\} \in E$   
*<proof>*

**lemma** *not-vert-adj[simp]*:  $\neg \text{vert-adj } v u \implies \{v, u\} \notin E$   
*<proof>*

**definition** *neighborhood* :: 'a  $\Rightarrow$  'a set **where** — Neighbors in Roth Development [1]

*neighborhood*  $x \equiv \{v \in V . \text{vert-adj } x \ v\}$

**lemma** *neighborhood-incident*:  $u \in \text{neighborhood } v \iff \{u, v\} \in \text{incident-edges } v$   
 ⟨proof⟩

**definition** *neighbors-ss* :: 'a  $\Rightarrow$  'a set  $\Rightarrow$  'a set **where**  
*neighbors-ss*  $x \ Y \equiv \{y \in Y . \text{vert-adj } x \ y\}$

**lemma** *vert-adj-edge-iff2*:

**assumes**  $v1 \neq v2$

**shows**  $\text{vert-adj } v1 \ v2 \iff (\exists e \in E . \text{vincident } v1 \ e \wedge \text{vincident } v2 \ e)$

⟨proof⟩

Incident simple edges, i.e. excluding loops

**definition** *incident-sedges* :: 'a  $\Rightarrow$  'a edge set **where**  
*incident-sedges*  $v \equiv \{e \in E . \text{vincident } v \ e \wedge \text{card } e = 2\}$

**lemma** *finite-inc-sedges*:  $\text{finite } E \implies \text{finite } (\text{incident-sedges } v)$   
 ⟨proof⟩

**lemma** *incident-sedges-empty[simp]*:  $v \notin V \implies \text{incident-sedges } v = \{\}$   
 ⟨proof⟩

**definition** *has-loop* :: 'a  $\Rightarrow$  bool **where**  
*has-loop*  $v \equiv \{v\} \in E$

**lemma** *has-loop-in-verts*:  $\text{has-loop } v \implies v \in V$   
 ⟨proof⟩

**lemma** *is-loop-set-alt*:  $\{\{v\} \mid v . \text{has-loop } v\} = \{e \in E . \text{is-loop } e\}$   
 ⟨proof⟩

**definition** *incident-loops* :: 'a  $\Rightarrow$  'a edge set **where**  
*incident-loops*  $v \equiv \{e \in E . e = \{v\}\}$

**lemma** *card1-incident-imp-vert*:  $\text{vincident } v \ e \wedge \text{card } e = 1 \implies e = \{v\}$   
 ⟨proof⟩

**lemma** *incident-loops-alt*:  $\text{incident-loops } v = \{e \in E . \text{vincident } v \ e \wedge \text{card } e = 1\}$   
 ⟨proof⟩

**lemma** *incident-loops-simp*:  $\text{has-loop } v \implies \text{incident-loops } v = \{\{v\}\} \neg \text{has-loop } v \implies \text{incident-loops } v = \{\}$   
 ⟨proof⟩

**lemma** *incident-loops-union*:  $\bigcup (\text{incident-loops } ` V) = \{e \in E . \text{is-loop } e\}$



*<proof>*

**lemma** *finite-incident-loops*: *finite (incident-loops v)*  
*<proof>*

**lemma** *incident-loops-card*: *card (incident-loops v) ≤ 1*  
*<proof>*

**lemma** *incident-edges-union*: *incident-edges v = incident-sedges v ∪ incident-loops v*  
*<proof>*

**lemma** *incident-edges-sedges[simp]*:  $\neg \text{has-loop } v \implies \text{incident-edges } v = \text{incident-sedges } v$   
*<proof>*

**lemma** *incident-sedges-union*:  $\bigcup (\text{incident-sedges } ` V) = \{e \in E . \text{is-sedge } e\}$   
*<proof>*

**lemma** *empty-not-edge*:  $\{\} \notin E$   
*<proof>*

The degree definition is complicated by loops - each loop contributes two to degree. This is required for basic counting properties on the degree to hold

**definition** *degree* :: *'a ⇒ nat* **where**  
*degree v ≡ card (incident-sedges v) + 2 \* (card (incident-loops v))*

**lemma** *degree-no-loops[simp]*:  $\neg \text{has-loop } v \implies \text{degree } v = \text{card (incident-edges } v)$   
*<proof>*

**lemma** *degree-none[simp]*:  $\neg v \in V \implies \text{degree } v = 0$   
*<proof>*

**lemma** *degree0-inc-edges-empt-iff*:  
**assumes** *finite E*  
**shows** *degree v = 0 ↔ incident-edges v = {}*  
*<proof>*

**lemma** *incident-edges-neighbors-img*: *incident-edges v = (λ u . {v, u}) ` (neighborhood v)*  
*<proof>*

**lemma** *card-incident-sedges-neighborhood*: *card (incident-edges v) = card (neighborhood v)*  
*<proof>*

**lemma** *degree0-neighborhood-empt-iff*:  
**assumes** *finite E*

**shows**  $\text{degree } v = 0 \iff \text{neighborhood } v = \{\}$   
 ⟨proof⟩

**definition** *is-isolated-vertex*:: 'a  $\Rightarrow$  bool **where**  
*is-isolated-vertex*  $v \equiv v \in V \wedge (\forall u \in V . \neg \text{vert-adj } u \ v)$

**lemma** *is-isolated-vertex-edge*: *is-isolated-vertex*  $v \implies (\bigwedge e. e \in E \implies \neg (\text{vincident } v \ e))$   
 ⟨proof⟩

**lemma** *is-isolated-vertex-no-loop*: *is-isolated-vertex*  $v \implies \neg \text{has-loop } v$   
 ⟨proof⟩

**lemma** *is-isolated-vertex-degree0*: *is-isolated-vertex*  $v \implies \text{degree } v = 0$   
 ⟨proof⟩

**lemma** *iso-vertex-empty-neighborhood*: *is-isolated-vertex*  $v \implies \text{neighborhood } v = \{\}$   
 ⟨proof⟩

**definition** *max-degree* :: nat **where**  
*max-degree*  $\equiv \text{Max } \{\text{degree } v \mid v. v \in V\}$

**definition** *min-degree* :: nat **where**  
*min-degree*  $\equiv \text{Min } \{\text{degree } v \mid v. v \in V\}$

**definition** *is-edge-between* :: 'a set  $\Rightarrow$  'a set  $\Rightarrow$  'a edge  $\Rightarrow$  bool **where**  
*is-edge-between*  $X \ Y \ e \equiv \exists x \ y. e = \{x, y\} \wedge x \in X \wedge y \in Y$

All edges between two sets of vertices,  $X$  and  $Y$ , in a graph,  $G$ . Inspired by Szemerédi development [2] and generalised here

**definition** *all-edges-between* :: 'a set  $\Rightarrow$  'a set  $\Rightarrow$  ('a  $\times$  'a) set **where**  
*all-edges-between*  $X \ Y \equiv \{(x, y) . x \in X \wedge y \in Y \wedge \{x, y\} \in E\}$

**lemma** *all-edges-betw-D3*:  $(x, y) \in \text{all-edges-between } X \ Y \implies \{x, y\} \in E$   
 ⟨proof⟩

**lemma** *all-edges-betw-I*:  $x \in X \implies y \in Y \implies \{x, y\} \in E \implies (x, y) \in \text{all-edges-between } X \ Y$   
 ⟨proof⟩

**lemma** *all-edges-between-subset*: *all-edges-between*  $X \ Y \subseteq X \times Y$   
 ⟨proof⟩

**lemma** *all-edges-between-E-ss*: *mk-edge* ' *all-edges-between*  $X \ Y \subseteq E$   
 ⟨proof⟩

**lemma** *all-edges-between-rem-wf*: *all-edges-between*  $X \ Y = \text{all-edges-between } (X \cap V) \ (Y \cap V)$

*<proof>*

**lemma** *all-edges-between-empty* [simp]:

*all-edges-between* {} Z = {} *all-edges-between* Z {} = {}

*<proof>*

**lemma** *all-edges-between-disjnt1*: *disjnt* X Y  $\implies$  *disjnt* (*all-edges-between* X Z)  
(*all-edges-between* Y Z)

*<proof>*

**lemma** *all-edges-between-disjnt2*: *disjnt* Y Z  $\implies$  *disjnt* (*all-edges-between* X Y)  
(*all-edges-between* X Z)

*<proof>*

**lemma** *max-all-edges-between*:

**assumes** *finite* X *finite* Y

**shows** *card* (*all-edges-between* X Y)  $\leq$  *card* X \* *card* Y

*<proof>*

**lemma** *all-edges-between-Un1*:

*all-edges-between* (X  $\cup$  Y) Z = *all-edges-between* X Z  $\cup$  *all-edges-between* Y Z

*<proof>*

**lemma** *all-edges-between-Un2*:

*all-edges-between* X (Y  $\cup$  Z) = *all-edges-between* X Y  $\cup$  *all-edges-between* X Z

*<proof>*

**lemma** *finite-all-edges-between*:

**assumes** *finite* X *finite* Y

**shows** *finite* (*all-edges-between* X Y)

*<proof>*

**lemma** *all-edges-between-Union1*:

*all-edges-between* (*Union* X) Y = ( $\bigcup$  X  $\in$  X. *all-edges-between* X Y)

*<proof>*

**lemma** *all-edges-between-Union2*:

*all-edges-between* X (*Union* Y) = ( $\bigcup$  Y  $\in$  Y. *all-edges-between* X Y)

*<proof>*

**lemma** *all-edges-between-disjoint1*:

**assumes** *disjoint* R

**shows** *disjoint* (( $\lambda$ X. *all-edges-between* X Y) ‘ R)

*<proof>*

**lemma** *all-edges-between-disjoint2*:

**assumes** *disjoint* R

**shows** *disjoint* (( $\lambda$ Y. *all-edges-between* X Y) ‘ R)

*<proof>*

**lemma** *all-edges-between-disjoint-family-on1*:

**assumes** *disjoint R*

**shows** *disjoint-family-on*  $(\lambda X. \text{all-edges-between } X \ Y) \ R$

*<proof>*

**lemma** *all-edges-between-disjoint-family-on2*:

**assumes** *disjoint R*

**shows** *disjoint-family-on*  $(\lambda Y. \text{all-edges-between } X \ Y) \ R$

*<proof>*

**lemma** *all-edges-between-mono1*:

$Y \subseteq Z \implies \text{all-edges-between } Y \ X \subseteq \text{all-edges-between } Z \ X$

*<proof>*

**lemma** *all-edges-between-mono2*:

$Y \subseteq Z \implies \text{all-edges-between } X \ Y \subseteq \text{all-edges-between } X \ Z$

*<proof>*

**lemma** *inj-on-mk-edge*:  $X \cap Y = \{\} \implies \text{inj-on mk-edge } (\text{all-edges-between } X \ Y)$

*<proof>*

**lemma** *all-edges-between-subset-times*:  $\text{all-edges-between } X \ Y \subseteq (X \cap \bigcup E) \times (Y \cap \bigcup E)$

*<proof>*

**lemma** *all-edges-betw-prod-def-neighbors*:  $\text{all-edges-between } X \ Y = \{(x, y) \in X \times Y \mid \text{vert-adj } x \ y\}$

*<proof>*

**lemma** *all-edges-betw-sigma-neighbor*:

$\text{all-edges-between } X \ Y = (\text{SIGMA } x:X. \text{neighbors-ss } x \ Y)$

*<proof>*

**lemma** *card-all-edges-betw-neighbor*:

**assumes** *finite X finite Y*

**shows**  $\text{card } (\text{all-edges-between } X \ Y) = (\sum x \in X. \text{card } (\text{neighbors-ss } x \ Y))$

*<proof>*

**lemma** *all-edges-between-swap*:

$\text{all-edges-between } X \ Y = (\lambda(x,y). (y,x)) \ ` (\text{all-edges-between } Y \ X)$

*<proof>*

**lemma** *card-all-edges-between-commute*:

$\text{card } (\text{all-edges-between } X \ Y) = \text{card } (\text{all-edges-between } Y \ X)$

*<proof>*

**lemma** *all-edges-between-set*:  $\text{mk-edge } \ ` \ \text{all-edges-between } X \ Y = \{\{x, y\} \mid x \ y. x \in X \ \wedge \ y \in Y \ \wedge \ \{x, y\} \in E\}$

*<proof>*

## 1.5 Edge Density

The edge density between two sets of vertices,  $X$  and  $Y$ , in  $G$ . This is the same definition as taken in the Szemerédi development, generalised here [2]

**definition** *edge-density*  $X Y \equiv \text{card}(\text{all-edges-between } X Y) / (\text{card } X * \text{card } Y)$

**lemma** *edge-density-ge0*: *edge-density*  $X Y \geq 0$

*<proof>*

**lemma** *edge-density-le1*: *edge-density*  $X Y \leq 1$

*<proof>*

**lemma** *edge-density-zero*:  $Y = \{\} \implies \text{edge-density } X Y = 0$

*<proof>*

**lemma** *edge-density-commute*: *edge-density*  $X Y = \text{edge-density } Y X$

*<proof>*

**lemma** *edge-density-Un*:

**assumes** *disjnt*  $X1 X2$  *finite*  $X1$  *finite*  $X2$  *finite*  $Y$

**shows** *edge-density*  $(X1 \cup X2) Y = (\text{edge-density } X1 Y * \text{card } X1 + \text{edge-density } X2 Y * \text{card } X2) / (\text{card } X1 + \text{card } X2)$

*<proof>*

**lemma** *edge-density-eq0*:

**assumes** *all-edges-between*  $A B = \{\}$  **and**  $X \subseteq A$   $Y \subseteq B$

**shows** *edge-density*  $X Y = 0$

*<proof>*

**end**

A number of lemmas are limited to a finite graph

**locale** *fin-ulgraph* = *ulgraph* + *fin-graph-system*

**begin**

**lemma** *card-is-has-loop-eq*:  $\text{card} \{e \in E . \text{is-loop } e\} = \text{card} \{v \in V . \text{has-loop } v\}$

*<proof>*

**lemma** *finite-all-edges-between'*: *finite* (*all-edges-between*  $X Y$ )

*<proof>*

**lemma** *card-all-edges-between*:

**assumes** *finite*  $Y$

**shows**  $\text{card}(\text{all-edges-between } X Y) = (\sum_{y \in Y} \text{card}(\text{all-edges-between } X \{y\}))$

*<proof>*

**end**

## 1.6 Simple Graphs

A simple graph (or sgraph) constrains edges to size of two. This is the classic definition of an undirected graph

**locale** *sgraph* = *graph-system* +  
  **assumes** *two-edges*:  $e \in E \implies \text{card } e = 2$   
**begin**

**lemma** *wellformed-all-edges*:  $E \subseteq \text{all-edges } V$   
   $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

**lemma** *e-in-all-edges*:  $e \in E \implies e \in \text{all-edges } V$   
   $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

**lemma** *e-in-all-edges-ss*:  $e \in E \implies e \subseteq V' \implies V' \subseteq V \implies e \in \text{all-edges } V'$   
   $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

**lemma** *singleton-not-edge*:  $\{x\} \notin E$  — Suggested by Mantas Baksys  
   $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

**end**

It is easy to proof that *sgraph* is a sublocale of *ulgraph*. By using indirect inheritance, we avoid two unneeded cardinality conditions

**sublocale** *sgraph*  $\subseteq$  *ulgraph*  $V E$   
   $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

**locale** *fin-sgraph* = *sgraph* + *fin-graph-system*  
**begin**

**lemma** *fin-neighbourhood*: *finite* (*neighborhood*  $x$ )  
   $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

**lemma** *fin-all-edges*: *finite* (*all-edges*  $V$ )  
   $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

**lemma** *max-edges-graph*:  $\text{card } E \leq (\text{card } V)^2$   
   $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

**end**

**sublocale** *fin-sgraph*  $\subseteq$  *fin-ulgraph*  
   $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

**context** *sgraph*  
**begin**

**lemma** *no-loops*:  $v \in V \implies \neg \text{has-loop } v$   
   $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

Ideally, we'd redefine degree in the context of a simple graph. However, this requires a named loop locale, which complicates notation unnecessarily. This is the lemma that should always be used when unfolding the degree definition in a simple graph context

**lemma** *alt-degree-def[simp]*:  $\text{degree } v = \text{card } (\text{incident-edges } v)$   
*<proof>*

**lemma** *alt-deg-neighborhood*:  $\text{degree } v = \text{card } (\text{neighborhood } v)$   
*<proof>*

**definition** *degree-set* :: 'a set  $\Rightarrow$  nat **where**  
*degree-set*  $vs \equiv \text{card } \{e \in E. vs \subseteq e\}$

**definition** *is-complete-n-graph*:: nat  $\Rightarrow$  bool **where**  
*is-complete-n-graph*  $n \equiv \text{gorder} = n \wedge E = \text{all-edges } V$

The complement of a graph is a basic concept

**definition** *is-complement* :: 'a pregraph  $\Rightarrow$  bool **where**  
*is-complement*  $G \equiv V = \text{gverts } G \wedge \text{gedges } G = \text{all-edges } V - E$

**definition** *complement-edges* :: 'a edge set **where**  
*complement-edges*  $\equiv \text{all-edges } V - E$

**lemma** *is-complement-edges*:  $\text{is-complement } (V', E') \iff V = V' \wedge \text{complement-edges} = E'$   
*<proof>*

**interpretation** *G-comp*: *sgraph*  $V$  *complement-edges*  
*<proof>*

**lemma** *is-complement-edge-iff*:  $e \subseteq V \implies e \in \text{complement-edges} \iff e \notin E \wedge \text{card } e = 2$   
*<proof>*

**end**

A complete graph is a simple graph

**lemma** *complete-sgraph*: *sgraph*  $S$  (*all-edges*  $S$ )  
*<proof>*

**interpretation** *comp-sgraph*: *sgraph*  $S$  (*all-edges*  $S$ )  
*<proof>*

**lemma** *complete-fin-sgraph*: *finite*  $S \implies \text{fin-sgraph } S$  (*all-edges*  $S$ )  
*<proof>*

## 1.7 Subgraph Basics

A subgraph is defined as a graph where the vertex and edge sets are subsets of the original graph. Note that using the locale approach, we require each graph to be wellformed. This is interestingly omitted in a number of other formal definitions.

**locale** *subgraph* = *H*: *graph-system*  $V_H$  :: 'a *set*  $E_H$  + *G*: *graph-system*  $V_G$  :: 'a *set*  $E_G$  **for**  $V_H$   $E_H$   $V_G$   $E_G$  +  
**assumes** *verts-ss*:  $V_H \subseteq V_G$   
**assumes** *edges-ss*:  $E_H \subseteq E_G$

**lemma** *is-subgraphI[intro]*:  $V' \subseteq V \implies E' \subseteq E \implies \text{graph-system } V' E' \implies \text{graph-system } V E \implies \text{subgraph } V' E' V E$   
 ⟨*proof*⟩

**context** *subgraph*  
**begin**

Note: it could also be useful to have similar rules in *ulgraph* locale etc with subgraph assumption

**lemma** *is-subgraph-ulgraph*:  
**assumes** *ulgraph*  $V_G$   $E_G$   
**shows** *ulgraph*  $V_H$   $E_H$   
 ⟨*proof*⟩

**lemma** *is-simp-subgraph*:  
**assumes** *sgraph*  $V_G$   $E_G$   
**shows** *sgraph*  $V_H$   $E_H$   
 ⟨*proof*⟩

**lemma** *is-finite-subgraph*:  
**assumes** *fin-graph-system*  $V_G$   $E_G$   
**shows** *fin-graph-system*  $V_H$   $E_H$   
 ⟨*proof*⟩

**lemma** (**in** *graph-system*) *subgraph-refl*: *subgraph*  $V E V E$   
 ⟨*proof*⟩

**lemma** *subgraph-trans*:  
**assumes** *graph-system*  $V E$   
**assumes** *graph-system*  $V' E'$   
**assumes** *graph-system*  $V'' E''$   
**shows** *subgraph*  $V'' E'' V' E' \implies \text{subgraph } V' E' V E \implies \text{subgraph } V'' E'' V E$   
 ⟨*proof*⟩

**lemma** *subgraph-antisym*: *subgraph*  $V' E' V E \implies \text{subgraph } V E V' E' \implies V = V' \wedge E = E'$



*<proof>*

**end**

**lemma** (*in sgraph*) *subgraph-complete*: *subgraph V E V (all-edges V)*  
*<proof>*

We are often interested in the set of subgraphs. This is still very possible using locale definitions. Interesting Note - random graphs [3] has a different definition for the well formed constraint to be added in here instead of in the main subgraph definition

**definition** (*in graph-system*) *subgraphs*:: 'a pregraph set **where**  
*subgraphs*  $\equiv \{G . \text{subgraph } (gverts\ G) (gedges\ G)\ V\ E\}$

Induced subgraph - really only affects edges

**definition** (*in graph-system*) *induced-edges*:: 'a set  $\Rightarrow$  'a edge set **where**  
*induced-edges V'*  $\equiv \{e \in E. e \subseteq V'\}$

**lemma** (*in sgraph*) *induced-edges-alt*: *induced-edges V' = E  $\cap$  all-edges V'*  
*<proof>*

**lemma** (*in sgraph*) *induced-edges-self*: *induced-edges V = E*  
*<proof>*

**context** *graph-system*  
**begin**

**lemma** *induced-edges-ss*: *V'  $\subseteq$  V  $\implies$  induced-edges V'  $\subseteq$  E*  
*<proof>*

**lemma** *induced-is-graph-sys*: *graph-system V' (induced-edges V')*  
*<proof>*

**interpretation** *induced-graph*: *graph-system V' (induced-edges V')*  
*<proof>*

**lemma** *induced-is-subgraph*: *V'  $\subseteq$  V  $\implies$  subgraph V' (induced-edges V') V E*  
*<proof>*

**lemma** *induced-edges-union*:  
  **assumes** *VH1  $\subseteq$  S VH2  $\subseteq$  T*  
  **assumes** *graph-system VH1 EH1 graph-system VH2 EH2*  
  **assumes** *EH1  $\cup$  EH2  $\subseteq$  (induced-edges (S  $\cup$  T))*  
  **shows** *EH1  $\subseteq$  (induced-edges S)*  
*<proof>*

**lemma** *induced-edges-union-subgraph-single*:  
  **assumes** *VH1  $\subseteq$  S VH2  $\subseteq$  T*

```

assumes graph-system VH1 EH1 graph-system VH2 EH2
assumes subgraph (VH1  $\cup$  VH2) (EH1  $\cup$  EH2) (S  $\cup$  T) (induced-edges (S  $\cup$ 
T))
shows subgraph VH1 EH1 S (induced-edges S)
<proof>

```

```

lemma induced-union-subgraph:
assumes VH1  $\subseteq$  S and VH2  $\subseteq$  T
assumes graph-system VH1 EH1 graph-system VH2 EH2
shows subgraph VH1 EH1 S (induced-edges S)  $\wedge$  subgraph VH2 EH2 T (induced-edges
T)  $\longleftrightarrow$ 
subgraph (VH1  $\cup$  VH2) (EH1  $\cup$  EH2) (S  $\cup$  T) (induced-edges (S  $\cup$  T))
<proof>

```

**end**

**end**

**theory** Undirected-Graph-Walks **imports** Undirected-Graph-Basics

**begin**

## 2 Walks, Paths and Cycles

The definition of walks, paths, cycles, and related concepts are foundations of graph theory, yet there can be some differences in literature between definitions. This formalisation draws inspiration from Noschinski's Graph Library [5], however focuses on an undirected graph context compared to a directed graph context, and extends on some definitions, as required to formalise Balog Szemerédi Gowers theorem.

**context** ulgraph

**begin**

### 2.1 Walks

This definition is taken from the directed graph library, however edges are undirected

```

fun walk-edges :: 'a list  $\Rightarrow$  'a edge list where
  walk-edges [] = []
| walk-edges [x] = []
| walk-edges (x # y # ys) = {x,y} # walk-edges (y # ys)

```

```

lemma walk-edges-app: walk-edges (xs @ [y, x]) = walk-edges (xs @ [y]) @ [{y, x}]
<proof>

```

```

lemma walk-edges-tl-ss: set (walk-edges (tl xs))  $\subseteq$  set (walk-edges xs)
<proof>

```

```

lemma walk-edges-rev: rev (walk-edges xs) = walk-edges (rev xs)
<proof>

```

**lemma** *walk-edges-append-ss1*:  $set (walk-edges (ys)) \subseteq set (walk-edges (xs@ys))$   
 ⟨proof⟩

**lemma** *walk-edges-append-ss2*:  $set (walk-edges (xs)) \subseteq set (walk-edges (xs@ys))$   
 ⟨proof⟩

**lemma** *walk-edges-singleton-app*:  $ys \neq [] \implies walk-edges ([x]@ys) = \{x, hd\ ys\} \#$   
 $walk-edges\ ys$   
 ⟨proof⟩

**lemma** *walk-edges-append-union*:  $xs \neq [] \implies ys \neq [] \implies$   
 $set (walk-edges (xs@ys)) = set (walk-edges (xs)) \cup set (walk-edges (ys)) \cup \{\{last$   
 $xs, hd\ ys\}\}$   
 ⟨proof⟩

**lemma** *walk-edges-decomp-ss*:  $set (walk-edges (xs@[y]@zs)) \subseteq set (walk-edges (xs@[y]@ys@[y]@zs))$   
 ⟨proof⟩

**definition** *walk-length* :: 'a list  $\Rightarrow$  nat **where**  
 $walk-length\ p \equiv length (walk-edges\ p)$

**lemma** *walk-length-conv*:  $walk-length\ p = length\ p - 1$   
 ⟨proof⟩

**lemma** *walk-length-rev*:  $walk-length\ p = walk-length (rev\ p)$   
 ⟨proof⟩

**lemma** *walk-length-app*:  $xs \neq [] \implies ys \neq [] \implies walk-length (xs @ ys) = walk-length$   
 $xs + walk-length\ ys + 1$   
 ⟨proof⟩

**lemma** *walk-length-app-ineq*:  $walk-length (xs @ ys) \geq walk-length\ xs + walk-length$   
 $ys \wedge$   
 $walk-length (xs @ ys) \leq walk-length\ xs + walk-length\ ys + 1$   
 ⟨proof⟩

Note that while the trivial walk is allowed, the empty walk is not

**definition** *is-walk* :: 'a list  $\Rightarrow$  bool **where**  
 $is-walk\ xs \equiv set\ xs \subseteq V \wedge set (walk-edges\ xs) \subseteq E \wedge xs \neq []$

**lemma** *is-walkI*:  $set\ xs \subseteq V \implies set (walk-edges\ xs) \subseteq E \implies xs \neq [] \implies is-walk$   
 $xs$   
 ⟨proof⟩

**lemma** *is-walk-wf*:  $is-walk\ xs \implies set\ xs \subseteq V$   
 ⟨proof⟩

**lemma** *is-walk-wf-hd*:  $is-walk\ xs \implies hd\ xs \in V$   
*<proof>*

**lemma** *is-walk-wf-last*:  $is-walk\ xs \implies last\ xs \in V$   
*<proof>*

**lemma** *is-walk-singleton*:  $u \in V \implies is-walk\ [u]$   
*<proof>*

**lemma** *is-walk-not-empty*:  $is-walk\ xs \implies xs \neq []$   
*<proof>*

**lemma** *is-walk-not-empty2*:  $is-walk\ [] = False$   
*<proof>*

Reasoning on transformations of a walk

**lemma** *is-walk-rev*:  $is-walk\ xs \longleftrightarrow is-walk\ (rev\ xs)$   
*<proof>*

**lemma** *is-walk-tl*:  $length\ xs \geq 2 \implies is-walk\ xs \implies is-walk\ (tl\ xs)$   
*<proof>*

**lemma** *is-walk-append*:  
  **assumes** *is-walk*  $xs$   
  **assumes** *is-walk*  $ys$   
  **assumes**  $last\ xs = hd\ ys$   
  **shows**  $is-walk\ (xs\ @\ (tl\ ys))$   
*<proof>*

**lemma** *is-walk-decomp*:  
  **assumes**  $is-walk\ (xs@[y]@ys@[y]@zs)$  (**is** *is-walk*  $?w$ )  
  **shows**  $is-walk\ (xs@[y]@zs)$   
*<proof>*

**lemma** *is-walk-hd-tl*:  
  **assumes**  $is-walk\ (y\ \# \ ys)$   
  **assumes**  $\{x, y\} \in E$   
  **shows**  $is-walk\ (x\ \# \ y\ \# \ ys)$   
*<proof>*

**lemma** *is-walk-drop-hd*:  
  **assumes**  $ys \neq []$   
  **assumes**  $is-walk\ (y\ \# \ ys)$   
  **shows**  $is-walk\ ys$   
*<proof>*

**lemma** *walk-edges-index*:  
  **assumes**  $i \geq 0\ i < walk-length\ w$   
  **assumes**  $is-walk\ w$

**shows**  $(\text{walk-edges } w) ! i \in E$   
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

**lemma** *is-walk-index*:  
**assumes**  $i \geq 0$  *Suc*  $i < (\text{length } w)$   
**assumes** *is-walk*  $w$   
**shows**  $\{w ! i, w ! (i + 1)\} \in E$   
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

**lemma** *is-walk-take*:  
**assumes** *is-walk*  $w$   
**assumes**  $n > 0$   
**assumes**  $n \leq \text{length } w$   
**shows** *is-walk*  $(\text{take } n w)$   
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

**lemma** *is-walk-drop*:  
**assumes** *is-walk*  $w$   
**assumes**  $n < \text{length } w$   
**shows** *is-walk*  $(\text{drop } n w)$   
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

**definition** *walks* :: 'a list set **where**  
 $\text{walks} \equiv \{p. \text{is-walk } p\}$

**definition** *is-open-walk* :: 'a list  $\Rightarrow$  bool **where**  
 $\text{is-open-walk } xs \equiv \text{is-walk } xs \wedge \text{hd } xs \neq \text{last } xs$

**lemma** *is-open-walk-rev*:  $\text{is-open-walk } xs \longleftrightarrow \text{is-open-walk } (\text{rev } xs)$   
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

**definition** *is-closed-walk* :: 'a list  $\Rightarrow$  bool **where**  
 $\text{is-closed-walk } xs \equiv \text{is-walk } xs \wedge \text{hd } xs = \text{last } xs$

**lemma** *is-closed-walk-rev*:  $\text{is-closed-walk } xs \longleftrightarrow \text{is-closed-walk } (\text{rev } xs)$   
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

**definition** *is-trail* :: 'a list  $\Rightarrow$  bool **where**  
 $\text{is-trail } xs \equiv \text{is-walk } xs \wedge \text{distinct } (\text{walk-edges } xs)$

**lemma** *is-trail-rev*:  $\text{is-trail } xs \longleftrightarrow \text{is-trail } (\text{rev } xs)$   
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

## 2.2 Paths

There are two common definitions of a path. The first, given below, excludes the case where a path is a cycle. Note this also excludes the trivial path  $[x]$

**definition** *is-path* :: 'a list  $\Rightarrow$  bool **where**  
 $\text{is-path } xs \equiv (\text{is-open-walk } xs \wedge \text{distinct } (xs))$

**lemma** *is-path-rev*:  $is-path\ xs \longleftrightarrow is-path\ (rev\ xs)$   
 ⟨proof⟩

**lemma** *is-path-walk*:  $is-path\ xs \implies is-walk\ xs$   
 ⟨proof⟩

**definition** *paths* :: 'a list set **where**  
*paths*  $\equiv \{p . is-path\ p\}$

**lemma** *paths-ss-walk*:  $paths \subseteq walks$   
 ⟨proof⟩

A more generic definition of a path - used when a cycle is considered a path, and therefore includes the trivial path  $[x]$

**definition** *is-gen-path*:: 'a list  $\Rightarrow$  bool **where**  
*is-gen-path*  $p \equiv is-walk\ p \wedge ((distinct\ (tl\ p) \wedge hd\ p = last\ p) \vee distinct\ p)$

**lemma** *is-path-gen-path*:  $is-path\ p \implies is-gen-path\ p$   
 ⟨proof⟩

**lemma** *is-gen-path-rev*:  $is-gen-path\ p \longleftrightarrow is-gen-path\ (rev\ p)$   
 ⟨proof⟩

**lemma** *is-gen-path-distinct*:  $is-gen-path\ p \implies hd\ p \neq last\ p \implies distinct\ p$   
 ⟨proof⟩

**lemma** *is-gen-path-distinct-tl*:  
**assumes** *is-gen-path*  $p$  **and**  $hd\ p = last\ p$   
**shows**  $distinct\ (tl\ p)$   
 ⟨proof⟩

**lemma** *is-gen-path-trivial*:  $x \in V \implies is-gen-path\ [x]$   
 ⟨proof⟩

**definition** *gen-paths* :: 'a list set **where**  
*gen-paths*  $\equiv \{p . is-gen-path\ p\}$

**lemma** *gen-paths-ss-walks*:  $gen-paths \subseteq walks$   
 ⟨proof⟩

## 2.3 Cycles

Note, a cycle must be non trivial (i.e. have an edge), but as we let a loop by a cycle we broaden the definition in comparison to Noschinski [5] for a cycle to be of length greater than 1 rather than 3

**definition** *is-cycle* :: 'a list  $\Rightarrow$  bool **where**  
*is-cycle*  $xs \equiv is-closed-walk\ xs \wedge walk-length\ xs \geq 1 \wedge distinct\ (tl\ xs)$

**lemma** *is-gen-path-cycle*:  $is-cycle\ p \implies is-gen-path\ p$   
*<proof>*

**lemma** *is-cycle-alt-gen-path*:  $is-cycle\ xs \iff is-gen-path\ xs \wedge walk-length\ xs \geq 1$   
 $\wedge hd\ xs = last\ xs$   
*<proof>*

**lemma** *is-cycle-alt*:  $is-cycle\ xs \iff is-walk\ xs \wedge distinct\ (tl\ xs) \wedge walk-length\ xs$   
 $\geq 1 \wedge hd\ xs = last\ xs$   
*<proof>*

**lemma** *is-cycle-rev*:  $is-cycle\ xs \iff is-cycle\ (rev\ xs)$   
*<proof>*

**lemma** *cycle-tl-is-path*:  $is-cycle\ xs \wedge walk-length\ xs \geq 3 \implies is-path\ (tl\ xs)$   
*<proof>*

**lemma** *is-gen-path-path*:  
**assumes** *is-gen-path* *p* **and** *walk-length* *p*  $> 0$  **and**  $(\neg is-cycle\ p)$   
**shows** *is-path* *p*  
*<proof>*

**lemma** *is-gen-path-options*:  $is-gen-path\ p \iff is-cycle\ p \vee is-path\ p \vee (\exists v \in V.$   
 $p = [v])$   
*<proof>*

**definition** *cycles* :: 'a list set **where**  
 $cycles \equiv \{p. is-cycle\ p\}$

**lemma** *cycles-ss-gen-paths*:  $cycles \subseteq gen-paths$   
*<proof>*

**lemma** *gen-paths-ss*:  $gen-paths \subseteq cycles \cup paths \cup \{[v] \mid v. v \in V\}$   
*<proof>*

Walk edges are distinct in a path and cycle

**lemma** *distinct-edgesI*:  
**assumes** *distinct* *p* **shows** *distinct* (*walk-edges* *p*)  
*<proof>*

**lemma** *scycles-distinct-edges*:  
**assumes**  $c \in cycles$   $3 \leq walk-length\ c$  **shows** *distinct* (*walk-edges* *c*)  
*<proof>*

**end**

**context** *fin-ulgraph*  
**begin**

**lemma** *finite-paths: finite paths*  
*<proof>*

**lemma** *finite-cycles: finite (cycles)*  
*<proof>*

**lemma** *finite-gen-paths: finite (gen-paths)*  
*<proof>*

**end**

**end**

### 3 Connectivity

This theory defines concepts around the connectivity of a graph and its vertices, as well as graph properties that depend on connectivity definitions, such as shortest path, radius, diameter, and eccentricity

**theory** *Connectivity imports Undirected-Graph-Walks*  
**begin**

**context** *ulgraph*  
**begin**

#### 3.1 Connecting Walks and Paths

**definition** *connecting-walk* :: *'a*  $\Rightarrow$  *'a*  $\Rightarrow$  *'a list*  $\Rightarrow$  *bool* **where**  
*connecting-walk u v xs*  $\equiv$  *is-walk xs*  $\wedge$  *hd xs* = *u*  $\wedge$  *last xs* = *v*

**lemma** *connecting-walk-rev: connecting-walk u v xs*  $\longleftrightarrow$  *connecting-walk v u (rev xs)*  
*<proof>*

**lemma** *connecting-walk-wf: connecting-walk u v xs*  $\implies$  *u*  $\in$  *V*  $\wedge$  *v*  $\in$  *V*  
*<proof>*

**lemma** *connecting-walk-self: u*  $\in$  *V*  $\implies$  *connecting-walk u u [u]* = *True*  
*<proof>*

We define two definitions of connecting paths. The first uses the *gen-path* definition, which allows for trivial paths and cycles, the second uses the stricter definition of a path which requires it to be an open walk

**definition** *connecting-path* :: *'a*  $\Rightarrow$  *'a*  $\Rightarrow$  *'a list*  $\Rightarrow$  *bool* **where**  
*connecting-path u v xs*  $\equiv$  *is-gen-path xs*  $\wedge$  *hd xs* = *u*  $\wedge$  *last xs* = *v*

**definition** *connecting-path-str* :: *'a*  $\Rightarrow$  *'a*  $\Rightarrow$  *'a list*  $\Rightarrow$  *bool* **where**  
*connecting-path-str u v xs*  $\equiv$  *is-path xs*  $\wedge$  *hd xs* = *u*  $\wedge$  *last xs* = *v*



**lemma** *connecting-path-rev*:  $\text{connecting-path } u \ v \ xs \longleftrightarrow \text{connecting-path } v \ u \ (\text{rev } xs)$

*<proof>*

**lemma** *connecting-path-walk*:  $\text{connecting-path } u \ v \ xs \implies \text{connecting-walk } u \ v \ xs$

*<proof>*

**lemma** *connecting-path-str-gen*:  $\text{connecting-path-str } u \ v \ xs \implies \text{connecting-path } u \ v \ xs$

*<proof>*

**lemma** *connecting-path-gen-str*:  $\text{connecting-path } u \ v \ xs \implies (\neg \text{is-cycle } xs) \implies \text{walk-length } xs > 0 \implies \text{connecting-path-str } u \ v \ xs$

*<proof>*

**lemma** *connecting-path-alt-def*:  $\text{connecting-path } u \ v \ xs \longleftrightarrow \text{connecting-walk } u \ v \ xs \wedge \text{is-gen-path } xs$

*<proof>*

**lemma** *connecting-path-length-bound*:  $u \neq v \implies \text{connecting-path } u \ v \ p \implies \text{walk-length } p \geq 1$

*<proof>*

**lemma** *connecting-path-self*:  $u \in V \implies \text{connecting-path } u \ u \ [u] = \text{True}$

*<proof>*

**lemma** *connecting-path-singleton*:  $\text{connecting-path } u \ v \ xs \implies \text{length } xs = 1 \implies u = v$

*<proof>*

**lemma** *connecting-walk-path*:

**assumes**  $\text{connecting-walk } u \ v \ xs$

**shows**  $\exists \ ys . \text{connecting-path } u \ v \ ys \wedge \text{walk-length } ys \leq \text{walk-length } xs$

*<proof>*

**lemma** *connecting-walk-split*:

**assumes**  $\text{connecting-walk } u \ v \ xs$  **assumes**  $\text{connecting-walk } v \ z \ ys$

**shows**  $\text{connecting-walk } u \ z \ (xs \ @ \ (\text{tl } ys))$

*<proof>*

**lemma** *connecting-path-split*:

**assumes**  $\text{connecting-path } u \ v \ xs$  **connecting-path**  $v \ z \ ys$

**obtains**  $p$  **where**  $\text{connecting-path } u \ z \ p$  **and**  $\text{walk-length } p \leq \text{walk-length } (xs \ @ \ (\text{tl } ys))$

*<proof>*

**lemma** *connecting-path-split-length*:

**assumes**  $\text{connecting-path } u \ v \ xs$  **connecting-path**  $v \ z \ ys$

**obtains**  $p$  **where**  $\text{connecting-path } u \ z \ p$  **and**  $\text{walk-length } p \leq \text{walk-length } xs +$

*walk-length ys*  
*<proof>*

### 3.2 Vertex Connectivity

Two vertices are defined to be connected if there exists a connecting path. Note that the more general version of a connecting path is again used as a vertex should be considered as connected to itself

**definition** *vert-connected* :: 'a ⇒ 'a ⇒ bool **where**  
*vert-connected u v* ≡ ∃ xs . *connecting-path u v xs*

**lemma** *vert-connected-rev*: *vert-connected u v* ⟷ *vert-connected v u*  
*<proof>*

**lemma** *vert-connected-id*:  $u \in V \implies \text{vert-connected } u \ u = \text{True}$   
*<proof>*

**lemma** *vert-connected-trans*: *vert-connected u v* ⇒ *vert-connected v z* ⇒ *vert-connected u z*  
*<proof>*

**lemma** *vert-connected-wf*: *vert-connected u v* ⇒  $u \in V \wedge v \in V$   
*<proof>*

**definition** *vert-connected-n* :: 'a ⇒ 'a ⇒ nat ⇒ bool **where**  
*vert-connected-n u v n* ≡ ∃ p. *connecting-path u v p* ∧ *walk-length p = n*

**lemma** *vert-connected-n-imp*: *vert-connected-n u v n* ⇒ *vert-connected u v*  
*<proof>*

**lemma** *vert-connected-n-rev*: *vert-connected-n u v n* ⟷ *vert-connected-n v u n*  
*<proof>*

**definition** *connecting-paths* :: 'a ⇒ 'a ⇒ 'a list set **where**  
*connecting-paths u v* ≡ {xs . *connecting-path u v xs*}

**lemma** *connecting-paths-self*:  $u \in V \implies [u] \in \text{connecting-paths } u \ u$   
*<proof>*

**lemma** *connecting-paths-empty-iff*: *vert-connected u v* ⟷ *connecting-paths u v* ≠ {}  
*<proof>*

**lemma** *elem-connecting-paths*:  $p \in \text{connecting-paths } u \ v \implies \text{connecting-path } u \ v \ p$   
*<proof>*

**lemma** *connecting-paths-ss-gen*: *connecting-paths u v* ⊆ *gen-paths*  
*<proof>*

**lemma** *connecting-paths-sym*:  $xs \in \text{connecting-paths } u \ v \longleftrightarrow \text{rev } xs \in \text{connecting-paths } v \ u$

*<proof>*

A set is considered to be connected, if all the vertices within that set are pairwise connected

**definition** *is-connected-set* :: 'a set  $\Rightarrow$  bool **where**

*is-connected-set*  $V' \equiv (\forall \ u \ v . u \in V' \longrightarrow v \in V' \longrightarrow \text{vert-connected } u \ v)$

**lemma** *is-connected-set-empty*: *is-connected-set* {}

*<proof>*

**lemma** *is-connected-set-singleton*:  $x \in V \Longrightarrow \text{is-connected-set } \{x\}$

*<proof>*

**lemma** *is-connected-set-wf*: *is-connected-set*  $V' \Longrightarrow V' \subseteq V$

*<proof>*

**lemma** *is-connected-setD*: *is-connected-set*  $V' \Longrightarrow u \in V' \Longrightarrow v \in V' \Longrightarrow \text{vert-connected } u \ v$

*<proof>*

**lemma** *not-connected-set*:  $\neg \text{is-connected-set } V' \Longrightarrow u \in V' \Longrightarrow \exists \ v \in V' . \neg \text{vert-connected } u \ v$

*<proof>*

### 3.3 Graph Properties on Connectivity

The shortest path is defined to be the infimum of the set of connecting path walk lengths. Drawing inspiration from [4], we use the infimum and enats as this enables more natural reasoning in a non-finite setting, while also being useful for proofs of a more probabilistic or analysis nature

**definition** *shortest-path* :: 'a  $\Rightarrow$  'a  $\Rightarrow$  enat **where**

*shortest-path*  $u \ v \equiv \text{INF } p \in \text{connecting-paths } u \ v . \text{enat } (\text{walk-length } p)$

**lemma** *shortest-path-walk-length*: *shortest-path*  $u \ v = n \Longrightarrow p \in \text{connecting-paths } u \ v \Longrightarrow \text{walk-length } p \geq n$

*<proof>*

**lemma** *shortest-path-lte*:  $\bigwedge \ p . p \in \text{connecting-paths } u \ v \Longrightarrow \text{shortest-path } u \ v \leq \text{walk-length } p$

*<proof>*

**lemma** *shortest-path-obtains*:

**assumes** *shortest-path*  $u \ v = n$

**assumes**  $n \neq \text{top}$

**obtains**  $p$  **where**  $p \in \text{connecting-paths } u \ v$  **and** *walk-length*  $p = n$

*<proof>*

**lemma** *shortest-path-intro*:  
**assumes**  $n \neq \text{top}$   
**assumes**  $(\exists p \in \text{connecting-paths } u \ v . \text{walk-length } p = n)$   
**assumes**  $(\bigwedge p. p \in \text{connecting-paths } u \ v \implies n \leq \text{walk-length } p)$   
**shows**  $\text{shortest-path } u \ v = n$   
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

**lemma** *shortest-path-self*:  
**assumes**  $u \in V$   
**shows**  $\text{shortest-path } u \ u = 0$   
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

**lemma** *connecting-paths-sym-length*:  $i \in \text{connecting-paths } u \ v \implies \exists j \in \text{connecting-paths } v \ u. (\text{walk-length } j) = (\text{walk-length } i)$   
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

**lemma** *shortest-path-sym*:  $\text{shortest-path } u \ v = \text{shortest-path } v \ u$   
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

**lemma** *shortest-path-inf*:  $\neg \text{vert-connected } u \ v \implies \text{shortest-path } u \ v = \infty$   
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

**lemma** *shortest-path-not-inf*:  
**assumes**  $\text{vert-connected } u \ v$   
**shows**  $\text{shortest-path } u \ v \neq \infty$   
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

**lemma** *shortest-path-obtains2*:  
**assumes**  $\text{vert-connected } u \ v$   
**obtains**  $p$  **where**  $p \in \text{connecting-paths } u \ v$  **and**  $\text{walk-length } p = \text{shortest-path } u \ v$   
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

**lemma** *shortest-path-split*:  $\text{shortest-path } x \ y \leq \text{shortest-path } x \ z + \text{shortest-path } z \ y$   
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

**lemma** *shortest-path-invalid-v*:  $v \notin V \vee u \notin V \implies \text{shortest-path } u \ v = \infty$   
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

**lemma** *shortest-path-lb*:  
**assumes**  $u \neq v$   
**assumes**  $\text{vert-connected } u \ v$   
**shows**  $\text{shortest-path } u \ v > 0$   
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

Eccentricity of a vertex  $v$  is the furthest distance between it and a (different) vertex

**definition** *eccentricity* :: 'a ⇒ enat **where**  
*eccentricity* v ≡ SUP u ∈ V - {v}. *shortest-path* v u

**lemma** *eccentricity-empty-vertices*: V = {} ⇒ *eccentricity* v = 0  
 V = {v} ⇒ *eccentricity* v = 0  
 ⟨*proof*⟩

**lemma** *eccentricity-bot-iff*: *eccentricity* v = 0 ⇔ V = {} ∨ V = {v}  
 ⟨*proof*⟩

**lemma** *eccentricity-invalid-v*:  
 assumes v ∉ V  
 assumes V ≠ {}  
 shows *eccentricity* v = ∞  
 ⟨*proof*⟩

**lemma** *eccentricity-gt-shortest-path*:  
 assumes u ∈ V  
 shows *eccentricity* v ≥ *shortest-path* v u  
 ⟨*proof*⟩

**lemma** *eccentricity-disconnected-graph*:  
 assumes ¬ is-connected-set V  
 assumes v ∈ V  
 shows *eccentricity* v = ∞  
 ⟨*proof*⟩

The diameter is the largest distance between any two vertices

**definition** *diameter* :: enat **where**  
*diameter* ≡ SUP v ∈ V . *eccentricity* v

**lemma** *diameter-gt-eccentricity*: v ∈ V ⇒ *diameter* ≥ *eccentricity* v  
 ⟨*proof*⟩

**lemma** *diameter-disconnected-graph*:  
 assumes ¬ is-connected-set V  
 shows *diameter* = ∞  
 ⟨*proof*⟩

**lemma** *diameter-empty*: V = {} ⇒ *diameter* = 0  
 ⟨*proof*⟩

**lemma** *diameter-singleton*: V = {v} ⇒ *diameter* = *eccentricity* v  
 ⟨*proof*⟩

The radius is the smallest "shortest" distance between any two vertices

**definition** *radius* :: enat **where**  
*radius* ≡ INF v ∈ V . *eccentricity* v

**lemma** *radius-lt-eccentricity*:  $v \in V \implies \text{radius} \leq \text{eccentricity } v$   
 ⟨proof⟩

**lemma** *radius-disconnected-graph*:  $\neg \text{is-connected-set } V \implies \text{radius} = \infty$   
 ⟨proof⟩

**lemma** *radius-empty*:  $V = \{\}$   $\implies \text{radius} = \infty$   
 ⟨proof⟩

**lemma** *radius-singleton*:  $V = \{v\} \implies \text{radius} = \text{eccentricity } v$   
 ⟨proof⟩

The centre of the graph is all vertices whose eccentricity equals the radius

**definition** *centre* :: 'a set where  
*centre*  $\equiv \{v \in V. \text{eccentricity } v = \text{radius}\}$

**lemma** *centre-disconnected-graph*:  $\neg \text{is-connected-set } V \implies \text{centre} = V$   
 ⟨proof⟩

**end**

**lemma** (in *fin-ulgraph*) *fin-connecting-paths*: *finite* (*connecting-paths*  $u$   $v$ )  
 ⟨proof⟩

### 3.4 We define a connected graph as a non-empty graph (the empty set is not usually considered connected by convention), where the vertex set is connected

**locale** *connected-ulgraph* = *ulgraph* + *ne-graph-system* +  
**assumes** *connected*: *is-connected-set*  $V$   
**begin**

**lemma** *vertices-connected*:  $u \in V \implies v \in V \implies \text{vert-connected } u$   $v$   
 ⟨proof⟩

**lemma** *vertices-connected-path*:  $u \in V \implies v \in V \implies \exists p. \text{connecting-path } u$   $v$   $p$   
 ⟨proof⟩

**lemma** *connecting-paths-not-empty*:  $u \in V \implies v \in V \implies \text{connecting-paths } u$   $v$   
 $\neq \{\}$   
 ⟨proof⟩

**lemma** *min-shortest-path*: **assumes**  $u \in V$   $v \in V$   $u \neq v$   
**shows** *shortest-path*  $u$   $v$   $> 0$   
 ⟨proof⟩

The eccentricity, diameter, radius, and centre definitions tend to be only used in a connected context, as otherwise they are the INF/SUP value. In these contexts, we can obtain the vertex responsible

**lemma** *eccentricity-obtains-inf*:

**assumes**  $V \neq \{v\}$

**shows**  $\text{eccentricity } v = \infty \vee (\exists u \in (V - \{v\}) . \text{shortest-path } v \ u = \text{eccentricity } v)$   
*<proof>*

**lemma** *diameter-obtains*:  $\text{diameter} = \infty \vee (\exists v \in V . \text{eccentricity } v = \text{diameter})$   
*<proof>*

**lemma** *radius-diameter-singleton-eq*: **assumes**  $\text{card } V = 1$  **shows**  $\text{radius} = \text{diameter}$   
*<proof>*

**end**

**locale** *fin-connected-ulgraph* = *connected-ulgraph* + *fin-ulgraph*  
**begin**

In a finite context the supremum/infimum are equivalent to the Max/Min of the sets respectively. This can make reasoning easier

**lemma** *shortest-path-Min-alt*:

**assumes**  $u \in V \ v \in V$

**shows**  $\text{shortest-path } u \ v = \text{Min } ((\lambda p . \text{enat } (\text{walk-length } p)) \text{ ` } (\text{connecting-paths } u \ v))$  (is  $\text{shortest-path } u \ v = \text{Min } ?A$ )  
*<proof>*

**lemma** *eccentricity-Max-alt*:

**assumes**  $v \in V$

**assumes**  $V \neq \{v\}$

**shows**  $\text{eccentricity } v = \text{Max } ((\lambda u . \text{shortest-path } v \ u) \text{ ` } (V - \{v\}))$

*<proof>*

**lemma** *diameter-Max-alt*:  $\text{diameter} = \text{Max } ((\lambda v . \text{eccentricity } v) \text{ ` } V)$   
*<proof>*

**lemma** *radius-Min-alt*:  $\text{radius} = \text{Min } ((\lambda v . \text{eccentricity } v) \text{ ` } V)$   
*<proof>*

**lemma** *eccentricity-obtains*:

**assumes**  $v \in V$

**assumes**  $V \neq \{v\}$

**obtains**  $u$  **where**  $u \in V$  **and**  $u \neq v$  **and**  $\text{shortest-path } u \ v = \text{eccentricity } v$   
*<proof>*

**lemma** *radius-obtains*:

**obtains**  $v$  **where**  $v \in V$  **and**  $\text{radius} = \text{eccentricity } v$   
*<proof>*

**lemma** *radius-obtains-path-vertices*:

**assumes**  $\text{card } V \geq 2$   
**obtains**  $u \ v$  **where**  $u \in V$  **and**  $v \in V$  **and**  $u \neq v$  **and**  $\text{radius} = \text{shortest-path}$   
 $u \ v$   
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

**lemma** *diameter-obtains*:  
**obtains**  $v$  **where**  $v \in V$  **and**  $\text{diameter} = \text{eccentricity } v$   
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

**lemma** *diameter-obtains-path-vertices*:  
**assumes**  $\text{card } V \geq 2$   
**obtains**  $u \ v$  **where**  $u \in V$  **and**  $v \in V$  **and**  $u \neq v$  **and**  $\text{diameter} = \text{shortest-path}$   
 $u \ v$   
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

**lemma** *radius-diameter-bounds*:  
**shows**  $\text{radius} \leq \text{diameter}$   $\text{diameter} \leq 2 * \text{radius}$   
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

**end**

We define various subclasses of the general connected graph, using the functor locale pattern

**locale** *connected-sgraph* = *sgraph* + *ne-graph-system* +  
**assumes** *connected: is-connected-set*  $V$

**sublocale** *connected-sgraph*  $\subseteq$  *connected-ulgraph*  
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

**locale** *fin-connected-sgraph* = *connected-sgraph* + *fin-sgraph*

**sublocale** *fin-connected-sgraph*  $\subseteq$  *fin-connected-ulgraph*  
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

**end**

**theory** *Girth-Independence* **imports** *Connectivity*  
**begin**

## 4 Girth and Independence

We translate and extend on a number of definitions and lemmas on girth and independence from Noschinski's ugraph representation [4].

**context** *sgraph*  
**begin**

**definition** *girth* :: *enat* **where**  
 $\text{girth} \equiv \text{INF } p \in \text{cycles. enat (walk-length } p)$



**lemma** *girth-acyclic*:  $\text{cycles} = \{\}$   $\implies$   $\text{girth} = \infty$   
 ⟨proof⟩

**lemma** *girth-lte*:  $c \in \text{cycles} \implies \text{girth} \leq \text{walk-length } c$   
 ⟨proof⟩

**lemma** *girth-obtains*:  
 assumes  $\text{girth} \neq \text{top}$   
 obtains  $c$  **where**  $c \in \text{cycles}$  **and**  $\text{walk-length } c = \text{girth}$   
 ⟨proof⟩

**lemma** *girthI*:  
 assumes  $c' \in \text{cycles}$   
 assumes  $\bigwedge c. c \in \text{cycles} \implies \text{walk-length } c' \leq \text{walk-length } c$   
 shows  $\text{girth} = \text{walk-length } c'$   
 ⟨proof⟩

**lemma** (in *fin-sgraph*) *girth-min-alt*:  
 assumes  $\text{cycles} \neq \{\}$   
 shows  $\text{girth} = \text{Min } ((\lambda c. \text{enat } (\text{walk-length } c)) \text{ ` } \text{cycles})$  (is  $\text{girth} = \text{Min } ?A$ )  
 ⟨proof⟩

**definition** *is-independent-set* :: 'a set  $\Rightarrow$  bool **where**  
*is-independent-set*  $vs \equiv vs \subseteq V \wedge (\text{all-edges } vs) \cap E = \{\}$

A More mathematical way of thinking about it

**lemma** *is-independent-alt*:  $\text{is-independent-set } vs \longleftrightarrow vs \subseteq V \wedge (\forall v \in vs. \forall u \in vs. \neg \text{vert-adj } v \ u)$   
 ⟨proof⟩

**lemma** *singleton-independent-set*:  $v \in V \implies \text{is-independent-set } \{v\}$   
 ⟨proof⟩

**definition** *independent-sets* :: 'a set set **where**  
*independent-sets*  $\equiv \{vs. \text{is-independent-set } vs\}$

**definition** *independence-number* :: enat **where**  
*independence-number*  $\equiv \text{SUP } vs \in \text{independent-sets}. \text{enat } (\text{card } vs)$

**abbreviation**  $\alpha \equiv \text{independence-number}$

**lemma** *independent-sets-mono*:  
 $vs \in \text{independent-sets} \implies us \subseteq vs \implies us \in \text{independent-sets}$   
 ⟨proof⟩

**lemma** *le-independence-iff*:  
 assumes  $0 < k$   
 shows  $k \leq \alpha \longleftrightarrow k \in \text{card } \text{ ` } \text{independent-sets}$  (is  $?L \longleftrightarrow ?R$ )  
 ⟨proof⟩

```

lemma zero-less-independence:
  assumes  $V \neq \{\}$ 
  shows  $0 < \alpha$ 
  <proof>

end

context fin-sgraph
begin
lemma fin-independent-sets: finite (independent-sets)
  <proof>

lemma independence-le-card:
  shows  $\alpha \leq \text{card } V$ 
  <proof>

lemma independence-fin:  $\alpha \neq \infty$ 
  <proof>

lemma independence-max-alt:  $V \neq \{\} \implies \alpha = \text{Max } ((\lambda \text{ vs } . \text{enat } (\text{card } \text{vs})) \text{ `independent-sets})$ 
  <proof>

lemma independent-sets-ne:
  assumes  $V \neq \{\}$ 
  shows independent-sets  $\neq \{\}$ 
  <proof>

lemma independence-obtains:
  assumes  $V \neq \{\}$ 
  obtains vs where is-independent-set vs and  $\text{card } \text{vs} = \alpha$ 
  <proof>
end
end

```

## 5 Triangles in Graph

Triangles are an important tool in graph theory. This theory presents a number of basic definitions/lemmas which are useful for general reasoning using triangles. The definitions and lemmas in this theory are adapted from previous less general work in [2] and [1]

```

theory Graph-Triangles imports Undirected-Graph-Basics
  HOL-Combinatorics.Multiset-Permutations
begin

```

Triangles don't make as much sense in a loop context, hence we restrict this to simple graphs

**context** *sgraph*  
**begin**

**definition** *triangle-in-graph* :: 'a ⇒ 'a ⇒ 'a ⇒ bool **where**  
*triangle-in-graph* *x y z* ≡ ({*x,y*} ∈ *E*) ∧ ({*y,z*} ∈ *E*) ∧ ({*x,z*} ∈ *E*)

**lemma** *triangle-in-graph-edge-empty*: *E* = {} ⇒ ¬ *triangle-in-graph* *x y z*  
⟨*proof*⟩

**definition** *triangle-triples* **where**  
*triangle-triples* *X Y Z* ≡ {(*x,y,z*) ∈ *X* × *Y* × *Z*. *triangle-in-graph* *x y z*}

**definition**  
*unique-triangles*  
≡ ∀ *e* ∈ *E*. ∃! *T*. ∃ *x y z*. *T* = {*x,y,z*} ∧ *triangle-in-graph* *x y z* ∧ *e* ⊆ *T*

**definition** *triangle-set* :: 'a set set  
**where** *triangle-set* ≡ { {*x,y,z*} | *x y z*. *triangle-in-graph* *x y z*}

## 5.1 Preliminaries on Triangles in Graphs

**lemma** *card-triangle-triples-rotate*: *card* (*triangle-triples* *X Y Z*) = *card* (*triangle-triples* *Y Z X*)  
⟨*proof*⟩

**lemma** *triangle-commu1*:  
**assumes** *triangle-in-graph* *x y z*  
**shows** *triangle-in-graph* *y x z*  
⟨*proof*⟩

**lemma** *triangle-vertices-distinct1*:  
**assumes** *tri*: *triangle-in-graph* *x y z*  
**shows** *x* ≠ *y*  
⟨*proof*⟩

**lemma** *triangle-vertices-distinct2*:  
**assumes** *triangle-in-graph* *x y z*  
**shows** *y* ≠ *z*  
⟨*proof*⟩

**lemma** *triangle-vertices-distinct3*:  
**assumes** *triangle-in-graph* *x y z*  
**shows** *z* ≠ *x*  
⟨*proof*⟩

**lemma** *triangle-in-graph-edge-point*: *triangle-in-graph* *x y z* ⇔ {*y, z*} ∈ *E* ∧ *vert-adj* *x y* ∧ *vert-adj* *x z*  
⟨*proof*⟩

**lemma** *edge-vertices-not-equal*:

**assumes**  $\{x,y\} \in E$

**shows**  $x \neq y$

*<proof>*

**lemma** *edge-btw-vertices-not-equal*:

**assumes**  $(x, y) \in \text{all-edges-between } X Y$

**shows**  $x \neq y$

*<proof>*

**lemma** *mk-triangle-from-ss-edges*:

**assumes**  $(x, y) \in \text{all-edges-between } X Y$  **and**  $(x, z) \in \text{all-edges-between } X Z$  **and**  
 $(y, z) \in \text{all-edges-between } Y Z$

**shows**  $(\text{triangle-in-graph } x y z)$

*<proof>*

**lemma** *triangle-in-graph-verts*:

**assumes**  $\text{triangle-in-graph } x y z$

**shows**  $x \in V y \in V z \in V$

*<proof>*

**lemma** *convert-triangle-rep-ss*:

**assumes**  $X \subseteq V$  **and**  $Y \subseteq V$  **and**  $Z \subseteq V$

**shows**  $\text{mk-triangle-set } \{ \{x, y, z\} \in X \times Y \times Z . (\text{triangle-in-graph } x y z) \} \subseteq$   
 $\text{triangle-set}$

*<proof>*

**lemma** **(in** *fin-sgraph*) *finite-triangle-set*:  $\text{finite } (\text{triangle-set})$

*<proof>*

**lemma** *card-triangle-3*:

**assumes**  $t \in \text{triangle-set}$

**shows**  $\text{card } t = 3$

*<proof>*

**lemma** *triangle-set-power-set-ss*:  $\text{triangle-set} \subseteq \text{Pow } V$

*<proof>*

**lemma** *triangle-in-graph-ss*:

**assumes**  $E' \subseteq E$

**assumes**  $\text{sgraph.triangle-in-graph } E' x y z$

**shows**  $\text{triangle-in-graph } x y z$

*<proof>*

**lemma** *triangle-set-graph-edge-ss*:

**assumes**  $E' \subseteq E$

**shows**  $(\text{sgraph.triangle-set } E') \subseteq (\text{triangle-set})$

*<proof>*

**lemma** (in *fin-sgraph*) *triangle-set-graph-edge-ss-bound*:  
**assumes**  $E' \subseteq E$   
**shows**  $\text{card } (\text{triangle-set}) \geq \text{card } (\text{sgraph.triangle-set } E')$   
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

**end**

**locale** *triangle-free-graph* = *sgraph* +  
**assumes** *tri-free*:  $\neg(\exists x y z. \text{triangle-in-graph } x y z)$

**lemma** *triangle-free-graph-empty*:  $E = \{\}$   $\implies$  *triangle-free-graph*  $V E$   
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

**context** *fin-sgraph*  
**begin**

Converting between ordered and unordered triples for reasoning on cardinality

**lemma** *card-convert-triangle-rep*:  
**assumes**  $X \subseteq V$  **and**  $Y \subseteq V$  **and**  $Z \subseteq V$   
**shows**  $\text{card } (\text{triangle-set}) \geq 1/6 * \text{card } \{(x, y, z) \in X \times Y \times Z . (\text{triangle-in-graph } x y z)\}$   
(is  $- \geq 1/6 * \text{card } ?TT$ )  
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

**lemma** *card-convert-triangle-rep-bound*:  
**fixes**  $t :: \text{real}$   
**assumes**  $\text{card } \{(x, y, z) \in X \times Y \times Z . (\text{triangle-in-graph } x y z)\} \geq t$   
**assumes**  $X \subseteq V$  **and**  $Y \subseteq V$  **and**  $Z \subseteq V$   
**shows**  $\text{card } (\text{triangle-set}) \geq 1/6 * t$   
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$   
**end**  
**end**  
**theory** *Bipartite-Graphs* **imports** *Undirected-Graph-Walks*  
**begin**

## 6 Bipartite Graphs

An introductory library for reasoning on bipartite graphs.

### 6.1 Bipartite Set Up

All "edges", i.e. pairs, between any two sets

**definition** *all-bi-edges* :: 'a set  $\Rightarrow$  'a set  $\Rightarrow$  'a edge set **where**  
*all-bi-edges*  $X Y \equiv \text{mk-edge } (X \times Y)$

**lemma** *all-bi-edges-alt*:  
**assumes**  $X \cap Y = \{\}$

**shows**  $all\text{-}bi\text{-}edges\ X\ Y = \{e . card\ e = 2 \wedge e \cap X \neq \{\} \wedge e \cap Y \neq \{\}\}$   
 ⟨proof⟩

**lemma**  $all\text{-}bi\text{-}edges\text{-}alt2: all\text{-}bi\text{-}edges\ X\ Y = \{\{x, y\} \mid x\ y. x \in X \wedge y \in Y\}$   
 ⟨proof⟩

**lemma**  $all\text{-}bi\text{-}edges\text{-}wf: e \in all\text{-}bi\text{-}edges\ X\ Y \implies e \subseteq X \cup Y$   
 ⟨proof⟩

**lemma**  $all\text{-}bi\text{-}edges\text{-}2: X \cap Y = \{\} \implies e \in all\text{-}bi\text{-}edges\ X\ Y \implies card\ e = 2$   
 ⟨proof⟩

**lemma**  $all\text{-}bi\text{-}edges\text{-}main: X \cap Y = \{\} \implies all\text{-}bi\text{-}edges\ X\ Y \subseteq all\text{-}edges\ (X \cup Y)$   
 ⟨proof⟩

**lemma**  $all\text{-}bi\text{-}edges\text{-}finite: finite\ X \implies finite\ Y \implies finite\ (all\text{-}bi\text{-}edges\ X\ Y)$   
 ⟨proof⟩

**lemma**  $all\text{-}bi\text{-}edges\text{-}not\text{-}ssX: X \cap Y = \{\} \implies e \in all\text{-}bi\text{-}edges\ X\ Y \implies \neg e \subseteq X$   
 ⟨proof⟩

**lemma**  $all\text{-}bi\text{-}edges\text{-}sym: all\text{-}bi\text{-}edges\ X\ Y = all\text{-}bi\text{-}edges\ Y\ X$   
 ⟨proof⟩

**lemma**  $all\text{-}bi\text{-}edges\text{-}not\text{-}ssY: X \cap Y = \{\} \implies e \in all\text{-}bi\text{-}edges\ X\ Y \implies \neg e \subseteq Y$   
 ⟨proof⟩

**lemma**  $card\text{-}all\text{-}bi\text{-}edges:$   
**assumes**  $finite\ X\ finite\ Y$   
**assumes**  $X \cap Y = \{\}$   
**shows**  $card\ (all\text{-}bi\text{-}edges\ X\ Y) = card\ X * card\ Y$   
 ⟨proof⟩

**lemma** (in *sgraph*)  $all\text{-}edges\text{-}between\text{-}bi\text{-}subset: mk\text{-}edge\ 'all\text{-}edges\text{-}between\ X\ Y \subseteq all\text{-}bi\text{-}edges\ X\ Y$   
 ⟨proof⟩

## 6.2 Bipartite Graph Locale

For reasoning purposes, it is useful to explicitly label the two sets of vertices as X and Y. These are parameters in the locale

**locale**  $bipartite\text{-}graph = graph\text{-}system +$   
**fixes**  $X\ Y :: 'a\ set$   
**assumes**  $partition: partition\text{-}on\ V\ \{X, Y\}$   
**assumes**  $ne: X \neq Y$   
**assumes**  $edge\text{-}betw: e \in E \implies e \in all\text{-}bi\text{-}edges\ X\ Y$   
**begin**

**lemma**  $part\text{-}intersect\text{-}empty: X \cap Y = \{\}$

*<proof>*

**lemma** *X-not-empty*:  $X \neq \{\}$   
*<proof>*

**lemma** *Y-not-empty*:  $Y \neq \{\}$   
*<proof>*

**lemma** *XY-union*:  $X \cup Y = V$   
*<proof>*

**lemma** *card-edges-two*:  $e \in E \implies \text{card } e = 2$   
*<proof>*

**lemma** *partitions-ss*:  $X \subseteq V \ Y \subseteq V$   
*<proof>*

**end**

By definition, we say an edge must be between X and Y, i.e. contains two vertices

**sublocale** *bipartite-graph*  $\subseteq$  *sgraph*  
*<proof>*

**context** *bipartite-graph*  
**begin**

**abbreviation** *density*  $\equiv$  *edge-density*  $X \ Y$

**lemma** *bipartite-sym*: *bipartite-graph*  $V \ E \ Y \ X$   
*<proof>*

**lemma** *X-verts-not-adj*:  
**assumes**  $x1 \in X \ x2 \in X$   
**shows**  $\neg \text{vert-adj } x1 \ x2$   
*<proof>*

**lemma** *Y-verts-not-adj*:  
**assumes**  $y1 \in Y \ y2 \in Y$   
**shows**  $\neg \text{vert-adj } y1 \ y2$   
*<proof>*

**lemma** *X-vert-adj-Y*:  $x \in X \implies \text{vert-adj } x \ y \implies y \in Y$   
*<proof>*

**lemma** *Y-vert-adj-X*:  $y \in Y \implies \text{vert-adj } y \ x \implies x \in X$   
*<proof>*

**lemma** *neighbors-ss-eq-neighborhoodX*:  $v \in X \implies \text{neighborhood } v = \text{neighbors-ss}$

$v \in Y$   
*<proof>*

**lemma** *neighbors-ss-eq-neighborhood* $Y: v \in Y \implies \text{neighborhood } v = \text{neighbors-ss } v \ X$   
*<proof>*

**lemma** *neighborhood-subset-opp* $X: v \in X \implies \text{neighborhood } v \subseteq Y$   
*<proof>*

**lemma** *neighborhood-subset-opp* $Y: v \in Y \implies \text{neighborhood } v \subseteq X$   
*<proof>*

**lemma** *degree-neighbors-ss* $X: v \in X \implies \text{degree } v = \text{card } (\text{neighbors-ss } v \ Y)$   
*<proof>*

**lemma** *degree-neighbors-ss* $Y: v \in Y \implies \text{degree } v = \text{card } (\text{neighbors-ss } v \ X)$   
*<proof>*

**definition** *is-bicomplete*:: **bool** **where**  
*is-bicomplete*  $\equiv E = \text{all-bi-edges } X \ Y$

**lemma** *edge-betw-indiv*:  
**assumes**  $e \in E$   
**obtains**  $x \ y$  **where**  $x \in X \wedge y \in Y \wedge e = \{x, y\}$   
*<proof>*

**lemma** *edges-between-equals-edge-set*:  $\text{mk-edge } ( \text{all-edges-between } X \ Y ) = E$   
*<proof>*

Lemmas for reasoning on walks and paths in a bipartite graph

**lemma** *walk-alternates*:  
**assumes** *is-walk*  $w$   
**assumes**  $\text{Suc } i < \text{length } w \ i \geq 0$   
**shows**  $w ! i \in X \longleftrightarrow w ! (i + 1) \in Y$   
*<proof>*

A useful reasoning pattern to mimic "wlog" statements for properties that are symmetric is to interpret the symmetric bipartite graph and then directly apply the lemma proven earlier

**lemma** *walk-alternates-sym*:  
**assumes** *is-walk*  $w$   
**assumes**  $\text{Suc } i < \text{length } w \ i \geq 0$   
**shows**  $w ! i \in Y \longleftrightarrow w ! (i + 1) \in X$   
*<proof>*

**lemma** *walk-length-even*:  
**assumes** *is-walk*  $w$   
**assumes**  $\text{hd } w \in X$  **and**  $\text{last } w \in X$



**shows** *even* (*walk-length* *w*)  
⟨*proof*⟩

**lemma** *walk-length-even-sym*:  
**assumes** *is-walk* *w*  
**assumes** *hd* *w* ∈ *Y*  
**assumes** *last* *w* ∈ *Y*  
**shows** *even* (*walk-length* *w*)  
⟨*proof*⟩

**lemma** *walk-length-odd*:  
**assumes** *is-walk* *w*  
**assumes** *hd* *w* ∈ *X* **and** *last* *w* ∈ *Y*  
**shows** *odd* (*walk-length* *w*)  
⟨*proof*⟩

**lemma** *walk-length-odd-sym*:  
**assumes** *is-walk* *w*  
**assumes** *hd* *w* ∈ *Y* **and** *last* *w* ∈ *X*  
**shows** *odd* (*walk-length* *w*)  
⟨*proof*⟩

**lemma** *walk-length-even-iff*:  
**assumes** *is-walk* *w*  
**shows** *even* (*walk-length* *w*)  $\longleftrightarrow$  (*hd* *w* ∈ *X* ∧ *last* *w* ∈ *X*) ∨ (*hd* *w* ∈ *Y* ∧ *last* *w* ∈ *Y*)  
⟨*proof*⟩

**lemma** *walk-length-odd-iff*:  
**assumes** *is-walk* *w*  
**shows** *odd* (*walk-length* *w*)  $\longleftrightarrow$  (*hd* *w* ∈ *X* ∧ *last* *w* ∈ *Y*) ∨ (*hd* *w* ∈ *Y* ∧ *last* *w* ∈ *X*)  
⟨*proof*⟩

Classic basic theorem that a bipartite graph must not have any cycles with an odd length

**lemma** *no-odd-cycles*:  
**assumes** *is-walk* *w*  
**assumes** *odd* (*walk-length* *w*)  
**shows**  $\neg$  *is-cycle* *w*  
⟨*proof*⟩

**end**

A few properties rely on cardinality definitions that require the vertex sets to be finite

**locale** *fin-bipartite-graph* = *bipartite-graph* + *fin-graph-system*  
**begin**

**lemma** *fin-bipartite-sym: fin-bipartite-graph*  $V E Y X$   
*<proof>*

**lemma** *partitions-finite: finite*  $X$  *finite*  $Y$   
*<proof>*

**lemma** *card-edges-between-set: card* (*all-edges-between*  $X Y$ ) = *card*  $E$   
*<proof>*

**lemma** *density-simp: density = card* ( $E$ ) / ((*card*  $X$ ) \* (*card*  $Y$ ))  
*<proof>*

**lemma** *edge-size-degree-sumY: card*  $E$  = ( $\sum y \in Y .$  *degree*  $y$ )  
*<proof>*

**lemma** *edge-size-degree-sumX: card*  $E$  = ( $\sum y \in X .$  *degree*  $y$ )  
*<proof>*

**end**  
**end**

## 7 Graph Theory Inheritance

This theory aims to demonstrate the use of locales to transfer theorems between different graph/combinatorial structure representations

**theory** *Graph-Theory-Relations imports* *Undirected-Graph-Basics Bipartite-Graphs*

*Design-Theory.Block-Designs Design-Theory.Group-Divisible-Designs*  
**begin**

### 7.1 Design Inheritance

A graph is a type of incidence system, and more specifically a type of combinatorial design. This section demonstrates the correspondence between designs and graphs

**sublocale** *graph-system*  $\subseteq$  *inc: incidence-system*  $V$  *mset-set*  $E$   
*<proof>*

**sublocale** *fin-graph-system*  $\subseteq$  *finc: finite-incidence-system*  $V$  *mset-set*  $E$   
*<proof>*

**sublocale** *fin-ulgraph*  $\subseteq$  *d: design*  $V$  *mset-set*  $E$   
*<proof>*

**sublocale** *fin-ulgraph*  $\subseteq$  *d: simple-design*  $V$  *mset-set*  $E$   
*<proof>*

**locale** *graph-has-edges* = *graph-system* +  
**assumes** *edges-nempty*:  $E \neq \{\}$

**locale** *fin-sgraph-wedges* = *fin-sgraph* + *graph-has-edges*

The simple graph definition of degree overlaps with the definition of a point replication number

**sublocale** *fin-sgraph-wedges*  $\subseteq$  *bd*: *block-design*  $V$  *mset-set*  $E$   $\mathbb{2}$   
**rewrites** *point-replication-number* (*mset-set*  $E$ )  $x = \text{degree } x$   
**and** *points-index* (*mset-set*  $E$ )  $vs = \text{degree-set } vs$   
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

**locale** *fin-bipartite-graph-wedges* = *fin-bipartite-graph* + *fin-sgraph-wedges*

**sublocale** *fin-bipartite-graph-wedges*  $\subseteq$  *group-design*  $V$  *mset-set*  $E$   $\{X, Y\}$   
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

## 7.2 Adjacency Relation Definition

Another common formal representation of graphs is as a vertex set and an adjacency relation. This is a useful representation in some contexts - we use locales to enable the transfer of results between the two representations, specifically the mutual sublocales approach

**locale** *graph-rel* =  
**fixes** *vertices* :: 'a set ( $\langle V \rangle$ )  
**fixes** *adj-rel* :: 'a rel  
**assumes** *wf*:  $\bigwedge u v. (u, v) \in \text{adj-rel} \implies u \in V \wedge v \in V$   
**begin**

**abbreviation** *adj*  $u v \equiv (u, v) \in \text{adj-rel}$

**lemma** *wf-alt*:  $\text{adj } u v \implies (u, v) \in V \times V$   
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

**end**

**locale** *ulgraph-rel* = *graph-rel* +  
**assumes** *sym-adj*: *sym adj-rel*  
**begin**

This definition makes sense in the context of an undirected graph

**definition** *edge-set*:: 'a edge set **where**  
*edge-set*  $\equiv \{\{u, v\} \mid u v. \text{adj } u v\}$

**lemma** *obtain-edge-pair-adj*:  
**assumes**  $e \in \text{edge-set}$   
**obtains**  $u v$  **where**  $e = \{u, v\}$  **and**  $\text{adj } u v$

*<proof>*

**lemma** *adj-to-edge-set-card:*

**assumes**  $e \in \text{edge-set}$

**shows**  $\text{card } e = 1 \vee \text{card } e = 2$

*<proof>*

**lemma** *adj-to-edge-set-card-lim:*

**assumes**  $e \in \text{edge-set}$

**shows**  $\text{card } e > 0 \wedge \text{card } e \leq 2$

*<proof>*

**lemma** *edge-set-wf:*  $e \in \text{edge-set} \implies e \subseteq V$

*<proof>*

**lemma** *is-graph-system:*  $\text{graph-system } V \text{ edge-set}$

*<proof>*

**lemma** *sym-alt:*  $\text{adj } u \ v \longleftrightarrow \text{adj } v \ u$

*<proof>*

**lemma** *is-ulgraph:*  $\text{ulgraph } V \text{ edge-set}$

*<proof>*

**end**

**context** *ulgraph*

**begin**

**definition** *adj-relation* :: 'a rel **where**

$\text{adj-relation} \equiv \{(u, v) \mid u \ v . \text{vert-adj } u \ v\}$

**lemma** *adj-relation-wf:*  $(u, v) \in \text{adj-relation} \implies \{u, v\} \subseteq V$

*<proof>*

**lemma** *adj-relation-sym:*  $\text{sym } \text{adj-relation}$

*<proof>*

**lemma** *is-ulgraph-rel:*  $\text{ulgraph-rel } V \text{ adj-relation}$

*<proof>*

Temporary interpretation - mutual sublocale setup

**interpretation** *ulgraph-rel*  $V \text{ adj-relation}$  *<proof>*

**lemma** *vert-adj-rel-iff:*

**assumes**  $u \in V \ v \in V$

**shows**  $\text{vert-adj } u \ v \longleftrightarrow \text{adj } u \ v$

*<proof>*

**lemma** *edges-rel-is*:  $E = \text{edge-set}$   
 ⟨*proof*⟩

**end**

**context** *ulgraph-rel*  
**begin**

Temporary interpretation - mutual sublocale setup

**interpretation** *ulgraph V edge-set* ⟨*proof*⟩

**lemma** *rel-vert-adj-iff*:  $\text{vert-adj } u \ v \longleftrightarrow \text{adj } u \ v$   
 ⟨*proof*⟩

**lemma** *rel-item-is*:  $(u, v) \in \text{adj-rel} \longleftrightarrow (u, v) \in \text{adj-relation}$   
 ⟨*proof*⟩

**lemma** *rel-edges-is*:  $\text{adj-rel} = \text{adj-relation}$   
 ⟨*proof*⟩

**end**

**sublocale** *ulgraph-rel*  $\subseteq$  *ulgraph V edge-set*  
**rewrites** *ulgraph.adj-relation edge-set* = *adj-rel*  
 ⟨*proof*⟩

**sublocale** *ulgraph*  $\subseteq$  *ulgraph-rel V adj-relation*  
**rewrites** *ulgraph-rel.edge-set adj-relation* =  $E$   
 ⟨*proof*⟩

**locale** *sgraph-rel* = *ulgraph-rel* +  
**assumes** *irrefl-adj*: *irrefl adj-rel*  
**begin**

**lemma** *irrefl-alt*:  $\text{adj } u \ v \implies u \neq v$   
 ⟨*proof*⟩

**lemma** *edge-is-card2*:  
**assumes**  $e \in \text{edge-set}$   
**shows**  $\text{card } e = 2$   
 ⟨*proof*⟩

**lemma** *is-sgraph*: *sgraph V edge-set*  
 ⟨*proof*⟩

**end**

**context** *sgraph*  
**begin**

```

lemma is-rel-irrefl-alt:
  assumes  $(u, v) \in \text{adj-relation}$ 
  shows  $u \neq v$ 
   $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$ 

lemma is-rel-irrefl: irrefl adj-relation
   $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$ 

lemma is-sgraph-rel: sgraph-rel V adj-relation
   $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$ 

end

sublocale sgraph-rel  $\subseteq$  sgraph V edge-set
  rewrites ulgraph.adj-relation edge-set = adj-rel
   $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$ 

sublocale sgraph  $\subseteq$  sgraph-rel V adj-relation
  rewrites ulgraph-rel.edge-set adj-relation = E
   $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$ 

end

theory Undirected-Graphs-Root imports
  Undirected-Graph-Basics
  Undirected-Graph-Walks
  Connectivity
  Girth-Independence
  Graph-Triangles
  Bipartite-Graphs
  Graph-Theory-Relations
begin
end

```

## References

- [1] C. Edmonds, A. Koutsoukou-Argyraki, and L. C. Paulson. Roth’s Theorem on Arithmetic Progressions. *Archive of Formal Proofs*, Dec. 2021.
- [2] C. Edmonds, A. Koutsoukou-Argyraki, and L. C. Paulson. Szemerédi’s Regularity Lemma. *Archive of Formal Proofs*, Nov. 2021.
- [3] L. Hupel. Properties of random graphs – subgraph containment. *Archive of Formal Proofs*, February 2014. [https://isa-afp.org/entries/Random\\_Graph\\_Subgraph\\_Threshold.html](https://isa-afp.org/entries/Random_Graph_Subgraph_Threshold.html), Formal proof development.
- [4] L. Noschinski. Proof Pearl: A Probabilistic Proof for the Girth-Chromatic Number Theorem. In *Interactive Theorem Proving. ITP*

2012., volume 7406 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2012.

- [5] L. Noschinski. A Graph Library for Isabelle. *Mathematics in Computer Science*, 9(1):23–39, Mar. 2015. <http://link.springer.com/10.1007/s11786-014-0183-z>.