

UNIVERSITY OF BERGEN
DEPARTMENT OF INFORMATICS

Untitled

Author: Andreas Salhus Bakseter

Supervisors: Marc Bezem, Håkon Robbestad Gylderud



UNIVERSITETET I BERGEN
Det matematisk-naturvitenskapelige fakultet

February, 2023

Abstract

Lorem ipsum dolor sit amet, his veri singulis necessitatibus ad. Nec insolens periculis ex. Te pro purto eros error, nec alia graeci placerat cu. Hinc volutpat similique no qui, ad labitur mentitum democritum sea. Sale inimicus te eum.

No eros nemore impedit his, per at salutandi eloquentiam, ea semper euismod meliore sea. Mutat scaevola cotidieque cu mel. Eum an convenire tractatos, ei duo nulla molestie, quis hendrerit et vix. In aliquam intellegam philosophia sea. At quo bonorum adipisci. Eros labitur deleniti ius in, sonet congrue ius at, pro suas meis habeo no.

Acknowledgements

Lorem ipsum

Andreas Salhus Bakseter
Wednesday 15th February, 2023

Contents

1	Background	1
1.1	Formalizing Mathematical Problems	1
1.1.1	Proofs	1
1.2	Proof assistants	2
1.2.1	Coq	2
1.2.2	Agda	2
1.2.3	Isabelle	2
1.2.4	Lean	2
1.2.5	Higher-Order Logic	2
1.3	Type theory	2
1.3.1	Propositions as types	2
1.3.2	Extraction of programs from verified proofs	3
2	Our case	4
3	Approach & Design Choices	5
4	Implementation	6
5	Examples & Results	7
6	Evaluation	8
7	Conclusion	9
	Bibliography	10
A	Generated code from Protocol buffers	11

List of Figures

List of Tables

Listings

A.1 Source code of something	11
--	----

Chapter 1

Background

1.1 Formalizing Mathematical Problems

1.1.1 Proofs

When solving mathematical problems, one often uses proofs to justify some claim. We can group proofs into two types; *informal* and *formal* proofs.

Informal proofs

An informal proof is often written in a natural language, and the proof is adequate if most readers are convinced by the proof [3]. As a proof grows larger and more complex, it becomes harder to follow, which can ultimately lead to errors in the proof's reasoning. This might cause the whole proof to be incorrect [2].

Formal proofs

A formal proof is written in a formal language, and can be compared to a computer program written in a programming language. Writing a formal proof is more difficult than writing an informal proof.

1.2 Proof assistants

Using a *proof assistant*, we can verify a formal proof mechanically.

1.2.1 Coq

Coq is an example of a proof assistant. *Coq* uses type theory to formulate and verify proofs, but can also be used as a functional programming language [4].

1.2.2 Agda

1.2.3 Isabelle

1.2.4 Lean

1.2.5 Higher-Order Logic

1.3 Type theory

Type theory groups mathematical objects with similar properties together by assigning them a "type". Similarly to data types in computer programming, we can use types to represent mathematical objects. For example, we can use the data type `nat` to represent natural numbers.

1.3.1 Propositions as types

The concept of propositions as types sees the proving of a mathematical proposition as the same process as constructing a value of that type. For example, to prove a proposition P which states "all integers are the sum of four squares", we must construct a value of the type P that shows that this is true for all integers. Proofs are mathematical objects; thus a proposition can be viewed as having the type of all its proofs (if any!). We can use this correspondance to model a proof as a typed computer program. The power of this concept comes from the fact that we can use a type checker to verify that our program is typed correctly, and thus that the corresponding proof is valid.

1.3.2 Extraction of programs from verified proofs

Coq also enables us to extract and execute programs from our proofs, once they have been verified.

Chapter 2

Our case

We will use the Coq proof assistant to formalize parts of the proofs of the following paper, Bezem and Coquand [1]. This paper solves two problems that occur in dependent type systems where typings depend on universe-level constraints. Since this proof is complex enough that mistakes are possible it is a good candidate for formalization. We can also use this process to gain further insight into the algorithm that lies behind the proof. It might also be interesting to use Coq to extract programs from the final proofs.

Chapter 3

Approach & Design Choices

Chapter 4

Implementation

Chapter 5

Examples & Results

Chapter 6

Evaluation

Chapter 7

Conclusion

Bibliography

- [1] Marc Bezem and Thierry Coquand. Loop-checking and the uniform word problem for join-semilattices with an inflationary endomorphism. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 2022. ISSN 0304-3975. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tcs.2022.01.017>.
URL: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0304397522000317>.
- [2] Roxanne Khamisi. Mathematical proofs are getting harder to verify, 2006.
URL: <https://www.newscientist.com/article/dn8743-mathematical-proofs-getting-harder-to-verify>.
- [3] Benjamin C. Pierce. *Software Foundations: Volume 1: Logical Foundations*. 2022.
URL: <https://softwarefoundations.cis.upenn.edu/current/lf-current/index.html>.
- [4] The Coq Team. A short introduction to coq.
URL: <https://coq.inria.fr/a-short-introduction-to-coq>.

Appendix A

Generated code from Protocol buffers

Listing A.1: Source code of something

```
1 System.out.println("Hello Mars");
```