Formal Proof of Dilworth's Theorem

Vivek Soorya Maadoori S. M. Meesum Shiv Pillai T. V. H. Prathamesh Aditya Swami

October 13, 2025

Abstract

A *chain* is defined as a totally ordered subset of a partially ordered set. A *chain cover* refers to a collection of chains of a partially ordered set whose union equals the entire set. A *chain decomposition* is a chain cover consisting of pairwise disjoint sets. An *antichain* is a subset of elements of a partially ordered set in which no two elements are comparable.

In 1950, Dilworth proved that in any finite partially ordered set, the cardinality of a largest antichain equals the cardinality of a smallest chain decomposition. [2]

In this paper, we formalise a proof of the theorem above, also known as *Dilworth's theorem*, based on a proof by Perles (1963) [3]. Our formalisation draws on the formalisation of Dilworth's theorem for chain covers in Coq by Abhishek Kr. Singh [4], and builds on the AFP entry containing formalisation of minimal and maximal elements in a set by Martin Desharnais [1]. Our formalisation extends the prior work in Coq by including a formal proof of Dilworth's theorem for chain decomposition.

Contents

| 1 | Definitions | 2 |
|---|--|--------------|
| 2 | Preliminary Lemmas | 3 |
| 3 | Size of an antichain is less than or equal to the size of a chain cover | 8 |
| 4 | Existence of a chain cover whose cardinality is the cardinality of the largest antichain 4.1 Preliminary lemmas | 8 8 15 |
| 5 | Dilworth's Theorem for Chain Covers: Statement and Proof | 33 |

| 6 | Dilworth's Decomposition Theorem | | |
|------------|---|--|--|
| | 6.1 Preliminaries | | |
| | 6.2 | Statement and Proof | |
| | | | |
| | orts | Dilworth Main HOL.Complete-Partial-Order HOL.Relation HOL.Order-Relation | |
| beg | | Iin-Max-Least-Greatest. Min-Max-Least-Greatest-Set | |
| | | The Dilworth's theorem for chain cover is labelled Dilworth and the on to chain decomposition is labelled Dilworth_Decomposition. | |
| con beg | | i order | |
| 1 | D | efinitions | |
| | | on chain-on :: - set \Rightarrow - set \Rightarrow bool where a $A \ S \longleftrightarrow ((A \subseteq S) \land (Complete-Partial-Order.chain (\leq) A))$ | |
| | | on antichain :: - set \Rightarrow bool where n $S \longleftrightarrow (\forall x \in S. \ \forall y \in S. \ (x \le y \lor y \le x) \longrightarrow x = y)$ | |
| (an | ticha | on antichain-on :: - set \Rightarrow - set \Rightarrow bool where in-on A S) \longleftrightarrow l -order-on A (relation-of (\leq) A)) \land $(S \subseteq A) \land$ (antichain S) | |
| larg | est-a | on largest-antichain-on:: - set \Rightarrow - set \Rightarrow bool where entichain-on P lac \longleftrightarrow nain-on P lac \land (\forall ac. antichain-on P ac \longrightarrow card ac \leq card lac)) | |
| | | on chain-cover-on:: - set \Rightarrow - set set \Rightarrow bool where ver-on S $cv \longleftrightarrow (\bigcup cv = S) \land (\forall x \in cv . chain-on x S)$ | |
| | | on antichain-cover-on:: - set \Rightarrow - set set \Rightarrow bool where n-cover-on S $cv \longleftrightarrow (\bigcup cv = S) \land (\forall x \in cv \ . \ antichain-on \ S \ x)$ | |
| sma $(c$ | $\begin{array}{c} ullest \\ hain \end{array}$ | on smallest-chain-cover-on:: - set \Rightarrow - set set \Rightarrow bool where -chain-cover-on S $cv \equiv$ -cover-on S $cv \land$ cover-on S $cv \land$ card $cv2 \leq card$ $cv) \longrightarrow card$ $cv = card$ $cv2))$ | |
| | | on chain-decomposition where ecomposition S $cd \equiv ((chain\text{-}cover\text{-}on \ S \ cd) \land (\forall \ x \in cd. \ \forall \ y \in cd. \ x \neq y \longrightarrow (x \cap y = \{\})))$ | |

```
definition smallest-chain-decomposition:: - set \Rightarrow - set set \Rightarrow bool where smallest-chain-decomposition S cd \equiv (chain-decomposition S cd \land (\forall cd2. (chain-decomposition S cd2 \land card cd2 \leq card cd) \longrightarrow card cd = card cd2))
```

2 Preliminary Lemmas

The following lemma shows that given a chain and an antichain, if the cardinality of their intersection is equal to 0, then their intersection is empty...

```
lemma inter-nInf:
 assumes a1: Complete-Partial-Order.chain (\subseteq) X
     and a2: antichain Y
 and asmInf: card (X \cap Y) = 0
      shows X \cap Y = \{\}
proof (rule ccontr)
 assume X \cap Y \neq \{\}
 then obtain a b where 1:a \in (X \cap Y) b \in (X \cap Y) using asmInf by blast
 then have in-chain: a \in X \land b \in X using 1 by simp
 then have 3: (a \leq b) \vee (b \leq a) using a1
   by (simp add: chain-def)
 have in-antichain: a \in Y \land b \in Y using 1 by blast
 then have a = b using antichain-def a2 3
   by (metis order-class.antichain-def)
 then have \forall a \in (X \cap Y). \forall b \in (X \cap Y). a = b
   using 1 a1 a2 order-class.antichain-def
   by (smt (verit, best) IntE chain-def)
 then have card (X \cap Y) = 1 using 1 at a2 card-def
   by (smt (verit, best) all-not-in-conv asmInf card-0-eq card-le-Suc0-iff-eq
      finite-if-finite-subsets-card-bdd subset-eq subset-iff)
 then show False using asmInf by presburger
qed
```

The following lemma shows that given a chain X and an antichain Y that both are subsets of S, their intersection is either empty or has cardinality one..

```
lemma chain-antichain-inter:

assumes a1: Complete-Partial-Order.chain (\subseteq) X

and a2: antichain Y

and a3: X \subseteq S \land Y \subseteq S

shows (card\ (X \cap Y) = 1) \lor ((X \cap Y) = \{\})

proof (cases\ card\ (X \cap Y) \ge 1)

case True

then obtain a\ b where 1: a \in (X \cap Y)\ b \in (X \cap Y)

by (metis\ card\text{-}1\text{-}singletonE\ insert\text{-}subset\ obtain\text{-}subset\text{-}with\text{-}card\text{-}n})

then have a \in X \land b \in X using 1 by blast

then have 3: (a \le b) \lor (b \le a) using Complete\text{-}Partial\text{-}Order\text{-}chain\text{-}def\ a1}
```

```
by (smt (verit, best))
  have a \in Y \land b \in Y using 1 by blast
  then have a = b using a2 order-class.antichain-def 3
  then have \forall a \in (X \cap Y). \forall b \in (X \cap Y). a = b
   using 1 a1 a2 order-class.antichain-def
   by (smt (verit, best) Int-iff chainD)
  then have card (X \cap Y) = 1 using 1 a1 a2
   by (metis One-nat-def True card.infinite card-le-Suc0-iff-eq
            order-class.order-antisym\ zero-less-one-class.zero-le-one)
  then show ?thesis by presburger
next
 case False
 then have card (X \cap Y) < 1 by linarith
 then have card (X \cap Y) = 0 by blast
 then have X \cap Y = \{\} using assms inter-nInf by blast
 then show ?thesis by force
qed
Following lemmas show that given a finite set S, there exists a chain decom-
position of S.
lemma po\text{-}restr: assumes partial\text{-}order\text{-}on\ B\ r
                  and A \subseteq B
                shows partial-order-on A (r \cap (A \times A))
 using assms
 unfolding partial-order-on-def preorder-on-def antisym-def refl-on-def trans-def
 \mathbf{by}\ (metis\ (no\text{-}types,\ lifting)\ IntD1\ IntD2\ IntI\ Int-lower2\ inf.\ orderE\ mem-Sigma-iff)
lemma eq-restr: (Restr (relation-of (\leq) (insert a A)) A) = (relation-of (\leq) A)
  (is ?P = ?Q)
proof
 \mathbf{show} ?P \subseteq ?Q
 proof
   fix z
   assume z \in ?P
   then obtain x y where tuple: (x, y) = z using relation-of-def by blast
   then have 1: (x, y) \in ((relation - of (\leq) (insert \ a \ A)) \cap (A \times A))
     using relation-of-def
     using \langle z \in Restr \ (relation\text{-}of \ (\leq) \ (insert \ a \ A)) \ A \rangle by blast
   then have 2: (x, y) \in (relation - of (\leq) (insert \ a \ A)) by simp
   then have \beta: (x, y) \in (A \times A) using 1 by simp
   then have (x, y) \in (A \times A) \land (x \leq y) using relation-of-def 2
     by (metis (no-types, lifting) case-prodD mem-Collect-eq)
   then have (x, y) \in (relation-of (\leq) A) using relation-of-def by blast
   then show z \in ?Q using tuple by fast
  qed
\mathbf{next}
 \mathbf{show} \ ?Q \subseteq \ ?P
```

```
proof
   fix z
   assume asm1: z \in ?Q
   then obtain x y where tuple: (x, y) = z by (metis\ prod.collapse)
   then have \theta: (x, y) \in (A \times A) \land (x \leq y) using asm1 relation-of-def
     by (metis (mono-tags, lifting) case-prod-conv mem-Collect-eq)
   then have 1: (x, y) \in (A \times A) by fast
   have rel: x \leq y using \theta by blast
   have (A \times A) \subseteq ((insert \ a \ A) \times (insert \ a \ A)) by blast
   then have (x, y) \in ((insert \ a \ A) \times (insert \ a \ A)) using 1 by blast
   then have (x, y) \in (relation - of (\leq) (insert \ a \ A))
     using rel relation-of-def by blast
   then have (x, y) \in ((relation-of (\leq) (insert \ a \ A)) \cap (A \times A)) using 1 by fast
   then show z \in P using tuple by fast
 qed
qed
lemma part-ord:partial-order-on S (relation-of (\leq) S)
 by (smt (verit, ccfv-SIG) local.dual-order.eq-iff local.dual-order.trans
     partial-order-on-relation-of I)
The following lemma shows that a chain decomposition exists for any finite
set S.
lemma exists-cd: assumes finite S
                shows \exists cd. chain-decomposition S cd
  \mathbf{using}\ \mathit{assms}
proof(induction rule: finite.induct)
 case emptyI
 then show ?case using assms unfolding chain-decomposition-def chain-cover-on-def
   by (metis Sup-empty empty-iff)
next
 case (insertI A a)
 show ?case using assms
 proof (cases a \in A)
   case True
   then have 1: (insert \ a \ A) = A by fast
   then have \exists X. chain-decomposition A X using insertI by simp
   then show ?thesis using 1 by auto
  next
   case False
   have subset-a: \{a\} \subseteq (insert\ a\ A) by simp
   have chain-a: Complete-Partial-Order.chain (<) \{a\}
     using chain-singleton chain-def by auto
   have subset-A: A \subseteq (insert\ a\ A) by blast
   have partial-a: partial-order-on A ((relation-of (\leq) (insert a A)) \cap (A \times A))
     using po-restr insertI subset-A part-ord by blast
   then have chain-on-A: chain-on \{a\} (insert a A)
     unfolding order-class.chain-on-def using chain-a partial-a
              insertI.prems chain-on-def by simp
```

```
then obtain X where chain-set: chain-decomposition A X
     using insertI partial-a eq-restr
     by auto
   have chains-X: \forall x \in (insert \{a\} X). chain-on x (insert a A)
     using subset-A chain-set chain-on-def
          chain-decomposition-def chain-cover-on-def chain-on-A
     by auto
   have subsets-X: \forall x \in (insert \{a\} X). x \subseteq (insert a A)
     using chain-set chain-decomposition-def subset-a chain-cover-on-def
     by auto
   have null-inter-X: \forall x \in X. \ \forall y \in X. \ x \neq y \longrightarrow x \cap y = \{\}
     using chain-set chain-decomposition-def
     by (simp add: order-class.chain-decomposition-def)
  have \{a\} \notin X using False chain-set chain-decomposition-def chain-cover-on-def
     by (metis UnionI insertCI)
   then have null-inter-a: \forall x \in X. \{a\} \cap x = \{\}
     using False chain-set order-class.chain-decomposition-def
     using chain-decomposition-def chain-cover-on-def by auto
   then have null-inter: \forall x \in (insert \{a\} X). \forall y \in (insert \{a\} X). x \neq y \longrightarrow
x \cap y = \{\}
    using null-inter-X by simp
   have union: \bigcup (insert \{a\} X) = (insert a A) using chain-set
     by (simp add: chain-decomposition-def chain-cover-on-def)
   have chain-decomposition (insert a A) (insert \{a\} X)
    using subsets-X chains-X union null-inter unfolding chain-decomposition-def
          chain-cover-on-def
     by simp
   then show ?thesis by blast
 qed
qed
The following lemma shows that the chain decomposition of a set is a chain
cover.
lemma cd-cv:
 assumes chain-decomposition P cd
 shows chain-cover-on P cd
 using assms unfolding chain-decomposition-def by argo
The following lemma shows that for any finite partially ordered set, there
exists a chain cover on that set.
lemma exists-chain-cover: assumes finite P
               shows \exists cv. chain-cover-on P cv
proof-
 show ?thesis using assms exists-cd cd-cv by blast
lemma finite-cv-set: assumes finite P
                     and S = \{x. \ chain-cover-on \ P \ x\}
```

```
shows finite S
```

```
proof-
  have 1: \forall cv. chain-cover-on P cv \longrightarrow (\forall c \in cv. finite c)
   unfolding chain-cover-on-def chain-on-def chain-def
    using assms(1) rev-finite-subset by auto
  have 2: \forall cv. chain-cover-on <math>P cv \longrightarrow finite cv
    unfolding chain-cover-on-def
    using assms(1) finite-UnionD by auto
  have \forall cv. chain-cover-on P cv \longrightarrow (\forall c \in cv. c \subseteq P)
    unfolding chain-cover-on-def by blast
  then have \forall cv. chain\text{-}cover\text{-}on \ P \ cv \longrightarrow cv \subseteq Fpow \ P \ using \ Fpow\text{-}def \ 1 \ by
  then have \forall cv. chain-cover-on P cv \longrightarrow cv \in Fpow (Fpow P)
   using Fpow-def 2 by fast
  then have S \subseteq Fpow (Fpow P) using assms(2) by blast
  then show ?thesis
    using assms(1) by (meson Fpow-subset-Pow finite-Pow-iff finite-subset)
qed
```

The following lemma shows that for every element of an antichain in a set, there exists a chain in the chain cover of that set, such that the element of the antichain belongs to the chain.

```
lemma elem-ac-in-c: assumes a1: antichain-on P ac and chain-cover-on P cv shows \forall a \in ac. \exists c \in cv. a \in c proof—
have \bigcup cv = P using assms(2) chain-cover-on-def by simp then have ac \subseteq \bigcup cv using a1 antichain-on-def by simp then show \forall a \in ac. \exists c \in cv. a \in c by blast qed
```

For a function f that maps every element of an antichain to some chain it belongs to in a chain cover, we show that, the co-domain of f is a subset of the chain cover.

```
lemma f-image: fixes f:: -\Rightarrow -set
   assumes a1: (antichain-on\ P\ ac)
   and a2: (chain-cover-on\ P\ cv)
   and a3: \forall\ a\in\ ac.\ \exists\ c\in\ cv.\ a\in\ c\land\ f\ a=c
   shows (f`ac)\subseteq\ cv

proof
   have 1: \forall\ a\in\ ac.\ \exists\ c\in\ cv.\ a\in\ c\ using\ elem-ac-in-c\ a1\ a2\ by\ presburger
   fix y
   assume y\in (f`ac)
   then obtain x where f\ x=y\ x\in\ ac\ using\ a1\ a2\ by\ auto
   then have x\in\ y\ using\ a3\ by\ blast
   then show y\in\ cv\ using\ a3\ using\ \langle f\ x=y\rangle\ \langle x\in\ ac\rangle\ by\ blast
   qed
```

3 Size of an antichain is less than or equal to the size of a chain cover

The following lemma shows that given an antichain ac and chain cover cv on a finite set, the cardinality of ac will be less than or equal to the cardinality of cv.

```
lemma antichain-card-leq:
         assumes (antichain-on P ac)
             and (chain-cover-on\ P\ cv)
             and finite P
           shows card ac < card cv
proof (rule ccontr)
  assume a-contr: \neg card ac \leq card \ cv
  then have 1: card \ cv < card \ ac \ by \ simp
 have finite-cv: finite cv using assms(2,3) chain-cover-on-def
   by (simp add: finite-UnionD)
  have 2: \forall a \in ac. \exists c \in cv. a \in c \text{ using } assms(1,2) elem-ac-in-c by simp
  then obtain f where f-def: \forall a \in ac. \exists c \in cv. a \in c \land f a = c by metis
  then have (f \cdot ac) \subseteq cv using f-image assms by blast
  then have 3: card (f 'ac) \leq card cv using f-def finite-cv card-mono by metis
  then have card (f \cdot ac) < card ac using 1 by auto
  then have \neg inj-on f ac using pigeonhole by blast
  then obtain a b where p1: f a = f b \ a \neq b \ a \in ac \ b \in ac
   using inj-def f-def by (meson inj-on-def)
  then have antichain-elem: a \in ac \land b \in ac using f-def by blast
  then have \exists c \in cv. f \ a = c \land f \ b = c \text{ using } f\text{-}def \ 2 \ 1 \ \langle f \ ac \subseteq cv \rangle \ p1(1) \text{ by}
  then have chain-elem: \exists c \in cv. a \in c \land b \in c
   using f-def p1(1) p1(3) p1(4) by blast
  then have a \leq b \vee b \leq a using chain-elem chain-cover-on-def chain-on-def
   by (metis \ assms(2) \ chainD)
  then have a = b
   using antichain-elem assms(1) antichain-on-def antichain-def by auto
  then show False using p1(2) by blast
qed
```

4 Existence of a chain cover whose cardinality is the cardinality of the largest antichain

4.1 Preliminary lemmas

The following lemma shows that the maximal set is an antichain.

```
lemma maxset-ac: antichain (\{x : is\text{-maximal-in-set } P x\}) using antichain-def local.is-maximal-in-set-iff by auto
```

The following lemma shows that the minimal set is an antichain.

```
lemma minset-ac: antichain (\{x : is\text{-minimal-in-set } P x\}) using antichain-def is-minimal-in-set-iff by force
```

The following lemma shows that the null set is both an antichain and a chain cover.

```
lemma antichain-null: antichain {}
proof-
    show ?thesis using antichain-def by simp
qed

lemma chain-cover-null: assumes P = {} shows chain-cover-on P {}
proof-
    show ?thesis using chain-cover-on-def
    by (simp add: assms)
qed
```

The following lemma shows that for any arbitrary x that does not belong to the largest antichain of a set, there exists an element y in the antichain such that x is related to y or y is related to x.

```
lemma x-not-in-ac-rel: assumes largest-antichain-on P ac
                       and x \in P
                       and x \notin ac
                       and finite P
                     shows \exists y \in ac. (x \leq y) \lor (y \leq x)
proof (rule ccontr)
 assume \neg (\exists y \in ac. \ x \leq y \lor y \leq x)
 then have 1: \forall y \in ac. (\neg(x \leq y) \land \neg(y \leq x)) by simp
 then have 2: \forall y \in ac. \ x \neq y by auto
  then obtain S where S-def: S = \{x\} \cup ac by blast
  then have S-fin: finite S
   using assms(4) assms(1) assms(2) largest-antichain-on-def antichain-on-def
   by (meson Un-least bot.extremum insert-subset rev-finite-subset)
  have S-on-P: antichain-on P S
  using S-def largest-antichain-on-def antichain-on-def assms(1,2) 1 2 antichain-def
   by auto
  then have ac \subset S using S-def assms(3) by auto
  then have card \ ac < card \ S using psubset-card-mono S-fin by blast
  then show False using assms(1) largest-antichain-on-def S-on-P by fastforce
qed
```

The following lemma shows that for any subset Q of the partially ordered P, if the minimal set of P is a subset of Q, then it is a subset of the minimal set of Q as well.

```
lemma minset-subset-minset:

assumes finite P

and Q \subseteq P

and \forall x. (is-minimal-in-set P x \longrightarrow x \in Q)
```

```
shows \{x: is\text{-}minimal\text{-}in\text{-}set\ P\ x\}\subseteq \{x: is\text{-}minimal\text{-}in\text{-}set\ Q\ x\} proof fix x assume asm1: x\in \{z: is\text{-}minimal\text{-}in\text{-}set\ P\ z\} have 1: x\in Q using asm1\ assms(3) by blast have partial\text{-}Q: partial\text{-}order\text{-}on\ Q\ (relation\text{-}of\ (\leq)\ Q) using assms(1)\ assms(3)\ partial\text{-}order\text{-}on\text{-}def by (simp\ add:\ partial\text{-}order\text{-}on\text{-}relation\text{-}ofI) have \forall\ q\in Q.\ q\in P using assms(2) by blast then have is\text{-}minimal\text{-}in\text{-}set\ Q\ x} using is\text{-}minimal\text{-}in\text{-}set\text{-}iff\ 1\ partial\text{-}Q} using asm1 by force then show x\in \{z: is\text{-}minimal\text{-}in\text{-}set\ Q\ z\} by blast qed
```

The following lemma show that if P is not empty, the minimal set of P is not empty.

```
lemma non-empty-minset: assumes finite P and P \neq \{\} shows \{x : is\text{-minimal-in-set } P x\} \neq \{\} by (simp \ add: \ assms \ ex\text{-minimal-in-set})
```

The following lemma shows that for all elements m of the minimal set, there exists a chain c in the chain cover such that m belongs to c.

```
lemma elem-minset-in-chain: assumes finite P and chain-cover-on P cv shows is-minimal-in-set P a \longrightarrow (\exists c \in cv. a \in c) using assms(2) chain-cover-on-def is-minimal-in-set-iff by auto
```

The following lemma shows that for all elements m of the maximal set, there exists a chain c in the chain cover such that m belongs to c.

```
lemma elem-maxset-in-chain: assumes finite P and chain-cover-on P cv shows is-maximal-in-set P a \longrightarrow (\exists \ c \in cv. \ a \in c) using chain-cover-on-def assms is-maximal-in-set-iff by auto
```

The following lemma shows that for a given chain cover and antichain on P, if the cardinality of the chain cover is equal to the cardinality of the antichain then for all chains c of the chain cover, there exists an element a of the antichain such that a belongs to c.

```
lemma card-ac-cv-eq: assumes finite P and chain-cover-on P cv and antichain-on P ac and card cv = card ac shows \forall \ c \in cv. \ \exists \ a \in ac. \ a \in c proof (rule\ ccontr) assume \neg\ (\forall\ c \in cv. \ \exists\ a \in ac. \ a \notin c) then obtain c where c \in cv \ \forall\ a \in ac. \ a \notin c by blast
```

```
then have \forall a \in ac. \ a \in \bigcup (cv - \{c\}) (\mathbf{is} \ \forall \ a \in ac. \ a \in ?cv-c)
   using assms(2,3) unfolding chain-cover-on-def antichain-on-def by blast
  then have 1: ac \subseteq ?cv-c by blast
  have 2: partial-order-on ?cv-c (relation-of (\le) ?cv-c)
   using assms(1) assms(3) partial-order-on-def
   by (simp add: partial-order-on-relation-ofI)
  then have ac-on-cv-v: antichain-on ?cv-c ac
   using 1 assms(3) antichain-on-def unfolding antichain-on-def by blast
  have \beta: \forall a \in (cv - \{c\}). a \subseteq ?cv - c by auto
 have 4: \forall a \in (cv - \{c\}). Complete-Partial-Order.chain (\leq) a using assms(2)
   unfolding chain-cover-on-def chain-on-def
   by (meson DiffD1 Union-upper chain-subset)
 have 5: \forall a \in (cv - \{c\}). chain-on a ?cv-c using chain-on-def 2 3 4
   by metis
  have \bigcup (cv - \{c\}) = ?cv - c by simp
  then have cv-on-cv-v: chain-cover-on ?cv-c (cv - \{c\})
   using 5 chain-cover-on-def by simp
  have card\ (cv - \{c\}) < card\ cv
   by (metis \langle c \in cv \rangle \ assms(1) \ assms(2) \ card-Diff1-less
       chain-cover-on-def finite-UnionD)
  then have card\ (cv - \{c\}) < card\ ac\ using\ assms(4) by simp
  then show False using ac-on-cv-v cv-on-cv-v antichain-card-leg assms part-ord
   by (metis Diff-insert-absorb Diff-subset Set.set-insert Union-mono assms(2,4)
       card-Diff1-less-iff card-seteq chain-cover-on-def rev-finite-subset)
qed
The following lemma shows that if an element m from the minimal set is in
a chain, it is less than or equal to all elements in the chain.
lemma e-minset-lesseg-e-chain: assumes chain-on c P
                              and is-minimal-in-set P m
                              and m \in c
                            shows \forall a \in c. m < a
proof-
 have 1: c \subseteq P using assms(1) unfolding chain-on-def by simp
  then have is-minimal-in-set c m using 1 assms(2,3) is-minimal-in-set-iff by
 then have \beta: \forall a \in c. (a \leq m) \longrightarrow a = m unfolding is-minimal-in-set-iff by
 have \forall a \in c. \ \forall b \in c. \ (a \leq b) \lor (b \leq a) \text{ using } assms(1)
```

The following lemma shows that if an element m from the maximal set is in a chain, it is greater than or equal to all elements in the chain.

lemma e-chain-lesseq-e-maxset: assumes chain-on c P and is-maximal-in-set P m

unfolding chain-on-def chain-def by blast then show ?thesis using 3 assms(3) by blast

qed

```
and m \in c
shows \forall a \in c. \ a \leq m
```

using assms chainE chain-on-def is-maximal-in-set-iff local.less-le-not-le subsetD

by metis

The following lemma shows that for any two elements of an antichain, if they both belong to the same chain in the chain cover, they must be the same element.

```
lemma ac\text{-}to\text{-}c: assumes finite P
and chain\text{-}cover\text{-}on P cv
and antichain\text{-}on P ac
shows \forall a \in ac. \forall b \in ac. \exists c \in cv. a \in c \land b \in c \longrightarrow a = b

proof—
show ?thesis
using assms chain\text{-}cover\text{-}on\text{-}def antichain\text{-}on\text{-}def
unfolding chain\text{-}cover\text{-}on\text{-}def chain\text{-}on\text{-}def antichain\text{-}on\text{-}def antichain\text{-}on\text{-}on\text{-}on\text{-}on\text{-}on\text{-}on\text{-}on\text{-}on\text{-}on\text{-}on\text{-}on\text{-}on\text{-}on\text{-}on\text{-}on\text{-}on\text{-}o
```

The following lemma shows that for two finite sets, if their cardinalities are equal, then their cardinalities would remain equal after removing a single element from both sets.

```
lemma card-Diff1-eq: assumes finite A and finite B and card A = card B shows \forall a \in A. \forall b \in B. card (A - \{a\}) = card (B - \{b\}) proof—
show ?thesis using assms(3) by auto qed
```

The following lemma shows that for two finite sets A and B of equal cardinality, removing two unique elements from A and one element from B will ensure the cardinality of A is less than B.

```
lemma card-Diff2-1-less: assumes finite A and finite B and card A = card B and a \in A and b \in A and a \neq b shows \forall \ x \in B. \ card \ ((A - \{a\}) - \{b\}) < card \ (B - \{x\}) proof—show ?thesis by (metis Diff1 assms card-Diff1-eq card-Diff1-less-iff finite-Diff singletonD) qed
```

The following lemma shows that for all elements of a partially ordered set,

there exists an element in the minimal set that will be less than or equal to it.

```
lemma min\text{-}elem\text{-}for\text{-}P: assumes finite\ P shows \forall\ p\in P.\ \exists\ m.\ is\text{-}minimal\text{-}in\text{-}set\ P\ m\ \land\ m\leq p proof fix p assume asm:p\in P obtain m where m:\ m\in P\ m\leq p\ \forall\ a\in P.\ a\leq m\longrightarrow a=m using finite\text{-}has\text{-}minimal2[OF\ assms(1)\ asm] by metis hence is\text{-}minimal\text{-}in\text{-}set\ P\ m\ unfolding\ }is\text{-}minimal\text{-}in\text{-}set\text{-}iff} using part\text{-}ord by force then show \exists\ m.\ is\text{-}minimal\text{-}in\text{-}set\ P\ m\ \land\ m\leq p\ using\ m by blast qed
```

The following lemma shows that for all elements of a partially ordered set, there exists an element in the maximal set that will be greater than or equal to it.

```
lemma max-elem-for-P: assumes finite P shows \forall p \in P. \exists m. is-maximal-in-set P m \land p \leq m using assms finite-has-maximal2 by (metis dual-order.strict-implies-order is-maximal-in-set-iff)
```

The following lemma shows that if the minimal set is not considered as the largest antichain on a set, then there exists an element a in the minimal set such that a does not belong to the largest antichain.

```
lemma min-e-nIn-lac: assumes largest-antichain-on P ac
                      and \{x. is-minimal-in-set P x\} \neq ac
                      and finite P
                    shows \exists m. (is-minimal-in-set P m) \land (m \notin ac)
                       (is \exists m. (?ms \ m) \land (m \notin ac))
proof (rule ccontr)
  assume asm: \neg (\exists m. (?ms m) \land (m \notin ac))
  then have \forall m. \neg (?ms m) \lor m \in ac \text{ by } blast
  then have 1: \{m : ?ms \ m\} \subseteq ac \ by \ blast
  then show False
  proof cases
   assume \{m : ?ms m\} = ac
   then show ?thesis using assms(2) by blast
   assume \neg (\{m : ?ms \ m\} = ac)
   then have 1:\{m : ?ms \ m\} \subset ac \ using \ 1 \ by \ simp
   then obtain y where y-def: y \in ac ?ms y using asm assms(1,3)
     by (metis chain-cover-null elem-ac-in-c empty-subset ex-in-conv
              largest-antichain-on-def\ local.ex-minimal-in-set\ psubset E)
   then have y-in-P: y \in P
     using y-def(1) assms(1) largest-antichain-on-def antichain-on-def by blast
   then have 2: \forall x. (?ms \ x \longrightarrow x \neq y)  using y-def(2) \ 1 \ assms(1,3)
```

```
using asm min-elem-for-P DiffE mem-Collect-eq psubset-imp-ex-mem subset-iff unfolding largest-antichain-on-def antichain-def antichain-on-def by (smt\ (verit)) have partial-P: partial-order-on P (relation-of\ (\leq)\ P) using assms(1) largest-antichain-on-def antichain-on-def by simp then have \forall\ x.\ ?ms\ x \longrightarrow \neg\ (y \leq x) using 2 unfolding is-minimal-in-set-iff using \langle\ y \in P\rangle using 2 y-def(2) by blast then show False using y-def(2) by blast qed qed
```

The following lemma shows that if the maximal set is not considered as the largest antichain on a set, then there exists an element a in the maximal set such that a does not belong to the largest antichain.

```
lemma max-e-nIn-lac: assumes largest-antichain-on P ac
                         and \{x : is\text{-}maximal\text{-}in\text{-}set P x\} \neq ac
                         and finite P
                       shows \exists m . is-maximal-in-set <math>P m \land m \notin ac
                         (is \exists m. ?ms \ m \land m \notin ac)
proof (rule ccontr)
  assume asm:\neg (\exists m. ?ms m \land m \notin ac)
  then have \forall m . \neg ?ms m \lor m \in ac by blast
  then have 1: \{x : ?ms \ x\} \subseteq ac  by blast
  then show False
  proof cases
    assume asm: \{x : ?ms x\} = ac
    then show ?thesis using assms(2) by blast
    \mathbf{assume} \neg (\{x : ?ms \ x\} = ac)
    then have \{x : ?ms \ x\} \subset ac \text{ using } 1 \text{ by } simp
    then obtain y where y-def: y \in ac \neg (?ms \ y) using assms asm
     by blast
    then have y-in-P: y \in P
      using y-def(1) assms(1) largest-antichain-on-def antichain-on-def by blast
    then have 2: \forall x : ?ms x \longrightarrow x \neq y \text{ using } y\text{-}def(2) \text{ by } auto
    have partial-P: partial-order-on P (relation-of (\leq) P)
      \mathbf{using}\ assms(1)\ largest-antichain-on-def\ antichain-on-def\ \mathbf{by}\ simp
   then have \forall x : ?ms \ x \longrightarrow \neg \ (x \leq y) \text{ using } 2 \text{ unfolding } \textit{is-maximal-in-set-iff}
      using local.dual-order.order-iff-strict by auto
    then have 3: \forall x : ?ms x \longrightarrow (x > y) \lor \neg (x \le y) by blast
    then show False
    proof cases
      assume asm1: \exists x. ?ms x \land (x > y)
      have \forall x \in ac. (x \leq y) \lor (y \leq x) \longrightarrow x = y \text{ using } assms(1) \text{ y-def}(1)
        unfolding largest-antichain-on-def antichain-on-def antichain-def by simp
      then have \forall x : ?ms \ x \longrightarrow (x > y) \longrightarrow x = y \text{ using } 1 \text{ by } auto
```

```
then have \exists x. ?ms \ x \land y = x \text{ using } asm1 \text{ by } auto
     then show ?thesis using 2 by blast
     assume \neg (\exists x. ?ms x \land (x > y))
     then have \forall x. ?ms x \longrightarrow \neg (x \leq y) using 3 by simp
     have a: \exists z . ?ms z \land y \leq z
       using max-elem-for-P[OF\ assms(3)]\ y-in-P\ partial-P
       by fastforce
    have \forall a. ?ms \ a \longrightarrow (a \le y) \lor (y \le a) \longrightarrow a = y \text{ using } assms(1) \text{ y-def}(1)
1
       unfolding largest-antichain-on-def antichain-on-def antichain-def by blast
     then have \exists z .?ms z \land z = y  using a  by blast
     then show ?thesis using 2 by blast
   qed
 qed
qed
4.2
       Statement and Proof
Proves theorem for the empty set.
lemma largest-antichain-card-eq-empty:
 assumes largest-antichain-on P lac
     and P = \{\}
   shows \exists cv. (chain-cover-on P cv) \land (card cv = card lac)
  have lac = \{\} using assms(1) assms(2)
   unfolding largest-antichain-on-def antichain-on-def by simp
  then show ?thesis using assms(2) chain-cover-null by auto
qed
Proves theorem for the non-empty set.
lemma largest-antichard-card-eq:
         assumes asm1: largest-antichain-on P lac
             and asm2: finite P
             and asm3: P \neq \{\}
           shows \exists cv. (chain-cover-on P cv) \land (card cv = card lac)
 using assms
— Proof by induction on the cardinality of P
proof (induction card P arbitrary: P lac rule: less-induct)
  case less
 let ?max = \{x : is\text{-}maximal\text{-}in\text{-}set P x\}
 let ?min = \{x : is-minimal-in-set P x\}
 have partial-P: partial-order-on P (relation-of (\leq) P)
   using assms partial-order-on-def antichain-on-def largest-antichain-on-def
        less.prems(1) by presburger
 show ?case — the largest antichain is not the maximal set or the minimal set
 proof (cases \exists ac. (antichain-on P ac \land ac \neq ?min \land ac \neq ?max) \land card ac =
card lac)
```

```
obtain ac where ac:antichain-on P ac ac \neq ?min ac \neq ?max card ac = card
lac
     using True by force
   then have largest-antichain-on P ac using asm1 largest-antichain-on-def
       using less.prems(1) by presburger
   then have lac\text{-}in\text{-}P: lac \subseteq P
     using asm1 antichain-on-def largest-antichain-on-def less.prems(1) by pres-
burger
   then have ac\text{-}in\text{-}P: ac \subseteq P
     using ac(1) antichain-on-def by blast
   define p-plus where p-plus = \{x. \ x \in P \land (\exists \ y \in ac. \ y \le x)\}
      — set of all elements greater than or equal to any given element in the largest
antichain
   define p-minus where p-minus = \{x. \ x \in P \land (\exists \ y \in ac. \ x \leq y)\}
      — set of all elements less than or equal to any given element in the largest
antichain
   have 1: ac \subseteq p-plus
     — Shows that the largest antichain is a subset of p plus
     unfolding p-plus-def
   proof
     \mathbf{fix} \ x
     assume a1: x \in ac
     then have a2: x \in P
        using asm1 largest-antichain-on-def antichain-on-def less.prems(1) ac by
blast
     then have x \leq x using antichain-def by auto
     then show x \in \{x \in P. \exists y \in ac. y \le x\} using a1 a2 by auto
   qed
   have 2: ac \subseteq p\text{-}minus
       - Shows that the largest antichain is a subset of p min
     unfolding p-minus-def
   proof
     \mathbf{fix} \ x
     assume a1: x \in ac
     then have a2: x \in P
        using asm1 largest-antichain-on-def antichain-on-def less.prems(1) ac by
blast
     then have x \leq x using antichain-def by auto
     then show x \in \{x \in P. \exists y \in ac. x \leq y\} using a1 a2 by auto
   \mathbf{qed}
   have lac\text{-subset}: ac \subseteq (p\text{-plus} \cap p\text{-minus}) using 1 2 by simp
   have subset-lac: (p-plus \cap p-minus) \subseteq ac
   proof
     \mathbf{fix} \ x
     assume x \in (p\text{-}plus \cap p\text{-}minus)
     then obtain a b where antichain-elems: a \in ac \ b \in ac \ a \le x \ x \le b
       using p-plus-def p-minus-def by auto
     then have a \leq b by simp
```

```
then have a = b
    using antichain-elems(1) antichain-elems(2) less.prems
     asm1 largest-antichain-on-def antichain-on-def antichain-def ac by metis
  then have (a \le x) \land (x \le a)
    using antichain-elems(3) antichain-elems(4) by blast
  then have x = a by fastforce
  then show x \in ac using antichain-elems(1) by simp
then have lac\text{-}pset\text{-}eq:\ ac=(p\text{-}plus\cap p\text{-}minus)\ using\ lac\text{-}subset\ by\ simp
have P-PP-PM: (p-plus \cup p-minus) = P
proof
 show (p\text{-}plus \cup p\text{-}minus) \subseteq P
 proof
   \mathbf{fix} \ x
   assume x \in (p\text{-}plus \cup p\text{-}minus)
   then have x \in p-plus \forall x \in p-minus by simp
   then have x \in P using p-plus-def p-minus-def by auto
   then show x \in P.
  qed
\mathbf{next}
  show P \subseteq (p\text{-}plus \cup p\text{-}minus)
  proof
   \mathbf{fix} \ x
   assume x-in: x \in P
   then have x \in ac \lor x \notin ac by simp
   then have x \in (p\text{-}plus \cup p\text{-}minus)
   proof (cases \ x \in ac)
     case True
     then show ?thesis using lac-subset by blast
   next
     case False
     then obtain y where y \in ac \ (x \le y) \lor (y \le x)
       using asm1 False x-in asm2
        less.prems(1) less.prems(2)
        \langle largest-antichain-on\ P\ ac \rangle\ x-in\ x-not-in-ac-rel\ {\bf by}\ blast
     then have (x \in p\text{-}plus) \lor (x \in p\text{-}minus)
       unfolding p-plus-def p-minus-def using x-in by auto
     then show ?thesis by simp
    qed
    then show x \in p-plus \cup p-minus by simp
  qed
qed
obtain a where a-def: a \in ?min \ a \notin ac
  using asm1 ac True asm3 less.prems(1) less.prems(2) min-e-nIn-lac
  by (metis \langle largest-antichain-on\ P\ ac \rangle\ mem-Collect-eq)
then have \forall x \in ac. \neg (x \leq a)
  unfolding is-minimal-in-set-iff using partial-P lac-in-P
  using ac(1) antichain-on-def
  using local.nless-le by auto
```

```
then have a-not-in-PP: a \notin p-plus using p-plus-def by simp
have a \in P using a-def
 by (simp add: local.is-minimal-in-set-iff)
then have ppl: card p-plus < card P using P-PP-PM a-not-in-PP
 by (metis Un-upper1 card-mono card-subset-eq less.prems(2))
     order-le-imp-less-or-eq)
have p-plus-subset: p-plus \subseteq P using p-plus-def by simp
have antichain-lac: antichain ac
 using assms(1) less.prems ac
 unfolding largest-antichain-on-def antichain-on-def by simp
have finite-PP: finite p-plus using asm3 p-plus-subset finite-def
 using less.prems(2) rev-finite-subset by blast
have finite-lac: finite ac using ac-in-P asm3 finite-def
 using finite-subset less.prems(2) ac by auto
have partial-PP: partial-order-on p-plus (relation-of (<) p-plus)
 using partial-P p-plus-subset partial-order-on-def
 by (smt (verit, best) local.antisym-conv local.le-less local.order-trans
     partial-order-on-relation-ofI)
then have lac-on-PP: antichain-on p-plus ac
 using antichain-on-def 1 antichain-lac by simp
have card-ac-on-P: \forall ac. antichain-on P ac \longrightarrow card ac \le card ac
 using asm1 largest-antichain-on-def less.prems(1) by auto
then have \forall ac. antichain-on p-plus ac \longrightarrow card ac \leq card ac
 using p-plus-subset antichain-on-def largest-antichain-on-def
 by (meson partial-P preorder-class.order-trans)
then have largest-antichain-on p-plus ac
 using lac-on-PP unfolding largest-antichain-on-def
 by (meson \ \langle largest-antichain-on\ P \ ac \rangle \ antichain-on-def
     largest-antichain-on-def p-plus-subset preorder-class.order-trans)
then have cv-PP: \exists cv. chain-cover-on p-plus cv \land card cv = card ac
using less ppl by (metis 1 card.empty chain-cover-null finite-PP subset-empty)
then obtain cvPP where cvPP-def: chain-cover-on p-plus cvPP
      card \ cvPP = card \ ac
using ac(4) by auto
obtain b where b-def: b \in ?max \ b \notin ac
 using asm1 True asm3 less.prems(1) less.prems(2) max-e-nIn-lac
 using \langle largest-antichain-on\ P\ ac \rangle\ ac(3) by blast
then have \forall x \in ac. \neg (b < x)
 unfolding is-maximal-in-set-iff using partial-P ac-in-P
 nless-le by auto
then have b-not-in-PM: b \notin p-minus using p-minus-def by simp
have b \in P using b-def is-maximal-in-set-iff by blast
then have pml: card p-minus < card P using b-not-in-PM
by (metis P-PP-PM Un-upper2 card-mono card-subset-eq less.prems(2) nat-less-le)
have p-min-subset: p-minus \subseteq P using p-minus-def by simp
have finite-PM: finite p-minus using asm3 p-min-subset finite-def
 using less.prems(2) rev-finite-subset by blast
have partial-PM: partial-order-on p-minus (relation-of (\leq) p-minus)
 by (simp add: partial-order-on-relation-ofI)
```

```
then have lac-on-PM: antichain-on p-minus ac
     using 2 antichain-lac antichain-on-def by simp
   then have \forall \ ac. \ antichain-on \ p\text{-minus} \ ac \longrightarrow card \ ac \leq card \ ac
     using card-ac-on-P P-PP-PM antichain-on-def largest-antichain-on-def
     by (metis partial-P sup.coboundedI2)
   then have largest-antichain-on p-minus ac
     using lac-on-PM (largest-antichain-on P ac) antichain-on-def
           largest-antichain-on-def p-min-subset preorder-class.order-trans
     by meson
   then have cv-PM: \exists cv. chain-cover-on p-minus cv \land card cv = card ac
     using less pml P-PP-PM \langle a \in P \rangle a-not-in-PP finite-PM
   then obtain cvPM where cvPM-def:
               chain-cover-on p-minus cvPM
               card \ cvPM = card \ ac
     by auto
   have lac\text{-}minPP: ac = \{x : is\text{-}minimal\text{-}in\text{-}set \ p\text{-}plus \ x\} (is ac = ?msPP)
     show ac \subseteq \{x : is\text{-}minimal\text{-}in\text{-}set \ p\text{-}plus \ x\}
     proof
       \mathbf{fix} \ x
       assume asm1: x \in ac
       then have x-in-PP: x \in p-plus using 1 by auto
       obtain y where y-def: y \in p-plus y \leq x
         using 1 asm1 by blast
       then obtain a where a-def: a \in ac a \leq y using p-plus-def by auto
       then have \theta: a \in p-plus using 1 by auto
       then have I: a \leq x using a\text{-}def\ y\text{-}def(2) by simp
        then have II: a = x using asm1 \ a-def(1) antichain-lac unfolding an-
tichain-def by simp
       then have III: y = x using y-def(2) a-def(2) by simp
       have \forall p \in p-plus. (p \leq x) \longrightarrow p = x
       proof
         \mathbf{fix} p
         assume asmP: p \in p-plus
         show p \leq x \longrightarrow p = x
         proof
          assume p \leq x
          then show p = x
            using asmP p-plus-def II a-def(1) antichain-def antichain-lac
                  local.dual-order.antisym local.order.trans mem-Collect-eq
            by (smt\ (verit))
         qed
       qed
       then have is-minimal-in-set p-plus x using is-minimal-in-set-iff
         using partial-PP
         using x-in-PP by auto
       then show x \in \{x \text{ . } is\text{-}minimal\text{-}in\text{-}set p\text{-}plus } x\}
         using x-in-PP
```

```
using \forall p \in p-plus. p \leq x \longrightarrow p = x \land local.is-minimal-in-set-iff by force
 qed
\mathbf{next}
 show \{x : is\text{-}minimal\text{-}in\text{-}set \ p\text{-}plus \ x\} \subseteq ac
 proof
   \mathbf{fix} \ x
   assume asm2: x \in \{x : is-minimal-in-set p-plus x\}
   then have I: \forall a \in p-plus. (a \leq x) \longrightarrow a = x
     using is-minimal-in-set-iff
     by (metis dual-order.not-eq-order-implies-strict mem-Collect-eq)
   have x \in p-plus using asm2
     by (simp add: local.is-minimal-in-set-iff)
   then obtain y where y-def: y \in ac \ y \le x  using p-plus-def by auto
   then have y \in p-plus using 1 by auto
   then have y = x using y-def(2) I by simp
   then show x \in ac using y-def(1) by simp
 qed
qed
then have card-msPP: card ?msPP = card ac by simp
then have cvPP-elem-in-lac: \forall m \in ?msPP. \exists c \in cvPP. m \in c
 using cvPP-def(1) partial-PP asm3 p-plus-subset
       elem-minset-in-chain elem-ac-in-c
    lac-on-PP
 by (simp add: lac-minPP)
then have cv-for-msPP: \forall m \in ?msPP. \exists c \in cvPP. (\forall a \in c. m \leq a)
 using elem-minset-in-chain partial-PP assms(3)
       cvPP-def(1) e-minset-lesseq-e-chain
 unfolding chain-cover-on-def[of p-plus cvPP]
 by fastforce
have lac-elem-in-cvPP: \forall c \in cvPP. \exists m \in ?msPP. m \in c
 using cvPP-def card-msPP minset-ac card-ac-cv-eq
 by (metis P-PP-PM finite-Un lac-minPP lac-on-PP less.prems(2))
then have \forall c \in cvPP. \exists m \in ?msPP. (\forall a \in c. m \leq a)
 using e-minset-lesseq-e-chain chain-cover-on-def cvPP-def(1)
 by (metis mem-Collect-eq)
then have cvPP-lac-rel: \forall c \in cvPP. \exists x \in ac. (\forall a \in c. x \leq a)
 using lac-minPP by simp
have lac\text{-}maxPM: ac = \{x : is\text{-}maximal\text{-}in\text{-}set p\text{-}minus } x\} (is ac = ?msPM)
proof
 show ac \subseteq ?msPM
 proof
   \mathbf{fix} \ x
   assume asm1: x \in ac
   then have x-in-PM: x \in p-minus using 2 by auto
   obtain y where y-def: y \in p-minus x \leq y
     using 2 asm1 by blast
   then obtain a where a-def: a \in ac \ y \le a \ using \ p-minus-def by auto
   then have I: x \leq a using y\text{-}def(2) by simp
   then have II: a = x
```

```
using asm1 \ a\text{-}def(1) antichain-lac unfolding antichain-def by simp
   then have III: y = x using y-def(2) a-def(2) by simp
   have \forall p \in p-minus. (x \leq p) \longrightarrow p = x
   proof
     \mathbf{fix} p
     assume asmP: p \in p-minus
     show x \leq p \longrightarrow p = x
     proof
      assume x \leq p
       then show p = x
        using p-minus-def II a-def(1) antichain-def antichain-lac asmP
              dual-order.antisym order.trans mem-Collect-eq
        by (smt (verit))
     qed
   qed
   then have is-maximal-in-set p-minus x
     using partial-PM is-maximal-in-set-iff x-in-PM by force
   then show x \in \{x. is\text{-}maximal\text{-}in\text{-}set p\text{-}minus } x\}
     using x-in-PM by auto
 qed
next
 show ?msPM \subseteq ac
 proof
   \mathbf{fix} \ x
   assume asm2: x \in \{x : is-maximal-in-set p-minus x\}
   then have I: \forall a \in p-minus. (x \leq a) \longrightarrow a = x
     unfolding is-maximal-in-set-iff by fastforce
   have x \in p-minus using asm2
     \mathbf{by}\ (\mathit{simp}\ \mathit{add}\colon \mathit{local.is\text{-}maximal\text{-}in\text{-}set\text{-}iff})
   then obtain y where y-def: y \in ac \ x \le y using p-minus-def by auto
   then have y \in p-minus using 2 by auto
   then have y = x using y-def(2) I by simp
   then show x \in ac using y-def(1) by simp
 qed
qed
then have card-msPM: card ?msPM = card ac by simp
then have cvPM-elem-in-lac: \forall m \in ?msPM. \exists c \in cvPM. m \in c
 using cvPM-def(1) partial-PM asm3 p-min-subset elem-masset-in-chain
       elem-ac-in-c lac-maxPM lac-on-PM
 by presburger
then have cv-for-msPM: \forall m \in ?msPM. \exists c \in cvPM. (\forall a \in c. a \leq m)
 using elem-maxset-in-chain partial-PM assms(3) cvPM-def(1)
       e-chain-lesseq-e-maxset
 unfolding chain-cover-on-def[of p-minus cvPM]
 by (metis mem-Collect-eq)
have lac-elem-in-cvPM: \forall c \in cvPM. \exists m \in ?msPM. m \in c
 using cvPM-def card-msPM
   maxset-ac card-ac-cv-eq finite-subset lac-maxPM lac-on-PM less.prems(2)
   p-min-subset partial-PM
```

```
by metis
     then have \forall c \in cvPM. \exists m \in ?msPM. (\forall a \in c. a \leq m)
       using e-chain-lesseq-e-masset chain-cover-on-def cvPM-def(1)
       by (metis mem-Collect-eq)
   then have cvPM-lac-rel: \forall c \in cvPM. \exists x \in ac. (\forall a \in c. a \leq x)
     using lac-maxPM by simp
   obtain x \ cp \ cm where x-cp-cm: x \in ac \ cp \in cvPP \ (\forall \ a \in cp. \ x \leq a)
                               cm \in cvPM \ (\forall \ a \in cm. \ a \leq x)
     using cv-for-msPP cv-for-msPM lac-minPP lac-maxPM assms(1)
     unfolding largest-antichain-on-def antichain-on-def antichain-def
    by (metis P-PP-PM Sup-empty Un-empty-right all-not-in-conv chain-cover-on-def
           cvPM-def(1) cvPP-def(1) cvPP-lac-rel lac-elem-in-cvPM less.prems(3))
   have \exists f. \forall cp \in cvPP. \exists x \in ac. f cp = x \land x \in cp
  defining a function that maps chains in the p plus chain cover to the element in
the largest antichain that belongs to the chain.
     using lac-elem-in-cvPP lac-minPP by metis
    then obtain f where f-def: \forall cp \in cvPP. \exists x \in ac. fcp = x \land x \in cp by
blast
   have lac\text{-}image\text{-}f: f ' cvPP = ac
   proof
     show (f \cdot cvPP) \subseteq ac
     proof
       \mathbf{fix} \ y
       assume y \in (f \cdot cvPP)
       then obtain x where f x = y x \in cvPP using f-def by blast
       then have y \in x using f-def by blast
       then show y \in ac using f-def \langle f | x = y \rangle \langle x \in cvPP \rangle by blast
     qed
   next
     show ac \subseteq (f \cdot cvPP)
     proof
       \mathbf{fix} \ y
       assume y-in-lac: y \in ac
       then obtain x where x \in cvPP y \in x
         using cvPP-elem-in-lac lac-minPP by auto
       then have f x = y using f-def y-in-lac
         by (metis antichain-def antichain-lac cvPP-lac-rel)
       then show y \in (f \cdot cvPP) using \langle x \in cvPP \rangle by auto
     qed
   qed
   have \forall x \in cvPP. \ \forall y \in cvPP. \ f \ x = f \ y \longrightarrow x = y
   proof (rule ccontr)
     assume \neg (\forall x \in cvPP. \forall y \in cvPP. f x = f y \longrightarrow x = y)
     then have \exists x \in cvPP. \exists y \in cvPP. fx = fy \land x \neq y by blast
     then obtain z \times y where z-x-y: x \in cvPP \ y \in cvPP \ x \neq y \ z = f \ x \ z = f \ y
       by blast
     then have z-in: z \in ac using f-def by blast
```

```
then have \forall a \in ac. (a \in x \lor a \in y) \longrightarrow a = z
       \mathbf{using}\ \mathit{ac\text{-}to\text{-}c}\ \mathit{partial\text{-}P}\ \mathit{asm3}\ \mathit{p\text{-}plus\text{-}subset}\ \mathit{cvPP\text{-}def}(1)
             lac\text{-}on\text{-}PP \ z\text{-}x\text{-}y(1) \ z\text{-}x\text{-}y(2)
       by (metis antichain-def antichain-lac cvPP-lac-rel f-def z-x-y(4) z-x-y(5))
     then have \forall a \in ac. \ a \neq z \longrightarrow a \notin x \land a \notin y \text{ by } blast
     then have \forall a \in (ac - \{z\}). \ a \in \bigcup ((cvPP - \{x\}) - \{y\})
       using cvPP-def(1) 1 unfolding chain-cover-on-def by blast
     then have a: (ac - \{z\}) \subseteq \bigcup ((cvPP - \{x\}) - \{y\}) (is ?lac-z \subseteq ?cvPP-xy)
by blast
     have b: partial-order-on ?cvPP-xy (relation-of (\leq) ?cvPP-xy)
       using partial-PP \ cvPP-def(1) \ partial-order-on-def
             dual-order.eq-iff dual-order.eq-iff
             dual-order.trans partial-order-on-relation-ofI
             dual-order.trans\ partial-order-on-relation-of I
       by (smt (verit))
     then have ac-on-cvPP-xy: antichain-on ?cvPP-xy ?lac-z
       using a lac-on-PP antichain-on-def unfolding antichain-on-def
       by (metis DiffD1 antichain-def antichain-lac)
     have c: \forall a \in ((cvPP - \{x\}) - \{y\}). \ a \subseteq ?cvPP-xy by auto
     have d: \forall a \in ((cvPP - \{x\}) - \{y\}). Complete-Partial-Order.chain (\leq) a
using cvPP-def(1)
       unfolding chain-cover-on-def chain-on-def
       using z-x-y(2) by blast
     have e: \forall a \in ((cvPP - \{x\}) - \{y\}). chain-on a ?cvPP-xy
       using b c d chain-on-def
       by (metis Diff-iff Sup-upper chain-cover-on-def cvPP-def(1))
     have f: finite ?cvPP-xy using finite-PP cvPP-def(1)
       unfolding chain-cover-on-def chain-on-def
       by (metis (no-types, opaque-lifting) Diff-eq-empty-iff Diff-subset
                Un-Diff-cancel Union-Un-distrib finite-Un)
     \mathbf{have} \ \bigcup \ ((\mathit{cvPP} \ - \ \{x\}) \ - \ \{y\}) = \ ?\mathit{cvPP}\textit{-}\mathit{xy} \ \mathbf{by} \ \mathit{blast}
     then have cv-on: chain-cover-on ?cvPP-xy ((cvPP - \{x\}) - \{y\})
       using chain-cover-on-def[of ?cvPP-xy ((cvPP - \{x\}) - \{y\})]
             e chain-on-def by argo
     have card ((cvPP - \{x\}) - \{y\}) < card cvPP
     using z-x-y(1) z-x-y(2) finite-PP cvPP-def(1) chain-cover-on-def finite-UnionD
       by (metis card-Diff2-less)
     then have card ((cvPP - \{x\}) - \{y\}) < card (ac - \{z\})
       using cvPP-def(2) finite-PP finite-lac cvPP-def(1) chain-cover-on-def
             finite-UnionD z-x-y(1) z-x-y(2) z-x-y(3) z-in card-Diff2-1-less
       by metis
    then show False using antichain-card-leq ac-on-cvPP-xy cv-on f by fastforce
   then have inj-f: inj-on f cvPP using inj-on-def by auto
   then have bij-f: bij-betw f cvPP ac using lac-image-f bij-betw-def by blast
   have \exists g. \forall cm \in cvPM. \exists x \in ac. g cm = x \land x \in cm
     using lac-elem-in-cvPM lac-maxPM by metis
    then obtain g where g-def: \forall cm \in cvPM. \exists x \in ac. g \ cm = x \land x \in cm
by blast
```

```
have lac\text{-}image\text{-}g: g ' cvPM = ac
proof
  \mathbf{show} \ g \ `cvPM \subseteq ac
  proof
    \mathbf{fix} \ y
    assume y \in g 'cvPM
    then obtain x where x: g x = y x \in cvPM using g-def by blast
    then have y \in x using g-def by blast
    then show y \in ac using g-def x by auto
  qed
next
  show ac \subseteq g ' cvPM
  proof
   \mathbf{fix} \ y
    assume y-in-lac: y \in ac
    then obtain x where x: x \in cvPM \ y \in x
      using cvPM-elem-in-lac lac-maxPM by auto
    then have g x = y using g-def y-in-lac
      by (metis antichain-def antichain-lac cvPM-lac-rel)
    then show y \in g ' cvPM using x by blast
  qed
qed
have \forall x \in cvPM. \forall y \in cvPM. g = g = g \longrightarrow x = y
proof (rule ccontr)
  \mathbf{assume} \neg (\forall x \in cvPM. \ \forall y \in cvPM. \ g \ x = g \ y \longrightarrow x = y)
  then have \exists x \in cvPM. \exists y \in cvPM. gx = gy \land x \neq y by blast
  then obtain z x y where z-x-y: x \in cvPM y \in cvPM
                               x \neq y z = g x z = g y  by blast
  then have z-in: z \in ac using g-def by blast
  then have \forall a \in ac. (a \in x \lor a \in y) \longrightarrow a = z
    using ac\text{-}to\text{-}c partial\text{-}P asm3 z\text{-}x\text{-}y(1) z\text{-}x\text{-}y(2)
    by (metis antichain-def antichain-lac cvPM-lac-rel g-def z-x-y(4) z-x-y(5))
  then have \forall a \in ac. \ a \neq z \longrightarrow a \notin x \land a \notin y \text{ by } blast
  then have \forall a \in (ac - \{z\}). \ a \in \bigcup ((cvPM - \{x\}) - \{y\})
    using cvPM-def(1) 2 unfolding chain-cover-on-def by blast
 then have a: (ac - \{z\}) \subseteq \bigcup ((cvPM - \{x\}) - \{y\}) (is ?lac-z \subseteq ?cvPM-xy)
  have b: partial-order-on ?cvPM-xy (relation-of (\leq) ?cvPM-xy)
    using partial-PP partial-order-on-def
    by (smt (verit) local.dual-order.eq-iff
        local.dual-order.trans\ partial-order-on-relation-of I)
  then have ac\text{-}on\text{-}cvPM\text{-}xy: antichain\text{-}on\ ?cvPM\text{-}xy\ ?lac\text{-}z
    using a antichain-on-def unfolding antichain-on-def
   by (metis DiffD1 antichain-def antichain-lac)
  have c: \forall a \in ((cvPM - \{x\}) - \{y\}). \ a \subseteq ?cvPM-xy by auto
  have d: \forall a \in ((cvPM - \{x\}) - \{y\}). Complete-Partial-Order.chain (\leq) a
    using cvPM-def(1)
    unfolding chain-cover-on-def chain-on-def
```

```
by (metis DiffD1)
     have e: \forall a \in ((cvPM - \{x\}) - \{y\}). chain-on a ?cvPM-xy
      using b c d chain-on-def
      by (metis Diff-iff Union-upper chain-cover-on-def cvPM-def(1))
     have f: finite?cvPM-xy using finite-PM cvPM-def(1)
       unfolding chain-cover-on-def chain-on-def
      by (metis (no-types, opaque-lifting) Diff-eq-empty-iff Diff-subset
                Un-Diff-cancel Union-Un-distrib finite-Un)
     have \bigcup ((cvPM - \{x\}) - \{y\}) = ?cvPM-xy by blast
     then have cv-on: chain-cover-on ?cvPM-xy ((cvPM - \{x\}) - \{y\})
       using chain-cover-on-def e by simp
     have card ((cvPM - \{x\}) - \{y\}) < card cvPM
          using z-x-y(1) z-x-y(2) finite-PM cvPM-def(1) chain-cover-on-def fi-
nite-UnionD
      by (metis card-Diff2-less)
     then have card ((cvPM - \{x\}) - \{y\}) < card (ac - \{z\})
      \mathbf{using}\ cvPM\text{-}def(2)\ finite\text{-}PM\ finite\text{-}lac\ cvPM\text{-}def(1)\ chain\text{-}cover\text{-}on\text{-}def
            finite-UnionD z-x-y(1) z-x-y(2) z-x-y(3) z-in card-Diff2-1-less
      by metis
    then show False using antichain-card-leq ac-on-cvPM-xy cv-on f by fastforce
   then have inj-g: inj-on g cvPM using inj-on-def by auto
   then have bij-g: bij-betw g cvPM ac using lac-image-g bij-betw-def by blast
   define h where h = inv-into cvPP f
   then have bij-h: bij-betw h ac cvPP
     using f-def bij-f bij-betw-inv-into by auto
   define i where i = inv-into cvPM g
   then have bij-i: bij-betw i ac cvPM
     using g-def bij-f bij-g bij-betw-inv-into by auto
   obtain j where j-def: \forall x \in ac. jx = (hx) \cup (ix)
     using h-def i-def f-def g-def bij-h bij-i
     by (metis\ sup-apply)
   have \forall x \in ac. \ \forall y \in ac. \ j \ x = j \ y \longrightarrow x = y
   proof (rule ccontr)
     assume \neg (\forall x \in ac. \ \forall y \in ac. \ j \ x = j \ y \longrightarrow x = y)
     then have \exists x \in ac. \exists y \in ac. j x = j y \land x \neq y by blast
     then obtain z \times y where z-x-y: x \in ac \ y \in ac \ z = j \times z = j \times y \times \neq y
     then have z-x: z = (h \ x) \cup (i \ x) using j-def by simp
     have z = (h \ y) \cup (i \ y) using j-def z-x-y by simp
     then have union-eq: (h \ x) \cup (i \ x) = (h \ y) \cup (i \ y) using z-x by simp
     have x-hx: x \in (h \ x) using h-def f-def bij-h
      by (metis bij-betw-apply f-inv-into-f lac-image-f z-x-y(1))
     have x-ix: x \in (i \ x) using i-def g-def bij-g bij-i
      by (metis bij-betw-apply f-inv-into-f lac-image-g z-x-y(1))
     have y \in (h \ y) using h-def f-def bij-h bij-h
      by (metis bij-betw-apply f-inv-into-f lac-image-f z-x-y(2))
     then have y \in (h \ x) \cup (i \ x) using union-eq by simp
     then have y-in: y \in (h \ x) \lor y \in (i \ x) by simp
```

```
then show False
     proof (cases \ y \in (h \ x))
       {\bf case}\  \, True
       have \exists c \in cvPP. (h x) = c using h-def f-def bij-h bij-f
         by (simp\ add:\ bij-betw-apply\ z-x-y(1))
       then obtain c where c-def: c \in cvPP (h x) = c by simp
       then have x \in c \land y \in c using x-hx True by simp
      then have x = y using z-x-y(1) z-x-y(2) asm1 c-def(1) cvPP-def less.prems
ac
         unfolding largest-antichain-on-def antichain-on-def antichain-def
                  chain-cover-on-def chain-on-def chain-def
         by (metis)
       then show ?thesis using z-x-y(5) by simp
     next
       case False
       then have y-ix: y \in (i \ x) using y-in by simp
       have \exists c \in cvPM. (ix) = c \text{ using } i\text{-def } g\text{-def } bij\text{-}i \text{ } bij\text{-}g
         by (simp\ add:\ bij-betw-apply\ z-x-y(1))
       then obtain c where c-def: c \in cvPM (i \ x) = c by simp
       then have x \in c \land y \in c using x-ix y-ix by simp
       then have x = y
         using z-x-y(1) z-x-y(2) asm1 ac c-def(1) cvPM-def less.prems
         unfolding largest-antichain-on-def antichain-on-def antichain-def
                  chain-cover-on-def chain-on-def chain-def
         by (metis)
       then show ?thesis using z-x-y(5) by simp
     qed
   qed
   then have inj-j: inj-on j ac using inj-on-def by auto
   obtain cvf where cvf-def: cvf = \{j \ x \mid x \ . \ x \in ac\} by simp
   then have \mathit{cvf} = j ' \mathit{ac} by \mathit{blast}
   then have bij-j: bij-betw j ac cvf using inj-j bij-betw-def by auto
   then have card-cvf: card cvf = card ac
     by (metis bij-betw-same-card)
   have j-h-i: \forall x \in ac. \exists cp \in cvPP. \exists cm \in cvPM. (hx = cp) \land (ix = cm)
                      \wedge (j x = (cp \cup cm))
     using j-def bij-h bij-i by (meson bij-betwE)
   have \bigcup cvf = (p\text{-}plus \cup p\text{-}minus)
   proof
     show \bigcup cvf \subseteq (p\text{-}plus \cup p\text{-}minus)
     proof
       \mathbf{fix} \ y
       assume y \in \bigcup cvf
       then obtain z where z-def: z \in \mathit{cvf}\ y \in z by \mathit{blast}
       then obtain cp cm where cp-cm: cp \in cvPP cm \in cvPM z = (cp \cup cm)
         using cvf-def h-def i-def j-h-i by blast
       then have y \in cp \lor y \in cm using z\text{-}def(2) by simp
        then show y \in (p\text{-}plus \cup p\text{-}minus) using cp\text{-}cm(1) cp\text{-}cm(2) cvPP\text{-}def
cvPM-def
```

```
unfolding chain-cover-on-def chain-on-def by blast
     qed
   \mathbf{next}
     show (p\text{-}plus \cup p\text{-}minus) \subseteq \bigcup cvf
     proof
       \mathbf{fix} \ y
       assume y \in (p\text{-}plus \cup p\text{-}minus)
       then have y-in: y \in p-plus \forall y \in p-minus by simp
       have p\text{-}plus = \bigcup cvPP \land p\text{-}minus = \bigcup cvPM  using cvPP\text{-}def \ cvPM\text{-}def
         unfolding chain-cover-on-def by simp
       then have y \in (\bigcup cvPP) \lor y \in (\bigcup cvPM) using y-in by simp
       then have \exists cp \in cvPP. \exists cm \in cvPM. (y \in cp) \lor (y \in cm)
         using cvPP-def cvPM-def
         by (meson\ Union-iff\ x-cp-cm(2)\ x-cp-cm(4))
       then obtain cp cm where cp-cm: cp \in cvPP cm \in cvPM y \in (cp \cup cm)
by blast
       have 1: \exists cm \in cvPM. \exists x \in ac. (x \in cp) \land (x \in cm)
         using cp-cm(1) f-def cvPM-elem-in-lac lac-maxPM by metis
       have 2: \exists cp \in cvPP. \exists x \in ac. (x \in cp) \land (x \in cm)
         using cp\text{-}cm(2) g\text{-}def cvPP\text{-}elem\text{-}in\text{-}lac lac\text{-}minPP
         by meson
       then show y \in \bigcup cvf
       proof (cases \ y \in cp)
         case True
         obtain x \ cmc where x-cm: x \in ac x \in cp x \in cmc cmc \in cvPM
           using 1 by blast
         have f cp = x using cp\text{-}cm(1) x-cm(1) f-def
          by (metis antichain-def antichain-lac cvPP-lac-rel x-cm(2))
         then have h-x: h x = cp using h-def cp-cm(1) inj-f by auto
         have g \ cmc = x \ using \ x-cm(4) \ x-cm(1) \ g-def
          by (metis antichain-def antichain-lac cvPM-lac-rel x-cm(3))
         then have i-x: i x = cmc using i-def
          by (meson\ bij-betw-inv-into-left\ bij-g\ x-cm(4))
         then have j x = h x \cup i x using j-def x-cm(1) by simp
         then have (h \ x \cup i \ x) \in cvf using cvf-def x-cm(1) by auto
         then have (cp \cup cmc) \in cvf using h-x i-x by simp
         then show ?thesis using True by blast
       next
         case False
         then have y-in: y \in cm using cp\text{-}cm(3) by simp
         obtain x \ cpc where x-cp: x \in ac \ x \in cm \ x \in cpc \ cpc \in cvPP
           using 2 by blast
         have g \ cm = x \ using \ cp-cm(2) \ x-cp(1) \ x-cp(2) \ g-def
          by (metis antichain-def antichain-lac cvPM-lac-rel)
         then have x-i: i x = cm using i-def x-cp(1)
          by (meson\ bij-betw-inv-into-left\ bij-g\ cp-cm(2))
         have f cpc = x using x - cp(4) x - cp(1) x - cp(3) f - def
          by (metis antichain-def antichain-lac cvPP-lac-rel)
         then have x-h: h = cpc using h-def x-cp(1) inj-f x-cp(4) by force
```

```
then have j x = h x \cup i x using j-def x-cp(1) by simp
         then have (h \ x \cup i \ x) \in \mathit{cvf} using \mathit{cvf}-def x-\mathit{cp}(1) by \mathit{auto}
         then have (cpc \cup cm) \in cvf using x-h x-i by simp
         then show ?thesis using y-in by blast
       ged
     qed
   qed
   then have cvf-P: \bigcup cvf = P \text{ using } P-PP-PM \text{ by } simp
   have \forall x \in cvf. chain-on x P
   proof
     \mathbf{fix} \ x
     assume asm1: x \in cvf
     then obtain a where a-def: a \in ac \ j \ a = x \ using \ cvf-def by blast
     then obtain cp cm where cp-cm: cp \in cvPP cm \in cvPM h a = cp \land i a =
cm
       using h-def i-def bij-h bij-i j-h-i by blast
     then have x-union: x = (cp \cup cm) using j-def a-def by simp
     then have a-in: a \in cp \land a \in cm using cp-cm h-def f-def i-def g-def
       by (metis \langle a \in ac \rangle \ bij-betw-inv-into-right \ bij-f \ bij-g)
     then have a-rel-cp: \forall b \in cp. (a \leq b)
       \mathbf{using}\ a\text{-}def(1)\ cp\text{-}cm(1)\ lac\text{-}minPP\ e\text{-}minset\text{-}lesseq\text{-}e\text{-}chain
       by (metis antichain-def antichain-lac cvPP-lac-rel)
     have a-rel-cm: \forall b \in cm. (b \leq a)
       using a-def(1) cp-cm(2) lac-maxPM e-chain-lesseq-e-maxset a-in
       by (metis antichain-def antichain-lac cvPM-lac-rel)
     then have \forall a \in cp. \ \forall b \in cm. \ (b \leq a) \text{ using } a\text{-rel-}cp \text{ by } fastforce
     then have \forall x \in (cp \cup cm). \ \forall y \in (cp \cup cm). \ (x \leq y) \lor (y \leq x)
       using cp\text{-}cm(1) cp\text{-}cm(2) cvPP\text{-}def cvPM\text{-}def
       unfolding chain-cover-on-def chain-on-def chain-def
       by (metis Un-iff)
     then have Complete-Partial-Order.chain (\leq) (cp \cup cm) using chain-def by
auto
      then have chain-x: Complete-Partial-Order.chain (\leq) x using x-union by
simp
     have x \subseteq P using cvf-P asm1 by blast
     then show chain-on x P using chain-x partial-P chain-on-def by simp
   qed
   then have chain-cover-on P cvf using cvf-P chain-cover-on-def[of P cvf] by
   then show caseTrue: ?thesis using card-cvf ac by auto
 next — the largest antichain is equal to the maximal set or the minimal set
   case False
   assume \neg (\exists ac. (antichain-on\ P\ ac \land ac \neq ?min \land ac \neq ?max) \land card\ ac =
card lac)
   then have \neg ((lac \neq ?max) \land (lac \neq ?min))
     using less(2) unfolding largest-antichain-on-def
   then have max-min-asm: (lac = ?max) \lor (lac = ?min) by simp
   then have caseAsm:
```

```
\forall \ ac. \ (antichain-on \ P \ ac \land ac \neq ?min \land ac \neq ?max) \longrightarrow card \ ac \leq card \ lac
     using asm1 largest-antichain-on-def less.prems(1) by presburger
   then have case2: \forall ac. (antichain-on P ac \land ac \neq ?min \land ac \neq ?max) \longrightarrow
card \ ac < card \ lac
       using False by force
   obtain x where x: x \in ?min
     \mathbf{using}\ is\text{-}minimal\text{-}in\text{-}set\text{-}iff\ non\text{-}empty\text{-}minset\ partial\text{-}P\ assms}(2,3)
     by (metis empty-Collect-eq less.prems(2) less.prems(3) mem-Collect-eq)
   then have x \in P using is-minimal-in-set-iff by simp
   then obtain y where y: y \in ?max \ x \le y using partial-P max-elem-for-P
       using less.prems(2) by blast
   define PD where PD-def: PD = P - \{x,y\}
   then have finite-PD: finite PD using asm3 finite-def
       by (simp \ add: \ less.prems(2))
   then have partial-PD: partial-order-on PD (relation-of (<) PD)
       using partial-P partial-order-on-def
       by (simp add: partial-order-on-relation-ofI)
   then have max-min-nPD: \neg (?max \subseteq PD) \land \neg (?min \subseteq PD)
       using PD-def x y(1) by blast
   have a1: \forall a \in P. (a \neq x) \land (a \neq y) \longrightarrow a \in PD
       using PD-def by blast
     then have \forall a \in ?max. (a \neq x) \land (a \neq y) \longrightarrow a \in PD
       using is-maximal-in-set-iff by blast
   then have (?max - \{x, y\}) \subseteq PD (is ?maxPD \subseteq PD) by blast
   have card-maxPD: card (?max - \{x,y\}) = (card ?max - 1) using x y
     proof cases
       assume x = y
       then show ?thesis using y(1) by force
     next
       assume \neg (x = y)
       then have x < y using y(2) by simp
       then have \neg (is-maximal-in-set P x) using x y(1)
        using \langle x \neq y \rangle is-maximal-in-set-iff by fastforce
       then have x \notin ?max by simp
       then show ?thesis using y(1) by auto
     have \forall a \in ?min. (a \neq x) \land (a \neq y) \longrightarrow a \in PD
       using is-minimal-in-set-iff a1
       by (simp add: a1 local.is-minimal-in-set-iff)
   then have (?min - \{x, y\}) \subseteq PD (is ?minPD \subseteq PD) by blast
   have card-minPD: card (?min - \{x,y\}) = (card ?min - 1) using x y
   proof cases
     assume x = y
     then show ?thesis using x by auto
     assume \neg (x = y)
     then have x < y using y(2) by simp
     then have \neg (is-minimal-in-set P y) using is-minimal-in-set-iff x y(1)
        by force
```

```
then have y \notin ?min by simp
     then show ?thesis using x
        by (metis Diff-insert Diff-insert0 card-Diff-singleton-if)
   qed
   then show ?thesis
   proof cases
     assume asm:lac = ?max — case where the largest antichain is the maximal
     then have card-maxPD: card ?maxPD = (card lac - 1) using card-maxPD
by auto
     then have ac-less: \forall ac. (antichain-on P ac \land ac \neq ?max \land ac \neq ?min)
                     \longrightarrow card \ ac \leq (card \ lac - 1)
        using case2 by auto
     have PD-sub: PD \subset P using PD-def
        by (simp add: \langle x \in P \rangle subset-Diff-insert subset-not-subset-eq)
     then have PD-less: card PD < card P  using asm3  card-def
        by (simp add: less.prems(2) psubset-card-mono)
      have maxPD-sub: ?maxPD \subseteq PD
        using PD-def \langle \{x. is-maximal-in-set P x\} - \{x, y\} \subseteq PD \rangle by blast
     have ?maxPD \subseteq ?max by blast
    then have antichain ?maxPD using masset-ac unfolding antichain-def by
blast
     then have ac-maxPD: antichain-on PD ?maxPD
        using maxPD-sub antichain-on-def partial-PD by simp
     have acPD-nMax-nMin: \forall ac . (antichain-on PD ac) <math>\longrightarrow (ac \neq ?max \land ac)
\neq ?min)
        using max-min-nPD antichain-on-def
        by auto
     have \forall ac. (antichain-on PD ac) \longrightarrow (antichain-on P ac)
        using antichain-on-def antichain-def
        by (meson PD-sub partial-P psubset-imp-subset subset-trans)
     then have \forall ac. (antichain-on PD \ ac) \longrightarrow card \ ac < (card \ lac - 1)
        using ac-less PD-sub max-min-nPD acPD-nMax-nMin by blast
     then have maxPD-lac: largest-antichain-on PD?maxPD
        using largest-antichain-on-def ac-maxPD card-maxPD by simp
     then have \exists cv. chain-cover-on PD cv \land card cv = card ?maxPD
     proof cases
      assume PD \neq \{\}
      then show ?thesis using less PD-less maxPD-lac finite-PD by blast
     next
      assume \neg (PD \neq \{\})
      then have PD-empty: PD = \{\} by simp
      then have ?maxPD = \{\} using maxPD-sub by auto
      then show ?thesis
        using maxPD-lac PD-empty largest-antichain-card-eq-empty by simp
     then obtain cvPD where cvPD-def: chain-cover-on PD cvPD
                                card \ cvPD = card \ ?maxPD \ \mathbf{by} \ blast
     then have \bigcup cvPD = PD unfolding chain-cover-on-def by simp
```

```
then have union-cvPD: \bigcup (cvPD \cup \{\{x,y\}\}) = P \text{ using } PD\text{-}def
        using \langle x \in P \rangle y(1) is-maximal-in-set-iff by force
     have chains-cvPD: \forall x \in cvPD. chain-on x P
      using chain-on-def cvPD-def(1) PD-sub unfolding chain-cover-on-def
      by (meson subset-not-subset-eq subset-trans)
     have \{x,y\} \subseteq P using x y
       using union-cvPD by blast
     then have xy-chain-on: chain-on \{x,y\} P
      using partial-P y(2) chain-on-def chain-def
     define cvf where cvf-def: cvf = cvPD \cup \{\{x,y\}\}\}
     have cv-cvf: chain-cover-on P cvf
       using chains-cvPD union-cvPD xy-chain-on unfolding chain-cover-on-def
cvf-def
       by simp
     have \neg (\{x,y\} \subseteq PD) using PD-def by simp
     then have \{x,y\} \notin cvPD using cvPD-def(1)
        unfolding chain-cover-on-def chain-on-def by auto
    then have card\ (cvPD \cup \{\{x,y\}\}) = (card\ ?maxPD) + 1 using cvPD\text{-}def(2)
card-def
        then have card \ cvf = (card \ ?maxPD) + 1 \ using \ cvf-def \ by \ auto
     then have card \ cvf = card \ lac \ using \ card-maxPD \ asm
      by (metis Diff-infinite-finite Suc-eq-plus1 \{x, y\} \subseteq P) card-Diff-singleton
          card-Suc-Diff1 finite-PD finite-subset less.prems(2) maxPD-sub y(1))
     then show ?thesis using cv-cvf by blast
   next
     assume \neg (lac = ?max)
       complementary case where the largest antichain is the minimal set
     then have lac = ?min using max-min-asm by simp
     then have card-minPD: card ?minPD = (card lac - 1) using card-minPD
by simp
     then have ac\text{-less}: \forall ac. (antichain-on P ac \land ac \neq ?max \land ac \neq ?min)
                     \longrightarrow card\ ac \leq (card\ lac - 1)
        using case2 by auto
     have PD-sub: PD \subseteq P using PD-def by simp
     then have PD-less: card PD < card P  using asm3
       \mathbf{using}\ less.prems(2)\ max-min-nPD\ is-minimal-in-set-iff\ psubset-card-mono
      by (metis DiffE PD-def \langle x \in P \rangle insertCI psubsetI)
     have minPD-sub: ?minPD \subseteq PD using PD-def unfolding
       is-minimal-in-set-iff by blast
     have ?minPD \subseteq ?min by blast
     then have antichain ?minPD using minset-ac is-minimal-in-set-iff
      unfolding antichain-def
      by (metis DiffD1)
     then have ac-minPD: antichain-on PD?minPD
        using minPD-sub antichain-on-def partial-PD by simp
     have acPD-nMax-nMin: \forall ac . (antichain-on PD ac) <math>\longrightarrow (ac \neq ?max \land ac)
\neq ?min)
```

```
using max-min-nPD antichain-on-def
        by metis
     have \forall ac. (antichain-on PD ac) \longrightarrow (antichain-on P ac)
        using antichain-on-def antichain-def
        by (meson PD-sub partial-P subset-trans)
     then have \forall ac. (antichain-on PD \ ac) \longrightarrow card \ ac \leq (card \ lac - 1)
        using ac-less PD-sub max-min-nPD acPD-nMax-nMin by blast
     then have minPD-lac: largest-antichain-on PD ?minPD
       using largest-antichain-on-def ac-minPD card-minPD by simp
     then have \exists cv. chain-cover-on PD cv \land card cv = card ?minPD
     proof cases
      assume PD \neq \{\}
      then show ?thesis using less PD-less minPD-lac finite-PD by blast
     next
       assume \neg (PD \neq \{\})
      then have PD-empty: PD = \{\} by simp
      then have ?minPD = \{\} using minPD-sub by auto
      then show ?thesis
        using minPD-lac PD-empty largest-antichain-card-eq-empty by simp
     then obtain cvPD where cvPD-def: chain-cover-on PD cvPD
                                 card \ cvPD = card \ ?minPD \ \mathbf{by} \ blast
     then have \bigcup cvPD = PD unfolding chain-cover-on-def by simp
     then have union\text{-}cvPD: \bigcup (cvPD \cup \{\{x,y\}\}) = P using PD\text{-}def
        using \langle x \in P \rangle \quad y(1)
        using is-maximal-in-set-iff by force
     have chains-cvPD: \forall x \in cvPD. chain-on x P
        using chain-on-def cvPD-def(1) PD-sub unfolding chain-cover-on-def
        by (meson Sup-le-iff partial-P)
     have \{x,y\} \subseteq P using x \ y using union-cvPD by blast
     then have xy-chain-on: chain-on \{x,y\} P
        using partial-P y(2) chain-on-def chain-def by fast
     define cvf where cvf-def: cvf = cvPD \cup \{\{x,y\}\}\}
     then have cv-cvf: chain-cover-on P cvf
       using chains-cvPD union-cvPD xy-chain-on unfolding chain-cover-on-def
     have \neg (\{x,y\} \subseteq PD) using PD-def by simp
     then have \{x,y\} \notin cvPD using cvPD-def(1)
        unfolding chain-cover-on-def chain-on-def by auto
    then have card\ (cvPD \cup \{\{x,y\}\}) = (card\ ?minPD) + 1 using cvPD\text{-}def(2)
card-def
        by (simp\ add: \langle\bigcup\ cvPD = PD\rangle\ finite-PD\ finite-UnionD)
     then have card \ cvf = (card \ ?minPD) + 1 \ using \ cvf-def \ by \ auto
     then have card \ cvf = card \ lac \ using \ card-minPD
      by (metis Diff-infinite-finite Suc-eq-plus1
          \langle lac = \{x. \ is-minimal-in-set \ P \ x \} \rangle \langle \{x, \ y\} \subseteq P \rangle
          card-Diff-singleton card-Suc-Diff1 finite-PD finite-subset
          less.prems(2) minPD-sub x
       then show ?thesis using cv-cvf by blast
```

```
qed
qed
qed
```

5 Dilworth's Theorem for Chain Covers: Statement and Proof

We show that in any partially ordered set, the cardinality of a largest antichain is equal to the cardinality of a smallest chain cover.

```
theorem Dilworth:
   assumes largest-antichain-on P lac
   and finite P
   shows \exists cv. (smallest-chain-cover-on <math>P cv) \land (card \ cv = card \ lac)

proof—
   show ?thesis
   using antichain-card-leq largest-antichard-card-eq assms largest-antichain-on-def
   by (smt \ (verit, \ ccfv-SIG) \ card.empty \ chain-cover-null \ le-antisym \ le-zero-eq
   smallest-chain-cover-on-def)

qed
```

6 Dilworth's Decomposition Theorem

6.1 Preliminaries

Now we will strengthen the result above to prove that the cardinality of a smallest chain decomposition is equal to the cardinality of a largest antichain. In order to prove that, we construct a preliminary result which states that cardinality of smallest chain decomposition is equal to the cardinality of smallest chain cover.

We begin by constructing the function make_disjoint which takes a list of sets and returns a list of sets which are mutually disjoint, and leaves the union of the sets in the list invariant. This function when acting on a chain cover returns a chain decomposition.

```
fun make-disjoint::- set \ list \Rightarrow - \ where make-disjoint \ [] = ([]) |make-disjoint \ (s\#ls) = (s - (\bigcup \ (set \ ls)))\#(make-disjoint \ ls) lemma finite-dist-card-list: \ assumes finite \ S \ shows \exists \ ls. \ set \ ls = S \land length \ ls = card \ S \land distinct \ ls \ using \ assms \ distinct-\ card \ finite-\ distinct-\ list \ by \ metis
```

```
lemma len-make-disjoint:length xs = length (make-disjoint xs) by (induction xs, simp+)
```

We use the predicate list-all2 (\subseteq), which checks if two lists (of sets) have equal length, and if each element in the first list is a subset of the corresponding element in the second list.

```
lemma subset-make-disjoint: list-all2 (\subseteq) (make-disjoint xs) xs
 by (induction xs, simp, auto)
lemma subslist-union:
assumes list-all2 (\subseteq) xs ys
shows \bigcup (set xs) \subseteq \bigcup (set ys)
 using assms by (induction, simp, auto)
lemma make-disjoint-union: \bigcup (set \ (set \ (make-disjoint \ xs))
proof
 show \bigcup (set xs) \subseteq \bigcup (set (make-disjoint xs))
   by (induction xs, auto)
next
 show \bigcup (set (make-disjoint xs)) \subseteq \bigcup (set xs)
   using subslist-union subset-make-disjoint
   by (metis)
qed
lemma make-disjoint-empty-int:
 assumes X \in set (make-disjoint xs) Y \in set (make-disjoint xs)
and X \neq Y
shows X \cap Y = \{\}
  using assms
proof(induction \ xs \ arbitrary: \ X \ Y)
  case (Cons a xs)
  then show ?case
  \mathbf{proof}(cases\ X \neq a - (\bigcup\ (set\ xs)) \land\ Y \neq (a - (\bigcup\ (set\ xs))))
   case True
   then show ?thesis using Cons(1)[of X Y] Cons(2,3)
     \mathbf{by}\ (smt\ (verit,\ del\text{-}insts)\ Cons.prems(3)\ Diff\text{-}Int\text{-}distrib\ Diff\text{-}disjoint}
        Sup-upper\ make-disjoint.simps(2)\ make-disjoint-union\ inf.idem\ inf-absorb1
         inf-commute set-ConsD)
 next
   case False
   hence fa:X = a - (\bigcup (set \ xs)) \lor Y = a - (\bigcup (set \ xs)) by argo
   then show ?thesis
   \mathbf{proof}(cases\ X = a - (\bigcup\ (set\ xs))\ )
     hence Y \neq a - (\bigcup (set \ xs)) using Cons(4) by argo
     hence Y \in set \ (make-disjoint \ xs) \ using \ Cons(3) \ by \ simp
     hence Y \subseteq \bigcup (set (make-disjoint xs)) by blast
     hence Y \subseteq \bigcup (set \ xs) using make-disjoint-union by metis
```

```
hence X \cap Y = \{\} using True by blast
     then show ?thesis by blast
   \mathbf{next}
     {f case}\ {\it False}
     hence Y:Y = a - (\bigcup (set \ xs)) using Cons(4) fa by argo
     hence X \neq a - (\bigcup (set \ xs)) using False by argo
     hence X \in set \ (make-disjoint \ xs) \ using \ Cons(2) \ by \ simp
     hence X \subseteq \bigcup (set (make-disjoint xs)) by blast
     hence X \subseteq \bigcup (set xs) using make-disjoint-union by metis
     hence X \cap Y = \{\} using Y by blast
     then show ?thesis by blast
   qed
 qed
qed (simp)
lemma chain-subslist:
 assumes \forall i < length \ xs. \ Complete-Partial-Order.chain (<) (xs!i)
   and list-all2 (\subseteq) ys xs
 shows \forall i < length \ ys. \ Complete-Partial-Order.chain (<math>\leq) (ys!i)
  using assms(2,1)
proof(induction)
  case (Cons \ x \ xs \ y \ ys)
  then have list-all2 \subseteq xs ys by auto
  then have le: \forall i < length \ xs. \ Complete-Partial-Order.chain \ (\leq) \ (xs ! i)
   using Cons by fastforce
  then have x \subseteq y using Cons(1) by auto
  then have Complete-Partial-Order.chain (\leq) x using Cons
   using chain-subset by fastforce
  then show ?case using le
   by (metis all-nth-imp-all-set insert-iff list.simps(15) nth-mem)
qed(argo)
lemma chain-cover-disjoint:
 assumes chain-cover-on P (set C)
 shows chain-cover-on P (set (make-disjoint C))
proof-
 have \bigcup (set (make-disjoint C)) = P using make-disjoint-union assms(1)
   unfolding chain-cover-on-def by metis
  moreover have \forall x \in set (make\text{-}disjoint C). x \subseteq P
   using subset-make-disjoint assms unfolding chain-cover-on-def
   using calculation by blast
 moreover have \forall x \in set \ (make-disjoint \ C). \ Complete-Partial-Order.chain \ (\leq) \ x
   using chain-subslist assms unfolding chain-cover-on-def chain-on-def
   by (metis in-set-conv-nth subset-make-disjoint)
  ultimately show ?thesis unfolding chain-cover-on-def chain-on-def by auto
```

lemma make-disjoint-subset-i:

```
assumes i < length as shows (make-disjoint\ (as))!i \subseteq (as!i) using assms proof (induct\ as\ arbitrary:\ i) case (Cons\ a\ as) then show ?case proof (cases\ i=0) case False have i-1 < length\ as\ using\ Cons using False by force hence (make-disjoint\ as)!\ (i-1) \subseteq as!(i-1) using Cons(1)[of\ i-1] by argo then show ?thesis using False by simp qed (simp) qed (simp)
```

Following theorem asserts that the corresponding to the smallest chain cover on a finite set, there exists a corresponding chain decomposition of the same cardinality.

```
lemma chain-cover-decompsn-eq:
 assumes finite P
     and smallest-chain-cover-on P A
   shows \exists B. chain-decomposition P B \land card B = card A
  obtain As where As:set As = A length As = card A distinct As
   using assms
   \mathbf{by}\ (\mathit{metis}\ \mathit{chain\text{-}cover\text{-}on\text{-}}\mathit{def}\ \mathit{finite\text{-}UnionD}\ \mathit{finite\text{-}}\mathit{dist\text{-}card\text{-}}\mathit{list}
       smallest-chain-cover-on-def)
 hence ccdas:chain-cover-on P (set (make-disjoint As))
   using assms(2) chain-cover-disjoint[of P As]
   unfolding smallest-chain-cover-on-def by argo
  hence 1:chain-decomposition P (set (make-disjoint As))
   using make-disjoint-empty-int
   unfolding chain-decomposition-def by meson
  moreover have 2: card (set (make-disjoint As)) = card A
 \mathbf{proof}(rule\ ccontr)
   assume asm:\neg card (set (make-disjoint As)) = card A
   have length (make-disjoint As) = card A
     using len-make-disjoint As(2) by metis
   then show False
     using asm \ assms(2) \ card-length \ ccdas
           smallest-chain-cover-on-def
     by metis
 qed
  ultimately show ?thesis by blast
```

 \mathbf{lemma} smallest-cv-cd:

```
assumes smallest-chain-decomposition P cd
and smallest-chain-cover-on P cv
shows card cv \leq card cd
using assms unfolding smallest-chain-decomposition-def chain-decomposition-def
smallest-chain-cover-on-def by auto

lemma smallest-cv-eq-smallest-cd:
assumes finite P
and smallest-chain-decomposition P cd
and smallest-chain-cover-on P cv
shows card cv = card cd
using smallest-cv-cd[OF assms(2,3)] chain-cover-decompsn-eq[OF assms(1,3)]
by (metis assms(2) smallest-chain-decomposition-def)
```

6.2 Statement and Proof

We extend the Dilworth's theorem to chain decomposition. The following theorem asserts that size of a largest antichain is equal to the size of a smallest chain decomposition.

```
theorem Dilworth-Decomposition:
   assumes largest-antichain-on P lac
   and finite P
   shows \exists cd. (smallest-chain-decomposition P cd) \land (card cd = card lac)
   using Dilworth[OF assms] smallest-cv-eq-smallest-cd assms
   by (metis (mono-tags, lifting) cd-cv chain-cover-decompsn-eq
        smallest-chain-cover-on-def smallest-chain-decomposition-def)

end
```

end

Acknowledgement

We would like thank Divakaran D. for valuable suggestions.

References

- [1] M. Desharnais. Minimal, maximal, least, and greatest elements w.r.t. restricted ordering. *Archive of Formal Proofs*, October 2024. https://isa-afp.org/entries/Min_Max_Least_Greatest.html, Formal proof development.
- [2] R. P. Dilworth. A decomposition theorem for partially ordered sets. *Annals of Mathematics*, 51(1):161–166, 1950.

- [3] M. A. Perles. A proof of dilworths decomposition theorem for partially ordered sets. *Israel Journal of Mathematics*, 1:105–107, 1963.
- [4] A. K. Singh. Fully mechanized proofs of dilworths theorem and mirskys theorem. arXiv preprint arXiv:1703.06133, 2017.