

Formalization of 3-independence of simple tabulation hashing

Wei De Leong and Yong Kiam Tan and Seng Joe Watt

July 14, 2026

Abstract

Simple tabulation hashing [2] is a computationally-efficient hashing algorithm to get values that behave independently and are uniformly distributed for any 3 distinct keys. This entry formalizes the 3-independence and non-4-independence of simple tabulation hashing, based on the written proofs provided by [1, Solutions 8][4]

Contents

1	Preliminaries	2
1.1	The XOR operator	2
1.1.1	Definition of XOR	3
1.1.2	Standard Instantiations	4
1.1.3	Syntactic sugar	4
1.2	Intro rules, contrapositives and bijections	9
1.2.1	Application	11
2	Definitions	12
3	Proofs	14
3.1	Proof of 1-independence and uniformity	14
3.2	Proof of two-independence	14
3.3	Proof of 3-independence	14
3.4	Proof of 3-universal	15
3.5	Proof of non-4-universal	15
4	Appendix	16
4.1	Utility	16
4.2	Alternate proof of non-4-universal	16
4.2.1	Preliminaries	16
4.2.2	Proofs	17

```

theory Xor
imports
  Main
begin

```

This theory abstractly defines

- the binary operator *xor* (aliases (*XOR*) ($\oplus$))
- the n-ary version *xor-fold*
- and the Big version *xor-sum* (alias $\bigoplus_{i \in J}. f\ i$).

An implementation of xor should abide by the following laws:

- identity element
- commutative
- associative
- left/right neutrality
- self-inverse

which constitutes an abelian group.

Instantiations of `abel_group_xor` have been provided for `bool`, `nat` and `int`.

Other theories relating to xor:

- *abstract-boolean-algebra-sym-diff*
- *xor*
- (AFP) `Approximate_Model_Counting.RandomXOR` [3]

1 Preliminaries

1.1 The XOR operator

lemma (in *monoid-list*) *list-conv-take-drop*:
shows $F\ xs = F\ (take\ i\ xs) * F\ (drop\ i\ xs)$
<proof>

lemma (in *monoid-list*) *list-conv-take-nth-drop*:
assumes $i < length\ xs$
shows $F\ xs = F\ (take\ i\ xs) * xs\ !\ i * F\ (drop\ (Suc\ i)\ xs)$
<proof>

lemma (in *comm-monoid-list*) *absorb-right*:

assumes $i < \text{length } xs$

shows $F\ xs * v = F\ (xs[i := xs ! i * v])$

$\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma (in *semiring-bit-operations*) *eq-iff*:

shows *semiring-bit-operations-class.xor* $a\ b = 0 \longleftrightarrow a = b$

$\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

1.1.1 Definition of XOR

class *xor* =

fixes *xor* :: $\langle 'a \Rightarrow 'a \Rightarrow 'a \rangle$ (**infixr** $\langle \text{XOR} \rangle$ 59) — Definition of 2-ary xor

class *abel-group-xor* = *zero* + *xor* +

assumes *xor-commute*: $a\ \text{XOR}\ b = b\ \text{XOR}\ a$

assumes *xor-assoc*: $(a\ \text{XOR}\ b)\ \text{XOR}\ c = a\ \text{XOR}\ b\ \text{XOR}\ c$

assumes *xor-right-neutral*: $a\ \text{XOR}\ 0 = a$

assumes *eq-iff [iff]*: $a\ \text{XOR}\ b = 0 \longleftrightarrow a = b$

begin

lemma *self-inv [simp]*:

shows $a\ \text{XOR}\ a = 0$

$\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

The above properties show that XOR forms an abelian group

sublocale *group xor 0 id*

$\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

sublocale *abel-semigroup xor* $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

sublocale *comm-monoid xor 0* $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

sublocale *xor-sum: comm-monoid-set xor 0*

defines *xor-sum* = *xor-sum.F* $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

abbreviation *Xor-Sum* $\equiv$ *xor-sum* $(\lambda x. x)$

sublocale *xor-list: monoid-list xor 0*

defines *xor-fold* = *xor-list.F* $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

sublocale *xor-comm-list: comm-monoid-list xor 0*

rewrites *monoid-list.F xor 0* = *xor-fold*

$\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

sublocale *xor-list: comm-monoid-list-set xor 0*

rewrites *monoid-list.F xor 0* = *xor-fold* **and** *comm-monoid-set.F xor 0* =

xor-sum

$\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma *xor-cong*:

assumes $a \text{ XOR } b = 0$

shows $a = b$

$\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma *inj-on-UNIV*:

shows *inj-on xor UNIV*

$\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma *map-indices-conv-list-update-conv*:

shows $\text{map } (\lambda j. \text{ if } j = i \text{ then } g \ j \text{ else } xs \ ! \ j) \ [0..<\text{length } xs] = xs[i := g \ i]$

$\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma *fold-absorb*:

assumes $i < \text{length } xs$

shows $\text{xor-fold } xs \text{ XOR } v =$

$\text{xor-fold } (\text{map } (\lambda j. \text{ if } j = i \text{ then } xs \ ! \ j \text{ XOR } v \text{ else } xs \ ! \ j)) \ [0..<\text{length } xs])$

$\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

end

hide-fact *xor-commute xor-assoc xor-right-neutral*

1.1.2 Standard Instantiations

instantiation *bool* :: *abel-group-xor* **begin**

definition *zero-bool* $\equiv \text{False}$

definition *xor-bool* :: *bool* $\Rightarrow$ *bool* $\Rightarrow$ *bool* **where** *xor-bool* $a \ b \equiv (a \neq b)$

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

end

instantiation *nat* **and** *int* :: *abel-group-xor* **begin**

definition *xor-nat* :: *nat* $\Rightarrow$ *nat* $\Rightarrow$ *nat* **where** *xor-nat* $\equiv \text{semiring-bit-operations-class.xor}$

definition *xor-int* :: *int* $\Rightarrow$ *int* $\Rightarrow$ *int* **where** *xor-int* $\equiv \text{semiring-bit-operations-class.xor}$

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

end

1.1.3 Syntactic sugar

open-bundle *xor-syntax* **begin**

notation *xor* (**infixr** $\langle \oplus \rangle$ 59)

notation *Xor-Sum* ($\langle \bigoplus \rangle$)

Now: lots of fancy syntax. First, *xor-sum* $(\lambda x. e) \ A$ is written $\bigoplus_{x \in A} e$.

syntax (*ASCII*)

-xor-sum :: *pttrn* $\Rightarrow$ *'a set* $\Rightarrow$ *'b* $\Rightarrow$ *'b::abel-group-xor* ($\langle (\langle \text{indent}=3 \text{ notation}=\langle \text{binder} \text{ XORSUM} \rangle \rangle \text{XORSUM } (-/:-). / -) \rangle \ [0, 51, 10] \ 10)$

syntax

-xor-sum :: pttrn ⇒ 'a set ⇒ 'b ⇒ 'b::abel-group-xor (⟨(⟨indent=2 notation=⟨binder
 $\bigoplus \rangle \rangle \bigoplus (-/\in -). / - \rangle [0, 51, 10] 10)$

syntax-consts

-xor-sum ⇒ xor-sum

translations — Beware of argument permutation!

$\bigoplus_{i \in A}. b \equiv \text{CONST } \text{xor-sum } (\lambda i. b) A$

end

unbundle no xor-syntax

end

theory Dependent-Product

imports HOL-Probability.Probability

begin

The following lemma was reproduced from [3, Lemma *measure_pmf_prob_dependent_product_bound_eq*] The AFP imports `Monad_Normalisation.Monad_Normalisation` which alters some Isabelle syntax, which we want to avoid by copy pasting the lemmas here

lemma *measure-pmf-prob-dependent-product-bound-eq*:

assumes *countable A ∧ i. countable (B i)*

assumes $\bigwedge a. a \in A \implies \text{measure-pmf.prob } N (B a) = r$

shows $\text{measure-pmf.prob } (\text{pair-pmf } M N) (\text{Sigma } A B) = \text{measure-pmf.prob } M$
 $A * r$

(is ?L = ?R)

⟨proof⟩

The following lemma was reproduced from [3, Lemma *measure_pmf_prob_dependent_product_bound_eq'*] The AFP imports `Monad_Normalisation.Monad_Normalisation` which alters some Isabelle syntax, which we want to avoid by copy pasting the lemmas here

lemma *measure-pmf-prob-dependent-product-bound-eq'*:

— N is the pmf we want to fix depending on values from M

assumes $\bigwedge a. a \in A \cap \text{set-pmf } M \implies \text{measure-pmf.prob } N (B a) = r$

shows $\text{measure-pmf.prob } (\text{pair-pmf } M N) (\text{Sigma } A B) = \text{measure-pmf.prob } M$
 $A * r$

(is ?L = ?R)

⟨proof⟩

end

theory Xor-Inst

imports

Xor

Fixed-Length-Vector.Fixed-Length-Vector

begin

More instances for *abel-group-xor*

Sequences containing a base type that can be xor'd can itself also be xor'd,
via element-wise xor

XORing two vectors is defined as element-wise XOR

The identity vector is a vector where every element is zero

```
instance  $\langle proof \rangle$ 
end
```

```

unbundle no Fixed-Length-Vector.vec-syntax
end
theory Vec-Extras
imports
  HOL-Analysis.Finite-Cartesian-Product
  Fixed-Length-Vector.Fixed-Length-Vector
begin

```

setup-lifting *type-definition-vec*

- *vec-of-list-inject*: $\llbracket x \in \{xs. \text{length } xs = \text{CARD}('b)\}; y \in \{xs. \text{length } xs = \text{CARD}('b)\} \rrbracket \implies (\text{vec-of-list } x = \text{vec-of-list } y) = (x = y)$
- *vec-of-list-inverse*: $y \in \{xs. \text{length } xs = \text{CARD}('b)\} \implies \text{list-of-vec}(\text{vec-of-list } y) = y$
- *nth-vec.rep-eq*: $(\$) \ x = (!) \ (\text{list-of-vec } x) \circ \text{from-index}$

6

lift-definition *vec-of-fcp* :: ('a, 'b::{finite, index1}) *Finite-Cartesian-Product.vec* ⇒

('a, 'b) *Fixed-Length-Vector.vec* **is**
 ⟨λx. map (λi. *Finite-Cartesian-Product.vec-nth* x i :: 'a) (indexes :: 'b list)⟩
 ⟨proof⟩

definition *fcp-of-vec* :: ('a, 'b::{finite, index1}) *Fixed-Length-Vector.vec* ⇒
 ('a, 'b) *Finite-Cartesian-Product.vec* **where**

⟨*fcp-of-vec* ≡ λx. *Finite-Cartesian-Product.vec-lambda* (λi. x \$ i)⟩

lift-definition *enumerate-vec* :: nat ⇒ ('a, 'b) *Fixed-Length-Vector.vec* ⇒
 (nat × 'a, 'b) *Fixed-Length-Vector.vec* **is**
 ⟨*List.indexed-from*⟩ ⟨proof⟩

lemma *infinite-UNIV-vec*:

assumes *infinite* (UNIV :: 'a set) *finite* (UNIV :: 'b set)

shows *infinite* (UNIV :: ('a, 'b) *Fixed-Length-Vector.vec* set)

⟨proof⟩

lemma *infinite-index-UNIV-vec*:

assumes *infinite* (UNIV :: 'b set)

shows (UNIV :: ('a, 'b) *Fixed-Length-Vector.vec* set) = {*vec-of-list* []}

⟨proof⟩

lemma *card-UNIV-vec*:

shows *CARD*(('a, 'b) *Fixed-Length-Vector.vec*) = *CARD*('a) ^ *CARD*('b) (**is**
 ?lhs = ?rhs)

⟨proof⟩

lemma (**in** *index1*) *from-index-neq* [*simp*]:

assumes *a* ≠ *b*

shows *from-index* *a* ≠ *from-index* *b*

⟨proof⟩

lemma *list-of-vec-not-empty* [*simp*]:

fixes *xs* :: ('a, 'b :: *index1*) *Fixed-Length-Vector.vec*

shows *list-of-vec* *xs* ≠ []

⟨proof⟩

lemma *id-take-nth-drop-vec*:

fixes *xs* :: ('a, 'b :: *index1*) *Fixed-Length-Vector.vec*

assumes *i* < *CARD*('b)

shows

xs = *vec-of-list* (
 take *i* (*list-of-vec* *xs*) @
 list-of-vec *xs* ! *i* #
 drop (*Suc* *i*) (*list-of-vec* *xs*))

⟨proof⟩

lemma *id-take-nth-drop-vec'*:
fixes $xs :: ('a, 'b :: index1) \text{ Fixed-Length-Vector.vec}$
assumes $i < \text{CARD}('b)$
shows
 $xs = \text{vec-of-list } ($
 $\quad \text{take } i \text{ (list-of-vec } xs) \text{ @}$
 $\quad xs \$ \text{ to-index } i \#$
 $\quad \text{drop } (\text{Suc } i) \text{ (list-of-vec } xs))$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma *nth-not-mem-enumerate*:
assumes $y ! i \neq x ! i$
shows $(i, y ! i) \notin \text{set } (\text{List.indexed-from } 0 \ x)$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma *nth-not-mem-enumerate-take*:
assumes $y ! j \neq x ! j$
shows $(j, y ! j) \notin \text{set } (\text{List.indexed-from } 0 \ (\text{take } i \ x))$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma *nth-not-mem-enumerate-drop*:
assumes $y ! j \neq x ! j$
shows $(j, y ! j) \notin \text{set } (\text{List.indexed-from } (\text{Suc } i) \ (\text{drop } (\text{Suc } i) \ x))$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma *nth-enumerate-eq-vec*:
fixes $xs :: ('a, 'b :: index1) \text{ Fixed-Length-Vector.vec}$
assumes $m < \text{CARD}('b)$
shows $\text{enumerate-vec } n \ xs \$ \text{ to-index } m = (n + m, xs \$ \text{ to-index } m)$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma *in-set-enumerate-eq-vec*:
fixes $xs :: ('a, 'b :: index1) \text{ Fixed-Length-Vector.vec}$
shows $p \in \text{set-vec } (\text{enumerate-vec } n \ xs) \longleftrightarrow$
 $n \leq \text{fst } p \wedge \text{fst } p < \text{CARD}('b) + n \wedge xs \$ \text{ to-index } (\text{fst } p - n) = \text{snd } p$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma *inj-vec-of-fcp*:
shows $\text{inj } \text{vec-of-fcp}$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma *inj-fcp-of-vec*:
shows $\text{inj } \text{fcp-of-vec}$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma *fcp-of-vec-inverse*:

```

shows vec-of-fcp (fcp-of-vec x) = x
<proof>

lemma vec-of-fcp-inverse:
shows fcp-of-vec (vec-of-fcp x) = x
<proof>

lemma surj-vec-of-fcp:
shows surj vec-of-fcp
<proof>

lemma surj-fcp-of-vec:
shows surj fcp-of-vec
<proof>

lemma bij-vec-of-fcp:
shows bij vec-of-fcp
<proof>

lemma bij-fcp-of-vec:
shows bij fcp-of-vec
<proof>

unbundle no Fixed-Length-Vector.vec-syntax
end
theory Simple-Tabulation-Hashing
imports
  Universal-Hash-Families.Universal-Hash-Families-More-Product-PMF
  Dependent-Product
  Xor-Inst
  Vec-Extras
begin

unbundle Xor.xor-syntax
unbundle Fixed-Length-Vector.vec-syntax
unbundle no Finite-Cartesian-Product.vec-syntax
hide-type Finite-Cartesian-Product.vec

```

1.2 Intro rules, contrapositives and bijections

```

lemma (in prob-space) k-wise-indep-varsI:
assumes  $\bigwedge a J. \llbracket J \subseteq I; \text{card } J \leq k; \text{finite } J \rrbracket \implies$ 
   $\text{prob } \{\omega. \forall i \in J. X \ i \ \omega = a \ i\} = (\prod_{i \in J. \text{prob } \{\omega. X \ i \ \omega = a \ i\}})$ 
   $M = \text{measure-pmf } p$ 
shows k-wise-indep-vars k ( $\lambda \cdot. \text{count-space UNIV}$ ) X I
<proof>

```

```

lemma (in prob-space) indep-vars-pmf-contrapos:

```

assumes $\text{prob } \{\omega. \forall x \in J. P x (X' x \omega)\} \neq (\prod x \in J. \text{prob } \{\omega. P x (X' x \omega)\})$
 $\text{finite } J \ M = \text{measure-pmf } p$
shows $\neg \text{indep-vars } (\lambda \cdot. \text{count-space } UNIV) X' J$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

locale *bij-betw-funcsetE* **begin**

These lemmas prove bijections between sets of 2-arity functions and their decompositions

For example, a function $f : [0, 100] \rightarrow \{A, B, C\} \rightarrow \{True, False\}$ can be decomposed into 3 parts:

$$\begin{aligned} & [0, 100] \rightarrow \{A, B, C\} \rightarrow \{True, False\} \\ \equiv & [1, 100] \rightarrow \{A, B, C\} \rightarrow \{True, False\} \times \\ & \{A, C\} \rightarrow \{True, False\} \times \\ & \{True, False\} \end{aligned}$$

- base: $[1, 100] \rightarrow \{A, B, C\} \rightarrow \{True, False\}$ (split the 0-index, leaving 1-100 intact)
- z_0 : $\{A, C\} \rightarrow \{True, False\}$ (represents the 0-index, but further split the B-index)
- z_b : $B \in \{True, False\}$ (decides the value for $f\ 0\ B$)

f is equivalent to its reconstruction, $f = \text{base}(0 := z_0(B := z_b))$

context

fixes α **and** $A\ B :: \text{- set}$

assumes $\alpha \text{-in-} A$: $\alpha \in A$

begin

lemma *bij-PiE-remove-point*:

$\text{bij-betw } (\lambda (f, v). f(\alpha := v)) ((A - \{\alpha\} \rightarrow_E B) \times B) (A \rightarrow_E B)$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

Helper: "Absorb" a point into a function space bijection. This allows chaining: if we have a bijection F for a smaller domain $S \rightarrow (A - \{x\} \rightarrow B)$, we can automatically get a bijection for $S \times B \rightarrow (A \rightarrow B)$.

lemma *bij-absorb-point*:

assumes $\text{bij-betw } F\ S\ (A - \{\alpha\} \rightarrow_E B)$
shows $\text{bij-betw } (\lambda (s, v). (F\ s)(\alpha := v)) (S \times B) (A \rightarrow_E B)$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

Helper 2: "Lift Value" Attaches a computed value V to the function at point x . Used for the outer function (e.g., $a(\alpha := V)$).

lemma *bij-lift-value*:

assumes $\text{bij-betw } V\ S\ B$

shows *bij-betw* $(\lambda(f, s). f(\alpha := V s)) ((A - \{\alpha\} \rightarrow_E B) \times S) (A \rightarrow_E B)$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

end

Tuple Association Helper: $((A, B), C) \longleftrightarrow (A, B, C)$

lemma *bij-assoc-right-to-left*:

bij-betw $(\lambda(a, b, c). ((a, b), c)) (A \times B \times C) ((A \times B) \times C)$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *bij-assoc-left-to-right*:

bij-betw $(\lambda((a, b), c). (a, b, c)) ((A \times B) \times C) (A \times B \times C)$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *bij-betw-combine-right*:

assumes *bij-betw* $f B C$
shows *bij-betw* $(\lambda(a, b). (a, f b)) (A \times B) (A \times C)$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

1.2.1 Application

lemma *remove1-remove1*:

assumes $\alpha \in A \beta \in B$ *finite A finite B finite C* $C \neq \{\}$
shows *bij-betw*
 $(\lambda(a, b, c). a(\alpha := b(\beta := c)))$
 $((A - \{\alpha\} \rightarrow_E B \rightarrow_E C) \times (B - \{\beta\} \rightarrow_E C) \times C)$
 $(A \rightarrow_E B \rightarrow_E C)$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *remove1-remove2*:

assumes $\beta 1 \neq \beta 2 \alpha \in A \beta 1 \in B \beta 2 \in B$
finite A finite B finite C $C \neq \{\}$
shows *bij-betw*
 $(\lambda(a, b, c, d). a(\alpha := b(\beta 1 := c, \beta 2 := d)))$
 $((A - \{\alpha\} \rightarrow_E B \rightarrow_E C) \times (B - \{\beta 1, \beta 2\} \rightarrow_E C) \times C \times C)$
 $(A \rightarrow_E B \rightarrow_E C)$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *remove1-remove3*:

assumes $\beta 1 \neq \beta 2 \beta 2 \neq \beta 3 \beta 3 \neq \beta 1 \alpha \in A \beta 1 \in B \beta 2 \in B \beta 3 \in B$
finite A finite B finite C $C \neq \{\}$
shows *bij-betw*
 $(\lambda(a, b, c, d, e). a(\alpha := b(\beta 1 := c, \beta 2 := d, \beta 3 := e)))$
 $((A - \{\alpha\} \rightarrow_E B \rightarrow_E C) \times (B - \{\beta 1, \beta 2, \beta 3\} \rightarrow_E C) \times C \times C \times C)$
 $(A \rightarrow_E B \rightarrow_E C)$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *remove2-remove2' remove1*:

assumes $\alpha 1 \neq \alpha 2 \beta 1 \neq \beta 2 \alpha 1 \in A \alpha 2 \in A \beta 1 \in B \beta 2 \in B \beta 3 \in B$

```

      finite A finite B finite C C ≠ {}
shows bij-betw
  (λ(a,b,c,d,e,f). a(α1 := b(β1 := d, β2 := e), α2 := c(β3 := f)))
  ((A - {α1, α2} →E B →E C) × (B - {β1, β2} →E C) × (B - {β3} →E
C) × C × C × C)
  (A →E B →E C)
⟨proof⟩

end

```

2 Definitions

```

locale simple-tabulation-hashing =
  fixes n :: 'n :: {index1, zero} itself — key length, i.e. 4 for 4 'fragments
  fixes r :: 'result :: {abel-group-xor, finite} itself — bool or any type that supports
xor
  fixes q :: 'q :: index1 itself — digest length, i.e. 3
  fixes d :: 'fragment :: finite itself — domain of input key fragments
  assumes n: n = TYPE('n)
begin

```

In tabulation hashing, keys are split into n fragments, each piece hashed individually, before being combined into a final digest with the XOR operator. i.e. $x \equiv [x_0, x_1, x_2]$, $h(x) \equiv h_0x_0 \oplus h_1x_1 \oplus h_2x_2$

Therefore, the type variable 'n, $\text{CARD}('n)$ and n must reflect the number of parts in a key. In the example above, 'n = 3 (which is an alias for num1 bit1)

The final digest length is indicated by the type variable 'q, and 'result is any type that supports xor. For example, 'result = bool. When using 'result = bool and 'q = 3, it can be interpreted as using a 3-bit word as the output, which can encode $2^3 = 8$ possibilities, e.g. [True, False, True]

abbreviation cardn :: 'n *itself* $\Rightarrow$ nat **where** cardn - $\equiv \text{CARD}('n)$

abbreviation N :: 'n *itself* $\Rightarrow$ nat set **where** N type $\equiv \{..<\text{cardn type}\}$

abbreviation D :: 'fragment set **where** D $\equiv \text{UNIV}$

abbreviation Dn :: ('fragment, 'n) vec set ($\langle D^n \rangle$) **where**
— domain of all possible input keys s.t. each key is composed of exactly *n* fragments
 $D^n \equiv \text{UNIV}$

abbreviation R :: ('result, 'q) vec set **where**
— range of all possible outputs, s.t. each output is composed of exactly *q* bits
 $R \equiv \text{UNIV}$

abbreviation H :: 'n *itself* $\Rightarrow$ (nat $\Rightarrow$ 'fragment $\Rightarrow$ ('result, 'q) vec) set **where**

— set of all possible assignments and combinations for every column-item pair
 $H \text{ type} \equiv N \text{ type} \rightarrow_E D \rightarrow_E R$

definition $tb-S :: 'n \text{ itself} \Rightarrow (nat \Rightarrow 'fragment \Rightarrow ('result, 'q) \text{ vec}) \text{ pmf}$ **where**
 — Generator of instances of H
 $tb-S - \equiv \text{pmf-of-set } (H \ n)$

definition $tb-H :: ('fragment, 'n) \text{ vec} \Rightarrow (nat \Rightarrow 'fragment \Rightarrow ('result, 'q) \text{ vec}) \Rightarrow ('result, 'q) \text{ vec}$ **where**
 — Applies the tabulation hashing algorithm on *k* using a hash function from H
 $tb-H \ k \ h \equiv \text{xor-fold } (\text{map } (\lambda i. h \ i \ (k \ \$ \ \text{to-index } i))) \ ([0..<\text{cardn } n])$

lemma $tb-S\text{-alt-def}$:
shows $tb-S \ n = \text{prod-pmf } (N \ n) \ (\lambda-. \text{prod-pmf } UNIV \ (\lambda-. \text{pmf-of-set } R))$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma $tb-H\text{-absorb}$:
assumes $i < \text{CARD}('n)$
shows $tb-H \ x \ h \oplus c = tb-H \ x \ (h(i := (h \ i)(x \ \$ \ \text{to-index } i := h \ i \ (x \ \$ \ \text{to-index } i) \oplus c)))$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma $tb-H\text{-absorb'}$:
shows $tb-H \ x \ h \oplus c = tb-H \ x \ (h(\text{from-index } i := (h \ (\text{from-index } i))(x \ \$ \ i := h \ (\text{from-index } i) \ (x \ \$ \ i) \oplus c)))$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma $tb-H\text{-extract}$:
assumes $i < \text{CARD}('n)$
shows $tb-H \ x \ (h(i := g(x \ \$ \ \text{to-index } i := \alpha))) = tb-H \ x \ (h(i := g(x \ \$ \ \text{to-index } i := 0))) \oplus \alpha$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma $tb-H\text{-extract'}$:
shows $tb-H \ x \ (h(\text{from-index } i := g(x \ \$ \ i := \alpha))) = tb-H \ x \ (h(\text{from-index } i := g(x \ \$ \ i := 0))) \oplus \alpha$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma $tb-H\text{-exch}$:
assumes $i < \text{CARD}('n)$
shows $tb-H \ x \ (a(i := aa(x \ \$ \ \text{to-index } i := b))) = \alpha \longleftrightarrow b = tb-H \ x \ (a(i := aa(x \ \$ \ \text{to-index } i := \alpha)))$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma $tb-H\text{-exch'}$:
shows $tb-H \ x \ (a(\text{from-index } i := aa(x \ \$ \ i := b))) = \alpha \longleftrightarrow b = tb-H \ x \ (a(\text{from-index } i := aa(x \ \$ \ i := \alpha)))$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma *tb-H-discard*:
assumes $x \ \$ \ i \neq y \ \$ \ i$
shows $tb-H \ x \ (a(\text{from-index } i := b(y \ \$ \ i := c))) = tb-H \ x \ (a(\text{from-index } i := b))$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

3 Proofs

3.1 Proof of 1-independence and uniformity

lemma *prob-tb-H-bin*:
shows $\text{measure-pmf.prob } (tb-S \ n) \ \{h. \ tb-H \ x \ h = \alpha\} = 1 \ / \ \text{real } (card \ R) \ (\text{is } ?lhs = ?rhs)$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

theorem *uniform*:
shows $\text{prob-space.uniform-on } (tb-S \ n) \ (tb-H \ key) \ R$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

3.2 Proof of two-independence

lemma *prob-tb-H-bin1-bin2*:
assumes $x \neq y$
shows $\text{measure-pmf.prob } (tb-S \ n) \ \{h. \ tb-H \ x \ h = \alpha \wedge tb-H \ y \ h = \beta\} = 1 \ / \ \text{real } (card \ R * card \ R)$
 $(\text{is } ?lhs = ?rhs)$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

3.3 Proof of 3-independence

lemma *prob-3same-conv*:
assumes $x \ \$ \ i \neq y \ \$ \ i \ y \ \$ \ i \neq z \ \$ \ i \ z \ \$ \ i \neq x \ \$ \ i$
shows $\text{measure-pmf.prob } (tb-S \ n) \ \{h. \ tb-H \ x \ h = \alpha \wedge tb-H \ y \ h = \beta \wedge tb-H \ z \ h = \gamma\} =$
 $1 \ / \ (\text{real } (card \ R) * \text{real } (card \ R) * \text{real } (card \ R)) \ (\text{is } ?lhs = ?rhs)$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *prob-2same-conv*:
assumes $x \ \$ \ i \neq y \ \$ \ i \ z \ \$ \ j \neq x \ \$ \ j \ i \neq j$
and $z \ \$ \ i = x \ \$ \ i$
shows $\text{measure-pmf.prob } (tb-S \ n) \ \{h. \ tb-H \ x \ h = \alpha \wedge tb-H \ y \ h = \beta \wedge tb-H \ z \ h = \gamma\} =$
 $1 \ / \ (\text{real } (card \ R) * \text{real } (card \ R) * \text{real } (card \ R)) \ (\text{is } ?lhs = ?rhs)$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *prob-tb-H-bin1-bin2-bin3*:
assumes $x \neq y \ y \neq z \ z \neq x$
shows $\text{measure-pmf.prob } (tb-S \ n) \ \{h. \ tb-H \ x \ h = \alpha \wedge tb-H \ y \ h = \beta \wedge tb-H \ z \ h = \gamma\} =$

$1 / (\text{real } (\text{card } R) * \text{real } (\text{card } R) * \text{real } (\text{card } R))$ (is ?lhs = ?rhs)
 <proof>

3.4 Proof of 3-universal

lemma *three-indep-vars*:

shows *prob-space.k-wise-indep-vars* (tb-S n) 3 (λ-. *count-space* R) tb-H D^n
 <proof>

theorem *three-universal*:

shows *prob-space.k-universal* (tb-S n) 3 tb-H D^n R
 <proof>

3.5 Proof of non-4-universal

lemma *prob-4-conv*:

fixes $u\ v :: \text{'fragment}$

assumes $W \oplus X \oplus Y \oplus Z = 0 \wedge h. P\ (h(0 := \text{undefined}, \text{Suc } 0 := \text{undefined}))$
 $= P\ h$

$CARD('n) > \text{Suc } 0\ u \neq v$

shows *measure-pmf.prob* (tb-S n) { $h::\text{nat} \Rightarrow \text{'fragment} \Rightarrow (\text{'result}, \text{'q})\ \text{vec.}$

$h\ 0\ u \oplus h\ (\text{Suc } 0)\ u \oplus P\ h = W \wedge$

$h\ 0\ u \oplus h\ (\text{Suc } 0)\ v \oplus P\ h = X \wedge$

$h\ 0\ v \oplus h\ (\text{Suc } 0)\ u \oplus P\ h = Y \wedge$

$h\ 0\ v \oplus h\ (\text{Suc } 0)\ v \oplus P\ h = Z \}$

$= 1 / (\text{real } (\text{card } R) * \text{real } (\text{card } R) * \text{real } (\text{card } R))$ (is ?lhs = ?rhs)

<proof>

lemma *not-four-indep*:

assumes $CARD('n) > 1$ — if $n = 1$, then tabulation hashing is 4-independent

$\text{card } D \geq 2$ — if $D =$ or $D = x$, then it is impossible to obtain 4 distinct
 keys

$\text{card } R > 1$ — tabulation hashing is 4-independent otherwise

shows $\neg \text{prob-space.k-wise-indep-vars}$ (tb-S n) 4 (λ-. *count-space* R) tb-H D^n

<proof>

theorem *not-four-universal*:

assumes $CARD('n) > 1$ — if $n = 1$, then tabulation hashing is 4-independent

$\text{card } D \geq 2$ — if $D =$ or $D = x$, then it is impossible to obtain 4 distinct
 keys

$\text{card } R > 1$ — tabulation hashing is 4-independent otherwise

shows $\neg \text{prob-space.k-universal}$ (tb-S n) 4 tb-H D^n R

<proof>

end

4 Appendix

4.1 Utility

context *prob-space*
begin

context
 fixes $K D k p$
 assumes *assms'*: $K \subseteq D$ *card* $K \leq k$ *finite* $K M = \text{measure-pmf } p$
begin

lemma *k-wise-indep-vars-probD*:
 assumes *k-wise-indep-vars* k ($\lambda\cdot$. *count-space UNIV*) $X D$
 shows $\text{prob } \{\omega. \forall x \in K. P x (X x \omega)\} = (\prod x \in K. \text{prob } \{\omega. P x (X x \omega)\})$
<proof>

lemma
 assumes *k-universal* $k X D R$
 shows
 k-universal-probD:
 $\bigwedge P. \text{prob } \{\omega. \forall x \in K. P x (X x \omega)\} = (\prod x \in K. \text{prob } \{\omega. P x (X x \omega)\})$
 (is *PROP ?thesis-0*) **and**
 k-universal-probD':
 $\text{prob } \{\omega. \forall x \in K. X x \omega = P x\} = (\prod x \in K. \text{indicat-real } R (P x) / \text{real } (\text{card } R))$
 (is *?thesis-1*)
<proof>
end
end

locale *simple-tabulation-hashing'* = *simple-tabulation-hashing* +
 assumes *r*: $r = \text{TYPE}('result::\{\text{finite}, \text{abel-group-xor}\})$
 assumes *q*: $q = \text{TYPE}('q::\text{index1})$
 assumes *d*: $d = \text{TYPE}('fragment::\text{finite})$
begin
end

4.2 Alternate proof of non-4-universal

4.2.1 Preliminaries

lemma (in *prob-space*) *finite-if-k-universal*:
 assumes *k-universal* $k X D R D \neq \{\}$
 shows *finite* R

$\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma *xor-sum-uniform*:

fixes $\alpha :: 'a :: \{\text{finite}, \text{abel-group-xor}\}$
defines $R \equiv \text{UNIV}$
assumes $[\text{simp}]: \text{finite } J \ J \neq \{\}$
shows $\text{measure-pmf.prob } (\text{pmf-of-set } (J \rightarrow_E R)) \ \{f. (\bigoplus_{x \in J}. f \ x) = \alpha\} = 1 /$
 $\text{real } \text{CARD}('a)$
(is ?lhs = ?rhs)
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma *k-universal-conv-pmf-of-set*:

defines $R \equiv \text{UNIV}$
assumes $\text{prob-space.k-universal } (\text{measure-pmf } p) \ k \ X \ D \ R$
and $J \subseteq D \ \text{card } J \leq k \ \text{finite } J \ D \neq \{\}$
shows $\text{map-pmf } (\lambda \omega. \lambda x \in J. X \ x \ \omega) \ p = \text{pmf-of-set } (J \rightarrow_E R)$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma *k-universal-imp-xor-sum-uniform*:

fixes $\alpha :: 'a :: \{\text{finite}, \text{abel-group-xor}\}$
defines $R \equiv \text{UNIV}$
assumes $\text{prob-space.k-universal } (\text{measure-pmf } p) \ k \ X \ D \ R$
and $J \subseteq D \ \text{card } J \leq k \ \text{finite } J \ J \neq \{\}$
shows $\text{measure-pmf.prob } p \ \{\omega. (\bigoplus_{x \in J}. X \ x \ \omega) = \alpha\} = 1 / \text{real } (\text{card } R)$
(is ?lhs = ?rhs)
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

4.2.2 Proofs

context *simple-tabulation-hashing* **begin**

lemma *k-wise-indep-vars-imp-xor-sum-uniform*:

assumes $\text{prob-space.k-wise-indep-vars } (\text{tb-S } n) \ k \ (\lambda \cdot. \text{count-space } R) \ \text{tb-H } D^n$
 $J \neq \{\} \ \text{card } J \leq k$
shows $\text{measure-pmf.prob } (\text{tb-S } n) \ \{h. (\bigoplus_{x \in J}. \text{tb-H } x \ h) = \alpha\} = 1 / \text{real } (\text{card } R)$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma *not-k-wise-indep-vars-by-xor-sum*:

assumes $\text{measure-pmf.prob } (\text{tb-S } n) \ \{h. (\bigoplus_{x \in J}. \text{tb-H } x \ h) = \alpha\} \neq 1 / \text{real } (\text{card } R)$
 $J \neq \{\} \ \text{card } J \leq k$
shows $\neg \text{prob-space.k-wise-indep-vars } (\text{tb-S } n) \ k \ (\lambda \cdot. \text{count-space } R) \ \text{tb-H } D^n$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma *not-four-indep'*:

assumes $CARD('n) > 1$ — if $n = 1$, then tabulation hashing is 4-independent
 $card\ D \geq 2$ — if $D =$ or $D = x$, then it is impossible to obtain 4 distinct
 keys
 $card\ R > 1$ — tabulation hashing is 4-independent otherwise
shows $\neg prob\text{-}space.k\text{-}wise\text{-}indep\text{-}vars\ (tb\text{-}S\ n)\ 4\ (\lambda\text{-} count\text{-}space\ R)\ tb\text{-}H\ D^n$
 $\langle proof \rangle$
end
end

References

- [1] D. Mareek. NTIN066 Data Structures 1. <https://ufal.mff.cuni.cz/courses/ntin066>, Apr 2023. Solutions 8 is relevant for simple tabulation hashing.
- [2] M. Patrascu and M. Thorup. The power of simple tabulation hashing. In *Proceedings of the Forty-Third Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing*, STOC '11, pages 1–10, New York, NY, USA, 2011. Association for Computing Machinery. numpages: 10, keywords: tabulation hashing, minwise independence, linear probing, independence, cuckoo hashing, concentration bounds, location: San Jose, California, USA.
- [3] Y. K. Tan and J. Yang. Approximate model counting. *Archive of Formal Proofs*, March 2024. https://isa-afp.org/entries/Approximate_Model_Counting.html, Formal proof development.
- [4] Wikipedia contributors. Tabulation hashing. https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Tabulation_hashing#Universality, Sep 2024. Accessed: 2026-03-28.