

The 4th Homotopy Group of the 3-Sphere in Cubical Agda

Axel Ljungström, Anders Mörtberg

Types 2022

WHAT?

- A computer formalisation of (most of) **Guillaume Brunerie's** PhD thesis in Cubical Agda
- **Synthetic** proof (in HoTT) of $\pi_4(\mathbb{S}^3) \cong \mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}$



Guillaume Brunerie

WHY?

- Brunerie's theorem is to this date one of the most advanced pieces of mathematics developed in HoTT
- Contains small 'gaps' which have made the theorem considered 'unformalisable'



Guillaume Brunerie

HOW?

- Cubical Agda and some trickery (streamlined proofs, new definitions, etc.)

HOW?

- Cubical Agda and some trickery (streamlined proofs, new definitions, etc.)
- Let's start with a brief overview of Brunerie's proof





Chapters 1-3

Chapter 1–3

- Brunerie constructs a map  : $\mathbb{S}^3 \rightarrow \mathbb{S}^2$ (the *Brunerie Map*).

Chapters 1–3

-  lives in $\pi_3(\mathbb{S}^2)$
- There is an equivalence $e : \pi_3(\mathbb{S}^2) \cong \mathbb{Z}$.
- Define $\beta : \mathbb{Z}$ by $\beta = e\left(\text{}\right)$
- **Main theorem:** We have $\pi_4(\mathbb{S}^3) \cong \mathbb{Z}/\beta\mathbb{Z}$.

Chapters 1–3

What's needed?

- The James Construction
 - ▶ we used a shortcut, but there's also a full formalisation by KANG Rongji
- The Hopf fibration
- The Blakers-Massey Theorem
 - ▶ full formalisation by KANG Rongji
- Whitehead products

Not easy, but doable!

What's left?

- So, all we need to prove now is $\beta = \pm 2$. Should be easy, right?

What's left?

- So, all we need to prove now is $\beta = \pm 2$. Should be easy, right?

- It's hard!



Chapters 4-6

Chapters 4–6

In order to prove $\beta = \pm 2$, Brunerie introduces a bunch of things:

- Symmetric monoidal structure of smash products

$$\begin{array}{ccc} & ((A \otimes B) \otimes C) \otimes D & \\ \alpha_{A,B,C} \otimes \text{id}_D \swarrow & & \searrow \alpha_{A \otimes B,C,D} \\ (A \otimes (B \otimes C)) \otimes D & & (A \otimes B) \otimes (C \otimes D) \\ \alpha_{A,B \otimes C,D} \searrow & & \swarrow \alpha_{A,B,C \otimes D} \\ A \otimes ((B \otimes C) \otimes D) & \xrightarrow{\text{id}_A \otimes \alpha_{B,C,D}} & A \otimes (B \otimes (C \otimes D)) \end{array}$$

Chapters 4–6

In order to prove $\beta = \pm 2$, Brunerie introduces a bunch of things:

- Symmetric monoidal structure of smash products

⇒ The graded ring structure of the *cup product*

$$\smile: H^i(X) \times H^j(X) \rightarrow H^{i+j}(X)$$

$$\begin{array}{ccc} & ((A \otimes B) \otimes C) \otimes D & \\ & \swarrow \alpha_{A,B,C} \otimes \text{id}_D & \searrow \alpha_{A \otimes B,C,D} \\ (A \otimes (B \otimes C)) \otimes D & & (A \otimes B) \otimes (C \otimes D) \\ & \searrow \alpha_{A,B \otimes C,D} & \swarrow \alpha_{A,B,C \otimes D} \\ A \otimes ((B \otimes C) \otimes D) & \xrightarrow{\text{id}_A \otimes \alpha_{B,C,D}} & A \otimes (B \otimes (C \otimes D)) \end{array}$$

- The *Mayer-Vietoris sequence*

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
 \tilde{H}^{n+1}(D) & \xrightarrow{i} & \tilde{H}^{n+1}(A) \times H^{n+1}(B) & \xrightarrow{\Delta} & H^{n+1}(C) \\
 & & \searrow d & & \\
 \tilde{H}^n(D) & \xrightarrow{i} & \tilde{H}^n(A) \times H^n(B) & \xrightarrow{\Delta} & H^n(C) \\
 & & \searrow d & & \\
 \tilde{H}^{n-1}(D) & \xrightarrow{i} & \tilde{H}^{n-1}(A) \times H^{n-1}(B) & \xrightarrow{\Delta} & H^{n-1}(C)
 \end{array}$$

- The *Gysin Sequence*

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} \mathbb{S}^{n-1} & \longrightarrow & E & \xrightarrow{p} & B & & \\ \dots & \longrightarrow & H^{i-1}(E) & \longrightarrow & H^{i-n}(B) & \xrightarrow{\sim e} & H^i(B) \xrightarrow{p^*} H^i(E) \longrightarrow \dots \end{array}$$

- The *Hopf Invariant* homomorphism

Definition 5.4.1. Given a pointed map $f : \mathbb{S}^{2n-1} \rightarrow \mathbb{S}^n$, we define

$$C_f := \mathbf{1} \sqcup^{\mathbb{S}^{2n-1}} \mathbb{S}^n,$$

$$\alpha_f := (i^*)^{-1}(\mathbf{c}_n) : H^n(C_f),$$

$$\beta_f := p^*(\mathbf{c}_{2n}) : H^{2n}(C_f),$$

Definition 5.4.2. The *Hopf invariant* of a pointed map $f : \mathbb{S}^{2n-1} \rightarrow \mathbb{S}^n$ is the integer $H(f) : \mathbb{Z}$ such that

$$\alpha_f^2 = H(f)\beta_f,$$

where α_f^2 is $\alpha_f \smile \alpha_f$.

- The *Iterated Hopf Construction*

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
 A & \xleftarrow{\text{fst}} & A \times (A \sqcup^{A \times A} A) & \xrightarrow{(a,x) \mapsto \nu'_a(x)} & \sum_{x:\Sigma A} H(x) \\
 \text{id} \downarrow & & \downarrow (a,x) \mapsto (a, \nu'_a(x)) & & \downarrow \text{id} \\
 A & \xleftarrow{\text{fst}} & A \times \sum_{x:\Sigma A} H(x) & \xrightarrow{\text{snd}} & \sum_{x:\Sigma A} H(x)
 \end{array}$$

Chapters 4–6

All in all:

- Symmetric monoidal structure of smash products
 \implies The graded ring structure of the cup product
 $\smile: H^i(X) \times H^j(X) \rightarrow H^{i+j}(X)$
- The *Mayer-Vietoris* sequence
- The *Gysin Sequence*
- The *Hopf Invariant* homomorphism
- The *Iterated Hopf Construction*

Chapters 4–6

All in all:

- **Symmetric monoidal structure of smash products**

⇒ The graded ring structure of the cup product

$$\smile: H^i(X) \times H^j(X) \rightarrow H^{i+j}(X)$$

- The *Mayer-Vietoris* sequence
- The *Gysin Sequence*
- The *Hopf Invariant* homomorphism
- The *Iterated Hopf Construction*

Our formalisation:

- ~~Symmetric monoidal structure of smash products~~

~~⇒~~ The graded ring structure of the cup product

$$\smile: H^i(X) \times H^j(X) \rightarrow H^{i+j}(X)$$

- The *Mayer-Vietoris* sequence
- The *Gysin Sequence*
- The *Hopf Invariant* homomorphism
- The *Iterated Hopf Construction*

Our formalisation:

- ~~Symmetric monoidal structure of smash products~~

~~⇒~~ The graded ring structure of the cup product

$$\smile: H^i(X) \times H^j(X) \rightarrow H^{i+j}(X)$$

- The *Mayer-Vietoris* sequence
- The *Gysin Sequence*
- The *Hopf Invariant* homomorphism
- The *Iterated Hopf Construction*

Formalisation

- Cubical Agda is excellent because it is entirely constructive
 - ▶ Things compute

New definition of cup product
+ Cubical Agda = **Definitional Equalities**



- Removes a lot of 'bureaucracy' from certain proofs
- The rest of the formalisation: challenging but straightforward

Formalisation

- Cubical Agda is excellent because it is entirely constructive
 - ▶ Things compute

New definition of cup product
+ Cubical Agda

= **Definitional Equalities**



- Removes a lot of 'bureaucracy' from certain proofs
- The rest of the formalisation: challenging but straightforward
- Many, many lines of code later, we have it:

$$\pi_4(\mathbb{S}^3) \cong \mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}$$



Chapters 4-6?

Teaser: new proof

- In fact, there is a new proof completely bypassing Chapters 4-6.
- Idea: Show $\beta = \pm 2$ directly by tracing the equivalence $\pi_3(\mathbb{S}^2) \cong \mathbb{Z}$

Teaser: new proof

- In fact, there is a new proof completely bypassing Chapters 4-6.
- Idea: Show $\beta = \pm 2$ directly by tracing the equivalence $\pi_3(\mathbb{S}^2) \cong \mathbb{Z}$
- Very direct. Easy to formalise (not dependent on Cubical methods).

Teaser: new proof

- In fact, there is a new proof completely bypassing Chapters 4-6.
- Idea: Show $\beta = \pm 2$ directly by tracing the equivalence $\pi_3(\mathbb{S}^2) \cong \mathbb{Z}$
- Very direct. Easy to formalise (not dependent on Cubical methods).
- Also gives a proof (partly) by *normalisation* – we can normalise a version of β in Cubical Agda and get our computer to spit out -2

Teaser: new proof

- In fact, there is a new proof completely bypassing Chapters 4-6.
- Idea: Show $\beta = \pm 2$ directly by tracing the equivalence $\pi_3(\mathbb{S}^2) \cong \mathbb{Z}$
- Very direct. Easy to formalise (not dependent on Cubical methods).
- Also gives a proof (partly) by *normalisation* – we can normalise a version of β in Cubical Agda and get our computer to spit out -2
- But that's a topic for a future talk...

Teaser: new proof

- In fact, there is a new proof completely bypassing Chapters 4-6.
- Idea: Show $\beta = \pm 2$ directly by tracing the equivalence $\pi_3(\mathbb{S}^2) \cong \mathbb{Z}$
- Very direct. Easy to formalise (not dependent on Cubical methods).
- Also gives a proof (partly) by *normalisation* – we can normalise a version of β in Cubical Agda and get our computer to spit out -2
- But that's a topic for a future talk...
- See my recent post on the HoTT blog for more details.

Homotopy Type Theory

[Home](#) [Blog](#) [Code](#) [Events](#) [Links](#) [References](#) [Wiki](#) [The Book](#)

– On the ∞ -topos semantics of homotopy type theory

The Brunerie Number Is -2

Posted on 9 June 2022 by [Axel Ljungström](#)

Summary

So we have 3 formalisations:

- A 'full' formalisation of Brunerie's thesis (modulo some trickery)
 - ▶ github.com/agda/cubical/blob/master/Cubical/Homotopy/Group/Pi4S3/Summary.agda
- A direct proof, replacing chapters 4–6
 - ▶ github.com/agda/cubical/blob/master/Cubical/Homotopy/Group/Pi4S3/DirectProof.agda
- A related proof by normalisation, replacing chapters 4–6

Summary

So we have 3 formalisations:

- A 'full' formalisation of Brunerie's thesis (modulo some trickery)
 - ▶ github.com/agda/cubical/blob/master/Cubical/Homotopy/Group/Pi4S3/Summary.agda
- A direct proof, replacing chapters 4–6
 - ▶ github.com/agda/cubical/blob/master/Cubical/Homotopy/Group/Pi4S3/DirectProof.agda
- A related proof by normalisation, replacing chapters 4–6

Questions?