

Pensieve header: Testing the associativity of compositions in GDO. Based on GenericDoPeGDO.nb in pensieve://Talks/DaNang-1905/.

tex

We test that the composition law of `\gdo\` is indeed associative, by defining it general and verifying associativity on random (and hence likely generic) morphisms. First, we define the composition law of two morphisms. The program first determines $\$E_i\$, \$F_i\$, and $\$G_i\$$ from $\$Q_i\$$ ($\$i=1,2\%$) by taking partial derivatives, and then outputs the scalar ω and quadratic Q , with equations~\eqref{eq:gdocompositions} converted nearly literally into code:$

pdfii

```
In[ ]:= M_{A \rightarrow B}[\omega1_, Q1_] // M_{B \rightarrow C}[\omega2_, Q2_] := Module[{GA, zC, E1, F1, G1, E2, F2, G2, I},
  GA = Table[GA_i, {i, A}]; zC = Table[z_i, {i, C}]; I = IdentityMatrix@Length@B;
  E1 = Table[E1_{Si,zj}, {i, A}, {j, B}]; E2 = Table[E2_{Si,zj}, {i, B}, {j, C}];
  F1 = Table[F1_{Si,Sj}, {i, A}, {j, A}]; F2 = Table[F2_{Si,Sj}, {i, B}, {j, B}];
  G1 = Table[G1_{zi,zj}, {i, B}, {j, B}]; G2 = Table[G2_{zi,zj}, {i, C}, {j, C}];
  Expand[ @ M_{A \rightarrow C}[\omega1 \omega2 Det[I - F2.G1]^{-1/2}, GA.E1.Inverse[I - F2.G1].E2.zC
    + \frac{1}{2} GA.(F1 + E1.F2.Inverse[I - G1.F2].E1^T).GA +
    \frac{1}{2} zC.(G2 + E2^T.G1.Inverse[I - F2.G1].E2).zC ] ]
```

tex

Next we implement “random morphisms” (verb”RM”) by picking their quadratic parts to have small random integer coefficients. We also set $M_1\$, $M_2\$, and $M_3\%$ to be random morphisms in $\text{Mor}(\{1,2\} \rightarrow \{1,2,3\})\$, $\text{Mor}(\{1,2,3\} \rightarrow \{1,2,3\})\$, and $\text{Mor}(\{1,2,3\} \rightarrow \{1,2\})\%$, respectively:$$$$

pdfii

```
In[ ]:= RM_{A \rightarrow B} := Module[{vs = Table[GA_i, {i, A}] \cup Table[z_i, {i, B}]},
  M_{A \rightarrow B}[1, Sum[RandomInteger[{-3, 3}] vi vj, {vi, vs}, {vj, vs}]]];
{M1 = RM_{\{1,2\} \rightarrow \{1,2,3\}}, M2 = RM_{\{1,2,3\} \rightarrow \{1,2,3\}}, M3 = RM_{\{1,2,3\} \rightarrow \{1,2\}}} // Column
```

pdfii

```
M_{\{1,2\} \rightarrow \{1,2,3\}} [1,
  3 z_1^2 + 4 z_1 z_2 - z_2^2 - 2 z_2 z_3 - z_1 \zeta_1 - 3 z_2 \zeta_1 - 4 z_3 \zeta_1 + \zeta_1^2 + 3 z_1 \zeta_2 - 6 z_2 \zeta_2 + 4 z_3 \zeta_2 + 4 \zeta_1 \zeta_2 + \zeta_2^2]
M_{\{1,2,3\} \rightarrow \{1,2,3\}} [1, 3 z_1^2 + z_1 z_2 + 2 z_2^2 - 2 z_1 z_3 + 4 z_2 z_3 - 3 z_3^2 - z_1 \zeta_1 - z_2 \zeta_1 + 6 z_3 \zeta_1 -
  \zeta_1^2 + 2 z_1 \zeta_2 + z_2 \zeta_2 - z_3 \zeta_2 - 2 \zeta_1 \zeta_2 - 3 \zeta_2^2 - z_1 \zeta_3 - z_2 \zeta_3 + z_3 \zeta_3 - 3 \zeta_1 \zeta_3 + 2 \zeta_2 \zeta_3 + 2 \zeta_3^2]
M_{\{1,2,3\} \rightarrow \{1,2\}} [1,
  -2 z_1^2 + 2 z_2^2 - 5 z_1 \zeta_1 - z_2 \zeta_1 + 2 \zeta_1^2 - z_1 \zeta_2 - 6 z_2 \zeta_2 + \zeta_1 \zeta_2 - 2 \zeta_2^2 - 2 z_2 \zeta_3 - 2 \zeta_1 \zeta_3 + 3 \zeta_2 \zeta_3 - \zeta_3^2]
```

tex

Just to get an appreciation of what compositions look like, we compute $(M_1 \text{ act } M_2) \text{ act } M_3\%$:

pdf

```
In[ ]:= (M1 // M2) // M3
```

pdf

```
Out[ ]:= M_{\{1,2\} \rightarrow \{1,2\}} [ \frac{1}{2 \sqrt{47913}}, \frac{655148 z_1^2}{15971} + \frac{9600305 z_1 z_2}{31942} + \frac{47930587 z_2^2}{95826} - \frac{1241140 z_1 \zeta_1}{15971} -
  \frac{12434423 z_2 \zeta_1}{47913} + \frac{1792724 \zeta_1^2}{47913} + \frac{2520132 z_1 \zeta_2}{15971} + \frac{16827871 z_2 \zeta_2}{31942} - \frac{2104097 \zeta_1 \zeta_2}{15971} + \frac{2273807 \zeta_2^2}{15971} ]
```

tex

Finally, we verify that composition is associative:

pdf

$$\text{In}[*]:= \left((M1 // M2) // M3 \right) == \left(M1 // (M2 // M3) \right)$$

pdf

Out[*]= True

tex

The last \verb"True" above is an in-practice proof of Theorem~\ref{thm:GDO},~(i).