

A STRUCTURAL PROOF OF THE LOWER BOUND 21 FOR 3×3 MATRIX MULTIPLICATION OVER $\mathbb{F}_2$

SHUXING YANG, RUI ZHAO, JUNYAO WU, YIZE WANG, WENHAO LI, FUJIA CHEN, TAOWEN DENG
SHENZHAN HONG, YAQI LI, ZICHEN LI, JINCHENG MI, YUANG PAN, KAIHAO ZHU, JUNJIE YANG
HONGSHENG CHEN^{*}, YIHAO YANG^{*}

College of Information Science and Electronic Engineering, Zhejiang University
Qiushi Engine Team

^{*}Corresponding authors: Hongsheng Chen (hansomchen@zju.edu.cn); Yihao Yang (yangyihao@zju.edu.cn).

ABSTRACT. We prove that the tensor rank of 3×3 matrix multiplication over $\mathbb{F}_2$ is at least 21. The structural proof, independently developed by Qiushi Engine, converts occupation constraints on a single tensor factor into algebraic relations coupling all three factors. Certified quotient-rank bounds and finite geometry force any hypothetical 20-term decomposition to have first-factor matrix-rank profile $(16, 1, 3)$. The ranks of the corresponding split-flattened summands therefore sum to 27, exactly the rank of the full split flattening. Equality in rank subadditivity forces their images to form a direct sum; normalization by the inverse flattening then makes the summands pairwise annihilating idempotents. An explicit product identity for matrix multiplication implies that at most one first factor can be invertible, contradicting the three forced by the profile. The same obstruction constrains 22-term decompositions attaining the split-rank bound. The complete proof, including the finite quotient bounds, is formalized in Lean. The accompanying research trajectory records Qiushi Engine's long-horizon autonomous research, from numerical experiments and quotient constructions to the structural proof.

1. INTRODUCTION

Matrix multiplication is a basic example of a bilinear map whose algebraic structure permits fewer products than its entrywise formula suggests. Strassen's seven-product algorithm for 2×2 matrices established this possibility [1]. For 3×3 matrices, the usual formula uses 27 products, whereas Laderman's algorithm uses 23 [2]. The minimum remains unknown. Its determination asks both for efficient constructions and for structural obstructions that apply to every possible bilinear algorithm.

A construction specifies linear forms in both inputs and the coefficients combining their products into the output. Quotient-rank bounds constrain a smaller set of data: the positions and multiplicities of the first-input forms. In this paper we combine these constraints with a split flattening of the complete multiplication tensor. At a hypothetical length of twenty, the two sets of conditions force equality in matrix-rank subadditivity. The equality case then yields relations among all three factor lists, strong enough to exclude the decomposition.

Write $T_{\langle 3,3,3 \rangle}$ for the 3×3 multiplication tensor and $R_{\mathbb{F}_2}(T_{\langle 3,3,3 \rangle})$ for its exact tensor rank over the two-element field $\mathbb{F}_2$. This rank is the least number of products of a linear form in the first input with a linear form in the second, with linear operations otherwise free [3]. We prove the following statement without imposing symmetry or support conditions on the algorithm.

Theorem 1.1. *Every exact bilinear algorithm for 3×3 matrix multiplication over $\mathbb{F}_2$ uses at least 21 scalar multiplications. Equivalently,*

$$R_{\mathbb{F}_2}(T_{\langle 3,3,3 \rangle}) \geq 21. \quad (1.1)$$

2020 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 68Q17; Secondary 15A69, 05B25, 68V20.

Key words and phrases. Matrix multiplication; algebraic complexity; tensor rank; bilinear complexity; finite fields; computer-assisted proof; formal verification.

Together with the explicit 23-term decomposition in Appendix C, this gives $21 \leq R_{\mathbb{F}_2}(T_{\langle 3,3,3 \rangle}) \leq 23$. Wang [4] obtained the same numerical lower bound by capacity-constrained profile enumeration. The proof here identifies a different obstruction: finite geometry forces a rank equality, and that equality supplies cross-factor relations which contradict the forced first-factor configuration.

1.1. The equality mechanism. Consider a decomposition $T_{\langle 3,3,3 \rangle} = \sum_{t=1}^r A_t \otimes B_t \otimes C_t$, with the factors represented by 3×3 coefficient matrices. For a subspace $W \leq M_3(\mathbb{F}_2)$, quotienting the first tensor factor by W removes every term with $A_t \in W$. A lower bound for the quotient rank therefore gives an upper bound on the number of such terms. We call these *occupation bounds*.

A second constraint retains the row and column indices of A_t . Splitting these indices gives a 27×27 matrix P for the multiplication tensor and matrices M_t for its summands. The matrix P is a permutation matrix, while $\text{rank } M_t = \text{rank } A_t$ for nonzero factors. Hence

$$P = \sum_t M_t, \quad 27 \leq \sum_t \text{rank } A_t. \quad (1.2)$$

This lower bound on the sum of matrix ranks is not by itself a lower bound of 21 on the number of terms. Its role is to combine with occupation geometry.

At length 20, eight strengthened quotient bounds force the first factors of rank at least two to have pairwise rank-one differences. Such matrices lie in a common affine row or column coset. The coset is an affine 3-space over $\mathbb{F}_2$, where further occupation bounds allow at most three selected points in every affine plane. These constraints, together with (1.2), force the matrix-rank profile

$$(n_1, n_2, n_3) = (16, 1, 3), \quad \sum_t \text{rank } A_t = 16 + 2 + 9 = 27. \quad (1.3)$$

The last equality is decisive. The images of the M_t span the 27-dimensional space, and their dimensions sum to 27; they therefore form a direct sum. Uniqueness of its components implies

$$M_t P^{-1} M_s = \delta_{ts} M_t. \quad (1.4)$$

For the multiplication tensor, the product on the left can be computed explicitly:

$$M(A, B, C) P^{-1} M(A', B', C') = M(AB' C^T A', B, C'). \quad (1.5)$$

The diagonal identities show that an invertible A_t requires invertible B_t and C_t . An off-diagonal identity would then make a product of invertible matrices zero if two first factors were invertible. The required three in (1.3) are impossible.

The resulting obstruction is useful separately from the finite classification: in *any* decomposition whose first-factor matrix ranks sum to 27, at most one first factor is invertible (Proposition 5.3 and Corollary 6.1). For a saturated 22-term decomposition with nonzero first factors, this leaves only the profiles $(17, 5, 0)$ and $(18, 3, 1)$. Thus the equality argument gives both the final contradiction at length 20 and restrictions on possible shorter algorithms beyond the known upper bound.

1.2. Background and related methods. Bläser's substitution argument gives the classical lower bound 19 for 3×3 multiplication [5]. On the constructive side, SAT methods have produced many inequivalent 23-term algorithms [6], while reinforcement learning has extended the search for exact decompositions across matrix formats [7]. These developments make small matrix-multiplication tensors a meeting point of algebraic complexity, computational search, and automated mathematical reasoning.

Wang's automated finite-field framework [8] raised the binary lower bound to 20 using symmetry classes of restrictions and recursive lower-bound certificates. We use its earlier, 496-representative quotient catalogue with the numeric labels fixed. The capacity viewpoint also appears in D'Ambrosio's determination of the binary rank of $\langle 2, 3, 4 \rangle$ [9].

Wang’s proof of 21 [4] and ours share the occupation bounds and the affine rank-one coset reduction. His argument strengthens a restriction table by rank-one-span searches and backtracking, then excludes rank-one completions of the remaining high-rank configurations by exhaustive enumeration. Here integer occupation certificates establish eight additional quotient bounds; affine-plane capacities force (1.3), and (1.4)–(1.5) give an algebraic contradiction involving all three factor lists. A public review draft in Tahir’s repository [10] gives another counting approach, using singular first factors and branch-and-bound exclusions of seven normal forms.

The row/column-coset lemma is a special case of the matrix-adjacency geometry initiated by Hua [11]; we give an elementary proof. The rank-additivity lemma is proved over an arbitrary field. Their combination with the finite quotient bounds is what converts first-factor occupation into the cross-factor obstruction for $T_{\langle 3,3,3 \rangle}$.

1.3. Formal proof and research development. The accompanying Lean development proves the tensor conventions, the occupation and geometric arguments, the saturation identities, and the finite lower bounds used by the proof. Its final theorem has no assumed finite-bound premises. The development also proves the full 496-representative quotient catalogue and its transport to arbitrary subspaces. The finite computations enter through exact integer branch certificates whose leaves and exhaustive splits are checked within Lean.

Qiushi Engine developed the structural argument during sustained autonomous research on exact matrix multiplication. The mathematical progression was from shorter-algorithm searches to quotient cores, from admissible first-factor supports to the question of factor compatibility, and finally to equality in the full tensor’s rank bound. Section 8 explains these transitions and their role in the discovery. The accompanying research trajectory [12] connects them to the supporting notes, programs, counterexamples, and results, preserving intermediate knowledge as well as the final proof.

The exposition follows the proof. Section 2 fixes the tensor and quotient conventions; Section 3 states and certifies the finite premises. Sections 4 and 5 establish the profile and its contradiction. The remaining sections give consequences, the formalization, and the research development. The appendices specify the finite data, a 23-term witness, and the formal interfaces and verification record.

2. TENSOR CONVENTIONS AND OCCUPATION

Let $V = M_3(\mathbb{F}_2)$, equipped with the nondegenerate coordinate pairing

$$\langle A, X \rangle = \sum_{i,j=0}^2 A_{ij} X_{ij} = \text{tr}(A^T X).$$

All matrix and vector coordinates are indexed by 0, 1, 2. Write $e_0 = (1, 0, 0)^T$, $e_1 = (0, 1, 0)^T$, $e_2 = (0, 0, 1)^T$ and $E_{ij} = e_i e_j^T$. Throughout the paper,

$$T_{\langle 3,3,3 \rangle} = \sum_{i,j,k=0}^2 E_{ij} \otimes E_{jk} \otimes E_{ik} \in V \otimes V \otimes V. \quad (2.1)$$

Thus its coefficient at $(3i + j, 3j + k, 3i + k)$ is 1, and all other coefficients are zero. Its contraction against X, Y, Z is $\text{tr}(XYZ^T)$.

Definition 2.1. A decomposition of length r is an identity

$$T_{\langle 3,3,3 \rangle} = \sum_{t=1}^r A_t \otimes B_t \otimes C_t, \quad A_t, B_t, C_t \in V. \quad (2.2)$$

The tensor rank $R_{\mathbb{F}_2}(T_{\langle 3,3,3 \rangle})$ is the least such r . Unless explicitly excluded, zero summands and repeated factors are permitted in a length- r expression. A minimal expression has no zero summands.

By contraction of (2.2), the corresponding algorithm is

$$XY = \sum_{t=1}^r \langle A_t, X \rangle \langle B_t, Y \rangle C_t \quad (X, Y \in V). \quad (2.3)$$

Conversely, evaluating (2.3) on pairs of matrix units recovers every coefficient of (2.2). Matrix rank $\text{rank}(A_t)$ and tensor rank $R_{\mathbb{F}_2}(T_{\langle 3,3,3 \rangle})$ will always be distinguished.

For a linear subspace $W \leq V$, put

$$q_W : V \longrightarrow V/W, \quad T_W = (q_W \otimes \text{id} \otimes \text{id})T_{\langle 3,3,3 \rangle}.$$

The dual of V/W is naturally $W^\perp$ under the coordinate pairing. Consequently T_W represents multiplication with its first input restricted to $W^\perp$, not to W . Indeed, a linear functional on V/W pulls back to a functional vanishing on W , and every such functional factors uniquely through q_W . Applying this identification in the first tensor slot proves the assertion, including equality of the two tensor ranks.

Lemma 2.2 (Occupation inequality). *For a length- r decomposition, let $m(W) = |\{t : A_t \in W\}|$. Then*

$$m(W) \leq r - R_{\mathbb{F}_2}(T_W). \quad (2.4)$$

More generally, if $W \leq U$ and T_W has a length- r decomposition, at most $r - R_{\mathbb{F}_2}(T_U)$ first factors, counted with multiplicity in V/W , belong to U/W .

Proof. Applying q_W to (2.2) kills every indexed term with first factor in W . Discarding these terms gives a decomposition of T_W with at most $r - m(W)$ terms. For the second assertion apply the induced map $V/W \rightarrow V/U$ instead. $\square$

2.1. Tensor symmetries. For $U, V_0, H \in \text{GL}_3(\mathbb{F}_2)$ the coefficient transformation

$$(A, B, C) \longmapsto (U^T A V_0^{-T}, V_0^T B H^{-T}, U^{-1} C H) \quad (2.5)$$

preserves (2.1). To check the contragredient factors, consider the input transformation

$$(X, Y, Z) \longmapsto (U X V_0^{-1}, V_0 Y H^{-1}, U^{-T} Z H^T).$$

It preserves $\text{tr}(XYZ^T)$ by cancellation and cyclicity of trace. Pullback under the coordinate pairing gives (2.5). The transformation

$$(A, B, C) \longmapsto (A^T, C, B) \quad (2.6)$$

is also a symmetry, as follows directly by exchanging i and j in the transformed sum (2.1). These symmetries preserve the matrix ranks of the factors and quotient tensor ranks.

The induced group on V consists of $A \mapsto PAQ$ and $A \mapsto PA^T Q$, for invertible P, Q . We denote it by G . It has $2 \cdot 168^2 = 56,448$ elements. Its action on subspaces is the one used in the frozen catalogue. Each of these first-factor actions extends to a symmetry of the complete tensor by (2.5) and (2.6).

3. THE FINITE QUOTIENT BOUNDS

The structural proof needs three families of quotient bounds: 19 for every line, 19 for every two-plane containing no nonzero rank-one matrix, and 17 for the affine-plane spans specified below. Their role is to limit how many first factors a short decomposition can place in those spaces. We first identify the spaces and then explain how their bounds are built from contractions, substitution, and finite occupation certificates.

3.1. The quotient catalogue. Let $(W_i, \ell_i)_{i=0}^{495}$ be the catalogue in Appendix B. Define

$$L_0(W) = \max(\{\ell_i : W = gW_i \text{ for some } g \in G\} \cup \{0\}). \quad (3.1)$$

The catalogue is the frozen table inherited from [8], not Wang's later strengthened table. The maximum makes the definition unambiguous even before orbit coverage and label consistency are proved. It defines a numeric function on actual subspaces.

Proposition 3.1 (Finite classification and direct bounds). *The catalogue covers every subspace of V under G , and its labels agree on overlapping orbits. The following values and bounds hold:*

- (i) $L_0(0) = 20$. For every nonzero $a \in V$, $L_0(\langle a \rangle) = 19$ and $R_{\mathbb{F}_2}(T_{\langle a \rangle}) \geq 19$.
- (ii) The two-dimensional subspaces of V have fourteen G -orbits. Exactly eight consist of planes whose three nonzero matrices have rank at least two. Their representatives are $W_{484}, \dots, W_{491}$ in Table 2, and $L_0(W_i) = 18$ for these indices.
- (iii) Put $p = \text{diag}(0, 1, 1)$, $R = \{e_0 w^T : w \in \mathbb{F}_2^3\}$, and $S = \langle p, R \rangle$. Then $L_0(S) = 14$ and $L_0(R) = 15$. Every three-dimensional subspace $K \leq S$ other than R has $L_0(K) = 17$ and $R_{\mathbb{F}_2}(T_K) \geq 17$.

Computer-assisted proof. The orbit coverage, label consistency, exact numeric values, and two-plane classification are checked against the finite definition (3.1). Separately, closed quotient-rank proofs establish the three line bounds and the normalized affine-hyperplane bounds. Exact tensor symmetries transport them to the families stated here. The lower-bound rules and representative source proofs are given in Section 3.2 and Appendix A.4. These proofs precede Theorem 1.1 in the dependency graph. Appendix A specifies the small spaces, and Section 7 identifies the formal interfaces. $\square$

The labels specify lower bounds rather than exact quotient ranks; the values 18 in (ii) will be strengthened while L_0 remains fixed. The line bounds already imply the full-tensor bound 20: in any minimal decomposition select a nonzero first factor a . Lemma 2.2 and the line bound give $1 \leq r - 19$, hence $r \geq 20$.

3.2. Deriving the source bounds. A source bound is a previously proved inequality for a quotient T_U , used to constrain a decomposition of T_W with $W \leq U$. The following rules establish these inequalities recursively.

For $L \in V$, write $H_L = \{X : \langle L, X \rangle = 0\}$. If $W \leq H_L$, contraction by L is well defined on V/W . Applied to T_W , it gives the matrix

$$C_L[(j, k), (i, l)] = L_{ij} \delta_{kl}, \quad \text{rank } C_L = 3 \text{ rank } L. \quad (3.2)$$

Indeed, $C_L = L^T \otimes I_3$ in the displayed ordering. Each simple tensor contracts to a matrix of rank at most one, so

$$R_{\mathbb{F}_2}(T_W) \geq 3 \text{ rank } L. \quad (3.3)$$

This gives basic bounds 3, 6, and 9. Several annihilating functionals can also be assembled into an ordinary flattening of T_W . A nonsingular minor of order d gives a lower bound d ; the finite proofs specify a minor and check a left inverse over $\mathbb{F}_2$.

Occupation can strengthen these initial bounds without finding a larger minor. For example, let

$$F = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad G_0 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad W = H_F \cap H_{G_0}. \quad (3.4)$$

The matrices $F, G_0, F + G_0$ all have rank two. Their three hyperplanes therefore have quotient rank at least 6. Every $X \in V$ belongs to at least one of them: among the binary values $\langle F, X \rangle$, $\langle G_0, X \rangle$, and their sum, one is zero. In a length- r decomposition of T_W , let m_1, m_2, m_3 count first factors in these hyperplanes modulo W . By coverage and Lemma 2.2,

$$r \leq m_1 + m_2 + m_3 \leq 3(r - 6), \quad \text{hence} \quad r \geq 9. \quad (3.5)$$

This proves the catalogue bound for W_8 : the annihilator of its displayed basis is precisely $\langle F, G_0 \rangle$. The example shows why several small contraction bounds can give more information than any one of them separately.

Some source bounds require substitution, a standard method in bilinear complexity [5]. Regard a quotient tensor as a family of second-factor slices S_b . A nonzero slice forces some summand to have a nonzero coefficient there. Subtracting suitable multiples of that slice from the others removes this summand, at the cost of modifying the remaining slices. If k selected slices are independent and a flattening of rank at least f survives all these modifications, every decomposition has length at least $k + f$. Appendix A.4 gives the precise survival condition and a complete $6 + 6 = 12$ example used among the source bounds. The condition is essential: the residual after substitution, rather than the original tensor, must retain the lower bound.

The recursive occupation step generalizes (3.5). Suppose $W \leq U_v$, $R_{\mathbb{F}_2}(T_{U_v}) \geq \lambda_v$, and nonnegative weights y_v cover each quotient class at least $c > 0$ times:

$$\sum_{v: X \in U_v} y_v \geq c \quad (X \in V). \quad (3.6)$$

Summing the occupation inequalities then gives

$$cr \leq \sum_v y_v m(U_v/W) \leq \sum_v y_v (r - \lambda_v). \quad (3.7)$$

Thus a cover and previously established source bounds can exclude a proposed length. More general exclusions split into exhaustive integer branches before taking such nonnegative combinations; these are the certificates described next.

For a concrete source used in the raise for W_{484} , consider

$$U = W_{450} = \text{span}(\text{mat}(68), \text{mat}(19), \text{mat}(10)),$$

with matrix codes as in Appendix A. Its certificate uses ten superspaces with proved bound 17 and eight with bound 9. The first ten have weights 4, 4, 2, 2, 2, 2, 2, 2, 2, 2; the others have weight one. They give a 4-fold cover of V/U , checked on its 64 classes. Equation (3.7) therefore reads

$$4r \leq 32r - (24 \cdot 17 + 8 \cdot 9) = 32r - 480.$$

No $r \leq 17$ satisfies this inequality, so $R_{\mathbb{F}_2}(T_U) \geq 18$. Since $W_{484} \leq U$, this is one of the bounds that forces occupation to vanish when a length-18 decomposition of $T_{W_{484}}$ is considered. The bound-17 sources are obtained by the same contraction, substitution, and occupation rules.

Finally, source statements pass between equivalent representatives using the tensor symmetries of Section 2. Containment has a fixed direction:

$$W \leq gU \implies R_{\mathbb{F}_2}(T_W) \geq R_{\mathbb{F}_2}(T_{gU}) = R_{\mathbb{F}_2}(T_U) \quad (g \in G). \quad (3.8)$$

The implication follows by applying $V/W \rightarrow V/gU$ to a decomposition.

These rules give concrete routes to the two remaining families in Proposition 3.1. For the line $W = \langle E_{00} \rangle$, the 255 planes containing W partition the nonzero classes of V/W . Fifteen of these planes have proved bound 17, from the types W_{478}, W_{479} ; the other 240 have proved bound 18, from $W_{480}, \dots, W_{483}$. The zero class belongs to every plane, so the same cover applies to decompositions with zero first factors. Equation (3.7) gives

$$r \leq 15(r - 17) + 240(r - 18) = 255r - 4575, \quad \text{hence} \quad r \geq 19. \quad (3.9)$$

The rank-two and rank-three line bounds follow by containment and symmetry from the raises for W_{484} and W_{488} proved below.

For the fourteen affine-plane spans, three representatives suffice: the coded bases $(272, 4, 2)$, $(273, 4, 2)$, and $(272, 4, 1)$ in Appendix A. The first is contained in a symmetry image of $W_{262} = (132, 12, 2, 1)$, whose bound 17 transfers by (3.8). The other two are symmetry-equivalent to W_{415} and W_{416} . Their integer occupation certificates exclude length

16 using respectively 101 and 373 source rows on the 63 nonzero quotient classes, with the branch rule described next. The remaining eleven spans are symmetry images of the third representative. Appendix D.2 locates these proofs and their source-bound dependencies.

3.3. The eight occupation systems. For $i = 484, \dots, 491$, put $Q_i = V/W_i$. Index non-negative integer weights by its nonzero classes $Q_i^* = Q_i \setminus \{0\}$, and impose

$$\begin{aligned} x_q &\in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} & (q \in Q_i^*), \\ \sum_{q \in Q_i^*} x_q &= 18, \\ \sum_{q \in (U/W_i) \setminus \{0\}} x_q &\leq 18 - L_0(U) \quad (W_i < U < V). \end{aligned} \tag{3.10}$$

Every quotient has dimension seven, so this specifies 127 variables and 29,210 proper nonzero quotient-subspace rows. The definition of L_0 and the complete catalogue make every coefficient and bound in these systems explicit.

Proposition 3.2 (Finite occupation exclusions). *For each $i = 484, \dots, 491$, system (3.10) has no integer solution. Its retained source rows have proved quotient bounds $R_{\mathbb{F}_2}(T_{U_v}) \geq \lambda_v$, and its zero-forcing rows have proved bounds at least 18.*

Integer-certificate proof. Let $J \subseteq Q_i^*$ be the quotient directions retained after zero-forcing, and let U_v be the retained superspaces. A row with $L_0(U) \geq 18$ forces all its nonnegative summands to zero. After these eliminations, the retained variables z_j satisfy

$$z_j \geq 0 \quad (j \in J), \quad \sum_{j \in J} z_j \geq 18, \quad \sum_j a_{vj} z_j \leq 18 - \lambda_v, \tag{3.11}$$

where $a_{vj} = 1$ exactly when $j \in U_v/W_i$, and is zero otherwise. The proved row label satisfies $\lambda_v \leq L_0(U_v)$. Replacing equality of the total by a lower bound weakens the system and is sufficient for the certificates. Table 3 records the retained sizes.

At an internal vertex the integer branch tree splits on $z_j \leq k$ or $z_j \geq k + 1$. These alternatives are exhaustive over $\mathbb{Z}$. At a leaf, take the retained inequalities, the nonnegativity and total inequalities as needed, and the branch inequalities along its path, all written as $a_v \cdot z \leq b_v$. The leaf supplies nonnegative integer multipliers y_v with

$$\sum_v y_v a_v = 0, \quad \sum_v y_v b_v < 0. \tag{3.12}$$

Multiplying and adding the inequalities would give $0 \leq \sum_v y_v b_v < 0$. Thus no leaf admits a solution; induction up the exhaustive branch tree excludes every integer solution of the retained system.

In the eight concrete certificates, Lean checks each coefficient cancellation and strict negative right-hand side in (3.12), and combines the leaves through explicit integer case splits. For all 5,917 source and zero-forcing rows, the data specify a basis of U_v , verify $W_i < U_v < V$, and check the membership coefficients and the bound $\lambda_v \leq L_0(U_v)$. Hence any solution of the full system would restrict to a solution excluded by the corresponding branch tree. The resulting eight statements quantify over arbitrary nonnegative integer weights on the actual quotient; they assume neither tensor realizability nor distinct support.

For the rank interpretation, every selected source bound $R_{\mathbb{F}_2}(T_{U_v}) \geq \lambda_v$ and zero-forcing bound at least 18 has its own closed proof, connected by checked quotient transports. Applying Lemma 2.2 to these proved quotients shows that a hypothetical short decomposition satisfies the retained system. Numeric comparisons with L_0 establish the full-system exclusion; the source proofs establish its tensor-rank interpretation. $\square$

Corollary 3.3 (Two-dimensional raises). *If $W \leq V$ is two-dimensional and all three nonzero matrices in W have rank at least two, then $R_{\mathbb{F}_2}(T_W) \geq 19$.*

Proof. First take $W = W_i$ and suppose T_W has a decomposition of length $r \leq 18$. There is at least one zero-forcing superspace $D > W$ with a directly proved bound $R_{\mathbb{F}_2}(T_D) \geq 18$. Quotienting to V/D already excludes $r < 18$. If $r = 18$, occupation in each zero-forcing superspace is at most zero. Hence every excluded direction and the zero quotient class have multiplicity zero. The retained nonnegative multiplicities have total 18, and the proved source bounds give every row in (3.11) by Lemma 2.2. The checked branch tree excludes this vector. Finally, classification and tensor symmetries transfer the bound to every all-high plane. $\square$

3.4. The Boolean and integer realizations. The research report certified the eight exclusions by CNF/DRAT refutations checked with DRAT-trim [13], using the earlier certified quotient table [12]. The Lean proof establishes the needed source bounds within Lean and uses integer branch certificates. Both routes apply occupation to the same quotient tensors and prove the same eight raises; their proof objects and dependency orders differ. The main theorem uses the selected source bounds and integer certificates above; the aggregate catalogue theorem is established afterward in Proposition 6.2. Appendix D.5 describes the Boolean encoding and its relation to the formal proof.

4. FROM OCCUPATION TO THE PROFILE (16, 1, 3)

Assume there is a decomposition of length at most 20. By the line bounds and the observation after Proposition 3.1, a minimal such decomposition has length exactly 20 and every factor in every term is nonzero. Fix this decomposition for the section.

4.1. Split flattening and distinct first factors. Define the A -split flattening by

$$\Phi_A(T)[(i, b), (j, c)] = T[3i + j, b, c], \quad 0 \leq i, j < 3, \quad 0 \leq b, c < 9.$$

It is a 27×27 matrix. For $P = \Phi_A(T_{\langle 3, 3, 3 \rangle})$, a row $(i, 3u + v)$ has its unique nonzero entry in column $(u, 3i + v)$. This correspondence is a bijection, so P is a permutation matrix of rank 27. For a simple tensor, write

$$M(A, B, C) = \Phi_A(A \otimes B \otimes C) = A \otimes (\text{vec}(B) \text{vec}(C)^T). \quad (4.1)$$

Here the Kronecker product on the right is a matrix product construction, and vectorization is row-major. Since B, C are nonzero, their outer product has rank one and $\text{rank } M(A, B, C) = \text{rank } A$. Therefore

$$27 = \text{rank } P \leq \sum_{t=1}^{20} \text{rank } A_t, \quad \sum_{t=1}^{20} (\text{rank } A_t - 1) \geq 7. \quad (4.2)$$

The first inequality also holds with zero factors, using $\text{rank } M(A, B, C) \leq \text{rank } A$.

The line cap is $20 - 19 = 1$. Since a line over $\mathbb{F}_2$ has just one nonzero element, Lemma 2.2 implies that the twenty A_t are pairwise distinct. Let

$$\mathcal{H} = \{A_t : \text{rank } A_t \geq 2\}.$$

Every term contributes at most two to the excess in (4.2), so $|\mathcal{H}| \geq 4$.

Lemma 4.1. *Distinct $a, b \in \mathcal{H}$ satisfy $\text{rank}(a - b) = 1$.*

Proof. The span $W = \langle a, b \rangle$ is a plane containing two first factors. If $a + b$ also had rank at least two, Corollary 3.3 would give $m(W) \leq 20 - 19 = 1$, a contradiction. Since $a + b \neq 0$ and subtraction equals addition in $\mathbb{F}_2$, its rank must be one. $\square$

4.2. Affine matrix geometry.

Lemma 4.2 (Affine row or column coset). *Let $\mathcal{H} \subseteq M_3(\mathbb{F}_2)$ contain at least four distinct matrices, and suppose $\text{rank}(a - b) = 1$ for all distinct $a, b \in \mathcal{H}$. Then either*

$$\mathcal{H} \subseteq p + \{uw^T : w \in \mathbb{F}_2^3\} \quad \text{or} \quad \mathcal{H} \subseteq p + \{wv^T : w \in \mathbb{F}_2^3\}$$

for a matrix p and a nonzero vector u or v .

Proof. Two nonzero rank-one matrices $u_1v_1^T, u_2v_2^T$ have a rank-one sum only if $u_1 = u_2$ or $v_1 = v_2$. Otherwise each pair is linearly independent over $\mathbb{F}_2$, and

$$u_1v_1^T + u_2v_2^T = (u_1 \quad u_2) \begin{pmatrix} v_1^T \\ v_2^T \end{pmatrix}$$

has rank two: the second map is surjective onto $\mathbb{F}_2^2$ and the first is injective from $\mathbb{F}_2^2$.

Fix distinct $a, b, c \in \mathcal{H}$ and write $a + b = u_1v_1^T$, $a + c = u_2v_2^T$. Their sum $b + c$ has rank one, so they share a left or right factor. They cannot share both, since $b \neq c$. Suppose they share the left factor u , with $v_1 \neq v_2$. For any other $d \in \mathcal{H}$, write $a + d = u'v'^T$. The rank-one conditions for $b + d$ and $c + d$ force $u' = u$: otherwise they would require both $v' = v_1$ and $v' = v_2$. Thus every difference from a has left factor u , proving the column-coset alternative. The case of a shared right factor is identical after transposition. $\square$

Apply the lemma to the high-rank factors. The symmetry (2.6) exchanges the two alternatives, so it suffices to consider a column coset. Left multiplication sends its common nonzero column to e_0 . Subtracting a first-row matrix from the base point does not change the coset, so its elements can be written

$$\begin{pmatrix} w^T \\ D \end{pmatrix}, \quad w \in \mathbb{F}_2^3, \quad D \in \mathbb{F}_2^{2 \times 3}. \quad (4.3)$$

If $\text{rank } D = 0$, no element has rank at least two. If $\text{rank } D = 1$, exactly six first rows lie outside its one-dimensional row space. Those six matrices have rank two; the other two have rank one. Distinctness of the first factors would then bound the entire rank excess by six, contradicting (4.2). Hence $\text{rank } D = 2$.

A right change of basis sends the row space of D to $\langle e_1^T, e_2^T \rangle$, and a left action $\text{diag}(1, K)$, $K \in \text{GL}_2(\mathbb{F}_2)$, puts the two lower rows into that ordered basis. Both transformations preserve the first-row direction and extend to tensor symmetries. We may therefore assume

$$\mathcal{H} \subseteq p + R, \quad p = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad R = \{e_0w^T : w \in \mathbb{F}_2^3\}. \quad (4.4)$$

The eight labels w identify this coset with affine 3-space over $\mathbb{F}_2$. Four matrices have rank two and four have rank three; the latter labels are precisely $w_0 = 1$.

4.3. Affine-plane capacities. Every affine plane $\pi = w_* + D_0 \subset \mathbb{F}_2^3$, with $\dim D_0 = 2$, corresponds to the linear three-space

$$K_\pi = \text{span}\{p + e_0w^T : w \in \pi\} \leq S = \langle p, R \rangle.$$

Indeed $K_\pi = \langle p + e_0w_*^T, e_0D_0^T \rangle$. The first generator is outside R , so its dimension is three and $K_\pi \cap (p + R)$ is exactly the four indicated coset elements. Conversely, each three-space in S other than R meets $p + R$ in such an affine plane. There are $7 \cdot 2 = 14$ of them. Proposition 3.1(iii) and occupation give

$$|\mathcal{H} \cap K_\pi| \leq m(K_\pi) \leq 3. \quad (4.5)$$

Lemma 4.3. *Every five-element subset of $\mathbb{F}_2^3$ contains a four-point affine plane.*

Proof. The ten unordered pair sums take only seven possible nonzero values. Two distinct pairs therefore have the same sum. They cannot share a point, since that would make their other endpoints equal. Their four distinct endpoints have sum zero. Translating one endpoint to zero leaves $0, u, v, u + v$ with distinct nonzero u, v , the points of an affine plane. $\square$

Proposition 4.4 (Forced profile). *In a hypothetical minimal length-20 decomposition, the counts of first factors of matrix ranks one, two, and three are respectively*

$$(n_1, n_2, n_3) = (16, 1, 3), \quad \sum_t \text{rank } A_t = 27. \quad (4.6)$$

Proof. Equations (4.5) and Lemma 4.3 imply $|\mathcal{H}| \leq 4$. The budget gives the reverse inequality. The four rank-three labels $w_0 = 1$ themselves form an affine plane, so at most three of the selected factors have rank three. With four high-rank factors the excess in (4.2) is $4 + n_3$. It is at least seven, forcing $n_3 = 3$, $n_2 = 1$, and $n_1 = 16$. Their rank sum is $16 + 2 + 9 = 27$. $\square$

The fourteen bounds 17 thus turn the rank budget into an exact equality. The next section extracts the algebraic consequences of that equality for the complete summands.

5. SATURATION AND THE CROSS-FACTOR CONTRADICTION

The equality in Proposition 4.4 is the point at which the first-factor geometry constrains the other two factors. We first record the linear-algebra statement responsible for this transition.

Lemma 5.1 (Rank-additive saturation). *Let k be a field and let $P, M_1, \dots, M_r$ be $n \times n$ matrices over k . Suppose P is invertible and*

$$P = \sum_{t=1}^r M_t, \quad \sum_{t=1}^r \text{rank } M_t = n.$$

Then, for all s, t ,

$$M_t P^{-1} M_s = \delta_{ts} M_t. \quad (5.1)$$

Consequently $E_t = M_t P^{-1}$ satisfy $\sum_t E_t = I$, $E_t^2 = E_t$, and $E_t E_s = 0$ for $t \neq s$.

Proof. Let $U_t = \text{im } M_t$. Since P is surjective and is the sum of the M_t , the subspaces U_t span k^n . Their dimensions sum to n , so the sum is direct. For $x \in k^n$, put $z = P^{-1} M_s x$. Then

$$\sum_t M_t z = Pz = M_s x \in U_s.$$

Uniqueness of components in $\bigoplus_t U_t$ gives $M_t z = 0$ if $t \neq s$ and $M_s z = M_s x$. This is (5.1). Right multiplication by P^{-1} gives the idempotent identities; their sum is $PP^{-1} = I$. $\square$

Orthogonality here means pairwise annihilation, not orthogonality for an inner product. The lemma allows zero summands and arbitrary fields.

Lemma 5.2 (Product formula). *For the convention (2.1), and arbitrary $A, B, C, A', B', C' \in M_3(\mathbb{F}_2)$,*

$$M(A, B, C) P^{-1} M(A', B', C') = M(AB' C^T A', B, C'). \quad (5.2)$$

Proof. Since P is a permutation matrix, $P^{-1} = P^T$. For composite indices as in Section 4,

$$P^{-1}[(k, d), (m, e)] = T[3m + k, e, d].$$

The $((i, b), (j, c))$ entry of the left-hand side of (5.2) is therefore $B[b]C'[c]$ times

$$\sum_{k,m=0}^2 A[i, k] A'[m, j] \sum_{d,e=0}^8 C[d] T[3m + k, e, d] B'[e].$$

The inner sum has nonzero tensor coefficients only at $e = 3k + h$, $d = 3m + h$, for $0 \leq h < 3$, so it equals

$$\sum_{h=0}^2 C[m, h] B'[k, h] = (B' C^T)[k, m].$$

The full entry is thus $B[b] C'[c] (A B' C^T A')[i, j]$, as claimed. $\square$

If B and C are nonzero, the map $X \mapsto M(X, B, C)$ is injective. To see this, choose entries $B[b] \neq 0$ and $C[c] \neq 0$. The entries with these fixed b, c recover all entries of X up to the same nonzero scalar. In particular $M(X, B, C) = 0$ implies $X = 0$.

Proposition 5.3 (Invertibility obstruction at saturation). *In a decomposition of $T_{\langle 3,3,3 \rangle}$ with nonzero factors and $\sum_t \text{rank } A_t = 27$, at most one first factor is invertible.*

Proof. Set $M_t = M(A_t, B_t, C_t)$. Their sum is P , and their ranks sum to 27. Lemmas 5.1 and 5.2, followed by the preceding injectivity observation, give

$$A_t B_t C_t^T A_t = A_t, \quad (5.3)$$

$$A_t B_s C_t^T A_s = 0 \quad (t \neq s). \quad (5.4)$$

For an invertible A_t , multiplying (5.3) on both sides by A_t^{-1} yields

$$B_t C_t^T = A_t^{-1}. \quad (5.5)$$

Thus both B_t and C_t are invertible. If A_t and A_s are invertible at two distinct indices, all four factors in $A_t B_s C_t^T A_s$ are invertible by (5.5). Their product cannot be zero, contradicting (5.4). $\square$

Proof of Theorem 1.1. The line quotient bounds exclude minimal decompositions shorter than 20. If a minimal length-20 decomposition existed, Proposition 4.4 would give rank sum 27 and three invertible first factors. Proposition 5.3 permits at most one. Hence there is no decomposition of length at most 20, and (2.3) gives the asserted lower bound for bilinear algorithms. $\square$

6. SATURATED DECOMPOSITIONS AND FURTHER CONSEQUENCES

For a length- r decomposition define the A -slot excess by

$$\Delta_A = \sum_{t=1}^r \text{rank } A_t - 27.$$

The split bound shows that $\Delta_A \geq 0$. A decomposition is *saturated in the A -slot* if $\Delta_A = 0$.

Corollary 6.1 (Zero terms and saturated profiles). *In an arbitrary length decomposition saturated in the A -slot, including one with zero summands, at most one A_t is invertible. If its length is 22 and all A_t are nonzero, its A -slot matrix-rank profile is either*

$$(17, 5, 0) \quad \text{or} \quad (18, 3, 1). \quad (6.1)$$

Without the nonzero- A_t hypothesis, either these profiles hold or deleting a zero first factor gives a saturated length-21 decomposition.

Proof. For arbitrary factors,

$$27 \leq \sum_t \text{rank } M(A_t, B_t, C_t) \leq \sum_t \text{rank } A_t = 27.$$

Hence each individual rank deficit is zero. In particular if $A_t \neq 0$, neither B_t nor C_t can be zero. Removing all terms with $A_t = 0$ leaves nonzero factors and preserves the rank sum, so Proposition 5.3 applies.

For 22 nonzero first factors, write n_j for the count of rank j . Then $n_1 + n_2 + n_3 = 22$ and $n_1 + 2n_2 + 3n_3 = 27$, whence $n_2 + 2n_3 = 5$. Since $n_3 \leq 1$, the only possibilities are (6.1). If a

first factor is zero, deletion leaves length 21 and the same rank sum. Two such zero factors would produce length 20, contrary to Theorem 1.1. $\square$

The cyclic symmetry

$$(A, B, C) \mapsto (B, C^T, A^T)$$

follows by relabelling i, j, k in (2.1), and its third iterate is the identity. Transpose preserves matrix rank. Thus the split bound, the invertibility obstruction, and Corollary 6.1 hold separately in the B - and C -slots. Saturation in one slot does not imply saturation in either other slot.

6.1. Positive rank excess. At length 21, the three occupation capacities driving the length-20 argument change as follows:

Subspace family	Length 20	Length 21
Lines with bound 19	1	2
All-high planes with bound 19	1	2
Affine-plane spans with bound 17	3	4

Repeated first factors and two high-rank factors in an all-high plane are no longer immediately excluded. Four coset labels forming an affine plane are also allowed. The argument therefore no longer forces the profile or rank equality. At positive excess the hypotheses of Lemma 5.1 are unavailable.

The excess has a precise linear-algebraic meaning. For nonzero summands set $U_t = \text{im } M_t$. The addition map

$$\Sigma : \bigoplus_t U_t \longrightarrow \mathbb{F}_2^{27}, \quad (u_t)_t \mapsto \sum_t u_t$$

is surjective because $\sum_t M_t = P$ is invertible. Rank-nullity gives

$$\dim \ker \Sigma = \sum_t \dim U_t - 27 = \Delta_A. \quad (6.2)$$

Zero excess means that components are unique, which is exactly what produces the identities in Lemma 5.1. Positive excess measures the remaining linear relations between these components. Extending the method to length 21 therefore requires stronger occupation bounds or cross-factor relations that remain effective when this kernel has small positive dimension. The interval 21–23 leaves both improved constructions and stronger lower bounds to be determined.

6.2. Global frozen-table soundness. The full catalogue extends the selected quotient bounds to a single lower-bound function on all subspaces of V .

Proposition 6.2. *For every frozen representative and every subspace $W \leq V$,*

$$R_{\mathbb{F}_2}(T_{W_i}) \geq \ell_i \quad (0 \leq i < 496), \quad R_{\mathbb{F}_2}(T_W) \geq L_0(W).$$

Computer-assisted proof. The completed registry supplies a closed proof at each of the 496 listed bases and labels. Its bindings check equal spans, containment with quotient monotonicity, or invertible tensor transport to the individual source proofs. The entry $W_{495} = 0$, labelled 20, may now use Theorem 1.1, since $T_0 = T_{\langle 3,3,3 \rangle}$. For each G -image, tensor symmetry preserves the quotient rank. Taking the maximum in (3.1) gives the second inequality. $\square$

With universal soundness available, there is also a direct link from any short quotient decomposition to the full occupation system. At length $r \leq 18$, its nonzero first-factor multiplicities satisfy the caps $r - L_0(U)$. Increasing any one multiplicity by $18 - r$ preserves every enlarged cap $18 - L_0(U)$ and makes the total 18. This explains the padding argument for the full systems used in the research report. The proof above instead extracts the retained system from separately established source bounds, as in the Lean main-theorem dependency graph.

7. LEAN FORMALIZATION

The Lean 4 formalization [14] follows the mathematical argument from the definition of multiplication to the lower bound. It includes the finite computations that establish the quotient premises, as well as the geometric and algebraic deductions. In particular, the statements connecting quotient tensors to finite integer systems are proved together with the certificate exclusions, so the same formal argument covers their mathematical interpretation and their application to the main theorem.

7.1. Mathematical statements. The field is represented by `ZMod 2`, and each factor is an actual 3×3 matrix. The entrywise definition of (2.1) is proved equivalent to the algorithm identity (2.3) for every pair of input matrices. The final declaration `bilinear_mul_requires_21` states that every such algorithm has at least 21 products. Zero summands are allowed in the quantified family; no minimality, distinctness, or symmetry condition is assumed.

The tensor-rank statement is `QiushiMatmul.rank_ge_21`. Its proof combines the structural argument with a closed collection of finite premises: bound 19 for the three line types and the eight all-high plane types, and bound 17 for the fourteen normalized affine-plane spans. The explicit upper-bound witness then gives `rank_between_21_and_23`. These declarations formalize Theorem 1.1 and its stated interval.

7.2. Finite proofs and reusable components. The integer certificates of Section 3 are expanded into Lean proofs. Each leaf proves a contradiction by an exact nonnegative combination of inequalities. Each internal node applies an exhaustive integer split. Quotient membership and the source rank bounds are proved before these certificates are applied to a hypothetical decomposition. Thus the final theorem derives its finite premises within the same proof system as the saturation argument.

The development uses Mathlib’s finite fields, matrices, subspaces, linear maps, dimension theory, and rank identities [15]. The problem-specific components include quotient/annihilator equivalence, occupation extraction, symmetry transport, affine-coset geometry, and the multiplication-specific product formula. Rank-additive saturation is formulated over any field. It can be reused independently of the binary finite data. The complete frozen-table theorem proves all 496 representative bounds and transports them to arbitrary subspaces; its logical place is after the main theorem, as in Proposition 6.2.

7.3. Kernel verification. The final theorems and their full transitive proof dependencies passed Lean’s unchanged kernel replay procedure from empty environments [16]. Their axiom dependencies are confined to

$$\{\text{propxt}, \text{Classical.choice}, \text{Quot.sound}\}.$$

The main theorem uses no additional axiom for a quotient bound and no external solver-success assumption. Its finite proofs are checked proof terms, not trusted outputs of the certificate generators.

Appendix D lists the principal interfaces, the pinned dependencies, and the replay groups. The accompanying formalization package [17] contains the sources, certificate data, generators, and commands for reproduction. Neither a running Qiushi Engine nor access to a language model is needed to check the proof.

8. QIUSHI ENGINE AND THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE PROOF

Qiushi Engine developed the structural proof through sustained autonomous research on exact matrix multiplication. Its research planning, construction, computation, and critical review operate with persistent mathematical memory, as described in its earlier work on an optical experimental platform [18]. Here the system began with the search for a shorter algorithm. The eventual lower-bound proof grew from a different question exposed by that

search: which constraints on candidate factors express compatibility with the full multiplication tensor?

The public research trajectory [12] brings together the relevant notes, programs, results, and corrections. It is organized by mathematical question rather than as a transcript or a strictly linear chronology. The following three developments explain how the representations changed and what was retained from each.

8.1. From numerical dependence to an exact deletion criterion. A general 22-term ansatz contains $22(9 + 9 + 9) = 594$ coefficients subject to 729 cubic tensor-coordinate identities. The early search also considered real-coefficient deformations of known 23-term schemes. The aim was to reach a configuration in which one product could be eliminated. A nearly dependent first-second factor pairing initially appeared to offer such a route.

The difficulty can be stated exactly. For a numerical decomposition $\mathcal{D} = \sum_{t=0}^{22} u_t \otimes v_t \otimes w_t$ over $\mathbb{R}$, normalize the nonzero pairing columns by setting

$$d_t = \frac{u_t \otimes v_t}{\|u_t \otimes v_t\|_2}, \quad \tilde{w}_t = \|u_t \otimes v_t\|_2 w_t, \quad D = [d_0 \ \cdots \ d_{22}].$$

Let λ be a unit right singular vector for $\sigma_{\min}(D)$, and choose k with $\lambda_k \neq 0$. If $D\lambda$ were zero, the k -th pairing column could be eliminated by replacing each remaining output vector with $\tilde{w}_t - (\lambda_t/\lambda_k)\tilde{w}_k$. For an approximate dependence the same operation gives a 22-term tensor $\mathcal{D}_{22}$, with exact error relative to the current tensor

$$\|\mathcal{D} - \mathcal{D}_{22}\|_F = \frac{\|D\lambda\|_2 \|\tilde{w}_k\|_2}{|\lambda_k|} = \frac{\sigma_{\min}(D) \|\tilde{w}_k\|_2}{|\lambda_k|}. \quad (8.1)$$

Thus a small pairing singular value alone is insufficient. The output factor may grow at the compensating rate.

To compare the result with the target tensor, write $E = \|\mathcal{D} - \mathcal{D}_{22}\|_F$ and $\varepsilon = \|T_{\langle 3,3,3 \rangle} - \mathcal{D}\|_F$, using the real tensor with the coefficients in (2.1). The triangle inequalities give

$$|E - \varepsilon| \leq \|T_{\langle 3,3,3 \rangle} - \mathcal{D}_{22}\|_F \leq E + \varepsilon. \quad (8.2)$$

Table 1 reports both quantities for a continuation from the integer 23-term scheme `serendipitous_8d34` in Perminov’s FastMatrixMultiplication collection [19]. The output vectors were transposed from the source’s column-major convention to (2.1); the source version and conversion are specified in Appendix D.6. The parameter t labels saved continuation points, not elapsed time. The same column, labelled 10 in the data, is eliminated at each point. Across these samples the pairing singular value falls by two orders of magnitude, but output growth keeps the deletion error of order one. The target residual remains below 4×10^{-12} . Thus (8.2) shows that the deleted representation is still about one unit from the target at each of these points.

TABLE 1. Pairing dependence and compensating output growth in a recorded real-coefficient continuation. Here E is the deletion error in (8.1), and ε is the target residual before deletion. Values are rounded from the archived data.

t	$\sigma_{\min}(D)$	$ \lambda_{10} $	$\ \tilde{w}_{10}\ _2$	E	ε
10	5.265×10^{-3}	0.7084	1.400×10^2	1.040	1.997×10^{-14}
20	7.051×10^{-4}	0.7076	1.064×10^3	1.061	1.902×10^{-13}
60	4.745×10^{-5}	0.7075	1.779×10^4	1.193	3.645×10^{-12}

Qiushi’s correction separated projective proximity from the tensor contribution it was meant to remove. The retained lesson was an exact one: a change to the first two factor lists must be assessed together with the output coefficients. The archive includes the continuation analysis, its corrected interpretation, and the data used in Table 1; the source links are collected in Appendix D.6.

8.2. Quotient cores and the completion problem. The finite-field search made a coordinate quotient a natural target. Taking $W = \langle E_{00} \rangle$ in the first factor gives an $8 \times 9 \times 9$ core. This is the E_{11} core of the research report, whose historical name uses one-based indices; the present paper uses indices $0, 1, 2$. A 19-term decomposition of this core, embedded in the coordinate complement, would need only the three deleted terms

$$\sum_{k=0}^2 E_{00} \otimes E_{0k} \otimes E_{0k} \quad (8.3)$$

to recover $T_{\langle 3,3,3 \rangle}$. It would therefore give a 22-product algorithm. The smaller object retained a direct route to the original problem.

Occupation constraints organized candidate first factors into finite configurations. Their feasibility, however, did not solve completion. For fixed first factors $a_t \in V/W$, the remaining obligation is

$$\sum_t a_t B_t[j, k] C_t[i, l] = \delta_{kl} q_W(E_{ij}) \quad (0 \leq i, j, k, l < 3). \quad (8.4)$$

Each pair B_t, C_t must satisfy all these equations simultaneously. Occupation records where the a_t lie, but omits these products and their shared coefficients. Fixed-factor solving, contractions, lift conditions, and relaxations examined different parts of this gap.

The gap also appeared in verification. An early cardinality encoding reused auxiliary variables between constraints and produced a spurious contradiction. Qiushi identified the collision, withdrew the affected exclusion, and rebuilt the encoding with disjoint counters. The mathematical requirement was then explicit: every legal multiplicity vector must extend to a simultaneous Boolean assignment. This requirement survives in the formal copy and counter semantics described in Appendix D.5.

The quotient search consequently left two distinct assets: the restoration formula for upper bounds and valid occupation constraints for lower bounds. The latter did not have to solve completion directly. They could instead force a configuration in which the full tensor itself supplied additional equations.

8.3. Returning to the full tensor. The split flattening introduced information absent from a quotient support: each complete algorithm term contributes an image space of dimension rank A_t , and these spaces together must span dimension 27. After the geometric reduction, the profile $(16, 1, 3)$ used exactly this dimension. There was no remaining dimensional overlap. Qiushi then used the uniqueness of components in that direct sum to obtain the saturation identities, and expanded their products in the coordinates of matrix multiplication.

This was a change in the kind of conclusion being sought. Earlier finite work had considered excluding completions of the surviving profile by additional support systems. The saturation argument instead gave a statement about every complete decomposition at rank sum 27: at most one first factor is invertible. It replaced the terminal support exclusions by Proposition 5.3. The research note on the shortened proof also identified that the proposed strengthening of orbit 479 was unnecessary for the coset reduction: its high-rank pair already has rank-one difference. That step requires only the eight all-high plane raises. The existing bound $R_{\mathbb{F}_2}(T_{W_{479}}) \geq 17$ still enters the line cover (3.9).

The same statement then returned information to the constructive problem. It restricts saturated 22-term algorithms through Corollary 6.1, while positive rank excess identifies where the argument must be extended.

8.4. Research memory and formal development. Qiushi Engine’s Meta-Trace links the history of questions, the evidence for claims, and changes in the research trajectory [18]. For this study, the accompanying record contains the deletion diagnostic, the core restoration map, the distinction between occupation and completion, the counter correction, and the saturation argument, together with the notes, programs, and computed data supporting them. Superseded interpretations are retained alongside the evidence that corrected them.

The subsequent Lean development and manuscript preparation included additional Codex assistance in proof completion, integration, and verification. Formalization preserved the structural argument while rebuilding its finite premises as proved quotient statements and integer certificates. The library also includes the occupation, substitution, and saturation lemmas used in the proof.

APPENDIX A. EXPLICIT FINITE PREMISES

A.1. Matrix codes and representative planes. For $0 \leq v < 512$ define $\text{mat}(v)_{ij}$ to be the bit at position $3i + j$ of v . Thus the least significant bit represents E_{00} , and code 272 represents $\text{diag}(0, 1, 1)$. A displayed tuple of codes denotes their $\mathbb{F}_2$ -linear span. The frozen RREF convention chooses pivots from bit 8 down to bit 0. The following ranks are the sorted ranks of the three nonzero elements, not necessarily the ranks in basis order.

TABLE 2. The eight all-high planes. Every inherited label is 18; every improved quotient lower bound is 19.

Index	Basis codes	Rank multiset	Orbit size
484	(19, 10)	(2, 2, 2)	98
485	(20, 10)	(2, 2, 2)	2,352
486	(68, 10)	(2, 2, 2)	1,176
487	(84, 10)	(2, 3, 3)	3,528
488	(96, 10)	(2, 2, 3)	14,112
489	(258, 10)	(2, 2, 2)	4,704
490	(275, 10)	(2, 3, 3)	4,704
491	(163, 84)	(3, 3, 3)	1,344

Their orbit sizes sum to 32,018. There are 43,435 two-planes in total. The six other orbit representatives have bases (2, 1), (10, 1), (16, 1), (20, 1), (84, 1), and (160, 1), with indices 478–483. Each contains a rank-one matrix and is outside the hypothesis of Corollary 3.3.

The total number of subspaces is obtained by counting ordered bases: each d -space has $\prod_{j=0}^{d-1} (2^d - 2^j)$ ordered bases, whereas V has $\prod_{j=0}^{d-1} (2^9 - 2^j)$ independent ordered d -tuples. Thus

$$\sum_{d=0}^9 \begin{bmatrix} 9 \\ d \end{bmatrix}_2 = 8,283,458, \quad \begin{bmatrix} n \\ d \end{bmatrix}_2 = \prod_{j=0}^{d-1} \frac{2^n - 2^j}{2^d - 2^j}.$$

Similarly $\begin{bmatrix} 9 \\ 2 \end{bmatrix}_2 = 43,435$, and $\sum_{d=1}^6 \begin{bmatrix} 7 \\ d \end{bmatrix}_2 = 29,210$. These count actual subspaces; the formal orbit classification supplies the separate coverage claim.

A.2. The normalized hyperplanes. The spaces $S = (272, 4, 2, 1)$ and $R = (4, 2, 1)$ have dimensions four and three. Their frozen values are 14 and 15. The other fourteen hyperplanes of S are listed below; each has frozen value 17. The index is the suffix in the formal name `affineHyperplane`.

Index	Basis codes	Index	Basis codes
0	(272, 4, 2)	7	(276, 2, 1)
1	(273, 4, 2)	8	(272, 5, 2)
2	(272, 4, 1)	9	(273, 5, 2)
3	(274, 4, 1)	10	(272, 6, 1)
4	(272, 4, 3)	11	(274, 6, 1)
5	(273, 4, 3)	12	(272, 5, 3)
6	(272, 2, 1)	13	(273, 5, 3)

Equivalently these are $\{\alpha p + e_0 w^T : a \cdot w = b\alpha\}$ for $a \in \mathbb{F}_2^3 \setminus 0$ and $b \in \mathbb{F}_2$. This formula proves that the list exhausts the fourteen affine-plane spans used in the proof.

The line representatives in the small premise interface are (1), (17), and (273), of matrix ranks one, two, and three. They are respectively equivalent to the frozen line representatives (1), (10), and (84), all with label 19.

A.3. Integer branch-certificate sizes. Table 3 describes the Lean integer branch certificates. A zero-forcing row has target-level bound 18 and removes its quotient directions by nonnegativity. Source rows retain their proved labels in (3.11). All systems begin with 127 nonzero directions and 29,210 rows; retaining fewer rows is a weakening, so infeasibility of the retained system proves infeasibility of the full one. The coefficient tests, row bindings, and exhaustive branches are part of the formal proof.

TABLE 3. Integer branch certificates after zero-weight elimination.

Plane	Live variables	Source rows	Zero-forcing rows	Leaves
484	43	1,665	84	569
485	41	421	86	40
486	41	262	86	14
487	48	668	79	89
488	41	413	86	32
489	32	371	95	43
490	43	713	84	115
491	49	726	78	120

A.4. Substitution and a source bound of twelve. The substitution rule used for the source bounds has a useful formulation in terms of slices. Let D be a finite-dimensional $\mathbb{F}_2$ -vector space, let β, γ be finite index sets, and write a tensor as $S : \beta \times \gamma \rightarrow D$. Its second-factor slices are the functions $S_b : c \mapsto S(b, c)$.

Lemma A.1 (Substitution with a surviving flattening). *Choose $b_1, \dots, b_k \in \beta$ such that the slices S_{b_l} are linearly independent, and $c_1, \dots, c_f \in \gamma$. Suppose that for every nonzero $y \in \mathbb{F}_2^f$ there exist $b \in \beta$ and $\phi \in D^*$ satisfying*

$$\phi \left(\sum_j y_j S(b_l, c_j) \right) = 0 \quad (1 \leq l \leq k), \quad \phi \left(\sum_j y_j S(b, c_j) \right) \neq 0. \quad (\text{A.1})$$

Then $R_{\mathbb{F}_2}(S) \geq k + f$.

Proof. Consider a decomposition $S(b, c) = \sum_{t=1}^r a_t B_t(b) C_t(c)$. If $k > 0$, the nonzero slice at b_1 forces $B_{t_0}(b_1) = 1$ for some t_0 . Replace the slice family by

$$S'(b, c) = S(b, c) + B_{t_0}(b) S(b_1, c).$$

The t_0 -th term cancels, leaving a decomposition with at most $r - 1$ terms. The other selected slices remain independent: a relation among them would give a relation among the original k selected slices, with the coefficient of S_{b_1} adjusted accordingly. For a witness in (A.1), the added multiple of S_{b_1} vanishes under ϕ . Hence the same condition holds for S' and its $k - 1$ remaining selected slices.

Iterate k times. In the final family, no nonzero linear combination of the f selected columns vanishes, since the surviving witness detects it at some b . These columns are therefore independent in the flattening with column index c and row space $D \otimes \mathbb{F}_2^\beta$. Its rank is at least f , whereas a decomposition with at most $r - k$ terms gives rank at most $r - k$. Thus $r \geq k + f$. $\square$

For a source actually used in the formal development, set

$$J = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad K = E_{22}, \quad W = H_J \cap H_K.$$

This is W_{11} in the catalogue. Quotient coordinates are $X \mapsto (\langle J, X \rangle, \langle K, X \rangle)$, so its slice family, with $b = (j, k)$ and $c = (i, l)$, is

$$S((j, k), (i, l)) = (\delta_{i+j, 2} \delta_{kl}, \delta_{i, 2} \delta_{j, 2} \delta_{kl}). \quad (\text{A.2})$$

Choose the six slices with $j = 0, 1$ and all k , and the six columns with $i = 0, 2$ and all l . The slices are independent: in the first component, each has a different nonzero coordinate $(i, l) = (2 - j, k)$.

Write a combination of the selected columns as $y = (a, b) \in \mathbb{F}_2^3 \oplus \mathbb{F}_2^3$, where a corresponds to $i = 0$ and b to $i = 2$. If $b \neq 0$, the second coordinate functional annihilates all six selected slice evaluations and detects $b_k \neq 0$ in a slice $(2, k)$. If $b = 0$ and $a \neq 0$, the first coordinate functional instead annihilates those evaluations and detects $a_k \neq 0$ in a slice $(2, k)$. This proves (A.1) for every nonzero y . Lemma A.1 yields $R_{\mathbb{F}_2}(T_{W_{11}}) \geq 6 + 6 = 12$. This example and (3.5) illustrate the two complementary operations used in the source proofs: preserving a flattening through substitution, and combining quotient capacities.

APPENDIX B. THE COMPLETE FROZEN CATALOGUE

Table 4 gives every pair (W_i, ℓ_i) used in definition (3.1). Parentheses enclose basis codes in the convention of Appendix A; the empty tuple is the zero space. The dimension is the number of basis vectors. The labels are frozen lower bounds, not asserted exact ranks. In particular entries 484–491 remain labelled 18 here even though their quotient ranks are at least 19.

Together with the explicitly defined group G , this catalogue specifies all eight systems (3.10) without an external lookup file. For any superspace row U , find a G -image of a listed basis spanning U and use its label. The proved coverage and consistency make this procedure total and independent of the representative found. The local source package also includes the same catalogue as structured JSON. Its transcription is checked against all 496 formal registry entries and the literal Lean basis and label definitions.

Table 4: All 496 frozen representative bases and labels.

i	Basis of W_i	ℓ_i	i	Basis of W_i	ℓ_i
0	(256, 128, 64, 32, 16, 8, 4, 2, 1)	0	248	(8, 4, 2, 1)	14
1	(128, 64, 32, 16, 8, 4, 2, 1)	3	249	(80, 4, 2, 1)	14
2	(256, 160, 64, 16, 8, 4, 2, 1)	6	250	(16, 8, 2, 1)	15
3	(256, 128, 68, 32, 20, 8, 2, 1)	9	251	(20, 8, 2, 1)	16
4	(64, 32, 16, 8, 4, 2, 1)	6	252	(32, 8, 2, 1)	15
5	(160, 64, 16, 8, 4, 2, 1)	9	253	(68, 8, 2, 1)	16
6	(256, 64, 16, 8, 4, 2, 1)	6	254	(84, 8, 2, 1)	16
7	(256, 96, 16, 8, 4, 2, 1)	9	255	(96, 8, 2, 1)	16
8	(304, 160, 64, 8, 4, 2, 1)	9	256	(160, 8, 2, 1)	15
9	(256, 160, 80, 8, 4, 2, 1)	9	257	(256, 8, 2, 1)	14
10	(256, 160, 68, 16, 8, 2, 1)	12	258	(272, 8, 2, 1)	15
11	(128, 68, 32, 20, 8, 2, 1)	12	259	(32, 12, 2, 1)	15
12	(256, 128, 32, 20, 8, 2, 1)	9	260	(80, 12, 2, 1)	16
13	(256, 160, 68, 20, 8, 2, 1)	12	261	(96, 12, 2, 1)	16
14	(256, 128, 96, 20, 8, 2, 1)	12	262	(132, 12, 2, 1)	17
15	(256, 128, 84, 32, 8, 2, 1)	9	263	(160, 12, 2, 1)	16

Continued on the next page

Table 4: continued

i	Basis of W_i	ℓ_i	i	Basis of W_i	ℓ_i
16	(256, 148, 80, 32, 12, 2, 1)	12	264	(256, 12, 2, 1)	16
17	(262, 128, 68, 32, 20, 10, 1)	14	265	(272, 12, 2, 1)	16
18	(32, 16, 8, 4, 2, 1)	9	266	(80, 32, 2, 1)	15
19	(64, 16, 8, 4, 2, 1)	9	267	(84, 32, 2, 1)	16
20	(96, 16, 8, 4, 2, 1)	12	268	(256, 32, 2, 1)	14
21	(256, 16, 8, 4, 2, 1)	9	269	(264, 32, 2, 1)	16
22	(160, 64, 8, 4, 2, 1)	9	270	(320, 32, 2, 1)	15
23	(128, 80, 8, 4, 2, 1)	12	271	(336, 32, 2, 1)	15
24	(160, 80, 8, 4, 2, 1)	11	272	(152, 80, 2, 1)	15
25	(256, 80, 8, 4, 2, 1)	12	273	(156, 80, 2, 1)	16
26	(288, 128, 8, 4, 2, 1)	9	274	(160, 80, 2, 1)	16
27	(304, 160, 8, 4, 2, 1)	11	275	(160, 84, 2, 1)	16
28	(280, 160, 80, 4, 2, 1)	11	276	(272, 96, 2, 1)	16
29	(160, 68, 16, 8, 2, 1)	15	277	(296, 96, 2, 1)	15
30	(256, 68, 16, 8, 2, 1)	12	278	(304, 96, 2, 1)	16
31	(68, 32, 20, 8, 2, 1)	15	279	(68, 16, 10, 1)	17
32	(128, 32, 20, 8, 2, 1)	12	280	(96, 16, 10, 1)	16
33	(160, 68, 20, 8, 2, 1)	14	281	(256, 16, 10, 1)	16
34	(256, 68, 20, 8, 2, 1)	14	282	(258, 16, 10, 1)	17
35	(128, 96, 20, 8, 2, 1)	15	283	(32, 20, 10, 1)	16
36	(256, 96, 20, 8, 2, 1)	13	284	(68, 20, 10, 1)	17
37	(256, 128, 20, 8, 2, 1)	12	285	(96, 20, 10, 1)	17
38	(288, 128, 20, 8, 2, 1)	12	286	(128, 20, 10, 1)	16
39	(256, 160, 20, 8, 2, 1)	12	287	(160, 20, 10, 1)	17
40	(128, 84, 32, 8, 2, 1)	12	288	(256, 20, 10, 1)	16
41	(384, 84, 32, 8, 2, 1)	12	289	(258, 20, 10, 1)	17
42	(256, 128, 32, 8, 2, 1)	9	290	(68, 32, 10, 1)	17
43	(272, 128, 32, 8, 2, 1)	12	291	(84, 32, 10, 1)	16
44	(272, 132, 32, 8, 2, 1)	12	292	(128, 32, 10, 1)	16
45	(256, 160, 68, 8, 2, 1)	13	293	(132, 32, 10, 1)	16
46	(288, 160, 68, 8, 2, 1)	12	294	(258, 32, 10, 1)	16
47	(304, 160, 68, 8, 2, 1)	14	295	(272, 32, 10, 1)	17
48	(256, 160, 84, 8, 2, 1)	12	296	(320, 32, 10, 1)	16
49	(256, 132, 96, 8, 2, 1)	12	297	(336, 32, 10, 1)	16
50	(272, 132, 96, 8, 2, 1)	13	298	(384, 32, 10, 1)	16
51	(148, 80, 32, 12, 2, 1)	14	299	(386, 32, 10, 1)	16
52	(256, 80, 32, 12, 2, 1)	12	300	(160, 68, 10, 1)	17
53	(384, 80, 32, 12, 2, 1)	12	301	(176, 68, 10, 1)	17
54	(256, 132, 32, 12, 2, 1)	12	302	(304, 68, 10, 1)	17
55	(272, 132, 32, 12, 2, 1)	14	303	(160, 84, 10, 1)	16
56	(256, 160, 80, 12, 2, 1)	14	304	(256, 84, 10, 1)	16
57	(272, 132, 96, 12, 2, 1)	14	305	(258, 84, 10, 1)	17
58	(256, 152, 80, 32, 2, 1)	12	306	(132, 96, 10, 1)	17
59	(264, 152, 80, 32, 2, 1)	12	307	(272, 96, 10, 1)	17
60	(256, 156, 80, 32, 2, 1)	12	308	(288, 96, 10, 1)	16
61	(264, 156, 80, 32, 2, 1)	12	309	(290, 96, 10, 1)	17
62	(272, 156, 80, 32, 2, 1)	12	310	(304, 96, 10, 1)	16
63	(256, 160, 68, 16, 10, 1)	14	311	(384, 96, 10, 1)	16
64	(258, 160, 68, 16, 10, 1)	15	312	(386, 96, 10, 1)	17

Continued on the next page

Table 4: continued

i	Basis of W_i	ℓ_i	i	Basis of W_i	ℓ_i
65	(260, 160, 68, 16, 10, 1)	15	313	(256, 160, 10, 1)	16
66	(260, 164, 68, 16, 10, 1)	12	314	(258, 160, 10, 1)	17
67	(262, 164, 68, 16, 10, 1)	15	315	(260, 160, 10, 1)	17
68	(288, 164, 68, 16, 10, 1)	14	316	(262, 160, 10, 1)	17
69	(256, 164, 96, 16, 10, 1)	15	317	(288, 160, 10, 1)	15
70	(258, 164, 96, 16, 10, 1)	13	318	(290, 160, 10, 1)	17
71	(128, 68, 32, 20, 10, 1)	14	319	(292, 160, 10, 1)	16
72	(258, 68, 32, 20, 10, 1)	15	320	(304, 160, 10, 1)	16
73	(322, 192, 32, 20, 10, 1)	12	321	(306, 160, 10, 1)	17
74	(324, 192, 32, 20, 10, 1)	14	322	(308, 160, 10, 1)	17
75	(262, 160, 68, 20, 10, 1)	16	323	(192, 36, 16, 1)	15
76	(288, 160, 68, 20, 10, 1)	15	324	(196, 36, 16, 1)	16
77	(260, 128, 96, 20, 10, 1)	15	325	(448, 36, 16, 1)	15
78	(262, 128, 96, 20, 10, 1)	14	326	(450, 36, 16, 1)	15
79	(258, 160, 96, 20, 10, 1)	14	327	(132, 96, 16, 1)	15
80	(260, 160, 96, 20, 10, 1)	15	328	(140, 96, 16, 1)	16
81	(290, 160, 96, 20, 10, 1)	15	329	(164, 96, 16, 1)	16
82	(292, 160, 96, 20, 10, 1)	14	330	(258, 96, 16, 1)	16
83	(274, 144, 68, 32, 10, 1)	14	331	(290, 96, 16, 1)	15
84	(258, 128, 84, 32, 10, 1)	14	332	(296, 96, 16, 1)	16
85	(262, 131, 68, 35, 20, 10)	17	333	(298, 96, 16, 1)	16
86	(16, 8, 4, 2, 1)	12	334	(140, 98, 16, 1)	16
87	(64, 8, 4, 2, 1)	11	335	(164, 98, 16, 1)	16
88	(80, 8, 4, 2, 1)	13	336	(256, 98, 16, 1)	16
89	(128, 8, 4, 2, 1)	12	337	(258, 98, 16, 1)	16
90	(160, 8, 4, 2, 1)	12	338	(288, 98, 16, 1)	16
91	(152, 80, 4, 2, 1)	12	339	(296, 98, 16, 1)	16
92	(160, 80, 4, 2, 1)	13	340	(258, 100, 16, 1)	16
93	(68, 16, 8, 2, 1)	15	341	(290, 100, 16, 1)	16
94	(256, 16, 8, 2, 1)	12	342	(296, 100, 16, 1)	16
95	(32, 20, 8, 2, 1)	15	343	(298, 100, 16, 1)	16
96	(68, 20, 8, 2, 1)	16	344	(386, 100, 16, 1)	16
97	(96, 20, 8, 2, 1)	15	345	(416, 100, 16, 1)	15
98	(128, 20, 8, 2, 1)	15	346	(424, 100, 16, 1)	16
99	(160, 20, 8, 2, 1)	15	347	(258, 228, 16, 1)	16
100	(256, 20, 8, 2, 1)	14	348	(262, 228, 16, 1)	16
101	(84, 32, 8, 2, 1)	15	349	(292, 228, 16, 1)	15
102	(128, 32, 8, 2, 1)	12	350	(294, 228, 16, 1)	16
103	(132, 32, 8, 2, 1)	15	351	(302, 228, 16, 1)	16
104	(384, 32, 8, 2, 1)	12	352	(136, 38, 20, 1)	16
105	(160, 68, 8, 2, 1)	15	353	(196, 38, 20, 1)	17
106	(256, 68, 8, 2, 1)	14	354	(136, 96, 20, 1)	17
107	(272, 68, 8, 2, 1)	15	355	(164, 96, 20, 1)	17
108	(160, 84, 8, 2, 1)	15	356	(290, 96, 20, 1)	17
109	(256, 84, 8, 2, 1)	14	357	(298, 96, 20, 1)	17
110	(132, 96, 8, 2, 1)	15	358	(386, 96, 20, 1)	17
111	(256, 96, 8, 2, 1)	14	359	(424, 96, 20, 1)	17
112	(272, 96, 8, 2, 1)	15	360	(160, 100, 20, 1)	16
113	(384, 96, 8, 2, 1)	14	361	(298, 100, 20, 1)	17

Continued on the next page

Table 4: continued

i	Basis of W_i	ℓ_i	i	Basis of W_i	ℓ_i
114	(256, 160, 8, 2, 1)	14	362	(296, 102, 20, 1)	17
115	(288, 160, 8, 2, 1)	12	363	(262, 160, 20, 1)	17
116	(304, 160, 8, 2, 1)	14	364	(264, 160, 20, 1)	16
117	(80, 32, 12, 2, 1)	14	365	(266, 160, 20, 1)	17
118	(132, 32, 12, 2, 1)	15	366	(268, 160, 20, 1)	17
119	(256, 32, 12, 2, 1)	14	367	(270, 160, 20, 1)	17
120	(272, 32, 12, 2, 1)	15	368	(322, 160, 20, 1)	17
121	(384, 32, 12, 2, 1)	14	369	(326, 160, 20, 1)	17
122	(148, 80, 12, 2, 1)	15	370	(334, 160, 20, 1)	16
123	(160, 80, 12, 2, 1)	15	371	(290, 224, 20, 1)	17
124	(256, 80, 12, 2, 1)	15	372	(298, 224, 20, 1)	17
125	(132, 96, 12, 2, 1)	15	373	(300, 224, 20, 1)	17
126	(256, 96, 12, 2, 1)	14	374	(282, 160, 84, 1)	17
127	(272, 96, 12, 2, 1)	15	375	(298, 160, 84, 1)	16
128	(384, 96, 12, 2, 1)	15	376	(160, 68, 19, 10)	17
129	(288, 132, 12, 2, 1)	15	377	(161, 68, 19, 10)	17
130	(256, 160, 12, 2, 1)	15	378	(162, 68, 19, 10)	17
131	(288, 160, 12, 2, 1)	14	379	(164, 68, 19, 10)	17
132	(304, 160, 12, 2, 1)	15	380	(258, 68, 19, 10)	17
133	(152, 80, 32, 2, 1)	14	381	(261, 68, 19, 10)	16
134	(156, 80, 32, 2, 1)	15	382	(262, 68, 19, 10)	17
135	(256, 80, 32, 2, 1)	12	383	(289, 68, 19, 10)	17
136	(264, 80, 32, 2, 1)	14	384	(68, 35, 20, 10)	17
137	(272, 80, 32, 2, 1)	14	385	(160, 68, 20, 10)	17
138	(400, 80, 32, 2, 1)	12	386	(161, 68, 20, 10)	17
139	(408, 80, 32, 2, 1)	14	387	(162, 68, 20, 10)	17
140	(256, 84, 32, 2, 1)	14	388	(164, 68, 20, 10)	17
141	(264, 84, 32, 2, 1)	15	389	(166, 68, 20, 10)	17
142	(272, 84, 32, 2, 1)	14	390	(167, 68, 20, 10)	17
143	(400, 84, 32, 2, 1)	14	391	(258, 68, 20, 10)	16
144	(408, 84, 32, 2, 1)	15	392	(259, 68, 20, 10)	17
145	(280, 160, 80, 2, 1)	14	393	(262, 68, 20, 10)	17
146	(280, 160, 84, 2, 1)	15	394	(289, 68, 20, 10)	17
147	(160, 68, 16, 10, 1)	16	395	(131, 96, 20, 10)	17
148	(164, 68, 16, 10, 1)	15	396	(133, 96, 20, 10)	17
149	(256, 68, 16, 10, 1)	15	397	(135, 96, 20, 10)	17
150	(258, 68, 16, 10, 1)	16	398	(161, 96, 20, 10)	17
151	(288, 68, 16, 10, 1)	15	399	(164, 96, 20, 10)	17
152	(164, 96, 16, 10, 1)	16	400	(259, 96, 20, 10)	17
153	(256, 96, 16, 10, 1)	15	401	(261, 96, 20, 10)	17
154	(288, 96, 16, 10, 1)	14	402	(391, 96, 20, 10)	17
155	(290, 96, 16, 10, 1)	15	403	(304, 161, 68, 10)	17
156	(68, 32, 20, 10, 1)	16	404	(309, 162, 68, 10)	17
157	(128, 32, 20, 10, 1)	15	405	(279, 178, 68, 10)	16
158	(192, 32, 20, 10, 1)	15	406	(276, 179, 68, 10)	17
159	(160, 68, 20, 10, 1)	16	407	(257, 163, 84, 10)	17
160	(258, 68, 20, 10, 1)	16	408	(262, 163, 84, 10)	17
161	(288, 68, 20, 10, 1)	16	409	(276, 165, 96, 10)	17
162	(128, 96, 20, 10, 1)	16	410	(4, 2, 1)	15

Continued on the next page

Table 4: continued

i	Basis of W_i	ℓ_i	i	Basis of W_i	ℓ_i
163	(160, 96, 20, 10, 1)	15	411	(8, 2, 1)	16
164	(256, 96, 20, 10, 1)	16	412	(12, 2, 1)	17
165	(288, 96, 20, 10, 1)	15	413	(32, 2, 1)	16
166	(290, 96, 20, 10, 1)	16	414	(80, 2, 1)	17
167	(258, 128, 20, 10, 1)	15	415	(84, 2, 1)	17
168	(260, 128, 20, 10, 1)	15	416	(96, 2, 1)	17
169	(288, 128, 20, 10, 1)	15	417	(16, 10, 1)	17
170	(292, 128, 20, 10, 1)	14	418	(20, 10, 1)	17
171	(294, 128, 20, 10, 1)	15	419	(32, 10, 1)	17
172	(256, 160, 20, 10, 1)	15	420	(68, 10, 1)	18
173	(258, 160, 20, 10, 1)	15	421	(84, 10, 1)	17
174	(260, 160, 20, 10, 1)	15	422	(96, 10, 1)	17
175	(262, 160, 20, 10, 1)	16	423	(160, 10, 1)	17
176	(128, 68, 32, 10, 1)	15	424	(256, 10, 1)	17
177	(144, 68, 32, 10, 1)	15	425	(258, 10, 1)	18
178	(272, 68, 32, 10, 1)	16	426	(272, 10, 1)	18
179	(128, 84, 32, 10, 1)	15	427	(36, 16, 1)	17
180	(144, 84, 32, 10, 1)	15	428	(96, 16, 1)	17
181	(258, 84, 32, 10, 1)	15	429	(98, 16, 1)	17
182	(272, 84, 32, 10, 1)	15	430	(100, 16, 1)	17
183	(384, 84, 32, 10, 1)	15	431	(228, 16, 1)	17
184	(386, 84, 32, 10, 1)	15	432	(256, 16, 1)	16
185	(400, 84, 32, 10, 1)	15	433	(258, 16, 1)	17
186	(258, 128, 32, 10, 1)	15	434	(266, 16, 1)	17
187	(262, 128, 32, 10, 1)	15	435	(38, 20, 1)	17
188	(274, 128, 32, 10, 1)	15	436	(96, 20, 1)	17
189	(278, 128, 32, 10, 1)	15	437	(100, 20, 1)	17
190	(324, 128, 32, 10, 1)	15	438	(102, 20, 1)	17
191	(326, 128, 32, 10, 1)	14	439	(160, 20, 1)	17
192	(340, 128, 32, 10, 1)	15	440	(224, 20, 1)	17
193	(342, 128, 32, 10, 1)	15	441	(258, 20, 1)	17
194	(262, 132, 32, 10, 1)	16	442	(264, 20, 1)	17
195	(274, 132, 32, 10, 1)	15	443	(266, 20, 1)	17
196	(278, 132, 32, 10, 1)	16	444	(160, 84, 1)	17
197	(324, 132, 32, 10, 1)	15	445	(266, 84, 1)	17
198	(326, 132, 32, 10, 1)	15	446	(304, 160, 1)	17
199	(336, 132, 32, 10, 1)	15	447	(306, 160, 1)	17
200	(338, 132, 32, 10, 1)	15	448	(314, 160, 1)	17
201	(340, 132, 32, 10, 1)	16	449	(316, 160, 1)	17
202	(304, 160, 68, 10, 1)	16	450	(68, 19, 10)	18
203	(272, 176, 68, 10, 1)	16	451	(257, 19, 10)	18
204	(274, 176, 68, 10, 1)	16	452	(35, 20, 10)	18
205	(276, 176, 68, 10, 1)	16	453	(68, 20, 10)	18
206	(256, 160, 84, 10, 1)	14	454	(96, 20, 10)	18
207	(258, 160, 84, 10, 1)	15	455	(129, 20, 10)	18
208	(260, 160, 84, 10, 1)	15	456	(161, 20, 10)	18
209	(288, 160, 84, 10, 1)	15	457	(449, 20, 10)	18
210	(290, 160, 84, 10, 1)	15	458	(450, 20, 10)	18
211	(292, 160, 84, 10, 1)	15	459	(160, 68, 10)	18

Continued on the next page

Table 4: continued

i	Basis of W_i	ℓ_i	i	Basis of W_i	ℓ_i
212	(274, 132, 96, 10, 1)	16	460	(161, 68, 10)	17
213	(276, 132, 96, 10, 1)	16	461	(162, 68, 10)	18
214	(278, 132, 96, 10, 1)	16	462	(178, 68, 10)	18
215	(292, 132, 96, 10, 1)	14	463	(179, 68, 10)	18
216	(294, 132, 96, 10, 1)	16	464	(180, 68, 10)	18
217	(308, 132, 96, 10, 1)	16	465	(304, 68, 10)	18
218	(310, 132, 96, 10, 1)	16	466	(305, 68, 10)	18
219	(324, 192, 36, 16, 1)	12	467	(163, 84, 10)	18
220	(334, 192, 36, 16, 1)	15	468	(164, 84, 10)	18
221	(330, 196, 36, 16, 1)	15	469	(258, 84, 10)	18
222	(262, 132, 96, 16, 1)	15	470	(259, 84, 10)	18
223	(294, 132, 96, 16, 1)	15	471	(289, 84, 10)	18
224	(302, 132, 96, 16, 1)	15	472	(290, 84, 10)	18
225	(262, 140, 96, 16, 1)	15	473	(293, 84, 10)	18
226	(290, 140, 96, 16, 1)	15	474	(294, 84, 10)	18
227	(294, 140, 96, 16, 1)	15	475	(165, 96, 10)	18
228	(262, 164, 96, 16, 1)	15	476	(276, 96, 10)	18
229	(266, 164, 96, 16, 1)	15	477	(286, 163, 84)	18
230	(270, 164, 96, 16, 1)	15	478	(2, 1)	17
231	(256, 140, 98, 16, 1)	15	479	(10, 1)	18
232	(258, 140, 98, 16, 1)	15	480	(16, 1)	18
233	(260, 140, 98, 16, 1)	15	481	(20, 1)	18
234	(264, 164, 98, 16, 1)	15	482	(84, 1)	18
235	(326, 136, 38, 20, 1)	16	483	(160, 1)	18
236	(262, 136, 96, 20, 1)	16	484	(19, 10)	18
237	(266, 136, 96, 20, 1)	16	485	(20, 10)	18
238	(294, 136, 96, 20, 1)	16	486	(68, 10)	18
239	(262, 160, 68, 19, 10)	16	487	(84, 10)	18
240	(261, 161, 68, 19, 10)	16	488	(96, 10)	18
241	(258, 162, 68, 19, 10)	16	489	(258, 10)	18
242	(258, 164, 68, 19, 10)	16	490	(275, 10)	18
243	(131, 68, 35, 20, 10)	17	491	(163, 84)	18
244	(133, 68, 35, 20, 10)	16	492	(1)	19
245	(262, 161, 68, 20, 10)	16	493	(10)	19
246	(259, 162, 68, 20, 10)	16	494	(84)	19
247	(259, 135, 96, 20, 10)	17	495	()	20

APPENDIX C. AN EXPLICIT 23-TERM WITNESS

For completeness, the following triples of row-major codes give a length-23 decomposition in convention (2.1). They are the reduction modulo two of the integer scheme `gg-333-rank23-rec-0-0-0-z.txt` from the flip-cpd collection of Khoruzhii, Gelß, and Pokutta [20]. Product order and row-major output coordinates are preserved. Appendix D.6 fixes the source version. This is the witness used by the formal declaration `rank23_entry_identity`.

t	A_t	B_t	C_t	t	A_t	B_t	C_t
1	400	304	418	13	284	264	12
2	260	193	10	14	9	67	66
3	73	7	64	15	256	432	130
4	393	12	68	16	146	40	4
5	292	448	8	17	448	4	320
6	8	2	210	18	7	8	5
7	265	72	65	19	32	128	24
8	146	16	2	20	384	52	288
9	269	65	3	21	268	9	9
10	72	2	192	22	56	256	40
11	392	260	36	23	16	16	432
12	144	288	390				

To check the witness, decode each integer into its nine bits and compute

$$\sum_{t=1}^{23} A_t[i, j] B_t[u, v] C_t[w, z] \pmod{2}.$$

For every choice of the six indices in $\{0, 1, 2\}$ this equals 1 precisely when $u = j$, $w = i$, and $z = v$, and is zero otherwise. These are all 729 tensor coordinates. This finite identity is checked by reduction in Lean, and it can also be reproduced directly from the table. Bilinearity then gives (2.3) for all input pairs. Together with Theorem 1.1, it proves the interval [21, 23].

APPENDIX D. FORMAL INTERFACES AND VERIFICATION RECORD

D.1. Statements and dependencies. The formal project uses Lean 4.33.1 and Mathlib, with dependency versions fixed in the accompanying source package. Definitions use the tensor convention (2.1). The declaration `tensorEntry_identity_iff_bilinearAlgorithm` proves its equivalence with (2.3) on all inputs. In the namespace `QiushiMatmul`, the two principal statements are

```
rank_ge_21 : RankAtLeast 21,
rank_between_21_and_23 : RankAtLeast 21 ∧ TensorEntryRankAtMost 23.
```

Here `RankAtLeast n` quantifies over every length r and every entrywise decomposition of that length, allowing zero summands, and asserts $n \leq r$.

The closed definition `provedFinitePremises` supplies the line, all-high plane, and normalized affine-plane bounds to `rank_ge_21_of_premises`. The plane bounds are `plane484_rank_ge_19` and `plane485Gen_1b19` through `plane491Gen_1b19`. The first is the named-space version of `plane484Gen_1b19` at `spanCodes` [19, 10]. Their proofs use separately established source bounds and checked tensor transports.

D.2. Locating the source bounds. All paths in this subsection are relative to the accompanying `formalization/` directory [17].

For the source-bound rules in Section 3.2, `contraction_seed_invertible_minor` proves the contraction bound from an explicit inverse minor; its multi-contraction versions handle stacked flattenings. `weighted_cover_quotient_decomp_false` proves the cover inequality,

and `step81o8s2Span_lb` is the source bound 9 in (3.5). `no_short_of_deletions` is Lemma A.1; `orbit11_lb12` is its worked application to W_{11} . The concrete weighted bound for W_{450} is `step108_orbit450_lb18_unconditional`. The interface `generic_plane_qra` combines source bounds, quotient membership, zero-forcing coverage, and an integer-system exclusion to obtain each plane raise.

The line-cover proof (3.9) is in `QiushiLineCoverageFinal.lean`, with its 255 planes, labels, and membership tests in `QiushiLineCoverageDefs.lean` and the eight coverage chunks it imports. The bound-17 inputs are `orbit478_lb17_mono` and `orbit479_lb17_graded`, transported by containment from the bounds for W_{412} and W_{417} . The four bound-18 inputs are `plane480Gen_lb18` through `plane483Gen_lb18`. Combining them gives `line_rank1_ge19` in `QiushiFinalTheorem.lean`. The rank-two and rank-three line transfers are in `QiushiLineFromPlane.lean`: the matrices of codes 25 in W_{484} and 106 in W_{488} are sent to codes 17 and 273, respectively.

The three affine-span proofs are collected in `QiushiRemainingPremises.lean` as `affineHyperplane0_rank_ge_17` through `affineHyperplane2_rank_ge_17`. For $(272, 4, 2)$, `QiushiMonoOrbit414From262.lean` uses the bound in `QiushiBranch262Extraction.lean` and the transformation $X \mapsto P^T X Q^{-T}$ with matrix codes $P = 161$, $Q = 84$; the preimages of the three generators have codes 136, 1, 2 in W_{262} . For $(273, 4, 2)$ and $(272, 4, 1)$, the files `QiushiBranch415Extraction.lean` and `QiushiBranch416Extraction.lean` connect the quotient decompositions to the 101-row and 373-row integer systems. Their respective `Dispatch` modules provide the source bounds and membership proofs, and the `NoModel` modules assemble the branch refutations. The eleven further affine spans are transported in `QiushiFinitePremisesReducer.lean`.

D.3. Catalogue and occupation interfaces. In the namespace `FrozenRegistry`, the theorem `all_representatives` proves the listed bounds. The declarations `L0_rank_sound` and `coverage_with_rank_bound` combine them with orbit coverage and consistent labels, as in Proposition 6.2.

Supplementary declarations prove the fourteen two-plane orbits, subspace counts, quotient/restriction equivalence, all 233,680 row bindings in the eight full occupation systems, target-19 occupation controls, projections of 23-term decompositions, and exact singleton capacities. In the namespace `FrozenOccupation`, `plane484_no_model` through `plane491_no_model` exclude arbitrary integer models of (3.10). These are separate from the tensor-rank statements and do not identify occupation feasibility with decomposition existence.

D.4. Recorded kernel checks. All 13,438 registered modules passed fresh-source compilation. The 89 terminal declarations and their dependencies were then replayed in the following six groups:

Group	Roots	Replayed declarations
Main theorem and global finite bounds	6	143,943
Complete calibration	7	37,629
Orbit classification and exact labels	12	33,687
Full occupation systems	8	47,338
Structural results and consequences	51	36,421
Boolean encodings	5	6,713

All six groups passed. Their dependency closures overlap, so the right-hand column is not additive. Each run used the official `Lean.Environment.replay` from an empty kernel environment, with constructor and recursor checks [16]. Root types and transitive axioms were also audited. These executions recheck the proof using Lean’s kernel; they do not constitute a second implementation of the kernel.

D.5. Certificate realizations. The main formal theorem uses integer branch certificates with proved quotient semantics. In the Boolean realization, a singleton cap c_q is encoded by

$x_q = \sum_{j=1}^{c_q} y_{qj}$, where the y_{qj} are Boolean copies. Every legal integer count is represented by choosing exactly x_q true copies; conversely, summing the copies recovers the count. Each occupation row becomes a cardinality constraint. Sequential counters [21] with disjoint auxiliary-variable sets encode all rows simultaneously, including the two inequalities imposing the total. Thus the integer system and its Boolean encoding are equisatisfiable.

Seven quotients have only singleton caps 0 and 1; orbit 489 has one direction with cap 2, represented by two copies. The Lean development proves the generic Boolean-copy and disjoint-counter semantics as well as the concrete integer exclusions. The historical CNF/DRAT certificates give a separate computational realization of the eight exclusions: their exact DIMACS and DRAT files are checked by the original proof package, whereas Lean checks the integer branch certificates. Feasible target-19 occupation vectors and projected 23-term controls check consistency of the constraints; they do not construct rank-19 quotient decompositions.

The build instructions and verification record for the proof library [17] identify the same sources, certificate data, and dependencies. The manuscript’s LaTeX package includes the finite catalogue and verification summary, and can be built independently of the formalization.

D.6. Sources for the research trajectory. The following links fix the research materials underlying Section 8 to a single repository revision. The manuscript data file `data/artifact-sources.json` also lists the upstream schemes and their coordinate conversions.

The numerical example uses the pairing singular values and the absorbed-factor data. The latter normalize a pairing column by a nonzero coordinate; Table 1 converts to unit Euclidean norm before applying (8.1). The target residuals are the recorded `solve.brent_residual_norm` values at $t = 10, 20, 60$ in the saved continuation states, which also contain all 621 coefficients at each point. The corrected cancellation analysis records the change in interpretation. The manuscript source includes the selected values and the arithmetic used for the displayed table.

The continuation starts from the integer scheme in Perminov’s collection [19]. The first two coefficient vectors are retained; the third is reindexed by $w_{3i+k}^{\text{new}} = w_{3k+i}^{\text{source}}$. The conversion program and the converted scheme specify the exact starting point. Appendix C uses a different construction, the general 3×3 integer scheme in flip-cpd [20]. Reducing its coefficients modulo two and reading $a_1, \dots, a_9$, $b_1, \dots, b_9$, and $c_1, \dots, c_9$ in row-major order gives exactly the printed triples.

The core-bridge analysis explains the relation between quotient construction and full-tensor bounds. The counter correction isolates the incompatible auxiliary-variable allocation and checks the corrected cardinality constraint. The shortened saturation proof records the replacement of the terminal support exclusions by saturation and the removal of the proposed orbit-479 strengthening from the coset reduction. These notes describe research states at the time they were written; the theorem and its final dependencies are given in the present paper and formalization.

REFERENCES

- [1] Volker Strassen. Gaussian elimination is not optimal. *Numerische Mathematik*, 13(4):354–356, 1969. doi:10.1007/BF02165411.
- [2] Julian D. Laderman. A noncommutative algorithm for multiplying 3×3 matrices using 23 multiplications. *Bulletin of the American Mathematical Society*, 82(1):126–128, 1976. doi:10.1090/S0002-9904-1976-13988-2.
- [3] Peter Bürgisser, Michael Clausen, and Mohammad Amin Shokrollahi. *Algebraic Complexity Theory*, volume 315 of *Grundlehren der mathematischen Wissenschaften*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1997. URL: <https://link.springer.com/book/10.1007/978-3-662-03338-8>, doi:10.1007/978-3-662-03338-8.
- [4] Chengu Wang. A lower bound of 21 for 3×3 matrix multiplication over $\mathbb{F}_2$. arXiv:2609.06725v2, 2026. URL: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2609.06725v2>.
- [5] Markus Bläser. On the complexity of the multiplication of matrices of small formats. *Journal of Complexity*, 19(1):43–60, 2003. doi:10.1016/S0885-064X(02)00007-9.

- [6] Marijn J. H. Heule, Manuel Kauers, and Martina Seidl. New ways to multiply 3×3 -matrices. *Journal of Symbolic Computation*, 104:899–916, 2021. doi:10.1016/j.jsc.2020.10.003.
- [7] Alhussein Fawzi, Matej Balog, Aja Huang, Thomas Hubert, Bernardino Romera-Paredes, Mohamadamin Barekatain, Alexander Novikov, Francisco J. R. Ruiz, Julian Schrittwieser, Grzegorz Swirszcz, David Silver, Demis Hassabis, and Pushmeet Kohli. Discovering faster matrix multiplication algorithms with reinforcement learning. *Nature*, 610:47–53, 2022. doi:10.1038/s41586-022-05172-4.
- [8] Chengu Wang. Automated lower bounds for small matrix multiplication complexity over finite fields. arXiv:2603.07280v6, 2026. Version 6; source of the fixed quotient catalogue. URL: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2603.07280v6>.
- [9] Ian D’Ambrosio. The exact $\mathbb{F}_2$ -rank of 2×3 by 3×4 matrix multiplication. Zenodo, version 1, 2026. doi:10.5281/zenodo.21895176.
- [10] A certificate-based conditional lower bound of 21 for 3×3 matrix multiplication over $\mathbb{F}_2$. Public review draft and code repository, released by Bilal Tahir. github.com/btahir/rank21-f2-review, 2026.
- [11] Loo-Keng Hua. Geometries of matrices. I. Generalizations of von Staudt’s theorem. *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society*, 57(3):441–481, 1945. doi:10.1090/S0002-9947-1945-0012679-8.
- [12] Shuxing Yang, Rui Zhao, Junyao Wu, Yize Wang, Wenhao Li, Fujia Chen, Taowen Deng, Shenzhan Hong, Yaqi Li, Zichen Li, Jincheng Mi, Yuang Pan, Kaihao Zhu, Junjie Yang, Hongsheng Chen, and Yihao Yang. A structural proof of the lower bound 21 for 3×3 matrix multiplication over $\mathbb{F}_2$. Qiushi Engine research report, 2026. English report and research trajectory. URL: <https://github.com/0xelra-AI/Qiushi-Engine-Matmul-Research/blob/lean-formalization/reports/en/main.pdf>.
- [13] Nathan Wetzler, Marijn J. H. Heule, and Warren A. Hunt, Jr. DRAT-trim: Efficient checking and trimming using expressive clausal proofs. In *Theory and Applications of Satisfiability Testing (SAT 2014)*, volume 8561 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 422–429. Springer, 2014. doi:10.1007/978-3-319-09284-3_31.
- [14] Leonardo de Moura and Sebastian Ullrich. The Lean 4 theorem prover and programming language. In *Automated Deduction (CADE 2021)*, volume 12699 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 625–635. Springer, 2021. doi:10.1007/978-3-030-79876-5_37.
- [15] The mathlib Community. The Lean mathematical library. In *Proceedings of the 9th ACM SIGPLAN International Conference on Certified Programs and Proofs (CPP 2020)*, pages 367–381. ACM, 2020. doi:10.1145/3372885.3373824.
- [16] Kim Morrison. Lean.Environment.replay. Lean 4 source code, 2026. Release v4.33.1. URL: <https://github.com/leanprover/lean4/blob/v4.33.1/src/Lean/Replay.lean>.
- [17] Qiushi Engine Team. Lean formalization of the structural lower bound for binary 3×3 matrix multiplication. GitHub research release, 2026. Proof library, finite certificates, and verification records. Directory [formalization/](https://github.com/0xelra-AI/Qiushi-Engine-Matmul-Research/releases/tag/lean-formalization). URL: <https://github.com/0xelra-AI/Qiushi-Engine-Matmul-Research/releases/tag/lean-formalization>.
- [18] Shuxing Yang, Fujia Chen, Rui Zhao, Junyao Wu, Yize Wang, Haiyao Luo, Ning Han, Qiaolu Chen, Yuze Hu, Wenhao Li, Mingzhu Li, Hongsheng Chen, and Yihao Yang. End-to-end autonomous scientific discovery on a real optical platform. arXiv:2604.27092, 2026. URL: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2604.27092>.
- [19] Andrew I. Perminov. FastMatrixMultiplication: Algorithm and scheme collection. Software and data repository, fixed source snapshot. github.com/dronperminov/FastMatrixMultiplication, 2026.
- [20] Kirill Khoruzhii, Patrick Gelß, and Sebastian Pokutta. Faster algorithms for structured matrix multiplication via flip graph search. In *Proceedings of the 2026 International Symposium on Symbolic and Algebraic Computation*, pages 227–236. ACM, 2026. doi:10.1145/3815436.3815455.
- [21] Carsten Sinz. Towards an optimal CNF encoding of Boolean cardinality constraints. In *Principles and Practice of Constraint Programming (CP 2005)*, volume 3709 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 827–831. Springer, 2005. doi:10.1007/11564751_73.