

On Some Points of a Simple Closed Curve¹

Artur Korniłowicz
University of Białystok

MML Identifier: JORDAN21.

The notation and terminology used here are introduced in the following papers: [26], [28], [2], [13], [1], [29], [5], [18], [17], [3], [14], [24], [9], [23], [4], [25], [7], [10], [11], [12], [19], [20], [22], [21], [6], [8], [15], [16], and [27].

1. ON THE SUBSETS OF \mathcal{E}_T^2

For simplicity, we follow the rules: C denotes a simple closed curve, P denotes a subset of \mathcal{E}_T^2 , R denotes a non empty subset of \mathcal{E}_T^2 , p denotes a point of \mathcal{E}_T^2 , and i, j, k, m, n denote natural numbers.

One can prove the following propositions:

- (1) For every point p of \mathcal{E}_T^n holds $\{p\}$ is Bounded.
- (2) For all real numbers s_1, t and for every subset P of \mathcal{E}_T^2 such that $P = \{[s, t]; s \text{ ranges over real numbers: } s_1 < s\}$ holds P is convex.
- (3) For all real numbers s_2, t and for every subset P of \mathcal{E}_T^2 such that $P = \{[s, t]; s \text{ ranges over real numbers: } s < s_2\}$ holds P is convex.
- (4) For all real numbers s, t_1 and for every subset P of \mathcal{E}_T^2 such that $P = \{[s, t]; t \text{ ranges over real numbers: } t_1 < t\}$ holds P is convex.
- (5) For all real numbers s, t_2 and for every subset P of \mathcal{E}_T^2 such that $P = \{[s, t]; t \text{ ranges over real numbers: } t < t_2\}$ holds P is convex.
- (6) NorthHalfline $p \setminus \{p\}$ is convex.
- (7) SouthHalfline $p \setminus \{p\}$ is convex.
- (8) WestHalfline $p \setminus \{p\}$ is convex.
- (9) EastHalfline $p \setminus \{p\}$ is convex.

¹The paper has been completed during the author's post-doctoral fellowship granted by the Shinshu University, Japan.

- (10) For every subset A of the carrier of \mathcal{E}_T^2 holds UBD A misses A .
- (11) Let P be a subset of the carrier of \mathcal{E}_T^2 and p_1, p_2, q_1, q_2 be points of \mathcal{E}_T^2 . Suppose P is an arc from p_1 to p_2 and $p_1 \neq q_1$ and $p_2 \neq q_2$. Then $p_1 \notin \text{Segment}(P, p_1, p_2, q_1, q_2)$ and $p_2 \notin \text{Segment}(P, p_1, p_2, q_1, q_2)$.
- (12) $\text{proj}2^\circ(C \cap \text{VerticalLine}(\frac{\text{W-bound}(C)+\text{E-bound}(C)}{2}))$ is not empty.
- (13) For every compact subset C of \mathcal{E}_T^2 holds $\text{proj}2^\circ(C \cap \text{VerticalLine}(\frac{\text{W-bound}(C)+\text{E-bound}(C)}{2}))$ is closed, lower bounded, and upper bounded.

2. GAUGES

The following propositions are true:

- (14) $\langle 1, 1 \rangle \in$ the indices of $\text{Gauge}(R, n)$.
- (15) $\langle 1, 2 \rangle \in$ the indices of $\text{Gauge}(R, n)$.
- (16) $\langle 2, 1 \rangle \in$ the indices of $\text{Gauge}(R, n)$.
- (17) Let C be a non vertical non horizontal compact subset of \mathcal{E}_T^2 . Suppose $m > k$ and $\langle i, j \rangle \in$ the indices of $\text{Gauge}(C, k)$ and $\langle i, j+1 \rangle \in$ the indices of $\text{Gauge}(C, k)$. Then $\rho(\text{Gauge}(C, m) \circ (i, j), \text{Gauge}(C, m) \circ (i, j+1)) < \rho(\text{Gauge}(C, k) \circ (i, j), \text{Gauge}(C, k) \circ (i, j+1))$.
- (18) For every non vertical non horizontal compact subset C of \mathcal{E}_T^2 such that $m > k$ holds $\rho(\text{Gauge}(C, m) \circ (1, 1), \text{Gauge}(C, m) \circ (1, 2)) < \rho(\text{Gauge}(C, k) \circ (1, 1), \text{Gauge}(C, k) \circ (1, 2))$.
- (19) Let C be a non vertical non horizontal compact subset of \mathcal{E}_T^2 . Suppose $m > k$ and $\langle i, j \rangle \in$ the indices of $\text{Gauge}(C, k)$ and $\langle i+1, j \rangle \in$ the indices of $\text{Gauge}(C, k)$. Then $\rho(\text{Gauge}(C, m) \circ (i, j), \text{Gauge}(C, m) \circ (i+1, j)) < \rho(\text{Gauge}(C, k) \circ (i, j), \text{Gauge}(C, k) \circ (i+1, j))$.
- (20) For every non vertical non horizontal compact subset C of \mathcal{E}_T^2 such that $m > k$ holds $\rho(\text{Gauge}(C, m) \circ (1, 1), \text{Gauge}(C, m) \circ (2, 1)) < \rho(\text{Gauge}(C, k) \circ (1, 1), \text{Gauge}(C, k) \circ (2, 1))$.
- (21) Let r, t be real numbers. Suppose $r > 0$ and $t > 0$. Then there exists a natural number n such that $i < n$ and $\rho(\text{Gauge}(C, n) \circ (1, 1), \text{Gauge}(C, n) \circ (1, 2)) < r$ and $\rho(\text{Gauge}(C, n) \circ (1, 1), \text{Gauge}(C, n) \circ (2, 1)) < t$.

3. MIDDLE POINTS

We now state four propositions:

- (22) $\text{UpperMiddlePoint } C \in C$.
- (23) $\text{LowerMiddlePoint } C \in C$.
- (24) $(\text{LowerMiddlePoint } C)_2 \neq (\text{UpperMiddlePoint } C)_2$.

(25) LowerMiddlePoint $C \neq$ UpperMiddlePoint C .

4. UPPERARC AND LOWERARC

Next we state several propositions:

- (26) $W\text{-bound}(C) = W\text{-bound}(\text{UpperArc}(C))$.
- (27) $E\text{-bound}(C) = E\text{-bound}(\text{UpperArc}(C))$.
- (28) $W\text{-bound}(C) = W\text{-bound}(\text{LowerArc}(C))$.
- (29) $E\text{-bound}(C) = E\text{-bound}(\text{LowerArc}(C))$.
- (30) $\text{UpperArc}(C) \cap \text{VerticalLine}(\frac{W\text{-bound}(C)+E\text{-bound}(C)}{2})$ is not empty and $\text{proj2}^\circ(\text{UpperArc}(C) \cap \text{VerticalLine}(\frac{W\text{-bound}(C)+E\text{-bound}(C)}{2}))$ is not empty.
- (31) $\text{LowerArc}(C) \cap \text{VerticalLine}(\frac{W\text{-bound}(C)+E\text{-bound}(C)}{2})$ is not empty and $\text{proj2}^\circ(\text{LowerArc}(C) \cap \text{VerticalLine}(\frac{W\text{-bound}(C)+E\text{-bound}(C)}{2}))$ is not empty.
- (32) For every compact connected subset P of \mathcal{E}_T^2 such that $P \subseteq C$ and $W_{\min}(C) \in P$ and $E_{\max}(C) \in P$ holds $\text{UpperArc}(C) \subseteq P$ or $\text{LowerArc}(C) \subseteq P$.

5. UMP AND LMP

Let P be a subset of the carrier of \mathcal{E}_T^2 . The functor $\text{UMP } P$ yielding a point of \mathcal{E}_T^2 is defined by:

$$(\text{Def. 1}) \quad \text{UMP } P = [\frac{E\text{-bound}(P)+W\text{-bound}(P)}{2}, \sup(\text{proj2}^\circ(P \cap \text{VerticalLine}(\frac{E\text{-bound}(P)+W\text{-bound}(P)}{2})))].$$

The functor $\text{LMP } P$ yielding a point of \mathcal{E}_T^2 is defined as follows:

$$(\text{Def. 2}) \quad \text{LMP } P = [\frac{E\text{-bound}(P)+W\text{-bound}(P)}{2}, \inf(\text{proj2}^\circ(P \cap \text{VerticalLine}(\frac{E\text{-bound}(P)+W\text{-bound}(P)}{2})))].$$

We now state a number of propositions:

- (33) $(\text{UMP } P)_1 = \frac{W\text{-bound}(P)+E\text{-bound}(P)}{2}$.
- (34) $(\text{UMP } P)_2 = \sup(\text{proj2}^\circ(P \cap \text{VerticalLine}(\frac{E\text{-bound}(P)+W\text{-bound}(P)}{2})))$.
- (35) $(\text{LMP } P)_1 = \frac{W\text{-bound}(P)+E\text{-bound}(P)}{2}$.
- (36) $(\text{LMP } P)_2 = \inf(\text{proj2}^\circ(P \cap \text{VerticalLine}(\frac{E\text{-bound}(P)+W\text{-bound}(P)}{2})))$.
- (37) For every non vertical compact subset C of \mathcal{E}_T^2 holds $\text{UMP } C \neq W_{\min}(C)$.
- (38) For every non vertical compact subset C of \mathcal{E}_T^2 holds $\text{UMP } C \neq E_{\max}(C)$.
- (39) For every non vertical compact subset C of \mathcal{E}_T^2 holds $\text{LMP } C \neq W_{\min}(C)$.
- (40) For every non vertical compact subset C of \mathcal{E}_T^2 holds $\text{LMP } C \neq E_{\max}(C)$.

- (41) For every compact subset C of \mathcal{E}_T^2 such that $p \in C \cap \text{VerticalLine}(\frac{\text{W-bound}(C)+\text{E-bound}(C)}{2})$ holds $p_2 \leq (\text{UMP } C)_2$.
- (42) For every compact subset C of \mathcal{E}_T^2 such that $p \in C \cap \text{VerticalLine}(\frac{\text{W-bound}(C)+\text{E-bound}(C)}{2})$ holds $(\text{LMP } C)_2 \leq p_2$.
- (43) $\text{UMP } C \in C$.
- (44) $\text{LMP } C \in C$.
- (45) $\mathcal{L}(\text{UMP } P, [\frac{\text{W-bound}(P)+\text{E-bound}(P)}{2}, \text{N-bound}(P)])$ is vertical.
- (46) $\mathcal{L}(\text{LMP } P, [\frac{\text{W-bound}(P)+\text{E-bound}(P)}{2}, \text{S-bound}(P)])$ is vertical.
- (47) $\mathcal{L}(\text{UMP } C, [\frac{\text{W-bound}(C)+\text{E-bound}(C)}{2}, \text{N-bound}(C)]) \cap C = \{\text{UMP } C\}$.
- (48) $\mathcal{L}(\text{LMP } C, [\frac{\text{W-bound}(C)+\text{E-bound}(C)}{2}, \text{S-bound}(C)]) \cap C = \{\text{LMP } C\}$.
- (49) $(\text{LMP } C)_2 < (\text{UMP } C)_2$.
- (50) $\text{UMP } C \neq \text{LMP } C$.
- (51) $\text{S-bound}(C) < (\text{UMP } C)_2$.
- (52) $(\text{UMP } C)_2 \leq \text{N-bound}(C)$.
- (53) $\text{S-bound}(C) \leq (\text{LMP } C)_2$.
- (54) $(\text{LMP } C)_2 < \text{N-bound}(C)$.
- (55) $\mathcal{L}(\text{UMP } C, [\frac{\text{W-bound}(C)+\text{E-bound}(C)}{2}, \text{N-bound}(C)])$ misses $\mathcal{L}(\text{LMP } C, [\frac{\text{W-bound}(C)+\text{E-bound}(C)}{2}, \text{S-bound}(C)])$.
- (56) Let A, B be subsets of \mathcal{E}_T^2 . Suppose $A \subseteq B$ and $\text{W-bound}(A) + \text{E-bound}(A) = \text{W-bound}(B) + \text{E-bound}(B)$ and $A \cap \text{VerticalLine}(\frac{\text{W-bound}(A)+\text{E-bound}(A)}{2})$ is non empty and $\text{proj2}^\circ(B \cap \text{VerticalLine}(\frac{\text{W-bound}(A)+\text{E-bound}(A)}{2}))$ is upper bounded. Then $(\text{UMP } A)_2 \leq (\text{UMP } B)_2$.
- (57) Let A, B be subsets of \mathcal{E}_T^2 . Suppose $A \subseteq B$ and $\text{W-bound}(A) + \text{E-bound}(A) = \text{W-bound}(B) + \text{E-bound}(B)$ and $A \cap \text{VerticalLine}(\frac{\text{W-bound}(A)+\text{E-bound}(A)}{2})$ is non empty and $\text{proj2}^\circ(B \cap \text{VerticalLine}(\frac{\text{W-bound}(A)+\text{E-bound}(A)}{2}))$ is lower bounded. Then $(\text{LMP } B)_2 \leq (\text{LMP } A)_2$.
- (58) Let A, B be subsets of \mathcal{E}_T^2 . Suppose $A \subseteq B$ and $\text{UMP } B \in A$ and $A \cap \text{VerticalLine}(\frac{\text{W-bound}(A)+\text{E-bound}(A)}{2})$ is non empty and $\text{proj2}^\circ(B \cap \text{VerticalLine}(\frac{\text{W-bound}(B)+\text{E-bound}(B)}{2}))$ is upper bounded and $\text{W-bound}(A) + \text{E-bound}(A) = \text{W-bound}(B) + \text{E-bound}(B)$. Then $\text{UMP } A = \text{UMP } B$.
- (59) Let A, B be subsets of \mathcal{E}_T^2 . Suppose $A \subseteq B$ and $\text{LMP } B \in A$ and $A \cap \text{VerticalLine}(\frac{\text{W-bound}(A)+\text{E-bound}(A)}{2})$ is non empty and $\text{proj2}^\circ(B \cap \text{VerticalLine}(\frac{\text{W-bound}(B)+\text{E-bound}(B)}{2}))$ is lower bounded and $\text{W-bound}(A) + \text{E-bound}(A) = \text{W-bound}(B) + \text{E-bound}(B)$. Then $\text{LMP } A = \text{LMP } B$.

- (60) $(\text{UMP UpperArc}(C))_2 \leq \text{N-bound}(C)$.
- (61) $\text{S-bound}(C) \leq (\text{LMP LowerArc}(C))_2$.
- (62) $\text{LMP } C \notin \text{LowerArc}(C)$ or $\text{UMP } C \notin \text{LowerArc}(C)$.
- (63) $\text{LMP } C \notin \text{UpperArc}(C)$ or $\text{UMP } C \notin \text{UpperArc}(C)$.
- (64) If $0 < n$, then $\sup(\text{proj}2^\circ(\tilde{\mathcal{L}}(\text{Cage}(C, n))) \cap \mathcal{L}(\text{Gauge}(C, n)) \circ (\text{Center Gauge}(C, n), 1), \text{Gauge}(C, n) \circ (\text{Center Gauge}(C, n), \text{len Gauge}(C, n)))) = \sup(\text{proj}2^\circ(\tilde{\mathcal{L}}(\text{Cage}(C, n))) \cap \text{VerticalLine}(\frac{\text{E-bound}(\tilde{\mathcal{L}}(\text{Cage}(C, n))) + \text{W-bound}(\tilde{\mathcal{L}}(\text{Cage}(C, n)))}{2}))$.
- (65) If $0 < n$, then $\inf(\text{proj}2^\circ(\tilde{\mathcal{L}}(\text{Cage}(C, n))) \cap \mathcal{L}(\text{Gauge}(C, n)) \circ (\text{Center Gauge}(C, n), 1), \text{Gauge}(C, n) \circ (\text{Center Gauge}(C, n), \text{len Gauge}(C, n)))) = \inf(\text{proj}2^\circ(\tilde{\mathcal{L}}(\text{Cage}(C, n))) \cap \text{VerticalLine}(\frac{\text{E-bound}(\tilde{\mathcal{L}}(\text{Cage}(C, n))) + \text{W-bound}(\tilde{\mathcal{L}}(\text{Cage}(C, n)))}{2}))$.
- (66) If $0 < n$, then $\text{UMP } \tilde{\mathcal{L}}(\text{Cage}(C, n)) = [\frac{\text{E-bound}(\tilde{\mathcal{L}}(\text{Cage}(C, n))) + \text{W-bound}(\tilde{\mathcal{L}}(\text{Cage}(C, n)))}{2}, \sup(\text{proj}2^\circ(\tilde{\mathcal{L}}(\text{Cage}(C, n))) \cap \mathcal{L}(\text{Gauge}(C, n)) \circ (\text{Center Gauge}(C, n), 1), \text{Gauge}(C, n) \circ (\text{Center Gauge}(C, n), \text{len Gauge}(C, n))))]$.
- (67) If $0 < n$, then $\text{LMP } \tilde{\mathcal{L}}(\text{Cage}(C, n)) = [\frac{\text{E-bound}(\tilde{\mathcal{L}}(\text{Cage}(C, n))) + \text{W-bound}(\tilde{\mathcal{L}}(\text{Cage}(C, n)))}{2}, \inf(\text{proj}2^\circ(\tilde{\mathcal{L}}(\text{Cage}(C, n))) \cap \mathcal{L}(\text{Gauge}(C, n)) \circ (\text{Center Gauge}(C, n), 1), \text{Gauge}(C, n) \circ (\text{Center Gauge}(C, n), \text{len Gauge}(C, n))))]$.
- (68) $(\text{UMP } C)_2 < (\text{UMP } \tilde{\mathcal{L}}(\text{Cage}(C, n)))_2$.
- (69) $(\text{LMP } C)_2 > (\text{LMP } \tilde{\mathcal{L}}(\text{Cage}(C, n)))_2$.
- (70) $\text{UMP UpperArc}(\tilde{\mathcal{L}}(\text{Cage}(C, n))) \in \text{UpperArc}(\tilde{\mathcal{L}}(\text{Cage}(C, n)))$.
- (71) $\text{LMP LowerArc}(\tilde{\mathcal{L}}(\text{Cage}(C, n))) \in \text{LowerArc}(\tilde{\mathcal{L}}(\text{Cage}(C, n)))$.
- (72) If $0 < n$, then there exists a natural number i such that $1 \leq i$ and $i \leq \text{len Gauge}(C, n)$ and $\text{UMP } \tilde{\mathcal{L}}(\text{Cage}(C, n)) = \text{Gauge}(C, n) \circ (\text{Center Gauge}(C, n), i)$.
- (73) If $0 < n$, then there exists a natural number i such that $1 \leq i$ and $i \leq \text{len Gauge}(C, n)$ and $\text{LMP } \tilde{\mathcal{L}}(\text{Cage}(C, n)) = \text{Gauge}(C, n) \circ (\text{Center Gauge}(C, n), i)$.
- (74) If $0 < n$, then $\text{UMP } \tilde{\mathcal{L}}(\text{Cage}(C, n)) = \text{UMP UpperArc}(\tilde{\mathcal{L}}(\text{Cage}(C, n)))$.
- (75) If $0 < n$, then $\text{LMP } \tilde{\mathcal{L}}(\text{Cage}(C, n)) = \text{LMP LowerArc}(\tilde{\mathcal{L}}(\text{Cage}(C, n)))$.
- (76) If $0 < n$, then $(\text{UMP } C)_2 < (\text{UMP UpperArc}(\tilde{\mathcal{L}}(\text{Cage}(C, n))))_2$.
- (77) If $0 < n$, then $(\text{LMP LowerArc}(\tilde{\mathcal{L}}(\text{Cage}(C, n))))_2 < (\text{LMP } C)_2$.
- (78) If $i \leq j$, then $(\text{UMP } \tilde{\mathcal{L}}(\text{Cage}(C, j)))_2 \leq (\text{UMP } \tilde{\mathcal{L}}(\text{Cage}(C, i)))_2$.
- (79) If $i \leq j$, then $(\text{LMP } \tilde{\mathcal{L}}(\text{Cage}(C, i)))_2 \leq (\text{LMP } \tilde{\mathcal{L}}(\text{Cage}(C, j)))_2$.
- (80) If $0 < i$ and $i \leq j$, then $(\text{UMP UpperArc}(\tilde{\mathcal{L}}(\text{Cage}(C, j))))_2 \leq (\text{UMP UpperArc}(\tilde{\mathcal{L}}(\text{Cage}(C, i))))_2$.

- (81) If $0 < i$ and $i \leq j$, then $(\text{LMP LowerArc}(\tilde{\mathcal{L}}(\text{Cage}(C, i))))_2 \leq (\text{LMP LowerArc}(\tilde{\mathcal{L}}(\text{Cage}(C, j))))_2$.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author would like to acknowledge Professor Andrzej Trybulec for his continuous encouragement to complete the proof of the Jordan Curve Theorem in Mizar as well as his precious suggestions regarding the proof itself.

REFERENCES

- [1] Grzegorz Bancerek. The fundamental properties of natural numbers. *Formalized Mathematics*, 1(1):41–46, 1990.
- [2] Grzegorz Bancerek. The ordinal numbers. *Formalized Mathematics*, 1(1):91–96, 1990.
- [3] Grzegorz Bancerek and Krzysztof Hryniewiecki. Segments of natural numbers and finite sequences. *Formalized Mathematics*, 1(1):107–114, 1990.
- [4] Leszek Borys. Paracompact and metrizable spaces. *Formalized Mathematics*, 2(4):481–485, 1991.
- [5] Czesław Byliński. Functions from a set to a set. *Formalized Mathematics*, 1(1):153–164, 1990.
- [6] Czesław Byliński. Gauges. *Formalized Mathematics*, 8(1):25–27, 1999.
- [7] Czesław Byliński and Piotr Rudnicki. Bounding boxes for compact sets in \mathcal{E}^2 . *Formalized Mathematics*, 6(3):427–440, 1997.
- [8] Czesław Byliński and Mariusz Żynel. Cages – the external approximation of Jordan’s curve. *Formalized Mathematics*, 9(1):19–24, 2001.
- [9] Agata Darmochwał. Compact spaces. *Formalized Mathematics*, 1(2):383–386, 1990.
- [10] Agata Darmochwał. The Euclidean space. *Formalized Mathematics*, 2(4):599–603, 1991.
- [11] Agata Darmochwał and Yatsuka Nakamura. The topological space \mathcal{E}_T^2 . Arcs, line segments and special polygonal arcs. *Formalized Mathematics*, 2(5):617–621, 1991.
- [12] Agata Darmochwał and Yatsuka Nakamura. The topological space \mathcal{E}_T^2 . Simple closed curves. *Formalized Mathematics*, 2(5):663–664, 1991.
- [13] Krzysztof Hryniewiecki. Basic properties of real numbers. *Formalized Mathematics*, 1(1):35–40, 1990.
- [14] Katarzyna Jankowska. Matrices. Abelian group of matrices. *Formalized Mathematics*, 2(4):475–480, 1991.
- [15] Artur Korniłowicz. Properties of left and right components. *Formalized Mathematics*, 8(1):163–168, 1999.
- [16] Artur Korniłowicz, Robert Milewski, Adam Naumowicz, and Andrzej Trybulec. Gauges and cages. Part I. *Formalized Mathematics*, 9(3):501–509, 2001.
- [17] Jarosław Kotowicz. Convergent real sequences. Upper and lower bound of sets of real numbers. *Formalized Mathematics*, 1(3):477–481, 1990.
- [18] Jarosław Kotowicz. Real sequences and basic operations on them. *Formalized Mathematics*, 1(2):269–272, 1990.
- [19] Yatsuka Nakamura and Czesław Byliński. Extremal properties of vertices on special polygons. Part I. *Formalized Mathematics*, 5(1):97–102, 1996.
- [20] Yatsuka Nakamura and Jarosław Kotowicz. The Jordan’s property for certain subsets of the plane. *Formalized Mathematics*, 3(2):137–142, 1992.
- [21] Yatsuka Nakamura and Andrzej Trybulec. A decomposition of a simple closed curves and the order of their points. *Formalized Mathematics*, 6(4):563–572, 1997.
- [22] Yatsuka Nakamura, Andrzej Trybulec, and Czesław Byliński. Bounded domains and unbounded domains. *Formalized Mathematics*, 8(1):1–13, 1999.
- [23] Beata Padlewska. Connected spaces. *Formalized Mathematics*, 1(1):239–244, 1990.
- [24] Beata Padlewska and Agata Darmochwał. Topological spaces and continuous functions. *Formalized Mathematics*, 1(1):223–230, 1990.
- [25] Konrad Raczkowski and Paweł Sadowski. Topological properties of subsets in real numbers. *Formalized Mathematics*, 1(4):777–780, 1990.

- [26] Andrzej Trybulec. Tarski Grothendieck set theory. *Formalized Mathematics*, 1(1):9–11, 1990.
- [27] Andrzej Trybulec. On the minimal distance between sets in Euclidean space. *Formalized Mathematics*, 10(3):153–158, 2002.
- [28] Zinaida Trybulec. Properties of subsets. *Formalized Mathematics*, 1(1):67–71, 1990.
- [29] Edmund Woronowicz. Relations and their basic properties. *Formalized Mathematics*, 1(1):73–83, 1990.

Received October 6, 2004
