

# Unraveling Arithmetic in Large Language Models: The Role of Algebraic Structures

Fu-Chieh Chang<sup>1,2</sup> and Pei-Yuan Wu<sup>2</sup>

{d09942015,peiyuanwu}@ntu.edu.tw

<sup>1</sup>MediaTek Research, Taipei, Taiwan

<sup>2</sup>Graduate Institute of Communication Engineering, National Taiwan University, Taipei, Taiwan

## Abstract

Large language models (LLMs) have demonstrated remarkable mathematical capabilities, largely driven by chain-of-thought (CoT) prompting, which decomposes complex reasoning into step-by-step solutions. This approach has enabled significant advancements, as evidenced by performance on benchmarks like GSM8K and MATH. However, the mechanisms underlying LLMs’ ability to perform arithmetic in a single step of CoT remain poorly understood. Existing studies debate whether LLMs encode numerical values or rely on symbolic reasoning, while others explore attention and multi-layered processing in arithmetic tasks. In this work, we propose that LLMs learn arithmetic by capturing algebraic structures, such as *Commutativity* and *Identity* properties. Since these structures are observable through input-output relationships, they can generalize to unseen data. We empirically demonstrate that LLMs can learn algebraic structures using a custom dataset of arithmetic problems. Our findings indicate that leveraging algebraic structures can enhance the LLMs’ arithmetic capabilities, offering insights into improving their arithmetic performance.

## 1 Introduction

With the advancement of large language models (LLMs), their mathematical capabilities have become a crucial factor in their success. This progress is largely credited to chain-of-thought (CoT) prompting [WWS<sup>+</sup>22], which enables LLMs to move beyond pattern matching and tackle complex reasoning problems through step-by-step guidance. The mathematical prowess of LLMs is evidenced by several commercial models [Ope24, Ant24] achieving notable success across benchmarks such as GSM8K [CKB<sup>+</sup>21] and MATH [HBK<sup>+</sup>21].

Despite their achievements in solving arithmetic problems, the underlying mechanisms through which LLMs learn arithmetic operations from training data remain unclear. While CoT explains how breaking down tasks into smaller steps facilitates mathematical problem-solving, the processes by which LLMs encode numerical values and execute arithmetic operations within individual steps of CoT are not yet well understood. Some studies [FZ24, LG24] suggest that LLMs can encode numerical values, whereas others [DLX<sup>+</sup>24] propose that LLMs learn symbolic relationships between numbers rather than directly encoding their values. Additionally, research such as [SBS23a] has explored the causal mediation analysis of arithmetic operations in LLMs, but no consensus has been reached on how or why LLMs are capable of arithmetic reasoning.

In this work, we offer a new perspective on how LLMs learn arithmetic. We propose that LLMs acquire arithmetic skills by learning algebraic structures, such as *Commutativity* and *Identity* properties. Since LLMs observe only input and output tokens during training, directly associating tokens with specific numerical values is challenging. However, algebraic structures can be discerned from the relationships between inputs and outputs. Furthermore, previous studies [KKP23, KKGP24, YDWY23] have shown that machine learning algorithms can learn symmetric structures from training data, though these findings have not yet been connected to arithmetic learning in LLMs.

We present empirical evidence that LLMs can learn algebraic structures from training data, generalize these structures to unseen test data, and use them to correctly solve arithmetic problems. To demonstrate this, we construct a dataset consisting of arithmetic problems involving symbols and operators, dividing it into training and testing sets. We show that LLMs can learn the *Commutativity*

and *Identity* properties from the training set and generalize these principles to the testing set. Our findings provide preliminary empirical evidence that LLMs can internalize algebraic structures, offering valuable insights for designing algorithms to enhance their arithmetic capabilities.

## 2 Related Works

**Chain-of-thought Reasoning in LLMs:** Chain-of-Thought (CoT) techniques [WWS<sup>+</sup>22] empower large language models (LLMs) to tackle complex mathematical reasoning tasks by breaking solutions into sequential steps, making them essential for solving mathematical problems. Recent studies shed light on CoT’s theoretical underpinnings. For example, [PLG24] models CoT with Bayesian networks, where questions, answers, and reasoning steps form interconnected nodes, demonstrating that structured reasoning improves LLM performance. [XL24] introduces the concept of length generalization, showing that LLMs can extrapolate from simple examples to address more complex problems. Expanding the PAC learning framework, [Mal23] shows that auto-regressive learners can effectively learn linear threshold circuits when CoT steps are provided. Additionally, [FZG<sup>+</sup>24] proves that CoT enables transformers to handle dynamic programming problems, even with polynomially increasing complexity. While these studies establish a theoretical basis for CoT, which decomposes complex mathematical problems into manageable steps, they do not address how LLMs can solve mathematical problems within a single step of CoT reasoning. This gap highlights the need for further exploration of the mechanisms that allow LLMs to process intricate mathematical tasks effectively.

**How Arithmetic Abilities Arise in LLMs:** The mechanisms behind LLMs’ arithmetic abilities remain debated. Some studies suggest that LLMs encode numerical values internally. [FZ24] demonstrates this by using linear probes on addition problems, showing that number values are encoded across layers and can be extracted. On the other hand, [LG24] finds that LLM errors distribute across digits rather than numeric values, revealing that numbers are represented with per-digit circular structures in base 10. Besides, other works argue that LLMs rely on symbolic reasoning. [DLX<sup>+</sup>24] shows LLMs learn simple patterns at the edges of a sequence of numbers faster than in the middle of the numbers of a sequence, indicating an easy-to-hard learning approach and symbolic arithmetic processing. [HLV24] explores GPT-2 small’s mechanism for predicting valid end years in date-related tasks, identifying a circuit responsible for “greater-than” comparisons that generalize across contexts. Additionally, [SBS23b] demonstrates that LLMs transmit query-relevant information through attention mechanisms and process results with MLP modules, integrating them into the residual stream. Despite these insights, there is no consensus on whether LLMs primarily encode numerical values or rely on symbolic reasoning, highlighting the need for further research to clarify their mathematical processing mechanisms.

**Machine Learning for Symmetric Discovery:** The ability to discover symmetries enables machine learning models to uncover algebraic structures from training data. [KKP23] demonstrate that sub-groups can be identified through a neural network with a specially designed architecture, supported by a general theorem. They validate their approach with numerical experiments on tasks such as image-digit sum and symmetric polynomial regression. Similarly, [KKG24] present a unified framework for discovering symmetries across various subgroups, including locally symmetric, dihedral, and cyclic subgroups. Their architecture combines linear, matrix-valued, and non-linear functions to systematically capture invariance. [YDWY23] introduce Latent LieGAN (LaLiGAN), a generative model that maps data to a latent space where nonlinear symmetries become linear. LaLiGAN simultaneously learns the mapping and the latent space symmetries, theoretically proving its ability to express nonlinear symmetries under specific group action conditions. However, these works do not explore the connection between symmetry learning and large language models’ (LLMs) arithmetic capabilities. While [IP24] reveals that LLMs struggle with fundamental group properties and exhibit vulnerabilities in arithmetic reasoning, it does not investigate whether LLMs are possible to learn algebraic structures from training data. In contrast, our work demonstrates that LLMs can learn algebraic structures from training instances and generalize to solve unseen arithmetic problems.

## 3 Methodology

### 3.1 Problem Settings

In this work, we show that LLMs can learn algebraic structures. That is, LLMs can discover the algebraic structures in the training instances, and generalized to unseen instances at inference time. We first define our scope of problems, since mathematical problems can take various forms, including representations with numeric symbols and operators, natural language descriptions, or real-world scenarios involving arithmetic computations. We focus on the simplest case where arithmetic problems are represented purely through numeric and operator symbols, such as  $2 + 3$ ,  $7 \times 8$ , or  $15 \div 5$ . Besides, given the broad scope of mathematical and arithmetic problems, we focus our study on arithmetic operations within a finite Abelian group, as shown in the following definition.

**Definition 3.1.** *A finite Abelian group is a set  $\mathcal{G}$  with a binary operation  $\circ$  that satisfies the following properties:*

- **Closure:** For any  $a, b \in \mathcal{G}$ , the result of  $a \circ b$  is also in  $\mathcal{G}$ .
- **Associativity:** For any  $a, b, c \in \mathcal{G}$ ,  $(a \circ b) \circ c = a \circ (b \circ c)$ .
- **Commutativity:** For any  $a, b \in \mathcal{G}$ ,  $a \circ b = b \circ a$ .
- **Identity:** There exists an element  $e \in \mathcal{G}$  such that for any  $a \in \mathcal{G}$ ,  $a \circ e = e \circ a = a$ .
- **Inverse:** For each  $a \in \mathcal{G}$ , there exists an element  $a^{-1} \in \mathcal{G}$  such that  $a \circ a^{-1} = a^{-1} \circ a = e$ .

A well-known example of a finite Abelian group is  $\mathbb{Z}_n$ , the set of integers modulo  $n$  under addition modulo  $n$ . For instance, in  $\mathbb{Z}_5$ , the elements are  $\{0, 1, 2, 3, 4\}$ , and the group operation is defined as  $a + b \pmod 5$ . The Identity element in this group is 0, and every element  $a$  has an inverse  $b$  such that  $a + b \equiv 0 \pmod 5$ . This structure satisfies all the group axioms and serves as a fundamental example for studying algebraic systems. In this work, we analyze the group operation properties of *Commutativity* and *Identity* in  $\mathbb{Z}_n$ .

### 3.2 Dataset

We denote the  $i$ -th element in  $\mathbb{Z}_n$  as  $z_i$ , such that  $z_0 = 0, z_1 = 1, \dots, z_n = n$ . The training dataset consists of addition problems involving two to four terms, defined as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} z_i + z_j &= z_{(i+j)\%n}, & \text{where } 0 \leq i, j < n, \\ z_i + z_j + z_k &= z_{(i+j+k)\%n}, & \text{where } 0 \leq i, j, k < n, \\ z_i + z_j + z_k + z_l &= z_{(i+j+k+l)\%n}, & \text{where } 0 \leq i, j, k, l < n, \end{aligned}$$

where  $\%$  denotes the mod operator. We enumerate all possible combinations of  $z_i, z_j, z_k$ , and  $z_l$ , and reserve a subset for testing. The testing set evaluates the model’s ability to generalize the algebraic properties of commutativity and identity learned from the training data. An example of the full training and testing set for the group  $\mathbb{Z}_5$  is provided in Appendix A.1. How we separate the training set and testing set are introduced as follows.

**Commutativity:** To demonstrate that LLMs can learn commutativity, we start by selecting a sequence of  $(z_{i_1}, z_{i_2}, \dots, z_{i_n})$ , where  $2 \leq n \leq 4$ ,  $z_{i_1} \leq z_{i_2} \leq \dots \leq z_{i_n}$ , and  $z_{i_1} > 0$ . We then enumerate all permutations of  $(z_{i_1}, z_{i_2}, \dots, z_{i_n})$  and substitute them into the equation:

$$z_{j_1} + z_{j_2} + \dots + z_{j_n} = z_{(i_1+i_2+\dots+i_n)\%n}, \quad (1)$$

where  $(z_{j_1}, z_{j_2}, \dots, z_{j_n})$  is a permutation of  $(z_{i_1}, z_{i_2}, \dots, z_{i_n})$ . For a given sequence  $(z_{i_1}, z_{i_2}, \dots, z_{i_n})$ , some of the equations derived from its permutations are included in the training set, while the remaining are allocated to the testing set. For any specific equation, if one of its permutation has not been seen in the training set, the LLM must infer that the addition operator is invariant under permutation. This training-testing split ensures that LLMs must learn that the addition operation is Commutativity.

For example, consider a sequence of elements  $(z_1, z_3, z_5)$ . There are six permutations, resulting in the following equations:

$$z_1 + z_3 + z_5 = z_9\%n, \tag{2a}$$

$$z_1 + z_5 + z_3 = z_9\%n, \tag{2b}$$

$$z_3 + z_1 + z_5 = z_9\%n, \tag{2c}$$

$$z_3 + z_5 + z_1 = z_9\%n, \tag{2d}$$

$$z_5 + z_1 + z_3 = z_9\%n, \tag{2e}$$

$$z_5 + z_3 + z_1 = z_9\%n. \tag{2f}$$

To split these into training and testing sets, the training set might include some of the equations: Eq. (2a), Eq. (2b) and Eq. (2f), while the testing set could include the remaining Eq. (2c), Eq. (2d) and Eq. (2e).

**Identity** In  $\mathbb{Z}_n$ , the identity element for the addition operation is  $z_0$ . To test whether LLMs learn the identity property, we select a set of variables  $(z_{i_1}, \dots, z_{i_n})$ , where  $1 \leq n \leq 3$ , and append  $z_0$  to this set. We then enumerate all permutations of  $(z_{i_1}, \dots, z_{i_n}, z_0)$  and substitute them into Eq. (1). To ensure that the LLMs cannot infer outcomes merely from permutation invariance, all permutations of a single set of variables  $(z_{i_1}, \dots, z_{i_n}, z_0)$  are assigned exclusively to either the training set or the testing set. For example, consider the sequence  $(z_3, z_5, z_0)$ . If any equation derived from its permutations is included in the testing set, all of the following equations must also be in the testing set:

$$\begin{aligned} z_0 + z_3 + z_5 = z_8\%n, & \quad z_0 + z_5 + z_3 = z_8\%n, & \quad z_3 + z_0 + z_5 = z_8\%n, \\ z_3 + z_5 + z_0 = z_8\%n, & \quad z_5 + z_0 + z_3 = z_8\%n, & \quad z_5 + z_3 + z_0 = z_8\%n. \end{aligned}$$

Additionally, the training set should include equations such as  $z_3 + z_5 = z_8\%n$  or  $z_5 + z_3 = z_8\%n$  to enable the LLMs to infer the correct values of these equations in the testing set by leveraging the identity property of  $z_0$ . Besides, the training set should also contain all permutations of other sequences, such as  $(z_2, z_4, z_0)$ , and  $z_2 + z_4 = z_6\%n$  which would yield the following equations in the training set:

$$\begin{aligned} z_2 + z_4 = z_6\%n, & \quad z_0 + z_2 + z_4 = z_6\%n, & \quad z_0 + z_4 + z_2 = z_6\%n, & \quad z_2 + z_0 + z_4 = z_6\%n, \\ z_2 + z_4 + z_0 = z_6\%n, & \quad z_4 + z_0 + z_2 = z_6\%n, & \quad z_4 + z_2 + z_0 = z_6\%n. \end{aligned}$$

### 3.3 Experiment Settings

In our experiments, we utilize GPT-2 as the language model. To ensure that the model learns algebraic structures exclusively from our training data, we reinitialize its weights before training, effectively removing any pre-trained knowledge. Additionally, we redesign the tokenizer to ensure that each element is tokenized as a single token. For instance, the element  $z_{11}$  is represented as one token **z11**, rather than multiple separate tokens for each character. To facilitate reproducibility, we have made our experimental code publicly available<sup>1</sup>.

## 4 Experiment Results

**Training Dynamics:** In this experiment, we set  $n = 11$  in  $\mathbb{Z}_n$ , with 80% of the samples used for training and 20% for testing. Fig. 1 illustrates the convergence of testing accuracy during the training process. The results demonstrate that both training and testing accuracy successfully converge, indicating that LLMs can effectively learn the commutativity and identity properties from the training data. However, an intriguing phenomenon is observed: the accuracy remains unchanged during the first 25,000 steps, then sharply increases between the 25,000th and 30,000th steps. This raises an interesting avenue for future research to explore the landscape of the loss function.

<sup>1</sup>[https://github.com/d09942015ntu/llm\\_algebra](https://github.com/d09942015ntu/llm_algebra)




Figure 1: Curve of training and testing accuracy

**Varying  $n$  and Training-Testing Split Ratio:** In this part, we vary the value of  $n$  in  $\mathbb{Z}_n$  and adjust the training-testing split ratio. We report the accuracy when the training accuracy reach a plateau over 99.9%, with results presented in Fig. 2. First, we observe that when  $n = 11$ , even with only 50% of the samples included in the training set, the testing accuracies of both commutativity and identity remain high. We attribute this to the fact that the increase of  $n$  causes the increases of possible permutations of variables  $(z_i, z_j, z_k, z_l)$  where  $0 < i, j, k, l < n$ , and hence the total number of possible samples,  $m = n^4 + n^3 + n^2$ , becomes significantly larger. In this scenario, despite the increasing number of potential combinations for  $(z_i, z_j, z_k, z_l)$  which complicate the input-output relation, LLMs can effectively learn the algebraic structures from a smaller subset of  $m$  and generalize to unseen instances. Conversely, when  $n$  is small, or when the training-testing split ratio is small, LLMs struggle to learn the algebraic structures and tend to memorize equations from the training set, resulting in poor generalization to testing samples. Furthermore, we observe that the identity property is more challenging to generalize to testing samples when the number of training samples is limited. We hypothesize that it is more challenging for LLMs to learn the identity property in our experimental settings. For instance, if an LLM is tasked with predicting the identity property for  $z_0 + z_3 + z_5 = z_{8\%n}$  in testing dataset, it must infer this property by generalizing from examples such as  $z_0 + z_2 + z_4 = z_{6\%n}$  and  $z_2 + z_4 = z_{6\%n}$  in training dataset. This inference is necessary because all permutations involving  $(z_0, z_3, z_5)$  are excluded from the training data. This exclusion are necessary since we need to ensure that LLMs infer the answer solely by identity and not by commutativity.




Figure 2: Accuracy curve of varying  $n$  and training-testing split ratio, where  $m$  denotes the total number of samples, and 60 in the x-axis means that 60% of the total samples are in training set.

## 5 Limitations

**Simplified Scenario:** In this work, we assume that the problem scope is limited to a finite Abelian group  $\mathbb{Z}_5$ , focusing solely on the properties of *Commutativity* and *Identity*. Other properties, such as *Inverse* and *Associativity*, remain to be verified. Furthermore, real-world mathematical problems often involve the field of real numbers, and whether LLMs can generalize their capabilities to arbitrary unseen numbers requires further investigation. Additionally, handling various forms of problem descriptions such as natural language presents a significant challenge. Despite these limitations, we believe our research takes the first step toward unraveling the mystery of LLMs’ mathematical capabilities. On the other hand, we tested only a relatively small language model, GPT-2. Whether larger language models can learn algebraic structures remains an open question. However, we hypothesize that larger models, with their greater expressive power, are also capable of capturing algebraic structures within training data.

**No Theoretical Result:** This work presents only empirical findings. To explore its theoretical foundations, learning the property of commutativity can be interpreted as discovering symmetric structures in the training data. Previous studies [KKP23, KKGP24] theoretically demonstrate that neural networks with specific architectures, such as a linear layer preceding a G-invariant network, can uncover symmetric properties in training data. However, extending these theoretical results to large language models with transformers is non-trivial. Additionally, there is no theoretical foundation to explain the learning of the identity property, necessitating further efforts to derive these related theories. Theoretical insights could also quantify the number of training samples  $m$  required for each  $\mathbb{Z}_n$  to achieve high testing accuracy. As future work, we aim to develop robust theoretical frameworks for understanding how LLMs can learn algebraic structures from training data, thereby contributing to the design of more theoretically sound algorithms.

## 6 Conclusion

In this paper, we have explored how large language models (LLMs) acquire arithmetic reasoning abilities, focusing specifically on their capacity to learn and generalize algebraic structures, such as commutativity and identity, within finite Abelian groups like  $\mathbb{Z}_n$ . Our findings demonstrate that LLMs can internalize these properties from training data and effectively generalize them to unseen test cases. By employing a carefully constructed dataset of arithmetic problems, we have shown that LLMs are capable of inferring algebraic structures through exposure to structured input-output pairs, providing new insights into their mathematical capabilities.

Our results also highlight the significance of algebraic structures in understanding how LLMs process and solve arithmetic tasks. Unlike traditional numerical encoding or symbolic reasoning approaches, our study emphasizes that LLMs can extract and utilize deeper algebraic principles to achieve generalization. This suggests that enhancing the design of training datasets with explicit algebraic structures could further improve the arithmetic reasoning capabilities of LLMs.

While our experiments focus on simplified scenarios within finite groups, they open the door to broader questions regarding the scalability and applicability of these findings. Can LLMs generalize similar algebraic reasoning to infinite domains or more complex mathematical structures such as *As-associative*, *Inverse* and *Distributive Law*? How do models larger than GPT-2 able to learn algebraic structures? These remain critical avenues for future exploration.

In summary, this work provides preliminary empirical evidence that LLMs can learn and generalize fundamental algebraic properties, offering a new perspective on their arithmetic learning mechanisms. We hope that this study serves as a stepping stone for future research aimed at uncovering the theoretical underpinnings of LLMs’ mathematical reasoning and designing more effective algorithms to enhance their capabilities. By bridging empirical findings with theoretical insights, we can better understand and optimize the learning potential of these powerful models.



## References

- [Ant24] Anthropic. Claude 3 haiku: our fastest model yet. <https://www.anthropic.com/news/claude-3-haiku>, 2024. Accessed: 2024-10-21.
- [CKB<sup>+</sup>21] Karl Cobbe, Vineet Kosaraju, Mohammad Bavarian, Mark Chen, Heewoo Jun, Lukasz Kaiser, Matthias Plappert, Jerry Tworek, Jacob Hilton, Reiichiro Nakano, et al. Training verifiers to solve math word problems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2110.14168*, 2021.
- [DLX<sup>+</sup>24] Chunyuan Deng, Zhiqi Li, Roy Xie, Ruidi Chang, and Hanjie Chen. Language models are symbolic learners in arithmetic. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.15580*, 2024.
- [FZ24] Zhifang Sui Fangwei Zhu, Damai Dai. Language models know the value of numbers, 2024.
- [FZG<sup>+</sup>24] Guhao Feng, Bohang Zhang, Yuntian Gu, Haotian Ye, Di He, and Liwei Wang. Towards revealing the mystery behind chain of thought: a theoretical perspective. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36, 2024.
- [HBK<sup>+</sup>21] Dan Hendrycks, Collin Burns, Saurav Kadavath, Akul Arora, Steven Basart, Eric Tang, Dawn Song, and Jacob Steinhardt. Measuring mathematical problem solving with the math dataset. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2103.03874*, 2021.
- [HLV24] Michael Hanna, Ollie Liu, and Alexandre Variengien. How does gpt-2 compute greater-than?: Interpreting mathematical abilities in a pre-trained language model. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36, 2024.
- [IP24] Shima Imani and Hamid Palangi. Exploring group and symmetry principles in large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.06120*, 2024.
- [KKG24] Pavan Karjol, Rohan Kashyap, Aditya Gopalan, and AP Prathosh. A unified framework for discovering discrete symmetries. In *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pages 793–801. PMLR, 2024.
- [KKP23] Pavan Karjol, Rohan Kashyap, and AP Prathosh. Neural discovery of permutation subgroups. In *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pages 4668–4678. PMLR, 2023.
- [LG24] Amit Arnold Levy and Mor Geva. Language models encode numbers using digit representations in base 10. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.11781*, 2024.
- [Mal23] Eran Malach. Auto-regressive next-token predictors are universal learners. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.06979*, 2023.
- [Ope24] OpenAI. Chatgpt. <https://chatgpt.com/>, 2024. Accessed: 2024-10-21.
- [PLG24] Ben Prystawski, Michael Li, and Noah Goodman. Why think step by step? reasoning emerges from the locality of experience. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36, 2024.
- [SBS23a] Alessandro Stolfo, Yonatan Belinkov, and Mrinmaya Sachan. A mechanistic interpretation of arithmetic reasoning in language models using causal mediation analysis. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.15054*, 2023.
- [SBS23b] Alessandro Stolfo, Yonatan Belinkov, and Mrinmaya Sachan. A mechanistic interpretation of arithmetic reasoning in language models using causal mediation analysis, 2023.
- [WWS<sup>+</sup>22] Jason Wei, Xuezhi Wang, Dale Schuurmans, Maarten Bosma, Fei Xia, Ed Chi, Quoc V Le, Denny Zhou, et al. Chain-of-thought prompting elicits reasoning in large language models. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 35:24824–24837, 2022.
- [XL24] Changnan Xiao and Bing Liu. A theory for length generalization in learning to reason. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.00560*, 2024.
- [YDWY23] Jianke Yang, Nima Dehmamy, Robin Walters, and Rose Yu. Latent space symmetry discovery. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.00105*, 2023.





$z0+z3+z0+z1=z4$	$z0+z3+z0+z2=z0$	$z0+z3+z0+z4=z2$	$z0+z3+z1+z0=z4$	$z0+z3+z1+z1=z0$
$z0+z3+z1+z2=z1$	$z0+z3+z1+z4=z3$	$z0+z3+z2+z0=z0$	$z0+z3+z2+z1=z1$	$z0+z3+z2+z3=z3$
$z0+z3+z2+z4=z4$	$z0+z3+z3+z2=z3$	$z0+z3+z3+z3=z4$	$z0+z3+z3+z4=z0$	$z0+z3+z4+z0=z2$
$z0+z3+z4+z1=z3$	$z0+z3+z4+z2=z4$	$z0+z3+z4+z3=z0$	$z0+z3+z4+z4=z1$	$z0+z4+z0+z0=z4$
$z0+z4+z0+z1=z0$	$z0+z4+z0+z3=z2$	$z0+z4+z1+z0=z0$	$z0+z4+z1+z1=z1$	$z0+z4+z1+z3=z3$
$z0+z4+z1+z4=z4$	$z0+z4+z2+z3=z4$	$z0+z4+z3+z0=z2$	$z0+z4+z3+z1=z3$	$z0+z4+z3+z2=z4$
$z0+z4+z3+z3=z0$	$z0+z4+z3+z4=z1$	$z0+z4+z4+z1=z4$	$z0+z4+z4+z3=z1$	$z1+z0+z0+z0=z1$
$z1+z0+z0+z2=z3$	$z1+z0+z0+z3=z4$	$z1+z0+z0+z4=z0$	$z1+z0+z1+z3=z0$	$z1+z0+z1+z4=z1$
$z1+z0+z2+z0=z3$	$z1+z0+z2+z2=z0$	$z1+z0+z2+z3=z1$	$z1+z0+z3+z0=z4$	$z1+z0+z3+z1=z0$
$z1+z0+z3+z2=z1$	$z1+z0+z3+z4=z3$	$z1+z0+z4+z0=z0$	$z1+z0+z4+z1=z1$	$z1+z0+z4+z3=z3$
$z1+z0+z4+z4=z4$	$z1+z1+z0+z3=z0$	$z1+z1+z0+z4=z1$	$z1+z1+z3+z0=z0$	$z1+z1+z4+z0=z1$
$z1+z2+z0+z0=z0$	$z1+z2+z0+z2=z0$	$z1+z2+z0+z3=z1$	$z1+z2+z2+z0=z0$	$z1+z2+z3+z0=z1$
$z1+z3+z0+z0=z4$	$z1+z3+z0+z1=z0$	$z1+z3+z0+z2=z1$	$z1+z3+z0+z4=z3$	$z1+z3+z1+z0=z0$
$z1+z3+z2+z0=z1$	$z1+z3+z4+z0=z3$	$z1+z4+z0+z0=z0$	$z1+z4+z0+z1=z1$	$z1+z4+z0+z3=z3$
$z1+z4+z0+z4=z4$	$z1+z4+z1+z0=z1$	$z1+z4+z3+z0=z3$	$z1+z4+z4+z0=z4$	$z2+z0+z0+z0=z2$
$z2+z0+z0+z1=z3$	$z2+z0+z0+z3=z0$	$z2+z0+z1+z0=z3$	$z2+z0+z1+z2=z0$	$z2+z0+z1+z3=z1$
$z2+z0+z2+z1=z0$	$z2+z0+z3+z0=z0$	$z2+z0+z3+z1=z1$	$z2+z0+z3+z3=z3$	$z2+z0+z3+z4=z4$
$z2+z0+z4+z3=z4$	$z2+z1+z0+z0=z3$	$z2+z1+z0+z2=z0$	$z2+z1+z0+z3=z1$	$z2+z1+z2+z0=z0$
$z2+z1+z3+z0=z1$	$z2+z2+z0+z1=z0$	$z2+z2+z1+z0=z0$	$z2+z3+z0+z0=z0$	$z2+z3+z0+z1=z1$
$z2+z3+z0+z3=z3$	$z2+z3+z0+z4=z4$	$z2+z3+z1+z0=z1$	$z2+z3+z3+z0=z3$	$z2+z3+z4+z0=z4$
$z2+z4+z0+z3=z4$	$z2+z4+z3+z0=z4$	$z3+z0+z0+z0=z3$	$z3+z0+z0+z1=z4$	$z3+z0+z0+z2=z0$
$z3+z0+z0+z4=z2$	$z3+z0+z1+z0=z4$	$z3+z0+z1+z1=z0$	$z3+z0+z1+z2=z1$	$z3+z0+z1+z4=z3$
$z3+z0+z2+z0=z0$	$z3+z0+z2+z1=z1$	$z3+z0+z2+z3=z3$	$z3+z0+z2+z4=z4$	$z3+z0+z3+z2=z3$
$z3+z0+z3+z3=z4$	$z3+z0+z3+z4=z0$	$z3+z0+z4+z0=z2$	$z3+z0+z4+z1=z3$	$z3+z0+z4+z2=z4$
$z3+z0+z4+z3=z0$	$z3+z0+z4+z4=z1$	$z3+z1+z0+z0=z4$	$z3+z1+z0+z1=z0$	$z3+z1+z0+z2=z1$
$z3+z1+z0+z4=z3$	$z3+z1+z1+z0=z0$	$z3+z1+z2+z0=z1$	$z3+z1+z4+z0=z3$	$z3+z2+z0+z0=z0$
$z3+z2+z0+z1=z1$	$z3+z2+z0+z3=z3$	$z3+z2+z0+z4=z4$	$z3+z2+z1+z0=z1$	$z3+z2+z3+z0=z3$
$z3+z2+z4+z0=z4$	$z3+z3+z0+z2=z3$	$z3+z3+z0+z3=z4$	$z3+z3+z0+z4=z0$	$z3+z3+z2+z0=z3$
$z3+z3+z3+z0=z4$	$z3+z3+z4+z0=z0$	$z3+z4+z0+z0=z2$	$z3+z4+z0+z1=z3$	$z3+z4+z0+z2=z4$
$z3+z4+z0+z3=z0$	$z3+z4+z0+z4=z1$	$z3+z4+z1+z0=z3$	$z3+z4+z2+z0=z4$	$z3+z4+z3+z0=z0$
$z3+z4+z4+z0=z1$	$z4+z0+z0+z0=z4$	$z4+z0+z0+z1=z0$	$z4+z0+z0+z3=z2$	$z4+z0+z1+z0=z0$
$z4+z0+z1+z1=z1$	$z4+z0+z1+z3=z3$	$z4+z0+z1+z4=z4$	$z4+z0+z2+z3=z4$	$z4+z0+z3+z0=z2$
$z4+z0+z3+z1=z3$	$z4+z0+z3+z2=z4$	$z4+z0+z3+z3=z0$	$z4+z0+z3+z4=z1$	$z4+z0+z4+z1=z4$
$z4+z0+z4+z3=z1$	$z4+z1+z0+z0=z0$	$z4+z1+z0+z1=z1$	$z4+z1+z0+z3=z3$	$z4+z1+z0+z4=z4$
$z4+z1+z1+z0=z1$	$z4+z1+z3+z0=z3$	$z4+z1+z4+z0=z4$	$z4+z2+z0+z3=z4$	$z4+z2+z3+z0=z4$
$z4+z3+z0+z0=z2$	$z4+z3+z0+z1=z3$	$z4+z3+z0+z2=z4$	$z4+z3+z0+z3=z0$	$z4+z3+z0+z4=z1$
$z4+z3+z1+z0=z3$	$z4+z3+z2+z0=z4$	$z4+z3+z3+z0=z0$	$z4+z3+z4+z0=z1$	$z4+z4+z0+z1=z4$
$z4+z4+z0+z3=z1$	$z4+z4+z1+z0=z4$	$z4+z4+z3+z0=z1$		

Listing 2: Testing set for Commutativity.

$z1+z2=z3$	$z1+z4=z0$	$z2+z1=z3$	$z2+z4=z1$		
$z3+z1=z4$	$z3+z2=z0$	$z3+z4=z2$	$z4+z1=z0$	$z4+z3=z2$	
$z1+z2+z3=z1$	$z1+z3+z3=z2$	$z1+z4+z4=z4$	$z2+z1+z1=z4$	$z2+z1+z2=z0$	
$z2+z3+z1=z1$	$z2+z3+z3=z3$	$z2+z4+z1=z2$	$z2+z4+z3=z4$	$z3+z1+z1=z0$	
$z3+z2+z2=z2$	$z3+z4+z3=z0$	$z4+z1+z1=z1$	$z4+z1+z2=z2$	$z4+z1+z3=z3$	
$z4+z2+z2=z3$	$z4+z2+z3=z4$	$z4+z2+z4=z0$	$z4+z3+z1=z3$	$z4+z4+z3=z1$	
$z1+z1+z2+z4=z3$	$z1+z1+z3+z2=z2$	$z1+z2+z1+z1=z0$	$z1+z2+z1+z4=z3$	$z1+z2+z2+z1=z1$	
$z1+z2+z2+z2=z2$	$z1+z2+z3+z3=z4$	$z1+z2+z4+z2=z4$	$z1+z3+z1+z1=z1$	$z1+z3+z1+z3=z3$	
$z1+z3+z1+z4=z4$	$z1+z3+z2+z2=z3$	$z1+z3+z4+z2=z0$	$z1+z4+z1+z1=z2$	$z1+z4+z1+z3=z4$	
$z1+z4+z1+z4=z0$	$z1+z4+z2+z1=z3$	$z1+z4+z2+z4=z1$	$z1+z4+z3+z2=z0$	$z2+z1+z1+z2=z1$	
$z2+z1+z2+z4=z4$	$z2+z1+z3+z1=z2$	$z2+z1+z3+z2=z3$	$z2+z1+z4+z2=z4$	$z2+z2+z1+z4=z4$	
$z2+z2+z4+z3=z1$	$z2+z2+z4+z4=z2$	$z2+z3+z1+z3=z4$	$z2+z3+z1+z4=z0$	$z2+z3+z2+z1=z3$	
$z2+z3+z2+z2=z4$	$z2+z3+z2+z4=z1$	$z2+z3+z3+z2=z0$	$z2+z3+z3+z3=z1$	$z2+z3+z3+z4=z2$	
$z2+z3+z4+z1=z0$	$z2+z4+z1+z3=z0$	$z3+z1+z2+z1=z3$	$z3+z1+z3+z1=z3$	$z3+z1+z3+z2=z4$	
$z3+z1+z3+z4=z1$	$z3+z1+z4+z4=z2$	$z3+z2+z1+z1=z2$	$z3+z2+z1+z4=z0$	$z3+z2+z2+z1=z3$	
$z3+z2+z2+z4=z1$	$z3+z2+z4+z4=z3$	$z3+z3+z2+z1=z4$	$z3+z3+z2+z2=z0$	$z3+z3+z3+z1=z0$	
$z3+z3+z4+z2=z2$	$z3+z4+z1+z1=z4$	$z3+z4+z1+z3=z1$	$z3+z4+z1+z4=z2$	$z3+z4+z2+z1=z0$	
$z3+z4+z2+z3=z2$	$z3+z4+z3+z1=z1$	$z3+z4+z3+z3=z3$	$z4+z1+z1+z4=z0$	$z4+z1+z2+z3=z0$	
$z4+z1+z2+z4=z1$	$z4+z1+z3+z1=z4$	$z4+z1+z3+z4=z2$	$z4+z1+z4+z2=z1$	$z4+z2+z1+z1=z3$	
$z4+z2+z2+z2=z0$	$z4+z2+z3+z1=z0$	$z4+z2+z3+z3=z2$	$z4+z2+z3+z4=z3$	$z4+z2+z4+z1=z1$	
$z4+z2+z4+z2=z2$	$z4+z2+z4+z4=z4$	$z4+z3+z2+z2=z1$	$z4+z3+z2+z4=z3$	$z4+z3+z3+z1=z1$	
$z4+z3+z3+z4=z4$	$z4+z3+z4+z3=z4$	$z4+z4+z3+z1=z2$	$z4+z4+z3+z2=z3$	$z4+z4+z3+z4=z0$	

Listing 3: Testing set for Identity.

$z0+z3=z3$	$z0+z4=z4$	$z3+z0=z3$	$z4+z0=z4$		
$z0+z0+z1=z1$	$z0+z0+z2=z2$	$z0+z1+z0=z1$	$z0+z1+z2=z3$	$z0+z2+z0=z2$	
$z0+z2+z1=z3$	$z0+z2+z3=z0$	$z0+z3+z2=z0$	$z0+z3+z3=z1$	$z1+z0+z0=z1$	

$z_1+z_0+z_2=z_3$   $z_1+z_2+z_0=z_3$   $z_2+z_0+z_0=z_2$   $z_2+z_0+z_1=z_3$   $z_2+z_0+z_3=z_0$   
 $z_2+z_1+z_0=z_3$   $z_2+z_3+z_0=z_0$   $z_3+z_0+z_2=z_0$   $z_3+z_0+z_3=z_1$   $z_3+z_2+z_0=z_0$   
 $z_3+z_3+z_0=z_1$   $z_0+z_0+z_1+z_1=z_2$   $z_0+z_0+z_2+z_2=z_4$   $z_0+z_0+z_2+z_4=z_1$   $z_0+z_0+z_3+z_3=z_1$   
 $z_0+z_0+z_4+z_2=z_1$   $z_0+z_0+z_4+z_4=z_3$   $z_0+z_1+z_0+z_1=z_2$   $z_0+z_1+z_1+z_0=z_2$   $z_0+z_1+z_1+z_1=z_3$   
 $z_0+z_1+z_1+z_2=z_4$   $z_0+z_1+z_2+z_1=z_4$   $z_0+z_1+z_2+z_4=z_2$   $z_0+z_1+z_3+z_3=z_2$   $z_0+z_1+z_4+z_2=z_2$   
 $z_0+z_2+z_0+z_2=z_4$   $z_0+z_2+z_0+z_4=z_1$   $z_0+z_2+z_1+z_1=z_4$   $z_0+z_2+z_1+z_4=z_2$   $z_0+z_2+z_2+z_0=z_4$   
 $z_0+z_2+z_2+z_2=z_1$   $z_0+z_2+z_2+z_3=z_2$   $z_0+z_2+z_2+z_4=z_3$   $z_0+z_2+z_3+z_2=z_2$   $z_0+z_2+z_4+z_0=z_1$   
 $z_0+z_2+z_4+z_1=z_2$   $z_0+z_2+z_4+z_2=z_3$   $z_0+z_2+z_4+z_4=z_0$   $z_0+z_3+z_0+z_3=z_1$   $z_0+z_3+z_1+z_3=z_2$   
 $z_0+z_3+z_2+z_2=z_2$   $z_0+z_3+z_3+z_0=z_1$   $z_0+z_3+z_3+z_1=z_2$   $z_0+z_4+z_0+z_2=z_1$   $z_0+z_4+z_0+z_4=z_3$   
 $z_0+z_4+z_1+z_2=z_2$   $z_0+z_4+z_2+z_0=z_1$   $z_0+z_4+z_2+z_1=z_2$   $z_0+z_4+z_2+z_2=z_3$   $z_0+z_4+z_2+z_4=z_0$   
 $z_0+z_4+z_4+z_0=z_3$   $z_0+z_4+z_4+z_2=z_0$   $z_0+z_4+z_4+z_4=z_2$   $z_1+z_0+z_0+z_1=z_2$   $z_1+z_0+z_1+z_0=z_2$   
 $z_1+z_0+z_1+z_1=z_3$   $z_1+z_0+z_1+z_2=z_4$   $z_1+z_0+z_2+z_1=z_4$   $z_1+z_0+z_2+z_4=z_2$   $z_1+z_0+z_3+z_3=z_2$   
 $z_1+z_0+z_4+z_2=z_2$   $z_1+z_1+z_0+z_0=z_2$   $z_1+z_1+z_0+z_1=z_3$   $z_1+z_1+z_0+z_2=z_4$   $z_1+z_1+z_1+z_0=z_3$   
 $z_1+z_1+z_2+z_0=z_4$   $z_1+z_2+z_0+z_1=z_4$   $z_1+z_2+z_0+z_4=z_2$   $z_1+z_2+z_1+z_0=z_4$   $z_1+z_2+z_4+z_0=z_2$   
 $z_1+z_3+z_0+z_3=z_2$   $z_1+z_3+z_3+z_0=z_2$   $z_1+z_4+z_0+z_2=z_2$   $z_1+z_4+z_2+z_0=z_2$   $z_2+z_0+z_0+z_2=z_4$   
 $z_2+z_0+z_0+z_4=z_1$   $z_2+z_0+z_1+z_1=z_4$   $z_2+z_0+z_1+z_4=z_2$   $z_2+z_0+z_2+z_0=z_4$   $z_2+z_0+z_2+z_2=z_1$   
 $z_2+z_0+z_2+z_3=z_2$   $z_2+z_0+z_2+z_4=z_3$   $z_2+z_0+z_3+z_2=z_2$   $z_2+z_0+z_4+z_0=z_1$   $z_2+z_0+z_4+z_1=z_2$   
 $z_2+z_0+z_4+z_2=z_3$   $z_2+z_0+z_4+z_4=z_0$   $z_2+z_1+z_0+z_1=z_4$   $z_2+z_1+z_0+z_4=z_2$   $z_2+z_1+z_1+z_0=z_4$   
 $z_2+z_1+z_4+z_0=z_2$   $z_2+z_2+z_0+z_0=z_4$   $z_2+z_2+z_0+z_2=z_1$   $z_2+z_2+z_0+z_3=z_2$   $z_2+z_2+z_0+z_4=z_3$   
 $z_2+z_2+z_2+z_0=z_1$   $z_2+z_2+z_3+z_0=z_2$   $z_2+z_2+z_4+z_0=z_3$   $z_2+z_3+z_0+z_2=z_2$   $z_2+z_3+z_2+z_0=z_2$   
 $z_2+z_4+z_0+z_0=z_1$   $z_2+z_4+z_0+z_1=z_2$   $z_2+z_4+z_0+z_2=z_3$   $z_2+z_4+z_0+z_4=z_0$   $z_2+z_4+z_1+z_0=z_2$   
 $z_2+z_4+z_2+z_0=z_3$   $z_2+z_4+z_4+z_0=z_0$   $z_3+z_0+z_0+z_3=z_1$   $z_3+z_0+z_1+z_3=z_2$   $z_3+z_0+z_2+z_2=z_2$   
 $z_3+z_0+z_3+z_0=z_1$   $z_3+z_0+z_3+z_1=z_2$   $z_3+z_1+z_0+z_3=z_2$   $z_3+z_1+z_3+z_0=z_2$   $z_3+z_2+z_0+z_2=z_2$   
 $z_3+z_2+z_2+z_0=z_2$   $z_3+z_3+z_0+z_0=z_1$   $z_3+z_3+z_0+z_1=z_2$   $z_3+z_3+z_1+z_0=z_2$   $z_4+z_0+z_0+z_2=z_1$   
 $z_4+z_0+z_0+z_4=z_3$   $z_4+z_0+z_1+z_2=z_2$   $z_4+z_0+z_2+z_0=z_1$   $z_4+z_0+z_2+z_1=z_2$   $z_4+z_0+z_2+z_2=z_3$   
 $z_4+z_0+z_2+z_4=z_0$   $z_4+z_0+z_4+z_0=z_3$   $z_4+z_0+z_4+z_2=z_0$   $z_4+z_0+z_4+z_4=z_2$   $z_4+z_1+z_0+z_2=z_2$   
 $z_4+z_1+z_2+z_0=z_2$   $z_4+z_2+z_0+z_0=z_1$   $z_4+z_2+z_0+z_1=z_2$   $z_4+z_2+z_0+z_2=z_3$   $z_4+z_2+z_0+z_4=z_0$   
 $z_4+z_2+z_1+z_0=z_2$   $z_4+z_2+z_2+z_0=z_3$   $z_4+z_2+z_4+z_0=z_0$   $z_4+z_4+z_0+z_0=z_3$   $z_4+z_4+z_0+z_2=z_0$   
 $z_4+z_4+z_0+z_4=z_2$   $z_4+z_4+z_2+z_0=z_0$   $z_4+z_4+z_4+z_0=z_2$