

Model theory of linear fragments of arithmetic

Petr Glivický

petrglivicky@gmail.com

Institute of Mathematics
Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic

(research performed at the Faculty of Mathematics and Physics,
Charles University in Prague)

Pražské setkání logiků
8.2.2014

Slides available at <http://www.glivicky.cz>

Content

- 1 Linear arithmetic
- 2 Analysis of Linear theories
 - Linear theories
 - QE for liner theories
 - Properties of linear arithmetic
 - A more detailed analysis
- 3 Dependency of Peano products
 - Dependency problem
 - Meeting pairs of Peano products
- 4 Proofs

Section 1

Linear arithmetic

Presburger arithmetic (Pr)

Language: $\langle 0, 1, +, \leq \rangle$

Axioms:

- defining axioms for $0, 1, +, \leq$
- induction scheme for all formulas

Proposition (Presburger)

1) Pr is model-complete.

Moreover: Every formula is in Pr equivalent to a disjunction of primitive positive formulas, i.e. to a formula of the form $\bigvee_{i < n} (\exists \bar{z}) \psi_i$, where each ψ_i is a system of linear inequalities.

2) Pr is decidable, complete, and $\langle \mathbb{N}, 0, 1, +, \leq \rangle$ is its prime model.

3) The induction scheme in Pr may be equivalently replaced by the scheme of integral divisibility

$$(\exists y, z)(x = ny + z \ \& \ z < n), \text{ for all } 0 < n \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Peano arithmetic (\mathcal{P})

Language: $\langle 0, 1, +, \cdot, \leq \rangle$

Axioms:

- defining axioms for $0, 1, +, \cdot, \leq$
- induction scheme for all formulas

Proposition (classical)

- 1) *The arithmetical hierarchy does not collapse in \mathcal{P} : For every $n \in \mathbb{N}$ there is a formula φ which is not equivalent in \mathcal{P} to any Σ_n -formula.*
- 2) *Any recursively axiomatizable extension of \mathcal{P} is incomplete and undecidable.*

Linear arithmetic

Presburger
arithmetic

Pr

$\langle 0, 1, +, \leq \rangle$

Linear
arithmetic

LA

$L^{lin} = \langle 0, 1, +, \underline{a}, \leq \rangle$

Peano
arithmetic

P

$\langle 0, 1, +, \cdot, \leq \rangle$

Linear arithmetic (LA) is the extension of Pr by

$$\underline{a}(x + 1) = \underline{a}x + \underline{a}1,$$

$$\underline{a}1 \neq n \text{ for all } n \in \mathbb{N},$$

induction for all L^{lin} -formulas.

Example

Let $\mathcal{M} = \langle M, 0, 1, +, \cdot, \leq \rangle \models P$ be nonstandard and $a \in M - \mathbb{N}$ then $\langle M, 0, 1, +, a \cdot _, \leq \rangle \models LA$.

LA as a theory of modules

ZLA is a \mathbb{Z} -like variant of LA.

Let $\mathcal{A} = \langle A, 0, 1, +, -, \underline{a}, \leq \rangle \models \text{ZLA}$. For each $q \in \mathbb{Q}[a] \cap A = D_{\mathcal{A}}$, we may define multiplication by q (a “scalar” \underline{q}).

$D_{\mathcal{A}}$ is a discretely ordered integral domain and \mathcal{A} may be seen as a discretely ordered $D_{\mathcal{A}}$ -module.

ZLA can be viewed as a theory of certain **discretely ordered** modules.

The theory of modules over a given ring R has a similar property as Pr:

Theorem (Baur-Monk)

Let \mathcal{M} be a module. Every formula is in \mathcal{M} equivalent to a disjunction of primitive positive formulas, i.e. to a formula of the form $\bigvee_{i < n} (\exists \bar{z}) \psi_i$, where each ψ_i is a system of linear equations.

LA can be viewed as an extension of both – Pr and the theory of modules – and also as a fragment of P.

Question: Are the properties of LA similar to those of Pr (and the theory of modules) or to those of P?

Section 2

Analysis of Linear theories

Doded

An ordered integral domain $D = \langle D, 0, 1, +, -, \cdot, \leq \rangle$ is called a **doded** if it

- is discretely ordered by \leq , with 1 being the least positive element,
- is regularly quasi-Euclidean, i.e. the Euclidean algorithm in D is correctly defined and always stops in finitely many steps,
- has degrees, i.e. there is a function $\text{deg} : D \rightarrow \mathbb{N} \cup \{-\infty\}$ such that $\text{rng}(\text{deg})$ is a lower set in $\mathbb{N} \cup \{-\infty\}$, and $\text{deg } r \leq \text{deg } q \Leftrightarrow |r| \leq n|q|$, for some $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

Example

The ordered ring \mathbb{Z} and the rings $D_{\mathcal{A}}$ for $\mathcal{A} \models \text{ZLA}$ are dodeds.

Lineal

Let $\mathcal{A} = \langle A, 0, 1, +, -, \underline{a}, \leq \rangle \models \text{ZLA}$:

In \mathcal{A} , we may define

- scalar multiplication \underline{q} , for $q \in D_{\mathcal{A}}$,
- constants $\mathbf{q} = \underline{q}(1)$, for $q \in D_{\mathcal{A}}$,
- integral inverses \underline{q}^{-1} , for $0 < q \in D_{\mathcal{A}}$ ($0 \leq x - \underline{q}(\underline{q}^{-1}(x)) < \mathbf{q}$).

The set $\mathbf{C}_{\mathcal{A}} = \{\mathbf{q}; q \in D_{\mathcal{A}}\}$ is a universe of a substructure of $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{A}} = \langle A, 0, 1, +, -, \leq, \underline{q}, \mathbf{q}, \underline{r}^{-1} \rangle_{q \in D_{\mathcal{A}}, 0 < r \in D_{\mathcal{A}}}$.

Linear

A **lineal** is any structure

$\mathcal{F} = \langle F, 0, 1, +, -, \leq, r, c, q^{-1} \rangle_{r \in D_{\mathcal{F}}, c \in C_{\mathcal{F}}, 0 < q \in D_{\mathcal{F}}}$ where

- $D_{\mathcal{F}}$ is an universe of a doded $D_{\mathcal{F}}$,
- \mathcal{F} and $C_{\mathcal{F}} = \mathcal{F} \upharpoonright C_{\mathcal{F}}$ are expansions of discretely ordered $D_{\mathcal{F}}$ -modules (with the least positive element 1) by constants c and integral inverses q^{-1} .

Example

The expansion $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{A}}$ of any model \mathcal{A} of ZPr or ZLA is a lineal.

Linealization

For different models $\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B} \models \text{ZLA}$, the rings of scalars $D_{\mathcal{A}}, D_{\mathcal{B}}$ may be **different subrings** of $\mathbb{Q}[a]$.

That is, the lineals $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{A}}, \mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{B}}$ are expansions of \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B} , respectively, **in different languages** and by **different sets of definitions**.

All the defined scalars and constants are from $\mathbb{Q}[a]$ – we say that ZLA has a **$(\mathbb{Q}[a], \mathbb{Q}[a])$ -linealization**.

Linear theory

Let L be a language extending $L^Z = \langle 0, 1, +, -, \leq \rangle$ (where $-$ is unary), T be an L -theory, and let D, C be sets of formulas (intended as definitions of scalars and constants).

A (D, C) -linearization of T is any map $\mathcal{A} \mapsto \mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{A}}$, for $\mathcal{A} \models T$, such that every

$$\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{A}} = \langle \mathcal{A}, 0, 1, +, -, \leq, r, c, q^{-1} \rangle_{r \in D_{\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{A}}}, c \in C_{\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{A}}}, q \in {}^+D_{\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{A}}}}$$

is a lineal equidefinable with \mathcal{A} and satisfying $D_{\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{A}}} \subseteq D$ and $C_{\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{A}}} \subseteq C$.

An L -theory T is a **linear theory** if it has an (Fm_L, Fm_L) -linearization.

Example

ZPr and ZLA are linear theories.

ZPr has a (\mathbb{Z}, \mathbb{Z}) -linearization, ZLA has a $(\mathbb{Q}[a], \mathbb{Q}[a])$ -linearization.

Solvable theories

We say that a theory T is $[n]$ -solvable [for $n \in \mathbb{N}$] if, for every model $\mathcal{M} \models T$, every L -formula $\varphi(x, \bar{y})$ [with $l(\bar{y}) \leq n$] and an $l(\bar{y})$ -tuple \bar{a} from M , it holds

$$\mathcal{M} \models (\exists x)\varphi(x, \bar{a}) \Rightarrow \mathcal{M} \models \varphi(t(\bar{a}), \bar{a}), \text{ for some } L_T\text{-term } t.$$

Proposition

For a theory T in a language with a constant symbol, it is equivalent:

- 1) T is solvable.
- 2) T has quantifier elimination and is axiomatizable by open formulas.
- 3) T is model-complete and is axiomatizable by open formulas.
- 4) For $\mathcal{N} \subseteq \mathcal{M} \models T$, it is $\mathcal{N} \prec \mathcal{M}$.
- 5) For $\mathcal{M} \models T$, $X \subseteq M$, it is $M\langle X \rangle = M_{(X)}$, and it is a dense set (of all atoms) in $\text{Df}^1(X, \mathcal{M})$.

Almost uniform solvability

We say that a theory T is **almost uniformly solvable** if, for each (quantifier-free) formula $\psi(x, \bar{y})$, there are finitely many terms t_i , $i < n$, such that

$$T \vdash (\exists x)\psi(x, \bar{y}) \rightarrow \bigvee_{i < n} \psi(t_i(\bar{y}), \bar{y}).$$

Lemma

The following are equivalent:

- 1) T is almost uniformly solvable.
- 2) For each (quantifier-free) formula $\psi(x, \bar{y})$ and $\mathcal{M} \models T$, there are finitely many terms t_i , $i < n$, such that $\mathcal{M} \models (\exists x)\psi(x, \bar{y}) \rightarrow \bigvee_{i < n} \psi(t_i(\bar{y}), \bar{y})$.

What do model theorists do when there is no quantifier elimination?
They change the language.

Example

All arithmetical theories with full induction ($T = \text{Pr}, \text{LA}, \text{P}$) have solvable extensions by definitions: For every $\varphi(x, \bar{y})$ define a new function $f(\bar{y})$ giving the minimal x such that $\varphi(x, \bar{y})$ holds (or 0 if there is no such x).

Solvable extensions by definitions

For a theory T and $F \subseteq Fm_L$, we write

$$T^F = T \cup \{\delta(\varphi); \varphi \in F\}$$

for the extension of T by functions definable by formulas from F , where $\delta(\varphi)$ is the conditional definition of a new function symbol $\underline{\varphi}$:

$$(\text{cor}(\varphi) \ \& \ \varphi(\bar{x}, \underline{\varphi}(\bar{x}))) \vee (\neg \text{cor}(\varphi) \ \& \ \varphi(\bar{x}) = 0).$$

Example

Let F be the set of all definitions of scalars and constants from $\mathbb{Q}[a]$ and of inverses q^{-1} for $0 < q \in \mathbb{Q}[a]$. Then ZLA^F is a theory whose models are exactly all lineals $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{A}}$ where $\mathcal{A} \models ZLA$ (**up to a reduction of language**).

Main theorem on linear theories

Theorem (Main theorem on linear theories)

Let T be a linear theory in a language L , $\mathcal{A} \mapsto \mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{A}}$ be a (D, C) -linearization, and $E = D \cup C \cup D^{-1}$.

Then T^E is almost uniformly solvable.

Corollaries

Corollary

- 1) T^E admits quantifier elimination and is axiomatizable by open formulas.
- 2) For $\mathcal{A} \models T$, the structure $\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{A}}$ of all constants of \mathcal{A} is the unique prime model of $Th(\mathcal{A})$.
- 3) For $\mathcal{A} \models T$, the theory $Th(\mathcal{A})$ is equivalent to $T \cup OTh_L(\mathcal{A}^C)$ (or equivalently to $T \cup OTh_L(\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{A}}^C)$), where $OTh_L(\mathcal{N})$ is the canonical L -translation of the set of all open sentences true in \mathcal{N} .

Properties of LA

\mathbf{LA}^\bullet denotes the extension of LA by conditional definitions of all scalars q , constants $\mathbf{q} = \underline{q}1$ and integral divisors \underline{q}^{-1} for $0 < q \in \mathbb{Q}[a]$.

\mathbb{J}_p denotes the set of all p -adic integers, for $p \in \mathbb{P}$.

\mathbf{LA}_τ , for $\tau \in \prod_{p \in \mathbb{P}} \mathbb{J}_p$, is the extension of LA by axioms (α_τ) expressing $\mathbf{a} = \tau_p(k) \bmod \mathbf{p}^k$, for all $p \in \mathbb{P}$, $0 < k \in \mathbb{N}$.

Let $\mathbb{Z}[a] \subseteq \mathbb{Q}[a]_\tau \subseteq \mathbb{Q}[a]$ be the set of all $\frac{r}{n} \in \mathbb{Q}[a]$, $0 < n \in \mathbb{N}$, $r \in \mathbb{Z}[a]$, such that “ $n|r$ whenever a satisfies the congruences (α_τ) ”.

We set $\underline{\mathbb{Q}[a]_\tau}^+ = \langle \mathbb{Q}[a]_\tau^+, 0, 1, +, -, \leq, \underline{a} \rangle$, where \underline{a} is the unary function of multiplication by the variable a .

Properties of LA

Theorem (Properties of LA)

- 1) LA^\bullet is almost uniformly solvable.
Hence: LA is model-complete.
Moreover: Every formula is in LA equivalent to a disjunction of primitive positive formulas, i.e. to a formula of the form $\bigvee_{i < n} (\exists \bar{z}) \psi_i$, where each ψ_i is a system of linear inequalities.
- 2) LA_τ , for $\tau \in \prod_{p \in \mathbb{P}} \mathbb{J}_p$, are all simple complete extensions of LA .
For $\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B} \models LA$, it is $\mathcal{A} \equiv \mathcal{B} \Leftrightarrow \mathbf{a}^{\mathcal{A}} \equiv \mathbf{a}^{\mathcal{B}} \pmod{n}$, for all $0 < n \in \mathbb{N}$.
- 3) $\mathbb{Q}[a]_\tau^+$ is the unique prime model of LA_τ , for $\tau \in \prod_{p \in \mathbb{P}} \mathbb{J}_p$.
- 4) LA is decidable.
 LA_τ is decidable if and only if τ is recursive.
- 5) The induction scheme in LA may be equivalently replaced by the scheme of integral divisibility
 $(\exists y, z)(x = \underline{q}y + z \ \& \ z < \underline{q})$, for all $0 < q \in \mathbb{Z}[a]$.

Properties of LA

Corollary

Up to elementary equivalence, models of LA are exactly all ultraproducts

$$\mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{U}} = \left(\prod_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \langle \mathbb{N}, 0, 1, +, -, \underline{n}, \leq \rangle \right) / \mathcal{U},$$

where \mathcal{U} is a non-principal ultrafilter on \mathbb{N} , i.e. $\mathcal{U} \in \beta\mathbb{N} - \mathbb{N}$.

Note: Properties of LA and Pr are similar, but the proof for LA is incomparably harder (due to [in]decomposability of sets $\{qx + ry; x, y \in A\}$ in $\mathcal{A} \models \text{Pr}[\text{LA}]$).

Open question

Open question

- a) Are model-theoretical properties of LA_κ , with $\kappa \geq 2$, still similar to those of Pr ? In particular, are theories LA_κ , with $\kappa \geq 2$, model-complete and decidable?
- b) Could be some model of P definable in a model of LA_κ ?

A more detailed analysis

Let \mathcal{F} be a **fixed linear**, in particular \mathcal{F} can be a linear extension of a model of ZLA.

We write D and C instead of $D_{\mathcal{F}}$ and $C_{\mathcal{F}}$.

A term $t(\bar{x})$ is **harmonic** if

$$t(\bar{x}) = \sum_{i=0}^{N-1} \underline{q_i r_i}^{-1}(x_{f(i)}) + \underline{c},$$

for some $q_i, r_i \in D$, $c \in C$ and $f : N \rightarrow I(\bar{x})$.

A formula is harmonic if all its maximal subterms are.

A “piecewise-term” τ is called an **almost-term** if it is of the form

$$\tau(\bar{x}) = \left\{ s(\bar{x}) + c_i \text{ if } \psi_i(\bar{x}), i < n, \right.$$

where $s(\bar{x})$ is a term, and $c_i \in C$, for $i < n$.

Harmonic form theorem

Theorem (Harmonic form theorem)

Let \mathcal{F} be a lineal.

- 1) For every term $t(\bar{x})$, there is an open harmonic almost-term $\tau(\bar{x})$ such that $\mathcal{F} \models t(\bar{x}) = \tau(\bar{x})$.
- 2) For every formula $\varphi(\bar{x})$, there is an open harmonic formula $\psi(\bar{x})$ such that $\mathcal{F} \models \varphi(\bar{x}) \leftrightarrow \psi(\bar{x})$.

Bases theorem

For $d \leq e \in \mathbb{N}$, a $[d, e]$ -basis is any sequence $\langle b_i \rangle_{d \leq i \leq e}$ of scalars with $\deg(b_i) = i$.

An almost-term τ or a formula φ is **over a set** S if for every subterm $r^{-1}(t)$ of τ resp. φ it is $r \in S$.

Theorem (Bases theorem)

Let $\bar{\delta} \in F^n$, $C_p(\bar{\delta}) = \prod_{i < n} [\delta_i, \delta_i + p - 1] \subseteq F^n$ be a cube with edges of scalar length $p \in \mathbb{D}$, $e = \deg(p)$, and B be a $[0, e]$ -basis. Let $l(\bar{x}) = n$. Then the following holds:

- 1) Every term $t(\bar{x})$ is on $C_p(\bar{\delta})$ equal to a harmonic almost-term $\tau(\bar{x})$ which is over mB for some $m \in \mathbb{N}$.
- 2) Every formula $\varphi(\bar{x})$ is on $C_p(\bar{\delta})$ equivalent to an open harmonic formula $\psi(\bar{x})$ which is over mB for some $m \in \mathbb{N}$.

Representation of definable sets

Corollary

Every set $D \subseteq F^n$ X -definable in a lineal \mathcal{F} can be written as

$$D = \bigcup_{i < k} g[P_i],$$

where $g : (K(\bar{a}) \times F)^n \rightarrow F^n$ is a $(\bar{\delta}, \bar{a}, p)$ -coordination of F^n , with $a_0 = m \in \mathbb{N}$, $\bar{a} = (a_0, \dots, a_N)$ and p a scalar, and $P_i \subseteq P_g$, for $i < k$, are finitely many polyhedra in $(K(\bar{a}) \times F)^n$ over parameters from $X \cup \bar{\delta}$.

“Every definable set is a finite union of linear images of polyhedra.”

Two-sorted QE for doded-modules

Let \mathbb{L} denotes the two-sorted language of “ordered rings-ordered modules”.

A **doded-module** is a (two-sorted) \mathbb{L} -structure $\mathcal{A} = \langle \mathcal{R}, \mathcal{M}, \cdot \rangle$ such that

- 1) \mathcal{R} is a doded,
- 2) $\langle \mathcal{M}, r \cdot _ \rangle_{r \in \mathcal{R}}$ is a discretely ordered (with 1 being the least positive element), integrally-divisible (i.e. $(\forall x)(\exists y)(\exists 0 \leq z < r \cdot 1)(x = r \cdot y + z)$ holds) \mathcal{R} -module.

Two-sorted QE for doded-modules

Let \mathbb{L}' denotes the extension of \mathbb{L} by symbols $\bar{\cdot}^{-1} : \mathcal{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathcal{R}$,
 $\bar{\cdot}^{-1} : \mathcal{R} \times \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$ for integral division.

For a doded-module \mathcal{A} , let \mathcal{A}' denotes the natural definable \mathbb{L}' -expansion of \mathcal{A} .

Theorem

Let $\mathcal{A} = \langle \mathcal{R}, \mathcal{M}, \cdot \rangle$ be a doded-module, $\varphi(\bar{r}, \bar{y}, x)$ be an \mathbb{L}' -formula without scalar quantifiers, and $\bar{\rho} \in R^{l(\bar{r})}$ be scalars. Then there are finitely many \mathbb{L}' -terms $t_i(\bar{r}, \bar{y})$, for $i < n$, with $n \in \mathbb{N}$, such that

$$\mathcal{A}' \models (\exists x)\varphi(\bar{\rho}, \bar{y}, x) \leftrightarrow \bigvee_{i < n} \varphi(\bar{\rho}, \bar{y}, t_i(\bar{\rho}, \bar{y})).$$

Two-sorted QE for doded-modules

Corollary

Let \mathcal{A} be a doded-module. Every scalar-quantifier-free \mathbb{L}' -formula is in \mathcal{A}' equivalent to a quantifier-free \mathbb{L}' -formula.

Section 3

Dependency of Peano products

Dependency problem

Given a “background model” \mathcal{B} and a set O of all n -ary operations on B satisfying certain global property (e.g. being a Peano product), we want to describe the dependency closure

$$\text{icl}^O(E) = \{\bar{d} \in B^n; (\forall o, o' \in O)(o \upharpoonright E = o' \upharpoonright E \Rightarrow o(\bar{d}) = o'(\bar{d}))\},$$

for $E \subseteq B^n$. We call this task the (\mathcal{B}, O, E) -dependency problem.

In particular, what if $\mathcal{B} \models \text{Pr}$ and O is the set of all Peano products on B ?

DD-theorem

Proposition (DD-theorem)

Let o be an n -ary operation on B , $\bar{d} \in B^n$, and $E = E_s \cup E_f \subseteq B^n$, where $|E_s| < |B|$, and suppose that there is a saturated (G, E_f) -fixator \mathcal{A} for o , with $G \subseteq \text{Aut}(B)$. Then the following statements are equivalent:

- 1) $\bar{d} \in \text{icl}_o^{\sim G}(E)$,
- 2) o is a.u.-definable at \bar{d} over E_s in \mathcal{A} .

An operation o is in \mathcal{A} **almost-uniformly definable (a.u.-definable)** at a point $\bar{d} \in A^n$ over a set $E \subseteq A^n$ if, for all $\langle \bar{e}', \bar{d}' \rangle_{\bar{e} \in E}$ such that $\varepsilon = \text{concat}\langle \bar{e}, o(\bar{e}), \bar{d} \rangle_{\bar{e} \in E}$ and $\varepsilon' = \text{concat}\langle \bar{e}', o(\bar{e}'), \bar{d}' \rangle_{\bar{e} \in E}$ are indistinguishable in \mathcal{A} , the pair $(o(\bar{d}), o(\bar{d}'))$ is equidefinable from $(\varepsilon, \varepsilon')$ in \mathcal{A} .

DD-theorem

Proposition (DD-theorem)

Let o be an n -ary operation on B , $\bar{d} \in B^n$, and $E = E_s \cup E_f \subseteq B^n$, where $|E_s| < |B|$, and suppose that there is a saturated (G, E_f) -fixator \mathcal{A} for o , with $G \subseteq \text{Aut}(B)$. Then the following statements are equivalent:

- 1) $\bar{d} \in \text{icl}_o^G(E)$,
- 2) o is a.u.-definable at \bar{d} over E_s in \mathcal{A} .

Let $G \subseteq \text{Aut}(B)$ be a subgroup, o an n -ary operation on B , and $E \subseteq B^n$. We say that a saturated expansion \mathcal{A} of B is a **(G, E) -fixator** for o if

$$g \in \text{Aut}(\mathcal{A}) \Leftrightarrow g \in G, \text{ and } og(\bar{x}) = go(\bar{x}) \text{ for all } \bar{x} \in E.$$

For $o, o' \in O$, we write $o \sim^G o'$ if $o \cong o'$ via some $g \in G$.

Dependency closure for Peano products

Let \mathcal{B} be a fixed saturated model of Pr. We determine $\text{icl}^O(E_a)$ for $E_a = B \times \{a\}$ where $a \in B$ is non-standard.

$$D_a = \left\{ \frac{p}{n}; 0 \leq p \in \mathbb{Z}[a], 0 < n \in \mathbb{N} \text{ and } \mathcal{B} \models n|p \right\} = \mathbb{Q}[a] \cap B$$

Theorem

It is $\text{icl}^{P(\mathcal{B})}(E_a) = \text{icl}^{\text{PP}(\mathcal{B})}(E_a) = \text{icl}^{\text{sPP}(\mathcal{B})}(E_a) = \text{icl}^{\cong_a}(E_a) = \text{icl}^{\cong_a}(E_a)$ and all are equal to $(D_a \times B) \cup (B \times D_a)$.

Here $P(\mathcal{B})$ denotes the set of all commutative, associative and distributive Robinson products on \mathcal{B} and $\text{PP}(\mathcal{B})$ [$\text{sPP}(\mathcal{B})$] the set of all [saturated] Peano products on \mathcal{B} .

The proof uses the DD-theorem and quantifier elimination for LA: **The fixator for E_a is a model of LA.**

Meeting pairs of Peano products

Let $a \in B - \mathbb{N}$. A pair (\cdot, \circ) of Peano products on \mathcal{B} is called an **a -meeting pair** if it is $\cdot \upharpoonright E_a = \circ \upharpoonright E_a$, and $d_0 \cdot d_1 \neq d_0 \circ d_1$, $d'_0 \cdot d'_1 \neq d'_0 \circ d'_1$, for some $d_0, d_1 < a < d'_0, d'_1$.

Corollary (Existence of meeting pairs)

Let $a \in B - \mathbb{N}$, and $\cdot \in \text{sPP}(\mathcal{B})$ be a saturated Peano product on \mathcal{B} . Then there is $\circ \in \text{sPP}(\mathcal{B})$ such that (\cdot, \circ) is an a -meeting pair of Peano products on \mathcal{B} . Moreover, \circ can be chosen in such a way that $\cdot \cong_a \circ$.

Construction of a new product

We denote LB_x [LcB_x] the set of formulas $\varphi(x, \bar{y})$ in the language of arithmetic $L^{ar} = \langle 0, S, +, \cdot, \leq \rangle$ such that every occurrence of multiplication in φ has the form $x \cdot z$ or $z \cdot x$, where z is a variable which is bound by a quantifier $Qz \leq x$ [$Qz \geq x$].

The L^{ar} -theory ILB [$ILcB$] is the extension of Robinson arithmetic Q by the scheme of induction $I(LB_x)$ [$I(LcB_x)$] for all formulas φ from LB_x [LcB_x] (here, x is the “induction variable”).

Proposition

Let $a \in B - \mathbb{N}$, and (\cdot, \circ) be an a -meeting pair of Peano products on B .

- 1) For $\times = \cdot \upharpoonright [0, a]^2 \cup \circ \upharpoonright (B^2 - [0, a]^2)$, it is $\langle B, \times \rangle \models ILB$.
- 2) For $\times' = \cdot \upharpoonright [a, \infty)^2 \cup \circ \upharpoonright (B^2 - [a, \infty)^2)$, it is $\langle B, \times' \rangle \models ILcB$.

Construction of a new product

Open question

Is it possible, by using similar methods, to construct Robinson products \times which satisfy $I(\Gamma)$ for other sets $\Gamma \subseteq Fm_{L^{ar}}$? In particular, is it possible to construct Peano products this way?

Section 4

Proofs

The proofs are based on a calculus of terms, which generalizes the calculus of continued fractions.

Let q, r be two scalars, $r > 0$. We define the bracket $\begin{bmatrix} q \\ r \end{bmatrix}(x) = r^{-1}qx$.

We also write

$$\begin{bmatrix} a_1 & \dots & a_n \\ b_1 & \dots & b_n \end{bmatrix}$$

instead of

$$\begin{bmatrix} a_1 \\ b_1 \end{bmatrix} \circ \dots \circ \begin{bmatrix} a_n \\ b_n \end{bmatrix}.$$

First, we reduce every bracket to a simpler term:

Proposition

Let q, r be scalars, $0 < r$. Then, for all $x \in F$,

$$\left[\begin{array}{c} q \\ r \end{array} \right] (x) = \sum_{i=1}^n q_i \cdot r_i^{-1} \mu_{r_{i+1}, \dots, r_n} (x + s_{q,r}) - t_{q,r} \quad (1)$$

where $s_{q,r} = \sum_{i=1}^{\lfloor \frac{n-1}{2} \rfloor} r_{2i} a_{2i+1}$, $t_{q,r} = \sum_{i=1}^{\lfloor \frac{n-1}{2} \rfloor} q_{2i} a_{2i+1}$ are constants and q_i, r_i are nominators and denominators of partial continued fractions of q/r .

Then, by induction,

$$\begin{bmatrix} a_1 & \dots & a_n \\ b_1 & \dots & b_n \end{bmatrix}$$

can be reduced to a combination of harmonic brackets

$$\begin{bmatrix} q & 1 \\ 1 & r \end{bmatrix}$$

.

This proves the harmonic form theorem.

Then the bases theorem is proved, which allows to conclude the proof by using Fourier-Motzkin elimination.

Thank you

Thank you for your attention.