

Fragments of IOpen

Konstantin Kovalyov

Phystech School of Applied Mathematics and Computer Science, Moscow Institute of Physics
and Technology, Moscow, Russia

kovalev.ka@phystech.edu

June 21, 2023

Abstract

In this paper we consider some fragments of IOpen (Robinson arithmetic \mathbb{Q} with induction for quantifier-free formulas) proposed by Harvey Friedman and answer some questions he asked about these theories. We prove that I(lit) is equivalent to IOpen and is not finitely axiomatizable over \mathbb{Q} , establish some inclusion relations between I(=) , I(\neq) , I(\leq) and I(\not\leq) . We also prove that the set of diophantine equations solvable in models of I(=) is (algorithmically) decidable.

0 Introduction

Recall that IOpen consists of Robinson arithmetic \mathbb{Q} with the induction schema for all quantifier free formulas. We assume that \leq is a symbol in the signature of \mathbb{Q} . In December 2021, Harvey Friedman posed some interesting questions about IOpen [1]. To formulate Friedman's questions, let us introduce these fragments of IOpen : I(lit) is \mathbb{Q} with induction schema for all atomic formulas and negated atomic formulas, I(=) is \mathbb{Q} with induction schema for all formulas of the form $t = s$, where t and s are arithmetic terms, in the similar way are defined theories I(\neq) , I(\leq) , I(\not\leq) . His questions concern relations between the following fragments with weaker induction: I(lit) , I(=) , I(\neq) , I(\leq) and I(\not\leq) .

Friedman stated the following questions:

1. Is I(lit) weaker than IOpen ?
2. What are relationships between I(=) , I(\neq) , I(\leq) , I(\not\leq) ?
3. Are there interesting theorems that are equivalent to I(lit) over \mathbb{Q} ?

It is also interesting to consider theories I(=, \neq) and IOpen(=) (induction for quantifier-free formulas, containing only atomic formulas of the form $s = t$) and ask a similar question about their equivalence.

In addition to these questions, we can also try to figure out decidability of set of Diophantine equations, that have a solution in theory \mathbb{T} , where \mathbb{T} is one of our theories. Formally, this set is $D(\mathbb{T}) = \{(s, t) \mid \exists \mathcal{M} \models \mathbb{T} + \exists \vec{x}(s(\vec{x}) = t(\vec{x}))\}$. There are some results in this area:

- $D(\mathbb{Q})$ is decidable (see [2])

- Decidability of $D(\text{IOpen})$ is not proved yet, there are partial results (see [3], [4], [5])

In Section 2 we prove that $\text{IOpen} \equiv \text{I(lit)}$ and I(lit) is not finitely axiomatizable, which answers questions 1 and 3 in the negative.

In Section 3 we establish the following facts about the relationships of our weak fragments:

- $\text{I(=)} \not\vdash \text{I(\neq)}, \text{I(\leq)}, \text{I(\not\leq)}$,
- $\text{I(\neq)} \not\vdash \text{I(\leq)}, \text{I(\not\leq)}$,
- $\text{I(\leq)} \not\vdash \text{I(=)}, \text{I(\neq)}, \text{I(\not\leq)}$,
- $\text{I(\neq)} + \forall x \forall y (x + y = y + x) \vdash \text{I(=)}$.

We show that $D(\text{I(=)})$ is decidable and that I(=) proves $Th_{=}(\mathbb{N})$ (all true identities in \mathbb{N}), but $\text{Q} + Th_{=}(\mathbb{N}) \not\vdash \text{I(=)}$.

In Section 4 we state the problems remaining open.

1 Preliminaries

Definition 1.1 (Robinson arithmetic). *Robinson arithmetic* Q consists of the following axioms in the arithmetical language $\mathcal{L}_{ar} = (0, S, +, \cdot, \leq)$:

$$(Q1) \quad Sx \neq 0$$

$$(Q2) \quad Sx = Sy \rightarrow x = y$$

$$(Q3) \quad x \neq 0 \rightarrow \exists y (x = Sy)$$

$$(Q4) \quad x + 0 = x$$

$$(Q5) \quad x + Sy = S(x + y)$$

$$(Q6) \quad x \cdot 0 = 0$$

$$(Q7) \quad x \cdot Sy = x \cdot y + x$$

$$(Q8) \quad x \leq y \leftrightarrow \exists r (r + x = y)$$

Definition 1.2. IOpen consists of Q and the induction schema for all quantifier free formulas in the language \mathcal{L}_{ar} , I(lit) consists of Q and induction schema for all literals in the language \mathcal{L}_{ar} (i.e. atomic formulas and their negations). In the similar way we can define I(=) , I(\neq) , I(\leq) and I(\not\leq) .

Proposition 1.1 ([6], Theorem 1.10). *The following formulas are provable in IOpen :*

$$(1) \quad x + y = y + x,$$

$$(2) \quad x + (y + z) = (x + y) + z,$$

$$(3) \quad x \cdot y = y \cdot x,$$

$$(4) \quad x(y + z) = xy + xz,$$

$$(5) \quad x(yz) = (xy)z,$$

$$(6) \quad x + y = x + z \rightarrow y = z,$$

$$(7) \quad x \leq y \vee y \leq x,$$

$$(8) \quad x \leq y \wedge y \leq x \rightarrow x = y,$$

$$(9) \quad (x \leq y \wedge y \leq z) \rightarrow x \leq z,$$

$$(10) \quad x \leq y \leftrightarrow x + z \leq y + z,$$

$$(11) \quad (z \neq 0 \wedge xz = yz) \rightarrow x = y,$$

$$(12) \quad z \neq 0 \rightarrow (x \leq y \leftrightarrow xz \leq yz).$$

Remark. (1)-(5) can be proven in $\mathsf{I}(=)$.

All rings and semirings in this paper will be commutative, associative with identity. Usually, structures will be denoted by calligraphic letters (such as $\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{R}, \dots$), and their domains will be denoted by M, F, R, \dots .

Definition 1.3. Let \mathcal{M} be a ring (semiring), \leq be a linear order on \mathcal{M} . Then (\mathcal{M}, \leq) is called *an ordered ring* if $\forall x, y, z \in M (x \leq y \leftrightarrow x + z \leq y + z)$ and $\forall x, y, z \in M, z > 0 (x \leq y \leftrightarrow x \cdot z \leq y \cdot z)$. An ordered ring (semiring) is called *discretely ordered* if 1 is the least positive element (or, equivalently, there is no elements between 0 and 1).

Definition 1.4. Let $\mathcal{M} \subseteq \mathcal{R}$ be two ordered rings (with the same orderings) and \mathcal{M} be discretely ordered. Then \mathcal{M} is *an integer part* of \mathcal{R} if $\forall r \in R \exists m \in M (m \leq r < m + 1)$. Such an m is called the integer part of r . Notation: $\mathcal{M} \subseteq^{IP} \mathcal{R}$.

Remark. Since \mathcal{M} is discretely ordered, for every $r \in R$ its integer part is uniquely defined.

Theorem 1.1 ([7]). *Let \mathcal{M} be a discretely ordered ring, \mathcal{M}^+ be the non-negative part of \mathcal{M} . Then, $\mathcal{M}^+ \models \mathsf{IOpen}$ iff $\mathcal{M} \subseteq^{IP} R(\mathcal{M})$, where $R(\mathcal{M})$ is the real closure of the ordered fraction field of \mathcal{M} .*

2 $\mathsf{IOpen} \equiv \mathsf{I}(\text{lit})$ and $\mathsf{I}(\text{lit})$ is not finitely axiomatizable

Proposition 2.1. *Statements (1)-(12) from Proposition 1.1 are provable in $\mathsf{I}(\text{lit})$.*

Proof. Recall these formulas:

$$(1) \quad x + y = y + x,$$

$$(2) \quad x + (y + z) = (x + y) + z,$$

$$(3) \quad x \cdot y = y \cdot x,$$

$$(4) \quad x(y + z) = xy + xz,$$

$$(5) \quad x(yz) = (xy)z,$$

$$(6) \quad x + y = x + z \rightarrow y = z,$$

$$(7) \ x \leq y \vee y \leq x,$$

$$(8) \ x \leq y \wedge y \leq x \rightarrow x = y,$$

$$(9) \ (x \leq y \wedge y \leq z) \rightarrow x \leq z,$$

$$(10) \ x \leq y \leftrightarrow x + y \leq x + z,$$

$$(11) \ (z \neq 0 \wedge xz = yz) \rightarrow x = y,$$

$$(12) \ z \neq 0 \rightarrow (x \leq y \leftrightarrow xz \leq yz).$$

As noted in Remark after Proposition 1.1, (1)-(5) are provable in $I(=)$. We outline the proofs of (6)-(12).

$$(6) \ x + y = x + z \rightarrow y = z.$$

Suppose $y \neq z$. We prove by induction on x the statement $x + y \neq x + z$.

If $x = 0$, $0 + y = y \neq z = 0 + z$ (here we used commutativity of addition and Q4).

Let $x + y \neq x + z$. Then, $Sx + y = S(x + y) \neq S(x + z) = Sx + z$ (here we used commutativity, Q2 and Q5).

$$(7) \ x \leq y \vee y \leq x.$$

Suppose there exist x, y such that $x \not\leq y$ and $y \not\leq x$. We prove $x \not\leq y + z$ by induction on z .

If $z = 0$, then $x \not\leq y = y + 0$.

Let $x \not\leq y + z$. Suppose, $x \leq y + Sz$. Then, there exists an r such that $r + x = y + Sz$. If $r = 0$, $x = y + Sz$, then, $y \leq x$, and we have a contradiction. Let $r = Sr'$. $S(r' + x) = Sr' + x = y + Sz = S(y + z) \Rightarrow r' + x = y + z$. So, $x \leq y + z$, a contradiction.

Now, let z be x . Then $x \not\leq y + x$, a contradiction.

(8)-(9) Could be easily done, using commutativity and associativity of addition and axioms of \mathbb{Q} .

$$(10) \ x \leq y \leftrightarrow x + z \leq y + z$$

If $x \leq y$, then $r + x = y$ for some r , so $r + (x + z) = y + z$ and $x + z \leq y + z$.

Suppose, $x + z \leq y + z$, but $x \not\leq y$. By (7), $y \leq x$. Since we've already proved the opposite implication, $y + z \leq x + z$. Then, by (8), $x + z = y + z$. Using (6), we obtain that $x = y$, so $x \leq y$.

$$(11) \ (z \neq 0 \wedge xz = yz) \rightarrow x = y$$

Suppose, $x \neq y$. By (7) we can assume, that, for example, $x \leq y$. Then, there is $r \neq 0$ such that $r + x = y$. Suppose, $xz = yz$, where $z \neq 0$. Then, $xz = (r + x)z$, by (6) and distributivity, $rz = 0$, which is impossible, since $z \neq 0$ and $r \neq 0$.

$$(12) \ z \neq 0 \rightarrow (x \leq y \leftrightarrow xz \leq yz)$$

Suppose, $x \leq y$, then $r + x = y$ for some r . Then $yz = rz + xz$, so $xz \leq yz$.

Using (7), we can prove the opposite implication.

□

So, every model of $\mathbb{I}(\text{lit})$ is a discretely ordered semiring. Let $\mathcal{M} = (M, +, \cdot, \leq, 0, 1)$ be a model of $\mathbb{I}(\text{lit})$. We can extend this semiring to a ring in the following way. Consider pairs (m, n) of elements of our semiring and define the equivalence relation on them: $(m, n) \sim (m', n') \Leftrightarrow m + n' = m' + n$ ((m, n) can be understood as $m - n$). It is easy to see that it is an equivalence relation. So, let $\widetilde{M} = M^2 / \sim$ and $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}} = (\widetilde{M}, \dots)$ with the operations defined in an obvious way. It will be a discretely ordered ring and hence an integral domain. Denote by $F(\mathcal{M})$ the (ordered) quotient field of $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}$, by $R(\mathcal{M})$ – the real closure of $F(\mathcal{M})$.

Lemma 2.1. *Let $f \in \widetilde{\mathcal{M}}[X]$, $f(\frac{a}{q}) \leq 0$, $f(\frac{b}{q}) > 0$, $a, b, q \in M$, $a < b$. Then $\exists c \in M : f(\frac{c}{q}) \leq 0 \wedge f(\frac{c+1}{q}) > 0$.*

Proof. Define $g \in \widetilde{\mathcal{M}}[X]$ in the following way: $g(X) := q^n f(\frac{X+a}{q})$, where $n = \deg f$. Then $g(0) \leq 0$, $g(b-a) > 0$ and $\mathcal{M} \models g(0) \leq 0 \wedge \exists c(g(c) > 0)$. Since $\mathcal{M} \models \mathbb{I}(\text{lit})$, $\mathcal{M} \models \exists c(g(c) \leq 0 \wedge g(c+1) > 0)$. Then $f(\frac{c+a}{q}) \leq 0$ and $f(\frac{c+a+1}{q}) > 0$. \square

Lemma 2.2. *Let $f \in \widetilde{\mathcal{M}}[X]$, $f(\frac{a}{q}) < 0$, $f(\frac{b}{q}) > 0$, $a, b, q \in M$, $a < b$ and f has no roots in $F(\mathcal{M})$. Then $\exists c \in M : a \leq c < b \wedge f(\frac{c}{q}) < 0 \wedge f(\frac{c+1}{q}) > 0$.*

Proof. Fix $a, b, q \in M$. Let $N(f) = \{m \in M \mid f(\frac{m}{q}) < 0\}$. Note that $|N(f)|$ is finite, since for every $m \in N(f)$ there exists a root of f in $R(\mathcal{M})$ between $\frac{m}{q}$ and $\frac{m+1}{q}$.

Suppose, there is $f \in \widetilde{\mathcal{M}}[X]$ such that $f(\frac{a}{q}) < 0$, $f(\frac{b}{q}) > 0$, but there is no c between a and b such that $f(\frac{c}{q}) < 0$ and $f(\frac{c+1}{q}) > 0$. Choose such an f with the minimal $|N(f)|$. By Lemma 2.1 there is a $c \in M$ such that $f(\frac{c}{q}) < 0$ and $f(\frac{c+1}{q}) > 0$. By the choice of f , $c < a$ or $c > b$.

If $c > b$, consider $\tilde{f}(X) := f(X)((2c+1) - 2qX)$. Then $\tilde{f}(\frac{a}{q}) = f(\frac{a}{q})(\frac{2c-2a+1}{q}) < 0$, $\tilde{f}(\frac{b}{q}) = f(\frac{b}{q})(\frac{2c-2b+1}{q}) > 0$, there is no such \tilde{c} between a and b such that $\tilde{f}(\frac{\tilde{c}}{q}) < 0$ and $\tilde{f}(\frac{\tilde{c}+1}{q}) > 0$ (on $[a, b]$ \tilde{f} has the same sign as f) and $N(f) = N(\tilde{f}) \setminus \{c\}$. Hence, we have a contradiction with the choice of f . If $c < a$, we can consider in a similar way $\tilde{f}(X) := f(X)(2qX - (2c+1))$. \square

Theorem 2.1. *Let $\mathcal{M} \models \mathbb{I}(\text{lit})$. Then $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}} \subseteq^{IP} R(\mathcal{M})$.*

Proof. First we prove that $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}} \subseteq^{IP} F(\mathcal{M})$. Consider $\frac{p}{q} \in F(\mathcal{M})$, $p > 0, q > 0$ (it is sufficient to prove the existence of the integer parts only for positive elements of $F(\mathcal{M})$). $\mathcal{M} \models 0 \cdot q \leq p \wedge (p+1)q > p$. Then, by induction, we obtain $\mathcal{M} \models \exists m(mq \leq p \wedge (m+1)q > p)$.

Consider a positive $r \in R(\mathcal{M}) \setminus F(\mathcal{M})$. Let $f \in \widetilde{\mathcal{M}}[X]$ be the minimal polynomial of r . Let introduce the following equivalence relation \sim on $R(\mathcal{M})$: $x \sim y \Leftrightarrow \exists z \in F(\mathcal{M}) : (x < z < y \vee y < z < x)$. Note that if $x \sim y$ and $q_1 < x < q_2$ for some $q_1, q_2 \in F(\mathcal{M})$, then $q_1 < y < q_2$. It is not very hard to prove that elements of $F(\mathcal{M})$ can be equivalent only to themselves. If f has some root $r' \sim r$, $r' \neq r$, then f' has a root r'' between r' and r by Rolle's theorem (and $r'' \sim r$). If r is a multiple root of f , then $f'(r) = 0$. So, we can take a derivative of f until $f^{(k)}$ has only one simple root $\tilde{r} \sim r$. Then we can find $q_1, q_2 \in F(\mathcal{M})$, $q_1, q_2 > 0$ such that the only root of $f^{(k)}$ between q_1 and q_2 is \tilde{r} (since r is positive, so is \tilde{r} , hence q_1, q_2 can be chosen positive). Let $q_i = \frac{a_i}{q}$, $q, a_i \in M$. Since \tilde{r} is simple, $f^{(k)}(q_1)f^{(k)}(q_2) < 0$. Also we can suppose that $f^{(k)}$ has no roots in $F(\mathcal{M})$ (if not, we can divide $f^{(k)}$ by $(X - q)$ for the suitable $q \in F(\mathcal{M})$ and then multiply by the suitable $m \in M$). So, we can apply Lemma 2.2 and obtain that there exists $b \in M$ such that $f^{(k)}(\frac{b}{q})f^{(k)}(\frac{b+1}{q}) \leq 0$, $a_1 \leq b < a_2$. This implies that there is a root between $\frac{b}{q}$ and $\frac{b+1}{q}$. Since there is only one root \tilde{r} on the segment $[q_1, q_2]$, $\frac{b}{q} \leq \tilde{r} \leq \frac{b+1}{q}$. Given that $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}} \subseteq^{IP} F(\mathcal{M})$, we obtain that \tilde{r} (and hence r) has an integer part in \mathcal{M} . \square

Corollary 1. $\mathbb{I}(\text{lit}) \vdash \mathbb{I}\text{Open}$.

Proof. Apply Theorem 1.1 to Theorem 2.1. □

Theorem 2.2. $\text{I}(\text{lit})$ is not finitely axiomatizable.

Proof. Suppose that $\text{I}(\text{lit})$ is finitely axiomatizable, then $\text{I}(\text{lit}) \equiv \mathbb{Q} + \Gamma$, where Γ is finite set of instances of induction axiom schema for literals. Denote by N the largest degree of polynomials from Γ (all terms in $\text{I}(\text{lit})$ are equal to polynomials) and denote by p_1, \dots, p_n all the prime numbers $\leq N$.

Consider the following structure \mathcal{M} : $M = \{a_m X^{\frac{m}{q}} + a_{m-1} X^{\frac{m-1}{q}} + \dots + a_1 X^{\frac{1}{q}} + a_0 \mid m, q \in \mathbb{N}, q = p_1^{\alpha_1} \dots p_n^{\alpha_n} \text{ for some } \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n \in \mathbb{N}, a_m, \dots, a_1 \in \mathbb{R}_{\text{alg}}, a_0 \in \mathbb{Z}, a_m \geq 0\}$ with the operations defined in the usual way. Note that the corresponding ring $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}$ is not contained as an integer part of the real closure of the fraction field of this ring. We denote this real closure by \mathcal{R} (in our case $\mathcal{R} = \{a_m X^{\frac{m}{q}} + a_{m-1} X^{\frac{m-1}{q}} + \dots + a_1 X^{\frac{1}{q}} + a_0 + a_{-1} X^{-\frac{1}{q}} + \dots \mid a_i \in \mathbb{R}_{\text{alg}}\}$, because of well known fact that the real closure of $\mathbb{Z}[X]$ is $\{a_m X^{\frac{m}{q}} + a_{m-1} X^{\frac{m-1}{q}} + \dots + a_1 X^{\frac{1}{q}} + a_0 + a_{-1} X^{-\frac{1}{q}} + \dots \mid a_i \in \mathbb{R}_{\text{alg}}\}$ and the latter contains \mathcal{M}). So, it is sufficient to prove $\mathcal{M} \models \mathbb{Q} + \Gamma$ and to apply Theorem 1.1.

Lemma 2.3. Let $f \in \widetilde{\mathcal{M}}[t] \setminus \{0\}$, $\deg f \leq N$ and $r = a_m X^{\frac{m}{q}} + a_{m-1} X^{\frac{m-1}{q}} + \dots + a_1 X^{\frac{1}{q}} + a_0 + a_{-1} X^{-\frac{1}{q}} + \dots \in R$ be a root of f , $m > 0$. Then $\frac{m}{q} = \frac{m'}{q'}$, where $q' = p_1^{\alpha_1} \dots p_n^{\alpha_n}$ (i.e. $a_m X^{\frac{m}{q}} \in \widetilde{\mathcal{M}}$).

Proof of Lemma 2.3. Let $f(t) = P_k t^k + \dots + P_0$, where $P_i \in \widetilde{\mathcal{M}}$, so $P_k r^k + \dots + P_0 = 0$. All nonzero $P_i r^i$ are of the form

$$b_i X^{\frac{i \cdot m}{q} + \frac{k_i}{C}} + \dots,$$

where $C = p_1^{\beta_1} \dots p_n^{\beta_n}$ is a common denominator of degrees in all P_i (i.e. $f \in \mathbb{R}_{\text{alg}}[X^{\frac{1}{C}}][t]$), $b_i \in \mathbb{R}_{\text{alg}} \setminus \{0\}$.

Consider the largest $\frac{i \cdot m}{q} + \frac{k_i}{C}$. Since $f(r) = 0$, there is $j \neq i$ such that

$$\frac{j \cdot m}{q} + \frac{k_j}{C} = \frac{i \cdot m}{q} + \frac{k_i}{C}.$$

So, $\frac{m}{q} = \frac{k_i - k_j}{C(j-i)}$. Let assume $j > i$, then, $m' := k_i - k_j$ and $q' := C(j-i)$. Since $j-i \leq N$, q' is of the required form. □

Lemma 2.4. Let $f \in \widetilde{\mathcal{M}}[t]$, $\deg f \leq N$ and $r = \sum_{k=m}^{-\infty} a_k X^{\frac{k}{q}} \in R$, $f(r) = 0$. Then r has an integer part in $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}$.

Proof of Lemma 2.4. Induction by $\max(m, 0)$. If $m \leq 0$, then $r \in (a_0 + 1, a_0 - 1)$ and r has an integer part. If $m > 0$, $a_m X^{\frac{m}{q}} \in \widetilde{\mathcal{M}}$ by Lemma 2.3. So, we can apply induction hypothesis to $f(t + a_m X^{\frac{m}{q}})$ and $r - a_m X^{\frac{m}{q}} = \sum_{k=m-1}^{-\infty} a_k X^{\frac{k}{q}}$. Denote by s the integer part of $r - a_m X^{\frac{m}{q}}$, then $a_m X^{\frac{m}{q}} + s$ will be the integer part of r . □

Proof of Theorem 2.2. Let $\varphi(x, \vec{y})$ be an atomic formula or the negation thereof such that $\text{Ind}_{\varphi} \in \Gamma$. Then, φ is equivalent to one of the following: $f(x) = 0$, $f(x) \neq 0$, $f(x) \leq 0$, $f(x) < 0$, where $f \in \widetilde{\mathcal{M}}[t]$ (with the coefficients dependent on \vec{y}) and $\deg f \leq N$. Cases $f(x) = 0$ and $f(x) \neq 0$ are trivial (since if polynomial has an infinite number of roots, then it is a zero polynomial). Consider the case $f(x) \leq 0$, the case $f(x) < 0$ is very similar. Suppose, $\mathcal{M} \models (f(0) \leq 0) \wedge \exists c(f(c) > 0)$. Let $A = \{r \in R \mid f(r) > 0 \wedge r > 0\}$. Since \mathcal{R} is real closed, A is a finite union of disjoint intervals. Since $\mathcal{M} \models \exists c(f(c) > 0)$, $M \cap A \neq \emptyset$. Consider the leftmost interval (a, b) of A containing some element c of M . Since $f(a) = 0$, we have $[a] \in M$, where $[a]$ is the integer part of a (by Lemma 2.4). Since $[a] \leq a < [a] + 1$ and \mathcal{M} is discretely ordered, $[a] + 1 \leq c$ and $[a] + 1 \in (a, b)$. So, $\mathcal{M} \models f([a]) \leq 0 \wedge f([a] + 1) > 0$. □

3 Relations between $I(=)$, $I(\neq)$ and $I(\leq)$

Our aim in this section is to prove the following theorems:

Theorem 3.1. *There are the following relations between considered fragments:*

- $I(=) \not\vdash I(\neq), I(\leq), I(\not\leq),$
- $I(\neq) \not\vdash I(\leq), I(\not\leq),$
- $I(\leq) \not\vdash I(=), I(\neq), I(\not\leq),$

Theorem 3.2. (i) $D(I(=))$ is decidable;

(ii) $I(=) \vdash Th_{=}(\mathbb{N});$

(iii) $\mathbf{Q} + Th_{=}(\mathbb{N}) \not\vdash I(=).$

Theorem 3.3. $I(\neq) + \forall x \forall y (x + y = y + x) \vdash I(=).$

Proposition 3.1. (i) $I(=) \not\vdash Sx \neq x$ and $I(=) \not\vdash x + z = x + y \rightarrow z = y;$

(ii) $I(=) \not\vdash I(\neq).$

Proof. (i) Consider the \mathcal{L}_{ar} -structure \mathcal{M} with the universe $M = \mathbb{N} \cup \{\omega\}$ and the operations defined in the following way: on natural numbers operations are defined in the standard way, $S\omega = \omega$, $x + \omega = \omega + x = \omega$, $0 \cdot \omega = \omega \cdot 0 = 0$, $x \neq 0 \rightarrow x \cdot \omega = \omega \cdot x = \omega$.

It is easy to see that $\mathcal{M} \models \mathbf{Q}$. It remains to show that \mathcal{M} satisfies the induction scheme for formulas of the form $t = s$.

Lemma 3.1. *Let $t(x, y_1, \dots, y_n)$ be a \mathcal{L}_{ar} -term and $y_1, \dots, y_n \in M$ are fixed. We say that term $t(x, \vec{y})$ is constant in x if $\exists z \in M \forall x \in M (t(x, \vec{y}) = z)$. Then $t(x, \vec{y})$ is constant in x or $t(\omega, \vec{y}) = \omega$. In the latter case, $t(x, \vec{y}) \geq x$ for all $x \in M$.*

Proof. Trivial induction on terms from variables x, y_1, \dots, y_n . □

Using this lemma, one can easily prove the claim. Suppose, $\mathcal{M} \models t(0, \vec{y}) = s(0, \vec{y})$ and $\mathcal{M} \models \forall x (t(x, \vec{y}) = s(x, \vec{y}) \rightarrow t(Sx, \vec{y}) = s(Sx, \vec{y}))$. Since $S\omega = \omega$, the latter means $\forall n \in \mathbb{N} (\mathcal{M} \models t(n, \vec{y}) = s(n, \vec{y}) \rightarrow t(Sn, \vec{y}) = s(Sn, \vec{y}))$. By the usual induction we obtain $\forall n \in \mathbb{N} (\mathcal{M} \models t(n, \vec{y}) = s(n, \vec{y}))$. If $t(x, \vec{y})$ and $s(x, \vec{y})$ are constant in x , then $\mathcal{M} \models \forall x (t(x, \vec{y}) = s(x, \vec{y}))$ and the induction axiom holds. If both t and s are not constant in x , then $t(\omega, \vec{y}) = \omega = s(\omega, \vec{y})$, so, $\mathcal{M} \models \forall x (t(x, \vec{y}) = s(x, \vec{y}))$. Assume that t is constant in x , s is not constant in x . If $t(x, \vec{y}) = n \in \mathbb{N}$, then $t(n+1, \vec{y}) = n \neq s(n+1, \vec{y}) \geq n+1$. So, $t(\omega, \vec{y}) = \omega = s(\omega, \vec{y})$.

Finally, note that the constructed model falsifies $Sx \neq x$ and $x + z = z + y \rightarrow z = y$ (since $S\omega = \omega$ and $\omega + 0 = \omega + 1$).

(ii) Note that $I(\neq) \vdash Sx \neq x$ ($S0 \neq 0$ and $Sx \neq x \rightarrow SSx \neq Sx$ are consequences of \mathbf{Q} , then apply the induction for the formula $Sx \neq x$). □

Proposition 3.2. (i) $I(=) \not\vdash \forall x \exists y (y^r \leq x \wedge \neg (Sy)^r \leq x)$ for all $r \geq 2$ (i.e. the existence of integer part of r -th roots is unprovable);

(ii) $I(=) \not\vdash I(\leq), I(\not\leq).$

Proof. (i) Consider the structure $\mathbb{Z}[X]^+ = \{a_n X^n + \dots + a_0 \in \mathbb{Z}[X] \mid a_n > 0 \vee a_n X^n + \dots + a_0 = 0\}$ with S , $+$ and \cdot defined in the usual way and $f \leq g \iff f(x) \leq g(x)$ for all sufficiently large x . It is obvious that $\mathbb{Z}[X]^+ \models \mathbb{Q}$.

Let $t(x, \vec{y}), s(x, \vec{y})$ be \mathcal{L}_{ar} -terms, $y_1, \dots, y_m \in \mathbb{Z}[X]^+$ are fixed. Suppose $t(0, \vec{y}) = s(0, \vec{y})$ and $\forall x (t(x, \vec{y}) = s(x, \vec{y}) \rightarrow t(Sx, \vec{y}) = s(Sx, \vec{y}))$. Then for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$ $t(k, \vec{y}) = s(k, \vec{y})$. We can represent $t(x, \vec{y}) - s(x, \vec{y})$ as $x^n P_n(\vec{y}) + \dots + P_0(\vec{y})$, where $P_i(\vec{y}) \in \mathbb{Z}[\vec{y}]$. Considering $k = 0, 1, \dots, n$ we obtain

$$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ 1 & 1 & \dots & 1 \\ \vdots & & \ddots & \vdots \\ 1 & n & \dots & n^n \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} P_0(\vec{y}) \\ \vdots \\ P_n(\vec{y}) \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ \vdots \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Since the left matrix is invertible (it is a Vandermonde matrix), $\begin{pmatrix} P_0(\vec{y}) \\ \vdots \\ P_n(\vec{y}) \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ \vdots \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}$. So, $\forall x (t(x, \vec{y}) = s(x, \vec{y}))$

and $\mathbb{Z}[X]^+ \models \mathbb{I}(=)$.

Let us now prove that $\mathbb{Z}[X]^+ \not\models \exists y (y^r \leq X \wedge \neg(y+1)^r \leq X)$ for $r \geq 2$. Consider any $y \in \mathbb{Z}[X]^+$. If $\deg y = 0$, then $(y+1)^r \in \mathbb{N}$, so $(y+1)^r < X$. If $\deg y \geq 1$, then $\deg y^r > 1$, so $y^r > X$.

(ii) It is easy to see that $\mathbb{Z}[X]^+ \not\models \mathbb{I}(\leq)$. Consider the induction axiom for the formula $x^r \leq y$. Suppose it holds in $\mathbb{Z}[X]^+$. Since $\mathbb{Z}[X]^+ \models 0^r \leq y, \neg \forall x (x^r \leq y), \mathbb{Z}[X]^+ \models \exists x (x^r \leq y \wedge \neg(Sx)^r \leq y)$. So we obtain a contradiction. In the similar way we can prove $\mathbb{Z}[X]^+ \not\models \mathbb{I}(\not\leq)$. \square

Proof of theorem 3.2. (i) We claim that if some equation $s = t$ has a solution in a model of $\mathbb{I}(=)$, then it has a solution in the model \mathcal{M} from Proposition 3.1.

Since in $\mathbb{I}(=)$ one can prove the commutativity, associativity and distributivity of addition and multiplication, all terms can be represented as

$$s(\vec{x}) = \sum_{(i_1, \dots, i_n): i_1 + \dots + i_n \leq k} a_{i_1, \dots, i_n} x_1^{i_1} \dots x_n^{i_n},$$

where k is a natural number and all a_{i_1, \dots, i_n} are numerals. It is clear that such a form can be found effectively.

Let $\deg s := \max\{i_1 + \dots + i_n \mid a_{i_1, \dots, i_n} \neq 0\}$.

Let us fix two terms $s(\vec{x})$ and $t(\vec{x})$. Consider three cases: 1) $\deg s = \deg t = 0$, 2) $\deg s > 0, \deg t = 0$ (or, symmetrically, $\deg s = 0, \deg t > 0$), 3) $\deg s > 0, \deg t > 0$.

1) s and t are constants, so it is easy to check whether they are equal.

2) Suppose there is $\mathcal{N} \models \mathbb{I}(=)$ such that $s(\vec{x}) = t(\vec{x})$ for some $x_1, \dots, x_n \in N$. Let $s(\vec{x}) = \sum_{\substack{(i_1, \dots, i_n): \\ i_1 + \dots + i_n \leq k}} a_{i_1, \dots, i_n} x_1^{i_1} \dots x_n^{i_n}$

in \mathcal{N} . Suppose that for some j x_j is a nonstandard. Then for all i_1, \dots, i_n such that $i_1 + \dots + i_n \leq k$ either $i_j = 0$ or $a_{i_1, \dots, i_n} x_1^{i_1} \dots x_{j-1}^{i_{j-1}} x_{j+1}^{i_{j+1}} \dots x_n^{i_n} = 0$ (otherwise $a_{i_1, \dots, i_n} x_1^{i_1} \dots x_n^{i_n}$ and $s(\vec{x})$ would be nonstandard, which is contradictory since $t(\vec{x})$ is a standard). So, if we replace x_i by 0, $s(\vec{x})$ will not change its value. Since that we can replace all of nonstandard x_i 's by 0 and obtain a solution of the considered equation in \mathbb{N} (and hence in \mathcal{M}). Also it is clear that all x_i can be bounded by t .

3) All such equations can be satisfied by taking $x_i = \omega$ ($s(\omega, \dots, \omega) = \omega = t(\omega, \dots, \omega)$).

From this we can easily obtain an algorithm to decide whether $s = t$ is satisfiable in $\mathbb{I}(=)$.

(ii) In fact, $Th_{=}(\mathbb{N})$ can be deduced from \mathbb{Q} and commutativity, associativity and distributivity of addition and multiplication.

Let us fix terms $s(\vec{x})$ and $t(\vec{x})$ such that $\mathbb{N} \models \forall \vec{x}(s(\vec{x}) = t(\vec{x}))$. As in (i), s and t can be represented as polynomials. Since they are equal in \mathbb{N} , they have equal coefficients and hence their equality is provable.

(iii) We introduce the following model \mathcal{N} : $N = \mathbb{N} \cup \{\omega_0, \omega_1\}$, operations on natural numbers defined in the standard way,

- $S\omega_i = \omega_i$, where $i \in \{0, 1\}$,
- $\omega_i + n = n + \omega_i = \omega_i$, where $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $i \in \{0, 1\}$,
- $\omega_i + \omega_j = \omega_{\max(i,j)}$, $i, j \in \{0, 1\}$,
- $0 \cdot \omega_i = \omega_i \cdot 0 = 0$, $i \in \{0, 1\}$,
- $n \cdot \omega_i = \omega_i \cdot n = \omega_i$, $i \in \{0, 1\}$, $n \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\}$,
- $\omega_i \cdot \omega_j = \omega_{\max(i,j)}$, $i, j \in \{0, 1\}$.

$\mathcal{N} \models \mathbb{Q}$ and operations in \mathcal{N} are commutative, associative and distributive, so $\mathcal{N} \models Th_{=}(\mathbb{N})$. But $\mathcal{N} \models 0 + \omega_0 = \omega_0 \wedge \forall x(x + \omega_0 = \omega_0 \rightarrow Sx + \omega_0 = \omega_0) \wedge \omega_1 + \omega_0 \neq \omega_0$, so $\mathcal{N} \not\models I(=)$.

□

Proposition 3.3. (i) $\mathbb{Z}[X]^+ \models I(\neq)$;

(ii) $I(\neq) \not\models I(\leq), I(\not\leq)$.

Proof. (i) We only need to prove $\mathbb{Z}[X]^+ \models Ind_{s(x,\vec{y}) \neq t(x,\vec{y})}$, where s and t are terms. Fix these terms and \vec{y} . There are $P_n(\vec{y}), \dots, P_0(\vec{y}) \in \mathbb{Z}[X]$ such that $s(x, \vec{y}) - t(x, \vec{y}) = P_n(\vec{y})x^n + \dots + P_0(\vec{y})$. Suppose, $P_n(\vec{y})0^n + \dots + P_0(\vec{y}) = P_0(\vec{y}) \neq 0$, $\forall x(P_n(\vec{y})x^n + \dots + P_0(\vec{y}) \neq 0 \rightarrow P_n(\vec{y})(Sx)^n + \dots + P_0(\vec{y}) \neq 0)$, but $\exists x \in \mathbb{Z}[X]^+ : P_n(\vec{y})x^n + \dots + P_0(\vec{y}) = 0$. Then, for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$ $P_n(\vec{y})(x-k)^n + \dots + P_0(\vec{y}) = 0$ (since we can apply a contraposition to the step and the usual induction).

$$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & x & \cdots & x^n \\ 1 & x-1 & \cdots & (x-1)^n \\ \vdots & & \ddots & \vdots \\ 1 & x-n & \cdots & (x-n)^n \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} P_0(\vec{y}) \\ \vdots \\ P_n(\vec{y}) \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ \vdots \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

□

Since this matrix is invertible (in $\mathbb{Z}(X)$), $P_n(\vec{y}) = \dots = P_0(\vec{y}) = 0$. So, $\forall x \in \mathbb{Z}[X](s(x, \vec{y}) = t(x, \vec{y}))$, a contradiction.

(ii) We have already proved in Proposition 3.2 that $\mathbb{Z}^+[X] \not\models I(\leq), I(\not\leq)$

Proposition 3.4. (i) $I(\leq) \not\models x + y = y + x, x \cdot y = y \cdot x, Sx \neq x$

(ii) $I(\leq) \not\models I(=), I(\neq), I(\not\leq)$.

Proof. (i) Consider the model \mathcal{M} : $M = \mathbb{N} \cup \{\omega_0, \omega_1\}$ with operations defined as follows (on \mathbb{N} all operations defined in the standard way):

- $S\omega_i = \omega_i$, where $i \in \{0, 1\}$
- $\omega_i + x = \omega_i$, $n + \omega_i = \omega_i$, where $i \in \{0, 1\}$, $x \in M$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$

- $0 \cdot x = x \cdot 0 = 0$, $\omega_i \cdot x = \omega_i$, $n \cdot \omega_i = \omega_i$, where $i \in \{0, 1\}$, $x \in M \setminus \{0\}$, $n \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\}$
- $n \leq \omega_i$, $\omega_i \leq \omega_j$, where $i, j \in \{0, 1\}$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$

We prove that \mathcal{M} is a model of $\mathbb{I}(\leq)$. It is not very hard to see that $\mathcal{M} \models \mathbb{Q}$. Let, for example, check $\mathcal{M} \models \forall x \forall y (x \cdot Sy = x \cdot y + x)$. Fix $x, y \in M$. If $x, y \in \mathbb{N}$ or $x = 0$, it is obvious. Consider the case $x \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\}$ and $y = \omega_i$: $x \cdot Sy = x \cdot \omega_i = \omega_i = \omega_i + \omega_i = x \cdot y + y$. If $x = \omega_i$, then $x \cdot Sy = \omega_i = x \cdot y + x$.

As in Proposition 3.1 we can formulate the analogous lemma about terms (i.e. for every term $t(x, \vec{y})$ and fixed $y_1, \dots, y_n \in M \exists z \in M \forall x \in M t(x, \vec{y}) = z$ or $t(\omega_i, \vec{y}) = \omega_i$, $i = 0, 1$ and $\forall x \in M t(x, \vec{y}) \geq x$) and end the proof of $\mathcal{M} \models \mathbb{I}(\leq)$ in a similar way.

Now, $\mathcal{M} \models \omega_0 + \omega_1 \neq \omega_1 + \omega_0$, $\omega_0 \cdot \omega_1 \neq \omega_1 \cdot \omega_0$, $S\omega_0 = \omega_0$, as required.

(ii) Easy follows from (i) since $\mathbb{I}(=) \vdash x + y = y + x$, $x \cdot y = y \cdot x$, $\mathbb{I}(\neq) \vdash Sx \neq x$ and $\mathcal{M} \not\models (\omega_0 \not\leq 0) \wedge \forall x (\omega_0 \not\leq x \rightarrow \omega_0 \not\leq Sx) \rightarrow \forall x (\omega_0 \not\leq x)$. □

Proof of the Theorem 3.1. Follows from Propositions 3.1-3.4. □

Proof of the Theorem 3.3. Firstly, we prove the following lemma.

Lemma 3.2. $\mathbb{I}(\neq) + \forall x \forall y (x + y = y + x)$ proves associativity, commutativity and distributivity of $+$ and \cdot .

Proof. • Associativity of addition.

Suppose there is x, y, z such that $x + (y + z) \neq (x + y) + z$. Consider the formula $\varphi(x, y, z, t) := \left((x + (y + z)) + ((x + y) + t) \neq ((x + y) + z) + (x + (y + t)) \right)$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi(x, y, z, 0) &\leftrightarrow (x + (y + z)) + (x + y) \neq ((x + y) + z) + (x + y) \\ &\leftrightarrow x + (y + z) \neq (x + y) + z \end{aligned}$$

(the latter equivalence is true since $\mathbb{I}(\neq) \vdash a + c = b + c \rightarrow a = b$). So, $\varphi(x, y, z, 0)$ is true.

Suppose, $\varphi(x, y, z, t)$ is true, but $\varphi(x, y, z, St)$ is false. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} \neg \varphi(x, y, z, St) &\leftrightarrow (x + (y + z)) + S((x + y) + t) = ((x + y) + z) + (x + S(y + t)) \\ &\leftrightarrow S((x + (y + z)) + ((x + y) + t)) = S(((x + y) + z) + (x + (y + t))) \\ &\leftrightarrow (x + (y + z)) + ((x + y) + t) = ((x + y) + z) + (x + (y + t)) \\ &\leftrightarrow \neg \varphi(x, y, z, t), \end{aligned}$$

so, we have got a contradiction. Applying induction to the formula φ , we obtain $\forall t \varphi(x, y, z, t)$. Now, substitute z instead of t :

$$(x + (y + z)) + ((x + y) + z) \neq ((x + y) + z) + (x + (y + z)),$$

contradiction with commutativity of addition.

- Right distributivity.

Suppose there is x, y, z such that $x(y + z) \neq xy + xz$. Consider the formula $\varphi(x, y, z, t) = \left(x(y + z) + xy + xt \neq xy + xz + x(y + t) \right)$ (since we have already proved associativity we can write terms as $s + t + r$).

It is easy to see that $\varphi(x, y, z, 0)$ and $\neg\varphi(x, y, z, St) \rightarrow \neg\varphi(x, y, z, t)$ are true. By induction we obtain $\forall t \varphi(x, y, z, t)$. After substitution $t := z$ we obtain a contradiction with commutativity.

All other identities can be proven in the same way. Let's list only the formulas $\varphi(x, y, z, t)$.

- Left distributivity: $\varphi(x, y, z, t) = \left((x + y)z + xz + yt \neq xy + yz + (x + y)t \right)$;
- commutativity of multiplication: $\varphi(x, y, z, t) = \left(xy + yt \neq yx + ty \right)$;
- associativity of multiplication: $\varphi(x, y, z, t) = \left(x(yz) + (xy)t \neq (xy)z + x(yt) \right)$.

□

Let $\mathcal{M} \models \mathbb{1}(\neq) + \forall x \forall y (x + y = y + x)$. By lemma 3.2 \mathcal{M} is a semiring that can be embedded in a ring $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}$ (as in the proof of the Theorem 2.1). Let $f \in \widetilde{\mathcal{M}}[t]$. We prove by induction on $\deg f$ that the induction for the formula $f(x) = 0$ holds.

If $\deg f = 0$, then $f(0) = f(x)$ for all $x \in M$. If $f(0) = 0$, then $\forall x (f(x) = 0)$.

Let $\deg f = n > 0$, $f(0) = 0$ and $\forall x \in M (f(x) = 0 \rightarrow f(Sx) = 0)$. For $g \in \widetilde{\mathcal{M}}[t]$ we define $\tilde{g}(t) = g(St) - g(t)$. Denote by $\tilde{g}^{(k)}$ the $(\tilde{\cdot})$ applied to g k times.

Proposition 3.5. $\forall k < n \forall x \in M (\tilde{f}^{(n-k)}(x) = 0)$.

Proof. Note that $\tilde{f}^{(n)}$ is a constant (since $\deg \tilde{g} < \deg g$) and $\forall m, k \in \mathbb{N} (\tilde{f}^{(k)}(m) = 0)$ (since by usual induction $f(\mathbb{N}) = \{0\}$ and $g(x) = g(Sx) \rightarrow \tilde{g}(x) = 0$).

Induction on k .

If $k = 0$, then $\tilde{f}^{(n-k)}$ is a zero constant (by above observations).

Let $k + 1 < n$. Then $\tilde{f}^{(n-(k+1))}(0) = 0$ and $\tilde{f}^{(n-(k+1))}(x) = 0 \rightarrow \tilde{f}^{(n-(k+1))}(Sx) = 0$ (by the induction hypothesis). Since $\deg \tilde{f}^{(n-(k+1))} < n$, we can apply induction axiom to the formula $\tilde{f}^{(n-(k+1))}(x) = 0$ and obtain that for all $x \in M \tilde{f}^{(n-(k+1))}(x) = 0$. □

Now, suppose that there exists $x_0 \in M$ such that $f(x_0) \neq 0$. Consider the formula $f(x) - f(x_0) \neq 0$. Then, $f(0) - f(x_0) \neq 0$ and $f(x) - f(x_0) \neq 0 \rightarrow f(Sx) - f(x_0) \neq 0$ (since $(f(Sx) - f(x_0)) - (f(x) - f(x_0)) = \tilde{f}^{(1)}(x) = 0$). Since $\mathcal{M} \models \mathbb{1}(\neq)$, we obtain $\forall x \in M (f(x) - f(x_0) \neq 0)$. It is a contradiction since we can substitute x_0 instead of x . □

4 Remaining questions

In this section we formulate some remaining problems.

Problem 1. Does $\mathbb{1}(=)$ follow from $\mathbb{1}(\neq)$?

If the answer to Problem 1 is negative (i.e. $\mathbb{1}(\neq) \not\models \mathbb{1}(=)$), then by Theorem 3.3 any countermodel must have noncommutative addition.

We introduce a structure with noncommutative operations. Informally speaking, this is an analogue of the $\mathbb{Z}[X]$, but with noncommutative operations. Clearly, since the commutativity of operations is provable in $\mathbb{1}(=)$, this structure will not be a model of $\mathbb{1}(=)$.

Consider all formal sums of the form $a_1X^{i_1} + \dots + a_nX^{i_n}$ (the order of the sum is significant and we allow the sum to be empty), where $a_j \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $i_j \in \mathbb{N}$. We introduce the following reductions of such sums:

$$a_1X^{i_1} + \dots + a_{j-1}X^{i_{j-1}} + 0X^{i_j} + a_{j+1}X^{i_{j+1}} + \dots + a_nX^{i_n} \mapsto a_1X^{i_1} + \dots + a_{j-1}X^{i_{j-1}} + a_{j+1}X^{i_{j+1}} + \dots + a_nX^{i_n}$$

and

$$a_1X^{i_1} + \dots + a_{j-1}X^{i_{j-1}} + a_jX^{i_{j-1}} + \dots + a_nX^{i_n} \mapsto a_1X^{i_1} + \dots + (a_{j-1} + a_j)X^{i_{j-1}} + \dots + a_nX^{i_n}.$$

Let \sim be the least equivalence relation, containing \mapsto .

Definition 4.1. A sum A is in *normal form* (NF) if there is no B such that $A \mapsto B$.

Remark. It is easy to see that for every sum A there is a unique sum B such that $A \sim B$ and B is in NF.

We will consider these sums up to \sim .

Operations are introduced in the following way:

$$(a_1X^{i_1} + \dots + a_nX^{i_n}) + (b_1X^{j_1} + \dots + b_mX^{j_m}) = a_1X^{i_1} + \dots + a_nX^{i_n} + b_1X^{j_1} + \dots + b_mX^{j_m},$$

$$SA = A + 1,$$

if $b \geq 0$:

$$(a_1X^{i_1} + \dots + a_nX^{i_n}) \cdot bX^j = \underbrace{(a_1X^{i_1+j} + \dots + a_nX^{i_n+j}) + \dots + (a_1X^{i_1+j} + \dots + a_nX^{i_n+j})}_{b \text{ times}},$$

if $b < 0$:

$$(a_1X^{i_1} + \dots + a_nX^{i_n}) \cdot bX^j = \underbrace{(-a_nX^{i_n+j} - \dots - a_1X^{i_1+j}) + \dots + (-a_nX^{i_n+j} - \dots - a_1X^{i_1+j})}_{|b| \text{ times}},$$

$$A \cdot (b_1X^{j_1} + \dots + b_mX^{j_m}) = A \cdot b_1X^{j_1} + \dots + A \cdot b_mX^{j_m}.$$

As we can see, the result of the operations respects the equivalence relation introduced above.

Let us call this structure \mathcal{M} . To get from \mathcal{M} a model of \mathbb{Q} , we need to take only the «nonnegative» (positive and zero) elements of \mathcal{M} . We call a sum *positive* if in its normal form the sum of all coefficients before X 's with the greatest degree is positive. For example, $-X + X^2$ and $-X^2 + X + 2X^2$ are positive, but $X - X^2$ is not. It is easy to see that the sum and the product of any two nonnegative sums is nonnegative. As usual, we denote the substructure of nonnegative elements \mathcal{M}^+ . Now, $\mathcal{M}^+ \models \mathbb{Q}$.

Conjecture 1. *The introduced structure \mathcal{M}^+ is a model of $\mathbb{I}(\neq)$.*

If this hypothesis turns out to be true, then $\mathbb{I}(\neq) \not\models \mathbb{I}(=)$.

Problem 2. *Is $\mathbb{I}(=, \neq)$ equivalent to $\mathbb{I}\text{Open}(=)$ (induction for quantifier-free formulas, containing only atomic formulas of the form $s = t$)?*

There is a following result on the alternative axiomatization of $\mathbb{I}\text{Open}(=)$, which can help in solving this problem.

Theorem 4.1 ([8], Theorem 2). *$\mathbb{I}\text{Open}(=)$ is equivalent to the theory, consisting of \mathbb{Q} , commutativity, associativity and distributivity of addition and multiplication, and the scheme of axioms of the form*

$$\underline{d}x = \underline{d}x' \rightarrow \forall y \bigvee_{i=0}^{d-1} ((y+i)x = (y+i)x')$$

for all $d \geq 2$, where $\underline{d} = S^d(0)$.

References

- [1] Harvey Friedman. FOM Posting 919: Proof Theory of Arithmetic/2, 2021.
- [2] Emil Jeřábek. Division by zero. *Archive for Mathematical Logic*, 55(7-8):997–1013, sep 2016.
- [3] A.J. Wilkie. Some results and problems on weak systems of arithmetic. In Angus Macintyre, Leszek Pacholski, and Jeff Paris, editors, *Logic Colloquium '77*, volume 96 of *Studies in Logic and the Foundations of Mathematics*, pages 285–296. Elsevier, 1978.
- [4] Lou van den Dries. *Some model theory and number theory for models of weak systems of arithmetic*, volume 834 of *Lecture Notes in Math.*, pages 346–362. Springer, Germany, 1980.
- [5] Margarita Otero. On diophantine equations solvable in models of open induction. *The Journal of Symbolic Logic*, 55(2):779–786, 1990.
- [6] Petr Hájek and Pavel Pudlák. *Metamathematics of First-Order Arithmetic*. Perspectives in Logic. Cambridge University Press, 2017.
- [7] J. Shepherdson. A non-standard model for a free variable fragment of number theory. *Bulletin de l'Académie Polonaise des Sciences, Série des Sciences Mathématiques, Astronomiques et Physiques*, 12, 01 1964.
- [8] J. Shepherdson. The rule of induction in the three variable arithmetic based on $+$ and $-$. *Annales de la faculté des sciences de l'université de Clermont, Mathématiques*, Volume 35 (1967), 1967.