

Constructive Quantifier Elimination with a Focus on Matrix Rings

Max Illmer and Tim Netzer

Department of Mathematics, University of Innsbruck

March 25, 2025

To the memory of Alexander Prestel

Abstract

We give a sufficient condition for a model theoretic structure B to 'inherit' quantifier elimination from another structure A . This yields an alternative proof of one of the main result from [8], namely quantifier elimination for certain matrix rings. The original proof uses model theory, and while it is very elegant and insightful, the proof we propose is much shorter and provides a constructive algorithm.

1 Introduction and Preliminaries

1.1 Introduction

In model theory it is common to infer certain properties of a structure from another, by giving a strong enough relation between the two. The two structures k and $\text{Mat}_n(k)$, where k is some ring and $\text{Mat}_n(k)$ denotes the matrix ring, are interesting examples of this. Although they are bi-interpretable, $\text{Mat}_n(k)$ does in general not inherit quantifier elimination from k , even if k is, for example, real closed or algebraically closed. However, extending the language of (ordered) rings by the two new functions trace and conjugate transpose, establishes a strong enough relation between the structures for quantifier elimination to actually transfer. This was first proven in [8] by showing model completeness and the amalgamation property for $\text{Mat}_n(k)$, whose combination is equivalent to quantifier elimination.

In this paper, we first discuss such relations between structures in broad generality, and then apply it to matrix rings. The main idea is to find maps that have enough expressive power to transfer a formula into the structure with quantifier elimination, and then pull it back again. We will use the same algebraic ingredient as in [8], the so-called Specht property of certain fields. This provides maps f_m into some finite-dimensional vector space

$k^{d(m)}$, whose fibers determine matrix-tuples up to simultaneous unitary similarity, which is granular enough for any definable set in $\text{Mat}_n(k)^m$. The only thing to show then is that the subset of $k^{d(m)}$, which “parametrizes” the definable set of interest in $\text{Mat}_n(k)^m$, is itself definable in the structure k . Important to note here is that if quantifier elimination over k can be done in a constructive way (as is the case for example over algebraically closed fields or real closed fields) and the invariants f_m are given explicitly, quantifier elimination can also be done constructively for $\text{Mat}_n(k)$ by our approach.

1.2 A Minimum of First Order Logic

The most important result of this paper can be stated without any serious logic or model theory. However, in order to rigorously state and prove the underlying principle, we will need a few basic definitions of first-order logic and model theory. If the reader is interested in a more thorough introduction, we recommend [4], [7] and [9].

Definition 1.1. A **formal language** is a set consisting of logical symbols and punctuation $\exists, \wedge, \neg, =, (, \dots$ together with **constant/function/relation symbols**, and an **arity-function**, assigning to each function and relation symbol its number of arguments. We denote formal languages by caligraphic letters such as \mathcal{L} . We can **extend** a language by an additional symbol S , and write (\mathcal{L}, S) for that.

Definition 1.2. Given a formal language \mathcal{L} , an **\mathcal{L} -structure** is a nonempty set A , together with an **interpretation function**, assigning to each constant symbol an element in A , and to each function/relation symbol an actual function/relation of the correct arity on A .

In order to speak of rings, a language \mathcal{L} needs at least two function symbols $+, \cdot$ of arity 2, and two constant symbols $0, 1$. With these symbols one can write down the ring axioms and the axioms of algebraically closed or real closed fields, for example. Throughout this paper, we will denote this specific language by \mathcal{F} . An obvious \mathcal{F} -structure is \mathbb{C} , with the usual interpretation of $+, \cdot, 0, 1$. If we want to talk about ordered rings, we can extend the language by the relation symbol \leq . An obvious (\mathcal{F}, \leq) -structure is \mathbb{R} with the usual interpretations. Note that for real closed fields, the extension by \leq is to some extent redundant, since nonnegative elements are squares and nonnegativity can thus be expressed in \mathcal{F} alone. However, this uses a quantifier, and to obtain quantifier elimination one needs to include the relation symbol \leq .

Terms and **formulas** in a language can formally be defined, but for our purpose it is enough to note that they are combinations of symbols and variables that syntactically make sense in the obvious way. For example, $1 + x$ is a term and $\forall x: x \geq 0$ is a formula. Variables not in the range of quantifiers (\exists, \forall) are called **free**. To emphasize the free variables x_1, \dots, x_m of a formula ϕ , we also sometimes write $\phi(x_1, \dots, x_m)$.

Definition 1.3. Given a formula $\phi(x_1, \dots, x_m)$ and a structure A , ϕ defines a subset of A^m in a natural way (we sometimes write $\phi(A)$ for this subset), as the set of m -tuples from A^m , for which after insertion into ϕ , the resulting statement is “true” in A (we again suppress some technical details here). Sets that can be expressed this way are called **definable**.

Definition 1.4. An \mathcal{L} -structure A admits **quantifier elimination**, if every definable set is also definable without quantifiers. More precisely, if for every \mathcal{L} -formula $\phi(x_1, \dots, x_m)$ there exists a quantifier-free \mathcal{L} -formula $\psi(x_1, \dots, x_m)$ with $\phi(A) = \psi(A)$.

It is a well-known fact that algebraically closed fields, i.e. \mathcal{F} -structures satisfying the axioms for algebraically closed fields, and real closed fields, i.e. (\mathcal{F}, \leq) -structures satisfying the axioms of real closed fields, admit quantifier elimination. In fact a stronger result holds, namely that quantifiers can be removed independently of the actual field (this means that the *theory* of algebraically or real closed fields admits quantifier elimination). Both results can actually be proven by showing that the projection of a definable set is again definable (definable sets for algebraically closed fields are constructible sets in the Zariski topology, while for real closed fields they are the semialgebraic sets). Since projections are defined by formulas of the form $\exists x \phi(x, x_1, \dots, x_m)$, the general case can then be deduced inductively. In the case of algebraically closed fields, a constructive proof boils down to a simple application of the Euclidean algorithm. For real closed fields the result is less trivial and content of the Tarski-Seidenberg Theorem. But also here there exist constructive proofs, see for example [1, 2, 12].

1.3 Complete Invariants

Definition 1.5. Given an equivalence relation \sim on some set X , we say that a function $f: X \rightarrow Y$ is a **complete invariant**, if the following holds true:

$$\forall a, b \in X: \quad a \sim b \iff f(a) = f(b).$$

It is also common to talk of a **complete set of invariants**, if f and Y can be written as a direct product in a compatible way.

Very often, additional properties for the set Y and the function f are required in order to make good use of the invariants. In our proof below for example, we want Y to be a finite dimensional vector space over a field k .

One crucial ingredient in the proof from [8] is the following theorem, which characterizes simultaneous unitary similarity of matrices in terms of a very nice complete set of invariants.

Theorem 1.1. Let k be a real closed field or its algebraic closure. Then for $n, m \in \mathbb{N}$ and $A = (A_1, \dots, A_m), B = (B_1, \dots, B_m) \in \text{Mat}_n(k)^m$ there exists a unitary $U \in \text{U}_n(k)$ with

$$U^* A_i U = B_i \quad \text{for } i = 1, \dots, m$$

if and only if

$$\mathrm{tr}(\omega(A_1, \dots, A_m, A_1^*, \dots, A_m^*)) = \mathrm{tr}(\omega(B_1, \dots, B_m, B_1^*, \dots, B_m^*))$$

holds for all words ω of length $\leq n^2$ in $2m$ non-commuting variables, where $*$ denotes the conjugate transpose.

First proofs of this theorem for real closed fields and their algebraic closure were given in [14] and [13] respectively, both, however, without bounds on the word lengths (which is vital for both the original proof of quantifier elimination in [8] as well as ours below).

If such a bound depending on n and m exists for a field k , it is also said that k has the **Specht property**. So the above theorem says that real closed fields and their algebraic closures have the Specht property.

Why are we interested in the specific equivalence relation of simultaneous unitary similarity? The reason is its natural connection with the language $(\mathcal{F}, \mathrm{tr}, *, \leq)$. If k is a real closed field or its algebraic closure, we consider $\mathrm{Mat}_n(k)$ as an $(\mathcal{F}, \mathrm{tr}, *, \leq)$ -structure, where tr is interpreted as the usual trace (multiplied with the identity), $*$ as conjugate transposition, and \leq as the partial ordering defined by positive semidefiniteness.

Note that for all results to come, interpreting \leq as the order on the (selfadjoint) center would also suffice. In fact it can be used to define positive semidefiniteness (see for example below, or also [3]). We instead opt for the interpretation of \leq by positive semidefiniteness, which is more natural in the context of free semialgebraic geometry.

Lemma 1.1. In the above case, definable sets are closed under simultaneous unitary similarity.

Proof. For any $U \in \mathrm{U}_n(k)$ and $A, B \in \mathrm{Mat}_n(k)$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} U^*AU + U^*BU &= U^*(A + B)U \\ U^*AUU^*BU &= U^*ABU \\ \mathrm{tr}(U^*AU) &= \mathrm{tr}(A) = U^*\mathrm{tr}(A)U \\ (U^*AU)^* &= U^*A^*U \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} A = 0 &\iff U^*AU = 0 \\ A \geq 0 &\iff U^*AU \geq 0. \end{aligned}$$

If $D \subseteq \mathrm{Mat}_n(k)^m$ is defined by a quantifier-free formula $\phi(x_1, \dots, x_m)$, this easily implies $(A_1, \dots, A_m) \in D \implies (U^*A_1U, \dots, U^*A_mU) \in D$. Existential quantifiers correspond to projections, and this clearly preserves closedness under simultaneous unitary similarity.

For general formulas the statement then follows by induction. \square

2 Results

We start by describing in a rather general way a relation between two structures, which allows to transfer quantifier elimination. To this end, let \mathcal{L} and \mathcal{G} be formal languages and A and B structures over \mathcal{L} and \mathcal{G} , respectively. We further assume that for every $m \in \mathbb{N}$ there exists a function $f_m: B^m \rightarrow A^{d(m)}$ with the following three properties:

- (i) For any definable set $D \subseteq B^m$, the set $f_m(D)$ is definable in $A^{d(m)}$.
- (ii) For any quantifier-free definable set $E \subseteq A^{d(m)}$, the set $f_m^{-1}(E) \subseteq B^m$ is quantifier-free definable.
- (iii) For any $a \in A^{d(m)}$ and any definable set $D \subseteq B^m$, we either have $f_m^{-1}(a) \subseteq D$ or $f_m^{-1}(a) \cap D = \emptyset$.

We call conditions (i) and (ii) **constructive**, if there is a constructive algorithm that turns definitions of sets into definitions of their image/preimage, as required.

Properties (i) and (ii) allow to transform definable sets back and forth via f_m . Property (iii) basically says that f_m is “injective up to definability”.

Theorem 2.1. Let A, B and $(f_m)_{m \in \mathbb{N}}$ be as described above. Then, if A admits quantifier elimination, so does B . Furthermore, if (i) and (ii) are constructive, and there exists a constructive algorithm for quantifier elimination in A , then there is also a constructive algorithm for quantifier elimination in B .

Proof. Let $D \subseteq B^m$ be definable. By (i) we know that $f_m(D)$ is definable in $A^{d(m)}$. Since A admits quantifier elimination, this set is also quantifier-free definable, and therefore by (ii) so is $f_m^{-1}(f_m(D))$. But due to (iii) we have $f_m^{-1}(f_m(D)) = D$, which finishes the proof. The statement about constructiveness follows directly from the argument. \square

Before getting to our main application, let us demonstrate the use of Theorem 2.1 in two easy cases.

Corollary 2.1. Let k be a real closed field and consider its algebraic closure \bar{k} as an $(\mathcal{F}, *, \leq)$ -structure, where $*$ is interpreted as complex conjugation, and \leq as the ordering on k . Then \bar{k} admits quantifier elimination.

Proof. First note that as a real closed field, k admits quantifier elimination with respect to the language (\mathcal{F}, \leq) . We then consider the mappings $f_m: \bar{k}^m \rightarrow k^{2m}$ that split numbers into real and imaginary parts. Now properties (i), (ii) and (iii) are easily checked, for (ii) we actually need $*$ and \leq in the language for \bar{k} . \square

The second example can also be found as a preliminary result in [8, Proposition 2.1.11].

Corollary 2.2. Let \mathcal{L} be a language extending the language \mathcal{F} of rings, and let k be a ring that admits quantifier elimination w.r.t. \mathcal{L} . Consider the ring $\text{Mat}_n(k)$ as an $(\mathcal{L}, (e_{ij})_{i,j \leq n})$ -structure, where all symbols from \mathcal{L} beyond \mathcal{F} are interpreted only on the center and as in k (functions are set 0 outside), and e_{ij} is interpreted as the usual matrix unit E_{ij} . Then $\text{Mat}_n(k)$ admits quantifier elimination.

Proof. We use the functions $f_m: \text{Mat}_n(k)^m \rightarrow k^{n^2 m}$ that map a matrix tuple to the tuple of all its matrix entries. Then property (i) is easy to see, (ii) follows from the fact that $E_{1i} A E_{j1} = a_{ij} E_{11}$ holds for all $A = (a_{ij})_{i,j} \in \text{Mat}_n(k)$, and (iii) is clear from injectivity of f_m . \square

This result is intuitively clear, as the addition of matrix units allows us to freely pick any particular matrix entry and operate on it. Much less obvious is the following result, shown in a slightly different form in [8].

Corollary 2.3. Let k be a real closed field or the algebraic closure thereof. Then the $(\mathcal{F}, \text{tr}, *, \leq)$ -structure $\text{Mat}_n(k)$ admits quantifier elimination.

Proof. Consider the functions $f_m: \text{Mat}_n(k)^m \rightarrow k^{d(m)}$ that compute the invariants from the Specht property, explicitly

$$f_m(A_1, \dots, A_m) = (\text{tr}(\omega(A_1, \dots, A_m, A_1^*, \dots, A_m^*)))_{\omega \in J(n,m)}$$

where $J(n, m)$ is the set of words of length $\leq n^2$ in $2m$ variables. Since k admits quantifier elimination as an $(\mathcal{F}, *, \leq)$ -structure (see Corollary 2.1 for the algebraically closed case), we are only left to show that f_m fulfills properties (i), (ii) and (iii), where (i) is clear. For (ii) let $E \subseteq k^{d(m)}$ be defined by the quantifier-free formula φ in the free variables x_ω (for $\omega \in J(n, m)$). If we just substitute the expression $\text{tr}(\omega(A_1, \dots, A_m, A_1^*, \dots, A_m^*))$ for x_ω , we obtain a quantifier-free formula defining $f_m^{-1}(E)$. (iii) is due to the fact that f_m is an invariant of simultaneous unitary similarity (see Theorem 1.1), and the orbits of simultaneous unitary similarity can never be split by a $(\mathcal{F}, \text{tr}, *, \leq)$ -definable set, as shown in Lemma 1.1. \square

Note that for the domain of the functions f_m we have

$$d(m) = |J(n, m)| = \sum_{i=1}^{n^2} (2m)^i = \frac{(2m)^{n^2+1} - 1}{2m - 1}.$$

Let us now elucidate how the above proof yields an algorithm for quantifier elimination in $\text{Mat}_n(k)$. We are given a formula $\phi(X_1, \dots, X_m)$ in the language $(\mathcal{F}, \text{tr}, *, \leq)$. We first replace each matrix variable in ψ (also the bound ones) by n^2 variables for its entries, and

spell out all computations to obtain an $(\mathcal{F}, *, \leq)$ -formula $\tilde{\phi}$ in (many) commuting variables. If the entries of X_i are denoted x_{rs}^i , the free variables of $\tilde{\phi}$ are all x_{rs}^i . We then consider the formula

$$\exists x_{rs}^1, \dots, x_{rs}^m: \tilde{\phi}(x_{rs}^i) \wedge x = f_m(x_{rs}^i),$$

where x is a $d(m)$ -tuple and $f_m(x_{rs}^i)$ denotes the function values computed in terms of the matrix entries, which can indeed be written down in the language $(\mathcal{F}, *, \leq)$. This formula now defines the image of the set defined by ϕ under f_m . By quantifier elimination in k , there exists an equivalent quantifier-free $(\mathcal{F}, *, \leq)$ -formula $\gamma(x)$. Replacing x by $f_m(X_1, \dots, X_m)$ yields a quantifier-free $(\mathcal{F}, \text{tr}, *, \leq)$ -formula ψ which is equivalent to ϕ .

The symbols tr , $*$ and \leq are very natural for (free) semialgebraic geometry. For example, they allow to use Newton sums (or the Specht property itself) to get information about the spectrum of a matrix. This was used in [3] for some explicit quantifier-free description of interesting sets, e.g. invertible matrices or positive semidefinite matrices (using only the ordering on the center). More generally speaking, all relevant properties in free semialgebraic geometry such as unitarity, positivity, having a certain rank and the like, are definable and can thus be described constructively without quantifiers, by the construction from above. But the resulting description from our method will of course not be the simplest possible or most intuitive one in general.

For example, let us define the real positive semidefinite 2×2 -matrices with our method. As \leq is already part of our language, the most obvious defining formula would of course be $A \geq 0$. What happens, however, if we strictly follow our algorithm? A well-known quantifier-free definition for positive semidefiniteness in the matrix entries $X = \begin{pmatrix} x & y \\ y & z \end{pmatrix}$ is

$$x + z \geq 0 \wedge xz - y^2 \geq 0.$$

Even in this very simple case, the invariant f_1 already has codomain \mathbb{R}^{31} . However, due to the predetermined symmetry of X , we only really have to consider 4 dimensions. Using this and proceeding as in our proof, with the help of a computer algebra system like Mathematica gives a final formula:

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{tr}(X) \geq 0, \text{tr}(X)^2 - \text{tr}(X^2) \geq 0, \\ & \text{tr}(X)^2 - 2\text{tr}(X^2) \leq 0, \text{tr}(X^2) \geq 0, \\ & \text{tr}(X)^3 - 3\text{tr}(X)\text{tr}(X^2) + 2\text{tr}(X^3) = 0, \text{tr}(X)^4 - 2\text{tr}(X)^2\text{tr}(X^2) - \text{tr}(X)^2 + 2\text{tr}(X^4) = 0, \\ & \bigwedge_{\omega \in J(2,1)} \text{tr}(\omega(X, X^*)) = \text{tr}(\omega(X, X)). \end{aligned}$$

It is easy to see that the first line gives a characterization of symmetric matrices as positive semidefinite. All the other lines could simply be replaced by $X = X^*$ instead.

Another example, where redundancy is even clearer, is if we describe the center $Z(\text{Mat}_n(k))$

by eliminating quantifiers in the defining formula

$$\forall Y: XY = YX.$$

Strictly following our proof would result in a definable set in $k^{2^{n^2+1}-1}$ as our “parameterizing” set. This set is actually in bijection to k itself, as the orbits under similarity obviously collapse on the center. However, a much easier quantifier-free description in this case is of course $nX = \text{tr}(X)$.

Finally note, that while all those results hold for any dimension n , the quantifier-free formulas we construct depend on n . Quantifier elimination in the dimension-free setup, which is often considered in free semialgebraic geometry, does not hold in general (see [6, 8] for example).

Acknowledgments

We thank Marcus Tressl for useful comments on a preliminary version of the paper.

References

- [1] Saugata Basu, Richard Pollack, and Marie-Françoise Roy, *Algorithms in real algebraic geometry*, Second Edition, Springer, Berlin, 2006.
- [2] Jacek Bochnak, Michel Coste, and Marie-Françoise Roy, *Real algebraic geometry*, Springer, Berlin, 1998.
- [3] Clemens Brüser, *Quantifier elimination in matrix algebras*, <https://resolver.obvsg.at/urn:nbn:at:at-ubi:1-101222>. Master’s Thesis, University of Innsbruck, 2022.
- [4] Chen Chung Chang and H Jerome Keisler, *Model theory*, Elsevier, 1990.
- [5] Harm Derksen, Igor Klep, Visu Makam, and Jurij Volčič, *Ranks of linear matrix pencils separate simultaneous similarity orbits*, *Advances in Mathematics* **415** (2023), 108888.
- [6] Tom Drescher, Tim Netzer, and Andreas Thom, *On projections of free semialgebraic sets*, *Advances in Geometry* **23** (2023), no. 2, 207–214.
- [7] Wilfrid Hodges, *Model theory*, Cambridge University Press, 1993.
- [8] Igor Klep and Marcus Tressl, *A model theoretic perspective on matrix rings*, *Mathematische Zeitschrift* **309** (2025), no. 3, 1–20.
- [9] Alexander Prestel and Charles N Delzell, *Mathematical logic and model theory: a brief introduction*, Springer, 2011.
- [10] Claudio Procesi, *The invariant theory of $n \times n$ matrices*, *Advances in Mathematics* **19** (1976), no. 3, 306–381.
- [11] Ju P Razmyslov, *Trace identities of full matrix algebras over a field of characteristic zero*, *Mathematics of the USSR-Izvestiya* **8** (1974), no. 4, 727.
- [12] Claus Scheiderer, *A course in real algebraic geometry – positivity and sums of squares*, Springer, 2024.

- [13] Konstantin Sergeevich Sibirskii, *Algebraic invariants for a set of matrices*, Siberian Mathematical Journal **9** (1968), no. 1, 115–124.
- [14] NA Wiegmann, *Necessary and sufficient conditions for unitary similarity*, Journal of the Australian Mathematical Society **2** (1961), no. 1, 122–126.