The Reverse Mathematics of Noether's Decomposition Lemma

Chris Conidis

College of Staten Island

March 15, 2021

Computable Rings

Definition

A *computable ring* is a computable subset $A \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ equipped with two computable binary operations $+$ and $\cdot$ on A, together with elements $0, 1 \in A$ such that $R = (A, 0, 1, +, \cdot)$ is a ring.

Computable Rings

Definition

A *computable ring* is a computable subset $A \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ equipped with two computable binary operations $+$ and $\cdot$ on A, together with elements $0, 1 \in A$ such that $R = (A, 0, 1, +, \cdot)$ is a ring.

All rings will be *countable* and *commutative*, unless we say otherwise.

Noether's Primary Decomposition Lemma

Primary Decomposition Lemma

If R is Noetherian, then R contains only finitely many minimal prime ideals.

Noether's Primary Decomposition Lemma

Primary Decomposition Lemma

If R is Noetherian, then R contains only finitely many minimal prime ideals.

Primary Decomposition Lemma

If R contains infinitely many minimal prime ideals, then R is not Noetherian, i.e. R contains an infinite strictly ascending chain of ideals

$$I_0 \subset I_1 \subset I_2 \subset \cdots \subset I_n \subset \cdots \subset R, \;\; n \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Classical Proof of the Lemma

Assume that R contains infinitely many distinct minimal primes.

Classical Proof of the Lemma

Assume that R contains infinitely many distinct minimal primes.
Need to construct an infinite strictly ascending chain

$$I_0 \subset I_1 \subset I_2 \subset \cdots I_n \subset \cdots \subset R.$$

Classical Proof of the Lemma

Assume that R contains infinitely many distinct minimal primes.
Need to construct an infinite strictly ascending chain

$$I_0 \subset I_1 \subset I_2 \subset \cdots I_n \subset \cdots \subset R.$$

Let $I_0 = \langle 0 \rangle_R \subset R$.
Since R contains infinitely many minimal primes, $\langle 0 \rangle_R \subset R$ is not a prime ideal. Therefore there exist $a_1, b_1 \in R$ such that $a_1, b_1 \notin I_0$ but $a_1 b_1 = 0 \in I_0$. Now, either a_1 or b_1 is contained in infinitely many minimal primes; add it to I_0 to get $I_1 \supset I_0$.

Classical Proof of the Lemma

Assume that R contains infinitely many distinct minimal primes.
Need to construct an infinite strictly ascending chain

$$I_0 \subset I_1 \subset I_2 \subset \cdots I_n \subset \cdots \subset R.$$

Let $I_0 = \langle 0 \rangle_R \subset R$.
Since R contains infinitely many minimal primes, $\langle 0 \rangle_R \subset R$ is not a prime ideal. Therefore there exist $a_1, b_1 \in R$ such that $a_1, b_1 \notin I_0$ but $a_1 b_1 = 0 \in I_0$. Now, either a_1 or b_1 is contained in infinitely many minimal primes; add it to I_0 to get $I_1 \supset I_0$.
Repeat with the invariant that

$$I_k = \langle c_1, c_2, \cdots, c_k \rangle_R \subset R, \ k \in \mathbb{N},$$

is contained in infinitely many minimal primes, and therefore is not prime itself. Uses $\emptyset''$.

The "Big Five:"

- RCA_0 : Recursive Comprehension Axiom
- WKL_0 : Weak König's Lemma
- ACA_0 : Arithmetic Comprehension Axiom
- ATR_0 : Arithmetic Transfinite Recursion
- $\Pi^1_1 - \mathsf{CA}_0$: Π^1_1 − Comprehension Axiom

Reverse Mathematics

The "Big Five:"

- RCA_0 : Recursive Comprehension Axiom
- WKL_0 : Weak König's Lemma
- ACA_0 : Arithmetic Comprehension Axiom
- ATR_0 : Arithmetic Transfinite Recursion
- $\Pi^1_1{-}\mathrm{CA}_0$: Π^1_1−Comprehension Axiom

- ADS : Ascending-Descending Chain Principle

The "Big Five:"

- RCA_0 : Recursive Comprehension Axiom
- WKL_0 : Weak König's Lemma
- ACA_0 : Arithmetic Comprehension Axiom
- ATR_0 : Arithmetic Transfinite Recursion
- $\Pi^1_1-CA_0$: Π^1_1-Comprehension Axiom

- ADS : Ascending-Descending Chain Principle
- $2-MLR$: Existence of 2-Random sets

The "Big Five:"

- RCA_0 : Recursive Comprehension Axiom
- WKL_0 : Weak König's Lemma
- ACA_0 : Arithmetic Comprehension Axiom
- ATR_0 : Arithmetic Transfinite Recursion
- $\Pi^1_1-\mathsf{CA}_0$: Π^1_1-Comprehension Axiom

- ADS : Ascending-Descending Chain Principle
- $2-\mathsf{MLR}$: Existence of 2-Random sets
- COH : Cohesive set principle

The "Big Five:"

- RCA_0 : Recursive Comprehension Axiom
- WKL_0 : Weak König's Lemma
- ACA_0 : Arithmetic Comprehension Axiom
- ATR_0 : Arithmetic Transfinite Recursion
- $\Pi^1_1-CA_0$: Π^1_1-Comprehension Axiom

- ADS : Ascending-Descending Chain Principle
- $2-MLR$: Existence of 2-Random sets
- COH : Cohesive set principle
- AMT : Atomic Model Theorem

The Tree Antichain Theorem

Definition

Let $T \subseteq 2^{<\mathbb{N}}$ be a tree. We say that T is <u>completely branching</u> if for all $\sigma \in T$, $\sigma^+ = \{\sigma 0, \sigma 1\} \subset 2^{<\mathbb{N}}$, either

$$\sigma^+ \subset T \quad \text{or} \quad \sigma^+ \cap T = \emptyset.$$

The Tree Antichain Theorem

Definition

Let $T \subseteq 2^{<\mathbb{N}}$ be a tree. We say that T is completely branching if for all $\sigma \in T$, $\sigma^+ = \{\sigma 0, \sigma 1\} \subset 2^{<\mathbb{N}}$, either

$$\sigma^+ \subset T \quad \text{or} \quad \sigma^+ \cap T = \emptyset.$$

TAC (Tree Antichain Theorem)

Every infinite completely branching computably enumerable tree $T \subseteq 2^{<\mathbb{N}}$ contains an infinite antichain.

The Tree Antichain Theorem

Definition

Let $T \subseteq 2^{<\mathbb{N}}$ be a tree. We say that T is completely branching if for all $\sigma \in T$, $\sigma^+ = \{\sigma 0, \sigma 1\} \subset 2^{<\mathbb{N}}$, either

$$\sigma^+ \subset T \quad \text{or} \quad \sigma^+ \cap T = \emptyset.$$

TAC (Tree Antichain Theorem)

Every infinite completely branching computably enumerable tree $T \subseteq 2^{<\mathbb{N}}$ contains an infinite antichain.

TAC (Tree Antichain Theorem–Equivalent Version)

Every infinite tree $T \subseteq 2^{<\mathbb{N}}$ with no terminal nodes and infinitely many splittings has an infinite antichain.

Two Paths to TAC

Fact (RCA_0)

TAC follows from each of 2-MLR and ADS (individually).

Fact (RCA_0)

TAC is restricted Π^1_2.

Fact (RCA_0)

TAC does not follow from WKL

Corollary

TAC is not equivalent to any other "known" subsystem of Second-Order Arithmetic.

Definition

Let R be a ring with multiplicative identity 1_R.

- We say that ideals $I, J \subseteq R$ are <u>coprime</u> whenever $I + J = R$, i.e. $1_R \in I + J$.

Definition

Let R be a ring with multiplicative identity 1_R.

- We say that ideals $I, J \subseteq R$ are coprime whenever $I + J = R$, i.e. $1_R \in I + J$.
- We say that ideals $I, J \subseteq R$ are uniformly coprime if for all $x \in I \cap J$ there exist $y \in I$, $z \in J$, and $a, b \in R$ such that

$$x = yz \quad \text{and} \quad ay + bz = 1_R.$$

Definition

Let R be a ring with multiplicative identity 1_R.

- We say that ideals $I, J \subseteq R$ are coprime whenever $I + J = R$, i.e. $1_R \in I + J$.
- We say that ideals $I, J \subseteq R$ are uniformly coprime if for all $x \in I \cap J$ there exist $y \in I$, $z \in J$, and $a, b \in R$ such that
$$x = yz \quad \text{and} \quad ay + bz = 1_R.$$

Primary Decomposition for Restricted Classes of Rings

Definition

Let R be a ring with multiplicative identity 1_R.

- We say that ideals $I, J \subseteq R$ are coprime whenever $I + J = R$, i.e. $1_R \in I + J$.
- We say that ideals $I, J \subseteq R$ are uniformly coprime if for all $x \in I \cap J$ there exist $y \in I$, $z \in J$, and $a, b \in R$ such that
$$x = yz \quad \text{and} \quad ay + bz = 1_R.$$

Theorem A

If R has infinitely many coprime minimal primes, then R is not Noetherian.

Theorem B

If R has infinitely many uniformly coprime minimal primes, then R is not Noetherian.

Algebraic Characterizations of TAC

Theorem ($RCA_0 + B\Sigma_2$)

Theorem B is equivalent to TAC.

Algebraic Characterizations of TAC

Theorem ($RCA_0 + B\Sigma_2$)

Theorem B is equivalent to TAC.

Conjecture ($RCA_0 + B\Sigma_2$)

Theorem A is equivalent to TAC.

TAC implies Theorem B

Given R with infinitely many minimal primes, construct $T = T_R \subseteq 2^{<\mathbb{N}}$ such that:

- every $\sigma \in T$ corresponds to some (zero-divisor) $x_\sigma \in R$;

TAC implies Theorem B

Given R with infinitely many minimal primes, construct $T = T_R \subseteq 2^{<\mathbb{N}}$ such that:

- every $\sigma \in T$ corresponds to some (zero-divisor) $x_\sigma \in R$;
- $\prod_{\sigma \in S} x_\sigma = 0_R$ whenever S covers $2^{\mathbb{N}}$;

TAC implies Theorem B

Given R with infinitely many minimal primes, construct $T = T_R \subseteq 2^{<\mathbb{N}}$ such that:

- every $\sigma \in T$ corresponds to some (zero-divisor) $x_\sigma \in R$;
- $\prod_{\sigma \in S} x_\sigma = 0_R$ whenever S covers $2^{\mathbb{N}}$;
- paths in T correspond to annihilator ideals;

TAC implies Theorem B

Given R with infinitely many minimal primes, construct $T = T_R \subseteq 2^{<\mathbb{N}}$ such that:

- every $\sigma \in T$ corresponds to some (zero-divisor) $x_\sigma \in R$;
- $\prod_{\sigma \in S} x_\sigma = 0_R$ whenever S covers $2^{\mathbb{N}}$;
- paths in T correspond to annihilator ideals;
- maximal paths correspond to maximal annihilator (hence minimal prime) ideals.

TAC implies Theorem B

Given R with infinitely many minimal primes, construct $T = T_R \subseteq 2^{<\mathbb{N}}$ such that:

- every $\sigma \in T$ corresponds to some (zero-divisor) $x_\sigma \in R$;
- $\prod_{\sigma \in S} x_\sigma = 0_R$ whenever S covers $2^{\mathbb{N}}$;
- paths in T correspond to annihilator ideals;
- maximal paths correspond to maximal annihilator (hence minimal prime) ideals.

TAC implies Theorem B

Given R with infinitely many minimal primes, construct $T = T_R \subseteq 2^{<\mathbb{N}}$ such that:

- every $\sigma \in T$ corresponds to some (zero-divisor) $x_\sigma \in R$;
- $\prod_{\sigma \in S} x_\sigma = 0_R$ whenever S covers $2^{\mathbb{N}}$;
- paths in T correspond to annihilator ideals;
- maximal paths correspond to maximal annihilator (hence minimal prime) ideals.

If $\{\alpha_i : i \in \mathbb{N}\}$ is an infinite $T-$antichain, and

$$I_N = Ann(\prod_{i=1}^{N} x_{\alpha_i}),$$

then

$$I_0 \subset I_1 \subset I_2 \cdots \subset I_N \subset \cdots .$$

Theorem B implies TAC

Given infinite Σ^0_1 completely branching $T \subseteq 2^{<\mathbb{N}}$.
Construct R via:

- R is a quotient of $\mathbb{Q}[X_\sigma : \sigma \in T]$ such that

Theorem B implies TAC

Given infinite Σ^0_1 completely branching $T \subseteq 2^{<\mathbb{N}}$.
Construct R via:

- R is a quotient of $\mathbb{Q}[X_\sigma : \sigma \in T]$ such that
    - $X_\emptyset = 0 \in R$,

Theorem B implies TAC

Given infinite Σ^0_1 completely branching $T \subseteq 2^{<\mathbb{N}}$.
Construct R via:

- R is a quotient of $\mathbb{Q}[X_\sigma : \sigma \in T]$ such that
  - $X_\emptyset = 0 \in R$,
  - $X_{\sigma 0} X_{\sigma 1} = X_\sigma$, and

Theorem B implies TAC

Given infinite Σ^0_1 completely branching $T \subseteq 2^{<\mathbb{N}}$.
Construct R via:

- R is a quotient of $\mathbb{Q}[X_\sigma : \sigma \in T]$ such that
  - $X_\emptyset = 0 \in R$,
  - $X_{\sigma 0} X_{\sigma 1} = X_\sigma$, and
  - inverses for all polynomials such that the intersection of the partial$-2^{\mathbb{N}}-$coverings yielded by the monomials is empty.

Theorem B implies TAC

Given infinite Σ^0_1 completely branching $T \subseteq 2^{<\mathbb{N}}$.
Construct R via:

- R is a quotient of $\mathbb{Q}[X_\sigma : \sigma \in T]$ such that
  - $X_\emptyset = 0 \in R$,
  - $X_{\sigma 0} X_{\sigma 1} = X_\sigma$, and
  - inverses for all polynomials such that the intersection of the partial$-2^{\mathbb{N}}-$coverings yielded by the monomials is empty.
- R is a PIR; every ideal $I \subset R$ is generated by a monomial.

Theorem B implies TAC

Given infinite Σ^0_1 completely branching $T \subseteq 2^{<\mathbb{N}}$.
Construct R via:

- R is a quotient of $\mathbb{Q}[X_\sigma : \sigma \in T]$ such that
  - $X_\emptyset = 0 \in R$,
  - $X_{\sigma 0} X_{\sigma 1} = X_\sigma$, and
  - inverses for all polynomials such that the intersection of the partial$-2^{\mathbb{N}}-$coverings yielded by the monomials is empty.
- R is a PIR; every ideal $I \subset R$ is generated by a monomial.
- Given an infinite strictly ascending $R-$chain, one can effectively find a principle generator for each ideal in the chain and use $\mathrm{B}\Sigma_2$ along with the sequence of exponents of these generators to build an infinite antichain of T in the context.

First-Order Considerations

Over RCA_0 we have that TAC $\rightarrow$ Theorem B.

First-Order Considerations

Over RCA_0 we have that TAC $\to$ Theorem B.
The converse follows from $\mathrm{RCA}_0 + \mathrm{B}\Sigma_2$.

First-Order Considerations

Over RCA_0 we have that TAC $\rightarrow$ Theorem B.
The converse follows from $\mathrm{RCA}_0 + \mathrm{B}\Sigma_2$.

Definition (RCA_0)

For each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, let $n-$TAC be the principle that says "for every infinite tree $T \subseteq 2^{<\mathbb{N}}$ with infinitely many splittings, there is a (path-)nonincreasing $f_T : T \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ such that:

First-Order Considerations

Over RCA_0 we have that TAC $\rightarrow$ Theorem B.
The converse follows from $\mathsf{RCA}_0 + \mathsf{B}\Sigma_2$.

Definition (RCA_0)

For each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, let $n-$TAC be the principle that says "for every infinite tree $T \subseteq 2^{<\mathbb{N}}$ with infinitely many splittings, there is a (path-)nonincreasing $f_T : T \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ such that:

- $f(\emptyset) = n$;
- there exist infinitely many $\sigma \in T$ and $i_\sigma \in \{0, 1\}$ such that:

$$f(\sigma) > f(\sigma i_\sigma).$$

First-Order Considerations

Over RCA_0 we have that TAC $\rightarrow$ Theorem B.
The converse follows from $\mathsf{RCA}_0 + \mathsf{B}\Sigma_2$.

Definition (RCA_0)

For each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, let $n-$TAC be the principle that says "for every infinite tree $T \subseteq 2^{<\mathbb{N}}$ with infinitely many splittings, there is a (path-)nonincreasing $f_T : T \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ such that:

- $f(\emptyset) = n$;
- there exist infinitely many $\sigma \in T$ and $i_\sigma \in \{0, 1\}$ such that:

$$f(\sigma) > f(\sigma i_\sigma).$$

TAC is equivalent to 1-TAC.

First-Order Considerations

Over RCA_0 we have that TAC $\to$ Theorem B.
The converse follows from $\mathsf{RCA}_0 + \mathsf{B}\Sigma_2$.

Definition (RCA_0)

For each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, let $n-$TAC be the principle that says "for every infinite tree $T \subseteq 2^{<\mathbb{N}}$ with infinitely many splittings, there is a (path-)nonincreasing $f_T : T \to \mathbb{N}$ such that:

- $f(\emptyset) = n$;
- there exist infinitely many $\sigma \in T$ and $i_\sigma \in \{0, 1\}$ such that:

$$f(\sigma) > f(\sigma i_\sigma).$$

TAC is equivalent to 1-TAC. Let WTAC be $n-$TAC without the n.

First-Order Considerations

Over RCA_0 we have that TAC $\rightarrow$ Theorem B.
The converse follows from $\mathsf{RCA}_0 + \mathsf{B}\Sigma_2$.

Definition (RCA_0)

For each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, let $n-$TAC be the principle that says "for every infinite tree $T \subseteq 2^{<\mathbb{N}}$ with infinitely many splittings, there is a (path-)nonincreasing $f_T : T \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ such that:

- $f(\emptyset) = n$;
- there exist infinitely many $\sigma \in T$ and $i_\sigma \in \{0, 1\}$ such that:

$$f(\sigma) > f(\sigma i_\sigma).$$

TAC is equivalent to 1-TAC. Let WTAC be $n-$TAC without the n.

TAC $\longrightarrow$ Theorem B $\longrightarrow$ WTAC, over RCA_0.

First-Order Considerations

Over RCA_0 we have that TAC $\rightarrow$ Theorem B.
The converse follows from $\mathsf{RCA}_0 + \mathsf{B}\Sigma_2$.

Definition (RCA_0)

For each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, let $n-$TAC be the principle that says "for every infinite tree $T \subseteq 2^{<\mathbb{N}}$ with infinitely many splittings, there is a (path-)nonincreasing $f_T : T \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ such that:

- $f(\emptyset) = n$;
- there exist infinitely many $\sigma \in T$ and $i_\sigma \in \{0, 1\}$ such that:

$$f(\sigma) > f(\sigma i_\sigma).$$

TAC is equivalent to 1-TAC. Let WTAC be $n-$TAC without the n.

TAC $\longrightarrow$ Theorem B $\longrightarrow$ WTAC, over RCA_0.
TAC $\longleftrightarrow$ Theorem A/B $\longleftrightarrow$ WTAC, over $\mathsf{RCA}_0 + \mathsf{B}\Sigma$.

First-Order Considerations

Over RCA_0 we have that TAC $\rightarrow$ Theorem B.
The converse follows from $\mathsf{RCA}_0 + \mathsf{B}\Sigma_2$.

Definition (RCA_0)

For each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, let $n-$TAC be the principle that says "for every infinite tree $T \subseteq 2^{<\mathbb{N}}$ with infinitely many splittings, there is a (path-)nonincreasing $f_T : T \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ such that:

- $f(\emptyset) = n$;
- there exist infinitely many $\sigma \in T$ and $i_\sigma \in \{0, 1\}$ such that:

$$f(\sigma) > f(\sigma i_\sigma).$$

TAC is equivalent to 1-TAC. Let WTAC be $n-$TAC without the n.

TAC $\longrightarrow$ Theorem B $\longrightarrow$ WTAC, over RCA_0.
TAC $\longleftrightarrow$ Theorem A/B $\longleftrightarrow$ WTAC, over $\mathsf{RCA}_0 + \mathsf{B}\Sigma$.
Q: What is the first order part of $n-$TAC, WTAC?

Consequences of the Hilbert Basis Theorem: The Krull Intersection Theorem

Theorem (Krull Intersection Theorem; KIT)

If R is an integral domain, $I \subset R$ an ideal, then

$$\bigcap_{n \in \mathbb{N}} I^n = 0_R.$$

Theorem (RCA_0, Conidis (2021))

KIT implies WKL_0.

The Primary Decomposition Lemma

We need to use infinite combinatorial structures (graphs) that are more general than trees and include (undirected) cycles.

The Primary Decomposition Lemma

We need to use infinite combinatorial structures (graphs) that are more general than trees and include (undirected) cycles.

Theorem

The Primary Decomposition Lemma follows from $CAC+WKL_0$.

The Primary Decomposition Lemma

We need to use infinite combinatorial structures (graphs) that are more general than trees and include (undirected) cycles.

Theorem

The Primary Decomposition Lemma follows from CAC+WKL_0.

Lemma (RCA_0)

- *If R is Noetherian, then the nilradical $N \subset R$ exists and $N^n = 0_R$, for some $n \in \mathbb{N}$.*

The Primary Decomposition Lemma

We need to use infinite combinatorial structures (graphs) that are more general than trees and include (undirected) cycles.

Theorem

The Primary Decomposition Lemma follows from CAC+WKL_0.

Lemma (RCA_0)

- *If R is Noetherian, then the nilradical $N \subset R$ exists and $N^n = 0_R$, for some $n \in \mathbb{N}$.*
- *PDL implies KIT (and thus WKL_0).*

The Primary Decomposition Lemma

We need to use infinite combinatorial structures (graphs) that are more general than trees and include (undirected) cycles.

Theorem

The Primary Decomposition Lemma follows from CAC+WKL_0.

Lemma (RCA_0)

- *If R is Noetherian, then the nilradical $N \subset R$ exists and $N^n = 0_R$, for some $n \in \mathbb{N}$.*
- *PDL implies KIT (and thus WKL_0).*

The Primary Decomposition Lemma

We need to use infinite combinatorial structures (graphs) that are more general than trees and include (undirected) cycles.

Theorem

The Primary Decomposition Lemma follows from $CAC+WKL_0$.

Lemma (RCA_0)

- *If R is Noetherian, then the nilradical $N \subset R$ exists and $N^n = 0_R$, for some $n \in \mathbb{N}$.*
- *PDL implies KIT (and thus WKL_0).*

Conjecture (RCA_0)

The Primary Decomposition Lemma implies:

- *KIT; (Milne's Lecture Notes; online)*
- *WKL_0;*
- *$TAC+WKL_0$.*

Thank You!