

~~F~~ Fact: The field of \mathbb{R} of real numbers is complete, ordered field

Field: A set \mathbb{K} with 2 binary operations: (Addition & multiplication)

* $(\mathbb{K}, +, 0) \rightarrow$ abelian group with 0 as additive identity

* $(\mathbb{K}^*, \cdot, 1) \rightarrow$ abelian group with 1 as multiplicative identity

$$[\mathbb{K}^* = \mathbb{K} - \{0\}]$$

* Multiplication distributes over addition

$$x \cdot (y+z) = xy + xz \quad \forall x, y, z \in \mathbb{K}$$

Partial order

\leq , is relation on a set, X is partial order if

i) $\forall a \in X, a \leq a$ (reflexive)

ii) $a \leq b \Rightarrow b \leq a \quad a, b \in X$ (symmetric)

iii) $a \leq b, b \leq c \Rightarrow a \leq c \quad a, b, c \in X$ (transitive)

Strict order

A relation $<$ on X is strict if

i) $a \neq a$ (non-reflexive)

ii) transitive

Ex: A partial order \leq on X induces a strict $<$ on X

Partial order :- reflexive, antisymmetric, transitive

Strict :- anti-reflexive, anti-symmetric, transitive

To induce a strict order $<$ from a partial order

we have $a < b \iff 1) a \leq b \wedge \neg(b \leq a)$

i.e for any element $a, b \in \text{set}$

$a < b$ if and only if $a \leq b$ and $\neg(b \leq a)$

So partial order

Total order

A relation is total order if

* It is partial order

* $\forall a, b$ either $a \leq b$ or $b \leq a$

Ex: \leq is partial order on $X \iff <$ satisfies Law trichotomy.

Law of trichotomy: $\forall a, b \in X, a \leq b, a = b, b \leq a$

Ordered Field

A field \mathbb{K} is strictly ordered if there exist strict order $<$ on \mathbb{K} st:

$$* \quad \forall a, b \in \mathbb{K}, \quad a < b, \quad a = b, \quad b < a$$

$$* \quad a < b \Rightarrow a + c < b + c \quad \forall c \in \mathbb{K}$$

$$a < b \Rightarrow ac < bc \quad c > 0$$

Ex: * $\mathbb{Q} \rightarrow$ rationals

$$* \quad \mathbb{Z}_p = \mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z} \quad p \in \mathbb{N} \text{ (Prime)}$$

Ex: assignment Q1

Wk 8) 23

ans) Let $P \subseteq \mathbb{K}$ st i and ii holds Then the relation defined by $a < b$ if $b - a \in P$ is strict order on \mathbb{K} making it an ordered field

Order in \mathbb{Q}

$$p \in \mathbb{Z}, q \in \mathbb{N}$$

$$\text{then } x = \frac{p}{q} > 0 \text{ if } pq > 0$$

$$\frac{p}{q} < \frac{r}{s} \text{ if } (rs - ps)qs > 0$$

Ex: If $x \in (\mathbb{K}, <)$ $x \neq 0$ then $x^2 > 0$

ans) consider $P = \{x \mid x \in \mathbb{K}, x < 0\}$ (ie +ve numbers in \mathbb{K})

consider $x \in \mathbb{K}, x \neq 0$

then $x \in P$, $-x \in P$

case 1 $x \in P$ ($x > 0$)

$$x \times x = x^2 \Rightarrow x \in P \quad (\text{Product of positive belong in } x^2 > 0)$$

case 2 $-x \in P$ ($x < 0$)

$$-x \times -x = x^2 \Rightarrow x^2 \in P$$

$$x^2 > 0$$

Proposition

An ordered field $(\mathbb{K}, <)$ contains the field of rational numbers as ordered subfield.

Proof: Consider +ve map $\phi: \mathbb{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{K}$ given by

$$\phi(n) = \begin{cases} 1 + 1 + \dots + 1 & (\text{integers}) ; n > 0 \\ 0 & ; n = 0 \\ (-1) + (-1) - \dots - (-1) & ; n < 0 \end{cases}$$

then ϕ is injective (one-to-one)

Also ϕ is ring homomorphism derivation

$$\text{i.e. } \phi(n+m) = \phi(n) + \phi(m) \quad (\text{closed})$$

$$\phi(n \cdot m) = \phi(n) \cdot \phi(m) \quad (\text{closed})$$

$$\phi(0_{\mathbb{Z}}) = 0_K \quad (\text{zero map to zero})$$

$$\phi(n) + \phi(-n) = \phi(0_{\mathbb{Z}}) = 0_K \quad (\text{additive inverse map})$$

$$\phi(1_{\mathbb{Z}}) = 1_K \quad (\text{multiplicative identity})$$

Now map ϕ induces a map $f: \mathbb{Q} \rightarrow K$

$$\text{Given by } f(p/q) = \phi(p) \phi(q)^{-1} \quad \forall p/q \in \mathbb{Q}$$

Then f induces an isomorphism b/w \mathbb{Q} and subfield $f(\mathbb{Q}) \subseteq K$

Def Let K_1, K_2 be field. Then a map $f: K_1 \rightarrow K_2$ called field homomorphism if

$$* \quad f(x+y) = f(x) + f(y)$$

$$* \quad f(x \cdot y) = f(x) \cdot f(y) \quad \forall x, y \in K_1$$

$$* \quad f(1) = 1$$

* If f is bijection in addition, then we say f is an isomorphism.

In this K_1 & K_2 are isomorphic field

* If $K_1 = K_2 = K$ $f: K \rightarrow K$ is isomorphism then we say f is automorphism of $\text{Aut}(K)$

Proposition

Let $f: \mathbb{Q} \rightarrow \mathbb{Q}$ to be an field automorphism, Then

$$f(1) = 1 \quad \text{Identity Isomorphism}$$

$$f(z) = f(1) + f(1) = z$$

$$f(n) = f(1) + f(1) + \dots + f(1) = n$$

$$f(n + (-n)) = f(n) + f(-n) \quad | \rightarrow |$$

$$= f(0) = 0 \quad n \rightarrow -n$$

$$\Rightarrow f(n) = -f(-n) \quad |_n \rightarrow |-n$$

Let $m/n \in \mathbb{Q} \quad n \in \mathbb{N} \quad m \in \mathbb{Z}$

$$f(1/n + \dots + 1/n) = f(1/n) + \dots + f(1/n) = n f(1/n)$$

$$f(1/n) = 1/n$$

$$f(m/n) = f(m) \cdot f(1/n) = m \cdot 1/n = m/n$$

$$\text{Automorphism } (\mathbb{Q}) = \{ ' \mathbb{Q} \}$$

$$\left[\mathbb{Q}(\sqrt{2}) \right]$$

complete ordered field

an ordered field $(K, <)$ with strict order, Let \leq be total associated with K .

Consider S , an nonempty subset of K , then

* U is called upper bound of S i.e. $a \leq U \forall a \in S$

* U^* be least upper bound of S if

i) $a \leq U^* \forall a \in S$

ii) for $U \in K$, $a \leq U \forall a \in S$

then $U^* \leq U$

* lly greatest lower bound. i) $a \geq V^* \forall a \in S$

ii) $\forall v \in K, v \leq a \forall a \in S$

then $V \leq V^*$

Dedekind complete

for ord $(K, <)$, if \neq nonempty bounded above subset of K has supremum in K .

Ex: \mathbb{Q} is not dedekind complete

$$S = \{x \in \mathbb{Q} : 0 < x \wedge x^2 > 2\}$$

$\text{Sup}(S)$ doesn't exist.

Ex: $(K, <)$, $S \neq \emptyset$ $S = \{-a \in K : a \in S\}$

i) show that if U is lub of S then $-U$ lub of $-S$ vice versa

ii) If $\text{sup}(S)$ exist then $\text{lub}(-S)$ exist vice versa

$$\text{lub}(-S) \rightarrow \text{sup}(S)$$

iii) $(K, <)$ is complete \Leftrightarrow $\forall S$ bounded below of K has inf in K

$(K, <)$ is complete.

Let take S bounded below subset

then looking $S' = (-a : a \in S)$

Since S is bounded below, S' is bounded above

any be completeness, S' have sup in K , let U be $\text{sup}(S')$

then S has inf and it is $-U$.

Since K is field, $-U \in K$ if $U \in K$.

so $\text{lub}(S) \in K$.

$\Rightarrow \forall S$, bounded below subset has lub in K .

Let A be any bounded above subset

Consider $A' = (-a : a \in A)$

Since A bounded above $\Rightarrow A'$ is bounded below

we have given \neq bounded below nonempty subset has inf in K

let $\text{lub}(A') = L \in K$

then $\text{sup}(A) = -L \Rightarrow \text{an } -L \in K (\because L \in K, K \text{ is field})$

$\Rightarrow \forall$ nonempty bounded above subset has sup in K

\Rightarrow complete ordered field.

i) If $\sup(s)$ exist then $\inf(-s)$ exist vice versa
 $\inf(s) \rightarrow \sup(-s)$

any i) $\sup(s)$ exist $\Rightarrow \inf(-s)$ exist & $\sup(s) = -\inf(-s)$

Let s be non empty set bounded above and.

$$U = \sup(s).$$

(considered) $-s = (-a : a \in s)$, set of negative numbers of s .

Claim: $-s$ is bounded below.

We know $\forall a \in s$,

$$a \leq U \quad \textcircled{1}$$

$$\textcircled{1} \times -1 \Rightarrow -a \geq -U$$

Since a is arbitrary, $-a$ depicts set $-s$.

so $\forall -a \in -s$ $-a$ bounded below. i.e $-U$ is lower bound.

$$\Rightarrow \inf(-s) = -U$$

$$\text{so } \sup(s) = U \text{ & } \inf(-s) = -U$$

$$\Rightarrow \sup(s) = -\inf(-s)$$

Thm: \mathbb{R} is complete ordered field.

Thm: If (\mathbb{K}, \leq) & (\mathbb{K}', \leq') are complete ordered, then there exist isomorphism $f: \mathbb{K} \rightarrow \mathbb{K}'$ st f is preserve order.

Properties of \mathbb{R}

1) If $x, y \in \mathbb{R}$ $y \geq x > 0$

then $nx > y \quad n \in \mathbb{N} \quad [\text{Archimedean property}]$

2) If $x, y \in \mathbb{R}$ then

$x < p < y \quad \text{where } p \in \mathbb{Q} \quad [\text{Denseinen of } \mathbb{Q} \text{ in } \mathbb{R}]$

Proof:

$x > y \quad \& \quad y \neq 0$, we need show

$$ny > x$$

take $S = \{ny : n \in \mathbb{N}, y \in \mathbb{R}\}$

Let $ny < x$. This implies S have bounded

let α be $\sup(S)$.

$$\alpha - y < \alpha$$

so $\exists \alpha - y < ny \quad \text{for some } m$

$$\Rightarrow \alpha < (m+1)y$$

$\Rightarrow \alpha$ is $\sup(S)$.

so $ny > x \quad \text{for any } n$.

$$\rightarrow ny >$$

Demo. let $x < y$,

$$y - x > 0$$

$$n(y - x) > 0$$

$$ny > nx + 1$$

$$\lfloor nx \rfloor \leq nx < \lfloor nx \rfloor + 1 \leq nx + 1 < ny$$

$$nx < \lfloor nx \rfloor + 1 < ny \Rightarrow x < \frac{\lfloor nx \rfloor + 1}{n} < y$$



Absolute valued Real numbers

$x \in \mathbb{R}$ then:

$$|x| = \begin{cases} x; & x \geq 0 \\ -x; & x < 0 \end{cases}$$

Properties of absolute value

- * $f: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^+$

- * $|x| \geq 0$ and $|x| = 0 \Leftrightarrow x = 0$

- * $|xy| = |x||y|$

- * $|x+y| \leq |x| + |y| \quad \forall x, y \in \mathbb{R}$

$|\cdot| : (\mathbb{K}, \leq) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_0$ called absolute value on (\mathbb{K}, \leq)

Sequence & Convergence

limit

$$\phi: \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$$

$$\phi = (a_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$$

$$l \in \mathbb{R}, \quad \varepsilon > 0 \quad \exists n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$$

$$\text{st } |a_{n-1}| < \varepsilon \quad \forall n \geq n_0$$

Recap.

Complete ordered field

(\mathbb{K}, \leq) is an ordered field

* Dedekind complete :- \forall nonempty bdd above subset has sup in \mathbb{K} .

* Existence :- \exists a complete ordered field

Ex: $\mathbb{R} \Rightarrow$ field of real numbers

* Uniqueness :- $f: (\mathbb{K}, \leq) \rightarrow (\mathbb{K}', \leq')$ is isomorphisms,
which also order preserving

Sequence of \mathbb{R}

$$\phi: \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$$

If $\phi(n) = a_n \in \mathbb{R}$, then we denote by

$$\phi_n \equiv (a_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$$

Convergence :-

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} a_n = l \text{ if}$$

$$\forall \varepsilon > 0, \exists n_0 \in \mathbb{N} \text{ st } |a_n - l| < \varepsilon, \forall n \geq n_0$$

proposition: Every convergent seq is bdd

(a_n) is bdd if $\exists M > 0$ st $|a_n| \leq M \quad \forall n$

proof: convergent seq : $\forall \varepsilon > 0, \exists N \in \mathbb{N}$ s.t $\forall n \geq N$,

$$|a_N - l| < \varepsilon$$

then \forall term after a_N is in the interval $[l - \varepsilon, l + \varepsilon]$

$$\text{let } U = \max \{a_1, a_2, \dots, a_N, [l - \varepsilon, l + \varepsilon]\}$$

then U is upperbound. By \exists lower bound $\Rightarrow a_n$ is bounded

Cauchy Sequence

A seq. (a_n) of \mathbb{R} is s.t. cauchy seq if $\forall \epsilon > 0 \exists n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ s.t $|a_n - a_m| < \epsilon$ s.t $n, m \geq n_0$

proposition: Every convergent seq. is cauchy seq.

Proof: convergent sequence (a_n) : $\forall \epsilon > 0, \exists n \in \mathbb{R}$ s.t $\forall N \geq n$

$$|a_N - l| < \epsilon$$

$$\Rightarrow \text{Let for } \forall N \geq n_1, |a_N - l| < \epsilon_1 \quad \& \quad \forall M \geq n_2$$

$$|a_{M-1}| < \epsilon_2 \quad |a_l - b| \geq$$

$$n = \max\{n_1, n_2\} \quad \text{then} \quad |a_N - l| + |a_{M-1}| < \epsilon$$

$$|a_N - l - a_{M-1}| \leq |a_N - l| + |a_{M-1}| < \epsilon_1 + \epsilon_2$$

$$|a_N - a_M| < \epsilon \quad \frac{\epsilon_1 + \epsilon_2}{2} = \epsilon_1 = \epsilon_2 = \epsilon$$

\Rightarrow \forall convergent seq. is cauchy

Subsequence

Seq: $\phi: \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$

Then $\phi: A \in \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is subsequence

proposition:- i) \forall subsequence of convergent seq is convergent and has the same limit

ii) \forall Real sequence has either a monotonically increasing subseq or strictly decreasing subsequence

• (a_n) is monotonically ↑ if $a_n \leq a_{n+1} \forall n$

• (a_n) is strictly ↓ if $a_n > a_{n+1}$

iii) \forall bdd monotonic seq is convergent

Proof: $X = (x_n)$ is bounded.

Let U be an supremum of X and L infimum of X .
then $\forall x_n \quad L \leq x_n \leq U$

Since X is monotonic sequence either

$\forall x_n \geq x_{n+1}$ or $x_n \leq x_{n+1}$

Let X be a increasing sequence

Claim: U is limit point of X

To prove U is the limit, we need show $\forall \epsilon > 0, \exists n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ s.t $\forall N \geq n_0$

$$|x_n - U| < \epsilon$$

for any monotonically sequence, $\exists N$ s.t

$$U - \epsilon < x_N \leq U \quad (\because x_n \text{ is bounded})$$

Now consider $\forall \epsilon > 0$, using above

$$U - \epsilon < x_N \leq U \Rightarrow U - \epsilon < x_n < U + \epsilon$$

$$\Rightarrow |x_n - U| < \epsilon$$

So U is limit point

likly for nonincreasing sequence

$$L + \epsilon > x_N \geq L$$

$$L + \epsilon > x_N > L - \epsilon$$

$$|x_n - L| < \epsilon$$

L is limit point

Ex: i) Cauchy seq is bdd. defined $|a_n - a_m| < \epsilon$

ii) Cauchy seq has convergent subsequence. then seq is also convergent

$$(a_n) \quad (a_{n_k})_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \quad \text{if } R \quad \forall \epsilon > 0 ; \exists k.$$

$$|a_n - a_m| < \epsilon/2 \rightarrow n \geq n_0 \quad \text{st } |a_{n_k} - a_m| < \epsilon/2 \quad \forall k > k_0$$

$$\text{Let } n_1 = \max \{n_0, k_0\}$$

then $n \geq n_1$, then

$$|a_n - a_1| = |a_n - a_{n_k} + a_{n_k} - a_1| \\ \leq |a_n - a_{n_k}| + |a_{n_k} - a_1| \quad ?$$

* Thm: Every Cauchy seq. of real is convergent

Proof: easy?

In other words, \mathbb{R} is Cauchy complete

i.e. \mathbb{R} is Dedekind complete and Cauchy complete

but Cauchy $\not\Rightarrow$ Dedekind ??

doubt: $f: \mathbb{Q} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ the final form $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} p/q = 0 \\ p/q \neq r \end{array} \right\}$
is complete as given constant seq with limit. but \mathbb{Q} not
Dedekind complete since x_2 without??

Thm: (\mathbb{K}, \leq) ord. field, then following are equivalent

* \mathbb{K} is Dedekind complete

* \mathbb{K} is Archimedean and \mathbb{K} is Cauchy complete

In simple terms $\text{Dedekind} \equiv \text{Archimedean} + \text{Cauchy}$.
 \downarrow
stronger).

proposition:

$\text{Aut}(\mathbb{R}) = \{1_{\mathbb{R}}\}$ Automorphism on \mathbb{R} is identity

If $f: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is field isomorphism

dark

Step 1) $f|_{\mathbb{Q}}: \mathbb{Q} \rightarrow \mathbb{Q}$ is field automorphism

$f|_{\mathbb{Q}} = 1_{\mathbb{Q}}$ (identity map)

Step 2) f is strictly increasing:

$x > 0 ; \exists y > 0$ s.t. $x = y^2$ (i.e. y is +ve root of x)

$$f(x) = f(y \times y) = f(y) + f(y) > 0$$

Now claim: If $\alpha \in \mathbb{R} - \mathbb{Q}$ then

$$f(\alpha) = \alpha$$

Suppose our claim is not then

either $f(\alpha) < \alpha$ or $f(\alpha) > \alpha$

$f(\alpha) < \gamma < \alpha$ (By density $\gamma \in \mathbb{Q}$)

$$\gamma < \alpha \Rightarrow f(\gamma) < f(\alpha) \Rightarrow \gamma < f(\alpha)$$

$\therefore \gamma \notin \mathbb{Q}$

$$\mathbb{C} := \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}$$

$$(a, b) + (c, d) = (a+c, bd)$$

$$(a, b) \cdot (c, d) = (ac - bd, ad + bc)$$

$\Rightarrow \mathbb{C} = \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}$ is field

$$\text{where } i = (0, 1) ; i^2 = (-1, 0)$$

$$a \mapsto a, 0$$

$$\text{by } (a, b) \mapsto a + ib$$

* $(0, 0)$ is additive identity

* \mathbb{C} is not ordered ($i^2 = -1$)

$$|z| = |a + ib| = \sqrt{a^2 + b^2}$$

$\Rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ is not dedekind complete

$\Rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ is cauchy complete

$$(8) \boxed{8/23} \quad \text{Aut}(\mathbb{Q}) = \{1_{\mathbb{Q}}\}$$

$$\text{Aut}(\mathbb{R}) = \{1_{\mathbb{R}}\}$$

$$\text{Aut}(\mathbb{C}) = \{1_{\mathbb{C}}, \text{conjugate}\} \quad \text{doubt?}$$

$$\text{Aut}(\mathbb{Q}[\sqrt{-1}]) = \{\text{conjugate}\}$$

Proposition

let $x \in \mathbb{R}$ and $x > 0$. (if $n > 1$) then \exists a unique $y > 0$ $\forall n \in \mathbb{N}$

$$\text{S.t } y^n = x$$

[This unique y is called the positive n^{th} root of x and we write $\sqrt[n]{x}$ or $x^{1/n}$]

Proof. consider the subset

$$E = \{t \in \mathbb{R} : t > 0, t^n < x\}$$

$$\text{Let } b_0 = \frac{x}{x+1} < 1 \quad \text{also } x/b_0 < x$$

$$\Rightarrow b_0^n < b_0 < x$$

so E is non empty

$$t_1 > x+1 > 1$$

$$\Rightarrow t_1^n > t_1 > x$$

$$t_1 \notin E$$

But t_0 is an upper bound of E

then by complete of \mathbb{R}

$$\exists y = \sup E \in \mathbb{R}$$

$$\text{Claim } y^n = x$$

$$\text{then } y^n = x \quad y^n > x \quad y^n < x$$

$$y^n < x < (y+1)^n$$

$$0 < x - y^n < (y+1)^n - y^n$$

$$b^n - a^n < (ba)^n b^{n-1}$$

Claim $y^n = x$

then $y^n = x$ $y^n > x$ $y^n < x$

$$y^n < x < (y+1)^n$$

$$0 < x - y^n < (y+1)^n - y^n$$

$$0 < \frac{x - y^n}{n(y+1)^{n-1}} < \frac{(y+1)^n - y^n}{n(y+1)^{n-1}} < 1$$

choose h such that

$$0 < h < \frac{x - y^n}{n(y+1)^{n-1}} < \frac{(y+1)^n - y^n}{n(y+1)^{n-1}} < 1$$

then

$$(y+h)^n - y^n < hn(y+h)^{n-1} < x - y^n$$

?

$$y+h^n < x$$

but y is sup cond

Assume $y^n > x$

$$y^n - x < y^m$$

$$0 < k < \frac{y^n - x}{y^m - x} \leq \frac{y^n - x}{y^{m-1}} < y$$

$$\text{choose } k = \frac{y^n - x}{n y^{n-1}} \quad (0 < k < y)$$

$$y^n - (y^n - k) < kn y^{n-1} = y^n - x$$

$$-(y-n) < -x$$

$$\Rightarrow (y-k)^n > x$$

$$\Rightarrow (y-k) \notin E$$

But contrad

only $y^n = x$

Rational function field over \mathbb{R}

$$\frac{P(x)}{Q(x)} + \frac{R(x)}{S(x)} = \frac{P(x)S(x) + R(x)Q(x)}{Q(x)S(x)}$$

$$\frac{P(x)}{Q(x)} \cdot \frac{R(x)}{S(x)} = \frac{P(x)}{Q(x)} \frac{R(x)}{S(x)}$$

$$\frac{P(x)}{Q(x)} = \frac{a_0 + a_1 x + \dots + a_n x^n}{b_0 + b_1 x + \dots + b_m x^m} > 0 \quad \text{if } a_n, b_m > 0$$

$x \in \mathbb{R}$; $x - y > 0$

$$\frac{P(x)}{Q(x)} > \frac{R(x)}{S(x)} \Rightarrow \frac{P(x)}{Q(x)} - \frac{R(x)}{S(x)} > 0$$

for $\forall \varepsilon > 0$, $\exists \delta < \varepsilon$ such that $\{\varepsilon \in \mathbb{R} : \varepsilon > 0\}$

Construction of \mathbb{Z}

on $\mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N}$ define $(n, m) \sim (n', m')$

$$\text{if } n+m = n'+m'$$

then from this equivalence class \in

$$\mathbb{Z} = \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N} / \sim$$

$\mathbb{Z} \models +$

$$[(c_n, m)] + [(a, b)] = [(c_n + a, m + b)]$$

$$[(n, m) \cdot (a, b)] = [(na + mb, nb + ma)]$$

$$[(0, 1)] \sim [(1, 1)] \rightarrow \text{additive identity}$$

$$[(0, 1)] \rightarrow -1 \text{ (in } \mathbb{Z})$$

DOVA

Rational function field over \mathbb{R}

$$\frac{P(x)}{Q(x)} + \frac{R(x)}{S(x)} = \frac{P(x)S(x) + Q(x)R(x)}{Q(x)S(x)}$$

$$\frac{P(x)}{Q(x)} \cdot \frac{R(x)}{S(x)} = \frac{P(x)}{Q(x)} \frac{R(x)}{S(x)}$$

$$\frac{P(x)}{Q(x)} = \frac{a_0 + a_1 x + \dots + a_n x^n}{b_0 + b_1 x + \dots + b_m x^m} > 0 \quad \text{if } a_n, b_m > 0$$

$$x \in \mathbb{R}; x - y > 0$$

$$\frac{P(x)}{Q(x)} > \frac{P(y)}{Q(y)} \Rightarrow \frac{P(x)}{Q(x)} - \frac{P(y)}{Q(y)} > 0$$

for $\forall \varepsilon > 0$, $\exists \delta < \varepsilon$ such that $\{x \in \mathbb{R} : |x - y| < \delta\}$

The field of rational function is non archimedean and nondedekind.

because if taking two elements,

$$Y(x) = \frac{a x^m + \dots}{b x^n}$$

$$Y(x) \geq 0 \text{ if } a/b > 0$$

$$h(u) = f(u) - g(u)$$

$$\text{if } h(u) \geq 0$$

$$\text{then } f(u) \geq g(u)$$

$$\text{if } h(u) \leq 0$$

$$\text{then } g(u) \geq f(u)$$

to be archimedean

$$f(u) = 2u \quad g(u) = 1$$

