From Dynamical Systems to Decidability of Logical Theories

Toghrul Karimov

Max Planck Institute for Software Systems, Germany

From Dynamical Systems to Decidability of Logical Theories

Toghrul Karimov

Max Planck Institute for Software Systems, Germany

(I work with Valérie Berthé and Florian Luca)

First-order logical theories

Mathematical structure:

$$\mathcal{S} = \langle \underbrace{\mathbb{Z}}_{\text{domain}} ; \underbrace{0, 1}_{\text{constants}} , \underbrace{+}_{\text{functions}} , \underbrace{<, \text{isAPowerOfTwo}}_{\text{predicates}} \rangle$$

First-order logical theories

Mathematical structure:

$$\mathcal{S} = \langle \underbrace{\mathbb{Z}}_{\text{domain}} ; \underbrace{0, 1}_{\text{constants}} , \underbrace{+}_{\text{functions}} , \underbrace{<, \text{isAPowerOfTwo}}_{\text{predicates}} \rangle$$

Predicates of one variable $\equiv$ subsets of $\mathbb{N}$:

$$\text{isAPowerOfTwo} \equiv \{2^n \colon n \geq 0\} =: 2^{\mathbb{N}}$$

First-order logical theories

Mathematical structure:

$$\mathcal{S} = \langle \underbrace{\mathbb{Z}}_{\text{domain}} ; \underbrace{0, 1}_{\text{constants}} , \underbrace{+}_{\text{functions}} , \underbrace{<, \text{isAPowerOfTwo}}_{\text{predicates}} \rangle$$

Predicates of one variable $\equiv$ subsets of $\mathbb{N}$:

$$\text{isAPowerOfTwo} \equiv \{2^n \colon n \geq 0\} =: 2^{\mathbb{N}}$$

The first-order theory of $\mathcal{S}$: the set of all sentences that are 1) true in $\mathcal{S}$

First-order logical theories

Mathematical structure:

$$\mathcal{S} = \langle \underbrace{\mathbb{Z}}_{\text{domain}} ; \underbrace{0, 1}_{\text{constants}} , \underbrace{+}_{\text{functions}} , \underbrace{<, \text{isAPowerOfTwo}}_{\text{predicates}} \rangle$$

Predicates of one variable $\equiv$ subsets of $\mathbb{N}$:

$$\text{isAPowerOfTwo} \equiv \{2^n \colon n \geq 0\} =: 2^{\mathbb{N}}$$

The first-order theory of $\mathcal{S}$: the set of all sentences that are 1) true in $\mathcal{S}$ and 2) constructed using the constants, functions, predicates, quantifiers $\forall, \exists$ over the elements of the domain, logical operations $\neg, \wedge, \vee$, and equality

First-order logical theories, cont'd

Mathematical structure:

$$\mathcal{S} = \langle \underbrace{\mathbb{N}}_{\text{domain}} ; \underbrace{0, 1}_{\text{constants}} , \underbrace{+}_{\text{functions}} , \underbrace{<, 2^{\mathbb{N}}}_{\text{predicates}} \rangle$$

The first-order theory of $\mathcal{S}$: all first-order sentences true in $\mathcal{S}$

First-order logical theories, cont'd

Mathematical structure:

$$\mathcal{S} = \langle \underbrace{\mathbb{N}}_{\text{domain}} ; \underbrace{0, 1}_{\text{constants}} , \underbrace{+}_{\text{functions}} , \underbrace{<, 2^{\mathbb{N}}}_{\text{predicates}} \rangle$$

The first-order theory of $\mathcal{S}$: all first-order sentences true in $\mathcal{S}$

- $\forall x \, \exists y : \big(y > x \ \land \ y \in 2^{\mathbb{N}} \ \land \ \exists z : y = z + z + z + 1\big)$ ✓

First-order logical theories, cont'd

Mathematical structure:

$$\mathcal{S} = \langle \underbrace{\mathbb{N}}_{\text{domain}} \; ; \; \underbrace{0, 1}_{\text{constants}} \; , \; \underbrace{+}_{\text{functions}} \; , \; \underbrace{<, \; 2^{\mathbb{N}}}_{\text{predicates}} \; \rangle$$

The first-order theory of $\mathcal{S}$: all first-order sentences true in $\mathcal{S}$

- $\forall x \, \exists y \colon \big(y > x \; \wedge \; y \in 2^{\mathbb{N}} \; \wedge \; \exists z \colon y = z + z + z + 1\big)$ ✓
- $\forall x \, \exists y \colon \big(y \leq x \; \wedge \; y \in 2^{\mathbb{N}}\big)$ ✗

First-order logical theories, cont'd

Mathematical structure:

$$\mathcal{S} = \langle \underbrace{\mathbb{N}}_{\text{domain}} ; \underbrace{0, 1}_{\text{constants}} , \underbrace{+}_{\text{functions}} , \underbrace{<, 2^{\mathbb{N}}}_{\text{predicates}} \rangle$$

The first-order theory of $\mathcal{S}$: all first-order sentences true in $\mathcal{S}$

- $\forall x \, \exists y \colon \big(y > x \ \wedge \ y \in 2^{\mathbb{N}} \ \wedge \ \exists z \colon y = z + z + z + 1\big)$ ✓
- $\forall x \, \exists y \colon \big(y \leq x \ \wedge \ y \in 2^{\mathbb{N}}\big)$ ✗

The first-order theory of $\mathcal{S}$ is *decidable* if there exists an algorithm that takes a sentence and decides whether it belongs to the theory

Linear numeration systems and FO decidability

Theorem

Let U be a Pisot numeration system with an irreducible characteristic polynomial. The structure $\langle \mathbb{N}; 0, 1, <, +, U \rangle$ is automatic and has a decidable first-order theory.

Linear numeration systems and FO decidability

Theorem

Let U be a Pisot numeration system with an irreducible characteristic polynomial. The structure $\langle \mathbb{N}; 0, 1, <, +, U \rangle$ is automatic and has a decidable first-order theory.

Proof. Every sentence can be equivalently written as

$$Qx_1 \cdots Qx_m \colon \varphi(x_1, \ldots, x_m)$$

where $Q_i \in \{\exists, \forall\}$ and φ is a Boolean combination of $x_i \in U$, $x_i \notin U$, $x_i = \mathrm{constant}$, $x_i < x_j$, and $x_i = x_j + x_k$.

Linear numeration systems and FO decidability

Theorem

Let U be a Pisot numeration system with an irreducible characteristic polynomial. The structure $\langle \mathbb{N}; 0, 1, <, +, U \rangle$ is automatic and has a decidable first-order theory.

Proof. Every sentence can be equivalently written as

$$Qx_1 \cdots Qx_m \colon \varphi(x_1, \ldots, x_m)$$

where $Q_i \in \{\exists, \forall\}$ and φ is a Boolean combination of $x_i \in U$, $x_i \notin U$, $x_i = \mathrm{constant}$, $x_i < x_j$, and $x_i = x_j + x_k$. Inductively build an automaton $\mathcal{A}$ over $\{0, 1\}^m$ that accepts $\langle x_1 \rangle_U \times \cdots \times \langle x_m \rangle_U$ iff $\varphi(x_1, \ldots, x_m)$ is true.

Linear numeration systems and FO decidability

Theorem

Let U be a Pisot numeration system with an irreducible characteristic polynomial. The structure $\langle \mathbb{N}; 0, 1, <, +, U \rangle$ is automatic and has a decidable first-order theory.

Proof. Every sentence can be equivalently written as

$$Qx_1 \cdots Qx_m \colon \varphi(x_1, \ldots, x_m)$$

where $Q_i \in \{\exists, \forall\}$ and φ is a Boolean combination of $x_i \in U$, $x_i \notin U$, $x_i = \mathrm{constant}$, $x_i < x_j$, and $x_i = x_j + x_k$. Inductively build an automaton $\mathcal{A}$ over $\{0, 1\}^m$ that accepts $\langle x_1 \rangle_U \times \cdots \times \langle x_m \rangle_U$ iff $\varphi(x_1, \ldots, x_m)$ is true. Eliminate quantifiers by taking projections and complements.

Linear numeration systems and FO decidability, cont'd

Theorem

Let U be a Pisot numeration system with an irreducible characteristic polynomial. The structure $\langle \mathbb{N}; 0, 1, <, +, U \rangle$ is automatic and has a decidable first-order theory.

Linear numeration systems and FO decidability, cont'd

Theorem

Let U be a Pisot numeration system with an irreducible characteristic polynomial. The structure $\langle \mathbb{N}; 0, 1, <, +, U \rangle$ is automatic and has a decidable first-order theory.

Theorem (Semënov 1979)

Let U be a Perron numeration system with an irreducible characteristic polynomial. The structure $\langle \mathbb{N}; 0, 1, <, +, U \rangle$ has a decidable first-order theory.

Linear numeration systems and FO decidability, cont'd

Theorem

Let U be a Pisot numeration system with an irreducible characteristic polynomial. The structure $\langle \mathbb{N}; 0, 1, <, +, U \rangle$ is automatic and has a decidable first-order theory.

Theorem (Semënov 1979)

Let U be a Perron numeration system with an irreducible characteristic polynomial. The structure $\langle \mathbb{N}; 0, 1, <, +, U \rangle$ has a decidable first-order theory.

The proof is by quantifier elimination. For non-Perron U and Perron U with a reducible characteristic polynomial, decidability remains a major open problem.

How to prove undecidability of the FO theory?

Theorem (Gödel 1931)

The first-order theory of $\langle \mathbb{N}; 0, 1, <, +, \cdot \rangle$ is undecidable

How to prove undecidability of the FO theory?

Theorem (Gödel 1931)

The first-order theory of $\langle \mathbb{N}; 0, 1, <, +, \cdot \rangle$ is undecidable

We can prove undecidability of the FO theory of $\mathcal{S} = \langle \mathbb{N}; 0, 1, <, +, U \rangle$ by showing that multiplication is definable in $\mathcal{S}$.

How to prove undecidability of the FO theory?

Theorem (Gödel 1931)

The first-order theory of $\langle \mathbb{N}; 0, 1, <, +, \cdot \rangle$ is undecidable

We can prove undecidability of the FO theory of $\mathcal{S} = \langle \mathbb{N}; 0, 1, <, +, U \rangle$ by showing that multiplication is definable in $\mathcal{S}$.

- $\mathcal{S} = \langle \mathbb{N}; 0, 1, <, +, \{n^2 \colon n \geq 0\} \rangle$.

How to prove undecidability of the FO theory?

Theorem (Gödel 1931)

The first-order theory of $\langle \mathbb{N}; 0, 1, <, +, \cdot \rangle$ is undecidable

We can prove undecidability of the FO theory of $\mathcal{S} = \langle \mathbb{N}; 0, 1, <, +, U \rangle$ by showing that multiplication is definable in $\mathcal{S}$.

- $\mathcal{S} = \langle \mathbb{N}; 0, 1, <, +, \{n^2 \colon n \geq 0\} \rangle$. We have that $a \cdot b = c$ if and only if there exist pairs of consecutive squares $(A, A'), (B, B'), (C, C')$ such that

$$A - A' = 2a + 1 \ \wedge \ B - B' = 2b + 1 \ \wedge \ C - C' = 2c + 1 \ \wedge \ C' - A' - B' = 2c.$$

How to prove undecidability of the FO theory?

Theorem (Gödel 1931)

The first-order theory of $\langle \mathbb{N}; 0, 1, <, +, \cdot \rangle$ is undecidable

We can prove undecidability of the FO theory of $\mathcal{S} = \langle \mathbb{N}; 0, 1, <, +, U \rangle$ by showing that multiplication is definable in $\mathcal{S}$.

- $\mathcal{S} = \langle \mathbb{N}; 0, 1, <, +, \{n^2 \colon n \geq 0\} \rangle$. We have that $a \cdot b = c$ if and only if there exist pairs of consecutive squares $(A, A'), (B, B'), (C, C')$ such that

$$A - A' = 2a + 1 \ \wedge \ B - B' = 2b + 1 \ \wedge \ C - C' = 2c + 1 \ \wedge \ C' - A' - B' = 2c.$$

- $\mathcal{S} = \langle \mathbb{N}; 0, 1, <, +, \{p(n) \geq 0 \colon n \geq 0\} \rangle$ where $\deg(p) \geq 2$ and $p(\mathbb{N})$ is infinite.

How to prove undecidability of the FO theory?

Theorem (Gödel 1931)

The first-order theory of $\langle \mathbb{N}; 0, 1, <, +, \cdot \rangle$ is undecidable

We can prove undecidability of the FO theory of $\mathcal{S} = \langle \mathbb{N}; 0, 1, <, +, U \rangle$ by showing that multiplication is definable in $\mathcal{S}$.

- $\mathcal{S} = \langle \mathbb{N}; 0, 1, <, +, \{n^2 \colon n \geq 0\} \rangle$. We have that $a \cdot b = c$ if and only if there exist pairs of consecutive squares $(A, A'), (B, B'), (C, C')$ such that

$$A - A' = 2a + 1 \ \wedge \ B - B' = 2b + 1 \ \wedge \ C - C' = 2c + 1 \ \wedge \ C' - A' - B' = 2c.$$

- $\mathcal{S} = \langle \mathbb{N}; 0, 1, <, +, \{p(n) \geq 0 \colon n \geq 0\} \rangle$ where $\deg(p) \geq 2$ and $p(\mathbb{N})$ is infinite.
- $\mathcal{S} = \langle \mathbb{N}; 0, 1, <, +, V_2, V_3 \rangle$ where $V_p(a, b) \Leftrightarrow b = p^{v_p(a)}$.

A modern method for proving undecidability

Theorem (Schulz, 2022)

The structure $\langle \mathbb{N}; 0, 1, <, +, 2^{\mathbb{N}}, 3^{\mathbb{N}} \rangle$ **does not** define multiplication

Theorem (Hieronymi and Schulz, 2022)

The first-order theory of $\langle \mathbb{N}; 0, 1, <, +, 2^{\mathbb{N}}, 3^{\mathbb{N}} \rangle$ is undecidable

A modern method for proving undecidability

Theorem (Schulz, 2022)

The structure $\langle \mathbb{N}; 0, 1, <, +, 2^{\mathbb{N}}, 3^{\mathbb{N}} \rangle$ **does not** define multiplication

Theorem (Hieronymi and Schulz, 2022)

The first-order theory of $\langle \mathbb{N}; 0, 1, <, +, 2^{\mathbb{N}}, 3^{\mathbb{N}} \rangle$ is undecidable

$\Rightarrow$ Cobham's theorem: a sequence that is both 2-automatic and 3-automatic must be ultimately periodic

A modern method for proving undecidability

Theorem (Schulz, 2022)

The structure $\langle \mathbb{N}; 0, 1, <, +, 2^{\mathbb{N}}, 3^{\mathbb{N}} \rangle$ **does not** define multiplication

Theorem (Hieronymi and Schulz, 2022)

The first-order theory of $\langle \mathbb{N}; 0, 1, <, +, 2^{\mathbb{N}}, 3^{\mathbb{N}} \rangle$ is undecidable

$\Rightarrow$ Cobham's theorem: a sequence that is both 2-automatic and 3-automatic must be ultimately periodic

Step 1: construct a map from $3^{\mathbb{N}} \times 3^{\mathbb{N}} \times \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{N}^*$ that is onto

A modern method for proving undecidability

Theorem (Schulz, 2022)

The structure $\langle \mathbb{N}; 0, 1, <, +, 2^{\mathbb{N}}, 3^{\mathbb{N}} \rangle$ **does not** define multiplication

Theorem (Hieronymi and Schulz, 2022)

The first-order theory of $\langle \mathbb{N}; 0, 1, <, +, 2^{\mathbb{N}}, 3^{\mathbb{N}} \rangle$ is undecidable

$\Rightarrow$ Cobham's theorem: a sequence that is both 2-automatic and 3-automatic must be ultimately periodic

Step 1: construct a map from $3^{\mathbb{N}} \times 3^{\mathbb{N}} \times \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{N}^*$ that is onto

Step 2: Assume the FO theory is decidable. Given a two-counter machine $\mathcal{M}$, write a formula Φ saying "there exist $3^a, 3^b, t, r$ such that the corresponding finite sequence is a halting run of $\mathcal{M}$." Check whether Φ is true.

A modern method for proving undecidability, cont'd

Theorem (Hieronymi and Schulz, 2022)

The first-order theory of $\langle \mathbb{N}; 0, 1, <, +, 2^{\mathbb{N}}, 3^{\mathbb{N}} \rangle$ is undecidable

Step 1: construct a map from $3^{\mathbb{N}} \times 3^{\mathbb{N}} \times \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{N}^*$ that is onto

A modern method for proving undecidability, cont'd

Theorem (Hieronymi and Schulz, 2022)

The first-order theory of $\langle \mathbb{N}; 0, 1, <, +, 2^{\mathbb{N}}, 3^{\mathbb{N}} \rangle$ is undecidable

Step 1: construct a map from $3^{\mathbb{N}} \times 3^{\mathbb{N}} \times \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{N}^*$ that is onto

Given x, define $\alpha(x), \beta(x)$ by $2^{\alpha(x)} < x < 2^{\alpha(x)+1}$ and $\beta(x) = \alpha(x - 2^{\alpha}(x))$. E.g. $\langle 37 \rangle_2 = 100101$, $\alpha(37) = 5$, and $\beta(37) = 2$.

A modern method for proving undecidability, cont'd

Theorem (Hieronymi and Schulz, 2022)

The first-order theory of $\langle \mathbb{N}; 0, 1, <, +, 2^{\mathbb{N}}, 3^{\mathbb{N}} \rangle$ is undecidable

Step 1: construct a map from $3^{\mathbb{N}} \times 3^{\mathbb{N}} \times \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{N}^*$ that is onto

Given x, define $\alpha(x), \beta(x)$ by $2^{\alpha(x)} < x < 2^{\alpha(x)+1}$ and $\beta(x) = \alpha(x - 2^{\alpha}(x))$. E.g. $\langle 37 \rangle_2 = 100101$, $\alpha(37) = 5$, and $\beta(37) = 2$.

Lemma

The map $(a, b, t, r) \to (\beta(3^n) - t)_{n=a}^{b} \cap [0, r]$ is onto $\mathbb{N}^*$

A modern method for proving undecidability, cont'd

Theorem (Hieronymi and Schulz, 2022)

The first-order theory of $\langle \mathbb{N}; 0, 1, <, +, 2^{\mathbb{N}}, 3^{\mathbb{N}} \rangle$ is undecidable

Step 2: Given a two-counter machine $\mathcal{M}$, write a formula $\Phi \equiv$ "there exist $3^a, 3^b, t, r$ such that the corresponding sequence is a halting run of $\mathcal{M}$." Check whether Φ is true.

A modern method for proving undecidability, cont'd

Theorem (Hieronymi and Schulz, 2022)

The first-order theory of $\langle \mathbb{N}; 0, 1, <, +, 2^{\mathbb{N}}, 3^{\mathbb{N}} \rangle$ is undecidable

Step 2: Given a two-counter machine $\mathcal{M}$, write a formula $\Phi \equiv$ "there exist $3^a, 3^b, t, r$ such that the corresponding sequence is a halting run of $\mathcal{M}$." Check whether Φ is true.

A two-counter machine is a program with two variables c_1, c_2 and instructions

- $c_i = c_i + 1$,
- $\text{JUMP TO } \ell$,
- $\text{IF } c_i > 0 \text{ THEN } c_i = c_i - 1 \text{ ELSE JUMP TO } \ell$, and
- HALT.

A modern method for proving undecidability, cont'd

Theorem (Hieronymi and Schulz, 2022)

The first-order theory of $\langle \mathbb{N}; 0, 1, <, +, 2^{\mathbb{N}}, 3^{\mathbb{N}} \rangle$ is undecidable

Step 2: Given a two-counter machine $\mathcal{M}$, write a formula $\Phi \equiv$ "there exist $3^a, 3^b, t, r$ such that the corresponding sequence is a halting run of $\mathcal{M}$." Check whether Φ is true.

A two-counter machine is a program with two variables c_1, c_2 and instructions

- $c_i = c_i + 1$,
- $\text{JUMP TO } \ell$,
- $\text{IF } c_i > 0 \text{ THEN } c_i = c_i - 1 \text{ ELSE JUMP TO } \ell$, and
- HALT.

The run of $\mathcal{M}$ is the instruction number and the values of c_1, c_2 after each step. It is undecidable whether a given two-counter machine has a finite run.

Powers of 2 and 3, bigger picture

Theorem (K., Luca, Nieuwveld, Ouaknine, Worrell 2025)

The existential fragment of the first-order theory of $\langle \mathbb{N}; 0, 1, <, +, 2^{\mathbb{N}}, 3^{\mathbb{N}} \rangle$ is decidable. The exists-forall-exists fragment of the full theory is undecidable.

Powers of 2 and 3, bigger picture

Theorem (K., Luca, Nieuwveld, Ouaknine, Worrell 2025)

The existential fragment of the first-order theory of $\langle \mathbb{N}; 0, 1, <, +, 2^{\mathbb{N}}, 3^{\mathbb{N}} \rangle$ is decidable.
The exists-forall-exists fragment of the full theory is undecidable.

The $\exists$-fragment: solving systems of inequalities of the form

$$\exists x_1 \in D_1 \cdots \exists x_m \in D_m \colon A \cdot (x_1, \ldots, x_m) \sim \mathbf{b}$$

where D_i is one of $\mathbb{N}, 2^{\mathbb{N}}, 3^{\mathbb{N}}$, $A \in \mathbb{Z}^{k \times m}$, $\mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{Z}^{k \times 1}$, and $\sim$ consists of (in)equalities.

Proof: Baker's theorem + Diophantine approximation arguments

Powers of 2 and 3, bigger picture

Now consider $\langle \mathbb{N}; 0, 1, <, +, n \mapsto 2^n, n \mapsto 3^n \rangle$. In this structure we have access to numbers of the form $2^{2^n}, 2^{3^n}, 2^{2^n+3^n}$ etc.

Powers of 2 and 3, bigger picture

Now consider $\langle \mathbb{N}; 0, 1, <, +, n \mapsto 2^n, n \mapsto 3^n \rangle$. In this structure we have access to numbers of the form $2^{2^n}, 2^{3^n}, 2^{2^n+3^n}$ etc.

Theorem (K., Luca, Nieuwveld, Ouaknine, Worrell 2025)

If the existential fragment of the first-order theory of $\langle \mathbb{N}; 0, 1, <, +, n \mapsto 2^n, n \mapsto 3^n \rangle$ is decidable, then we can effectively check whether a given finite word occurs (infinitely often) in the base-2 (or base-3) expansion of $\log_2(3)$.

Powers of 2 and 3, bigger picture

Now consider $\langle \mathbb{N}; 0, 1, <, +, n \mapsto 2^n, n \mapsto 3^n \rangle$. In this structure we have access to numbers of the form $2^{2^n}, 2^{3^n}, 2^{2^n+3^n}$ etc.

Theorem (K., Luca, Nieuwveld, Ouaknine, Worrell 2025)

If the existential fragment of the first-order theory of $\langle \mathbb{N}; 0, 1, <, +, n \mapsto 2^n, n \mapsto 3^n \rangle$ is decidable, then we can effectively check whether a given finite word occurs (infinitely often) in the base-2 (or base-3) expansion of $\log_2(3)$.

Problem

Is the first-order theory of $\langle \mathbb{N}; 0, 1, <, n \mapsto 2^n, n \mapsto 3^n \rangle$ decidable?

The Ramanujan τ function

The function $\tau\colon \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{Z}$ is defined by the generating function $q \prod_{m=1}^{\infty} (1 - q^m)^{24}$

It is multiplicative, and has the values 1, -24, 252, -1472, 4830, -6048, -16744, ...

The Ramanujan τ function

The function $\tau\colon \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{Z}$ is defined by the generating function $q\prod_{m=1}^{\infty}(1-q^m)^{24}$

It is multiplicative, and has the values 1, -24, 252, -1472, 4830, -6048, -16744, ...

Theorem (Bilu, Deshouillers, Gun, Luca, 2018)

Assume $\tau(n) \neq 0$ for all $n \geq 1$. Then for any permutation $\sigma\colon \{1,\dots,k\} \to \{1,\dots,k\}$, there exist infinitely many m such that

$$|\tau(m+\sigma(1))| < \cdots < |\tau(m+\sigma(k))|.$$

$\Rightarrow$ we can extract arbitrary finite permutations from the τ function

The Ramanujan τ function

The function $\tau\colon \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{Z}$ is defined by the generating function $q\prod_{m=1}^{\infty}(1-q^m)^{24}$

It is multiplicative, and has the values 1, -24, 252, -1472, 4830, -6048, -16744, ...

Theorem (Bilu, Deshouillers, Gun, Luca, 2018)

Assume $\tau(n) \neq 0$ for all $n \geq 1$. Then for any permutation $\sigma\colon \{1,\ldots,k\} \to \{1,\ldots,k\}$, there exist infinitely many m such that

$$|\tau(m+\sigma(1))| < \cdots < |\tau(m+\sigma(k))|.$$

$\Rightarrow$ we can extract arbitrary finite permutations from the τ function

Corollary

The first-order theory of $\langle \mathbb{Z}; 0, 1, <, +, n \mapsto \tau(n)\rangle$ is undecidable.

Strong Diophantine approximation properties $\Rightarrow$ FO undecidability

Problem

Let U be a linear numeration system. Is $\langle \mathbb{N}; 0, 1, <, +, U \rangle$ automatic? Does it have a decidable first-order theory?

Strong Diophantine approximation properties $\Rightarrow$ FO undecidability

Problem

Let U be a linear numeration system. Is $\langle \mathbb{N}; 0, 1, <, +, U \rangle$ automatic? Does it have a decidable first-order theory?

Theorem (K., Nieuwveld, Ouaknine)

Suppose U is defined by (the non-negative values of) a linear recurrence sequence with an irreducible characteristic polynomial and two non-real, non-repeated dominant roots.

Strong Diophantine approximation properties $\Rightarrow$ FO undecidability

Problem

Let U be a linear numeration system. Is $\langle \mathbb{N}; 0, 1, <, +, U \rangle$ automatic? Does it have a decidable first-order theory?

Theorem (K., Nieuwveld, Ouaknine)

Suppose U is defined by (the non-negative values of) a linear recurrence sequence with an irreducible characteristic polynomial and two non-real, non-repeated dominant roots. Then $\langle \mathbb{N}; 0, 1, <, +, U \rangle$ defines arbitrary finite sequences over $\mathbb{N}$ $\Rightarrow$ has an undecidable first-order theory and is not automatic.

The prized structure

Consider $\langle \mathbb{N}; 0, 1, <, +, P \rangle$ where P is the set of primes.

Goldbach's conjecture: $\forall x \geq 2\colon (\exists y\colon x = y + y \Rightarrow \exists p, q \in P\colon x = p + q)$
Twin primes: $\forall x\, \exists y > x\colon y \in P \ \wedge \ y + 2 \in P$

The prized structure

Consider $\langle \mathbb{N}; 0, 1, <, +, P \rangle$ where P is the set of primes.

Goldbach's conjecture: $\forall x \geq 2\colon (\exists y\colon x = y + y \Rightarrow \exists p, q \in P\colon x = p + q)$
Twin primes: $\forall x\, \exists y > x\colon y \in P \ \wedge\ y + 2 \in P$

Dickson's conjecture

Let $a_i x_i + b_i$, $1 \leq i \leq m$ be such that no prime p divides $(a_1 x_1 + b_1) \cdots (a_m x_m + b_m)$ for all $x \in \mathbb{Z}$. Then there exist infinitely many $x \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that all $a_i x_i + b_i$ are prime.

The prized structure

Consider $\langle \mathbb{N}; 0, 1, <, +, P \rangle$ where P is the set of primes.

Goldbach's conjecture: $\forall x \geq 2 \colon (\exists y \colon x = y + y \Rightarrow \exists p, q \in P \colon x = p + q)$
Twin primes: $\forall x \, \exists y > x \colon y \in P \ \wedge \ y + 2 \in P$

Dickson's conjecture

Let $a_i x_i + b_i$, $1 \leq i \leq m$ be such that no prime p divides $(a_1 x_1 + b_1) \cdots (a_m x_m + b_m)$ for all $x \in \mathbb{Z}$. Then there exist infinitely many $x \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that all $a_i x_i + b_i$ are prime.

Theorem (Bateman, Jockusch, Woods 1993)

Assuming Dickson's conjecture, the first-order theory of $\langle \mathbb{N}; 0, 1, <, +, P \rangle$ is undecidable, but the existential fragment is decidable.

Summary

Problem

Let U be a linear numeration system. Is $\langle \mathbb{N}; 0, 1, <, +, U \rangle$ automatic? Does it have a decidable first-order theory?

Theorem (Hieronymi and Schulz, 2022)

The first-order theory of $\langle \mathbb{N}; 0, 1, <, +, 2^{\mathbb{N}}, 3^{\mathbb{N}} \rangle$ is undecidable

Problem

Is the first-order theory of $\langle \mathbb{N}; 0, 1, <, n \mapsto 2^n, n \mapsto 3^n \rangle$ decidable?

Problem

How to solve $c_1 \cdot (2^{n_1}, \ldots, 2^{n_k}) + c_2 \cdot (3^{m_1}, \ldots, 3^{m_k}) + c_3 \cdot (5^{l_1}, \ldots, 5^{l_k}) = d$, where $c_1, c_2, c_3 \in \mathbb{Z}^k$ and $d \in \mathbb{Z}$ are given?

Problem

Prove anything about $\langle \mathbb{N}; 0, 1, <, +, P \rangle$ without assuming Dickson's conjecture