

Positive-  
existential  
definability

Laurent  
Moret-Bailly

(Positive-)  
existential sets

The results

The methods

Approximation  
properties

# Positive-existential definability in Noetherian rings

Laurent Moret-Bailly

IRMAR, Université de Rennes 1

Member of the European network *Arithmetic Algebraic Geometry*

ICMS workshop

Number Theory and Computability

June 2007

# Summary

Positive-  
existential  
definability

Laurent  
Moret-Bailly

(Positive-)  
existential sets

The results

The methods

Approximation  
properties

- 1 (Positive-)existential sets
- 2 The results
- 3 The methods
- 4 Approximation properties

# Conventions:

Positive-  
existential  
definability

Laurent  
Moret-Bailly

(Positive-)  
existential sets

The results

The methods

Approximation  
properties

- Rings are commutative with unit.
- If  $R$  is a ring, we shall consider definability over  $R$  with respect to the language  $L(R)$  which is the language of rings  $(+, \cdot, 0, 1)$ , augmented with:

# Conventions:

Positive-  
existential  
definability

Laurent  
Moret-Bailly

(Positive-)  
existential sets

The results

The methods

Approximation  
properties

- Rings are commutative with unit.
- If  $R$  is a ring, we shall consider definability over  $R$  with respect to the language  $L(R)$  which is the language of rings  $(+, \cdot, 0, 1)$ , augmented with:

# Conventions:

Positive-  
existential  
definability

Laurent  
Moret-Bailly

(Positive-)  
existential sets

The results

The methods

Approximation  
properties

- Rings are commutative with unit.
- If  $R$  is a ring, we shall consider definability over  $R$  with respect to the language  $L(R)$  which is the language of rings  $(+, \cdot, 0, 1)$ , **augmented with:**

# Conventions:

Positive-  
existential  
definability

Laurent  
Moret-Bailly

(Positive-)  
existential sets

The results

The methods

Approximation  
properties

- Rings are commutative with unit.
- If  $R$  is a ring, we shall consider definability over  $R$  with respect to the language  $L(R)$  which is the language of rings  $(+, \cdot, 0, 1)$ , augmented with:
  - one constant for each element of  $R$

# Conventions:

Positive-  
existential  
definability

Laurent  
Moret-Bailly

(Positive-)  
existential sets

The results

The methods

Approximation  
properties

- Rings are commutative with unit.
- If  $R$  is a ring, we shall consider definability over  $R$  with respect to the language  $L(R)$  which is the language of rings  $(+, \cdot, 0, 1)$ , augmented with:
  - one constant for each element of  $R$
  - the logical constant **FALSE**.

# Special subsets:

If  $R$  is a ring and  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , then:

- **basic algebraic subsets** of  $R^n$  are defined by **finite systems of polynomial equations**, with coefficients in  $R$ :

$$\{t \in R^n \mid F_1(t) = \cdots = F_r(t) = 0\}$$

- *algebraic subsets* of  $R^n$  are finite unions of basic algebraic subsets
- *constructible subsets* of  $R^n$  are finite Boolean combinations of (basic) algebraic subsets
- *positive-existential subsets* of  $R^n$  are projections of algebraic subsets of some  $R^{n+p}$
- *existential subsets* of  $R^n$  are projections of constructible subsets of some  $R^{n+p}$ .



# Special subsets:

If  $R$  is a ring and  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , then:

- *basic algebraic subsets* of  $R^n$  are defined by finite systems of polynomial equations, with coefficients in  $R$ :

$$\{t \in R^n \mid F_1(t) = \cdots = F_r(t) = 0\}$$

- *algebraic subsets* of  $R^n$  are **finite unions** of basic algebraic subsets
- *constructible subsets* of  $R^n$  are finite Boolean combinations of (basic) algebraic subsets
- *positive-existential subsets* of  $R^n$  are projections of algebraic subsets of some  $R^{n+p}$
- *existential subsets* of  $R^n$  are projections of constructible subsets of some  $R^{n+p}$ .

Positive-  
existential  
definability

Laurent  
Moret-Bailly

(Positive-)  
existential sets

The results

The methods

Approximation  
properties

# Special subsets:

If  $R$  is a ring and  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , then:

- *basic algebraic subsets* of  $R^n$  are defined by finite systems of polynomial equations, with coefficients in  $R$ :

$$\{t \in R^n \mid F_1(t) = \cdots = F_r(t) = 0\}$$

- *algebraic subsets* of  $R^n$  are finite unions of basic algebraic subsets
- *constructible subsets* of  $R^n$  are **finite Boolean combinations** of (basic) algebraic subsets
- *positive-existential subsets* of  $R^n$  are projections of algebraic subsets of some  $R^{n+p}$
- *existential subsets* of  $R^n$  are projections of constructible subsets of some  $R^{n+p}$ .

# Special subsets:

If  $R$  is a ring and  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , then:

- *basic algebraic subsets* of  $R^n$  are defined by finite systems of polynomial equations, with coefficients in  $R$ :

$$\{t \in R^n \mid F_1(t) = \cdots = F_r(t) = 0\}$$

- *algebraic subsets* of  $R^n$  are finite unions of basic algebraic subsets
- *constructible subsets* of  $R^n$  are finite Boolean combinations of (basic) algebraic subsets
- *positive-existential subsets* of  $R^n$  are **projections of algebraic subsets** of some  $R^{n+p}$
- *existential subsets* of  $R^n$  are projections of constructible subsets of some  $R^{n+p}$ .

# Special subsets:

If  $R$  is a ring and  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , then:

- *basic algebraic subsets* of  $R^n$  are defined by finite systems of polynomial equations, with coefficients in  $R$ :

$$\{t \in R^n \mid F_1(t) = \cdots = F_r(t) = 0\}$$

- *algebraic subsets* of  $R^n$  are finite unions of basic algebraic subsets
- *constructible subsets* of  $R^n$  are finite Boolean combinations of (basic) algebraic subsets
- *positive-existential subsets* of  $R^n$  are projections of algebraic subsets of some  $R^{n+p}$
- *existential subsets* of  $R^n$  are **projections of constructible subsets** of some  $R^{n+p}$ .

# Remarks:

Positive-  
existential  
definability

Laurent  
Moret-Bailly

(Positive-)  
existential sets

The results

The methods

Approximation  
properties

- One can replace “projections” by “images by polynomial maps”.
- If  $R$  is a domain, all algebraic sets are basic.
- (Positive-)existential sets are those defined by (positive-)existential formulas in the language  $L(R)$ .
- The reason for the logical constant FALSE is to make the empty subset of  $R^n$  positive-existential when  $R$  is the zero ring!

# Remarks:

Positive-  
existential  
definability

Laurent  
Moret-Bailly

(Positive-)  
existential sets

The results

The methods

Approximation  
properties

- One can replace “projections” by “images by polynomial maps”.
- If  $R$  is a domain, all algebraic sets are basic.
- (Positive-)existential sets are those defined by (positive-)existential formulas in the language  $L(R)$ .
- The reason for the logical constant FALSE is to make the empty subset of  $R^n$  positive-existential when  $R$  is the zero ring!

# Remarks:

Positive-  
existential  
definability

Laurent  
Moret-Bailly

(Positive-)  
existential sets

The results

The methods

Approximation  
properties

- One can replace “projections” by “images by polynomial maps”.
- If  $R$  is a domain, all algebraic sets are basic.
- (Positive-)existential sets are those defined by **(positive-)existential formulas** in the language  $L(R)$ .
- The reason for the logical constant FALSE is to make the empty subset of  $R^n$  positive-existential when  $R$  is the zero ring!

# Remarks:

- One can replace “projections” by “images by polynomial maps”.
- If  $R$  is a domain, all algebraic sets are basic.
- (Positive-)existential sets are those defined by (positive-)existential formulas in the language  $L(R)$ .
- The reason for the logical constant **FALSE** is to make the empty subset of  $R^n$  positive-existential when  $R$  is the zero ring!

Positive-  
existential  
definability

Laurent  
Moret-Bailly

(Positive-)  
existential sets

The results

The methods

Approximation  
properties



# Remarks:

- One can replace “projections” by “images by polynomial maps”.
- If  $R$  is a domain, all algebraic sets are basic.
- (Positive-)existential sets are those defined by (positive-)existential formulas in the language  $L(R)$ .
- The reason for the logical constant FALSE is to make the empty subset of  $R^n$  positive-existential when  $R$  is the zero ring!  
(for a nonzero ring, FALSE is equivalent to  $1 = 0$ )

Positive-  
existential  
definability

Laurent  
Moret-Bailly

(Positive-)  
existential sets

The results

The methods

Approximation  
properties

# “Existential” vs. “positive-existential”:

Positive-  
existential  
definability

Laurent  
Moret-Bailly

(Positive-)  
existential sets

The results

The methods

Approximation  
properties

Clearly, every positive-existential set is existential.

The converse is true (for given  $R$ ) if and only if  $R$  is “good” in the following sense:

## Definition

A ring  $R$  is **good** if

$$R \setminus \{0\} \text{ is positive-existential in } R$$

# “Existential” vs. “positive-existential”:

Positive-  
existential  
definability

Laurent  
Moret-Bailly

(Positive-)  
existential sets

The results

The methods

Approximation  
properties

Clearly, every positive-existential set is existential.

The converse is true (for given  $R$ ) if and only if  $R$  is “good” in the following sense:

## Definition

A ring  $R$  is **good** if

$R \setminus \{0\}$  is positive-existential in  $R$

# “Existential” vs. “positive-existential”:

Positive-  
existential  
definability

Laurent  
Moret-Bailly

(Positive-)  
existential sets

The results

The methods

Approximation  
properties

Clearly, every positive-existential set is existential.

The converse is true (for given  $R$ ) if and only if  $R$  is “good” in the following sense:

## Definition

A ring  $R$  is **good** if

$$R \setminus \{0\} \text{ is positive-existential in } R$$

and is **bad** otherwise.

Positive-  
existential  
definability

Laurent  
Moret-Bailly

(Positive-)  
existential sets

The results

The methods

Approximation  
properties

## Problem:

find useful classes of good (resp. bad) rings

# Some examples of good rings:

Positive-  
existential  
definability

Laurent  
Moret-Bailly

(Positive-)  
existential sets

The results

The methods

Approximation  
properties

- Every finite ring is good.
- Every field is good (nonzero = invertible).
- $R_1 \times R_2$  is good iff both  $R_1$  and  $R_2$  are.
- $\mathbb{Z}$  is good:

# Some examples of good rings:

- Every finite ring is good.
- Every field is good (nonzero = invertible).
- $R_1 \times R_2$  is good iff both  $R_1$  and  $R_2$  are.
- $\mathbb{Z}$  is good:

Positive-  
existential  
definability

Laurent  
Moret-Bailly

(Positive-)  
existential sets

The results

The methods

Approximation  
properties

# Some examples of good rings:

- Every finite ring is good.
- Every field is good (nonzero = invertible).
- $R_1 \times R_2$  is good iff both  $R_1$  and  $R_2$  are.
- $\mathbb{Z}$  is good:

Positive-  
existential  
definability

Laurent  
Moret-Bailly

(Positive-)  
existential sets

The results

The methods

Approximation  
properties



# Some examples of good rings:

- Every finite ring is good.
- Every field is good (nonzero = invertible).
- $R_1 \times R_2$  is good iff both  $R_1$  and  $R_2$  are.
- $\mathbb{Z}$  is good:

Positive-  
existential  
definability

Laurent  
Moret-Bailly

(Positive-  
existential sets

The results

The methods

Approximation  
properties

# Some examples of good rings:

- Every finite ring is good.
- Every field is good (nonzero = invertible).
- $R_1 \times R_2$  is good iff both  $R_1$  and  $R_2$  are.
- $\mathbb{Z}$  is good:

Positive-  
existential  
definability

Laurent  
Moret-Bailly

(Positive-  
existential sets

The results

The methods

Approximation  
properties

# Some examples of good rings:

- Every finite ring is good.
- Every field is good (nonzero = invertible).
- $R_1 \times R_2$  is good iff both  $R_1$  and  $R_2$  are.
- $\mathbb{Z}$  is good: for  $t \in \mathbb{Z}$ , we have

$$t \neq 0 \Leftrightarrow (\exists x)(\exists y) t^2 = (1 + 2x)(1 + 3y)$$

Positive-  
existential  
definability

Laurent  
Moret-Bailly

(Positive-  
existential sets

The results

The methods

Approximation  
properties

# Some examples of good rings:

- Every finite ring is good.
- Every field is good (nonzero = invertible).
- $R_1 \times R_2$  is good iff both  $R_1$  and  $R_2$  are.
- $\mathbb{Z}$  is good: for  $t \in \mathbb{Z}$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} t \neq 0 &\Leftrightarrow (\exists x)(\exists y) t^2 = (1 + 2x)(1 + 3y) \\ &\Leftrightarrow (\exists w)(\exists x)(\exists y) tw = (1 + 2x)(1 + 3y). \end{aligned}$$

# Some examples of good rings:

- Every finite ring is good.
- Every field is good (nonzero = invertible).
- $R_1 \times R_2$  is good iff both  $R_1$  and  $R_2$  are.
- $\mathbb{Z}$  is good: for  $t \in \mathbb{Z}$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned}t \neq 0 &\Leftrightarrow (\exists x)(\exists y) t^2 = (1 + 2x)(1 + 3y) \\ &\Leftrightarrow (\exists w)(\exists x)(\exists y) tw = (1 + 2x)(1 + 3y).\end{aligned}$$

- In fact, the last formula shows that **every ring of algebraic integers is good.**

Positive-  
existential  
definability

Laurent  
Moret-Bailly

(Positive-  
existential sets

The results

The methods

Approximation  
properties

# Some examples of bad rings:

Positive-  
existential  
definability

Laurent  
Moret-Bailly

(Positive-)  
existential sets

The results

The methods

Approximation  
properties

- If  $p$  is a prime,  $\mathbb{Z}_p$  is bad
- More generally, infinite compact topological rings are bad (examples:  $\mathbb{F}_p[[t]]$ ,  $\mathbb{F}_p^{\mathbb{N}}$ ).
- Infinite products of nonzero rings are bad.
- If  $R$  is a nonzero ring, and  $I$  is an infinite set, then  $R[(X_i)_{i \in I}]$  is bad.

# Some examples of bad rings:

Positive-  
existential  
definability

Laurent  
Moret-Bailly

(Positive-)  
existential sets

The results

The methods

Approximation  
properties

- If  $p$  is a prime,  $\mathbb{Z}_p$  is bad
- More generally, infinite compact topological rings are bad (examples:  $\mathbb{F}_p[[t]]$ ,  $\mathbb{F}_p^{\mathbb{N}}$ ).
- Infinite products of nonzero rings are bad.
- If  $R$  is a nonzero ring, and  $I$  is an infinite set, then  $R[(X_i)_{i \in I}]$  is bad.

# Some examples of bad rings:

Positive-  
existential  
definability

Laurent  
Moret-Bailly

(Positive-)  
existential sets

The results

The methods

Approximation  
properties

- If  $p$  is a prime,  $\mathbb{Z}_p$  is bad  
(every positive-existential set is  $p$ -adically compact).
- More generally, infinite compact topological rings are bad (examples:  $\mathbb{F}_p[[t]]$ ,  $\mathbb{F}_p^{\mathbb{N}}$ ).
- Infinite products of nonzero rings are bad.
- If  $R$  is a nonzero ring, and  $I$  is an infinite set, then  $R[(X_i)_{i \in I}]$  is bad.



# Some examples of bad rings:

Positive-  
existential  
definability

Laurent  
Moret-Bailly

(Positive-)  
existential sets

The results

The methods

Approximation  
properties

- If  $p$  is a prime,  $\mathbb{Z}_p$  is bad  
(every positive-existential set is  $p$ -adically compact).
- More generally, **infinite compact topological rings** are bad (examples:  $\mathbb{F}_p[[t]]$ ,  $\mathbb{F}_p^{\mathbb{N}}$ ).
- Infinite products of nonzero rings are bad.
- If  $R$  is a nonzero ring, and  $I$  is an infinite set, then  $R[(X_i)_{i \in I}]$  is bad.

# Some examples of bad rings:

Positive-  
existential  
definability

Laurent  
Moret-Bailly

(Positive-)  
existential sets

The results

The methods

Approximation  
properties

- If  $p$  is a prime,  $\mathbb{Z}_p$  is bad  
(every positive-existential set is  $p$ -adically compact).
- More generally, infinite compact topological rings are bad (examples:  $\mathbb{F}_p[[t]]$ ,  $\mathbb{F}_p^{\mathbb{N}}$ ).
- **Infinite products** of nonzero rings are bad.
- If  $R$  is a nonzero ring, and  $I$  is an infinite set, then  $R[(X_i)_{i \in I}]$  is bad.

# Some examples of bad rings:

Positive-  
existential  
definability

Laurent  
Moret-Bailly

(Positive-)  
existential sets

The results

The methods

Approximation  
properties

- If  $p$  is a prime,  $\mathbb{Z}_p$  is bad  
(every positive-existential set is  $p$ -adically compact).
- More generally, infinite compact topological rings are bad (examples:  $\mathbb{F}_p[[t]]$ ,  $\mathbb{F}_p^{\mathbb{N}}$ ).
- Infinite products of nonzero rings are bad.
- If  $R$  is a nonzero ring, and  $I$  is an infinite set, then  $R[(X_i)_{i \in I}]$  is bad.

# Main result for Noetherian domains:

Positive-  
existential  
definability

Laurent  
Moret-Bailly

(Positive-)  
existential sets

The results

The methods

Approximation  
properties

“Most” Noetherian domains are good:

Theorem

*Let  $R$  be a Noetherian domain.*

# Main result for Noetherian domains:

Positive-  
existential  
definability

Laurent  
Moret-Bailly

(Positive-)  
existential sets

The results

The methods

Approximation  
properties

“Most” Noetherian domains are good:

## Theorem

*Let  $R$  be a Noetherian domain.*

# Main result for Noetherian domains:

Positive-  
existential  
definability

Laurent  
Moret-Bailly

(Positive-)  
existential sets

The results

The methods

Approximation  
properties

“Most” Noetherian domains are good:

## Theorem

*Let  $R$  be a Noetherian domain.*

*If  $R$  is **not local Henselian**, then  $R$  is good.*

# Main result for Noetherian domains:

Positive-  
existential  
definability

Laurent  
Moret-Bailly

(Positive-)  
existential sets

The results

The methods

Approximation  
properties

“Most” Noetherian domains are good:

## Theorem

*Let  $R$  be a Noetherian domain.*

*If  $R$  is not local Henselian, then  $R$  is good.*

What about other Noetherian rings?

# Main result for Noetherian domains:

Positive-  
existential  
definability

Laurent  
Moret-Bailly

(Positive-)  
existential sets

The results

The methods

Approximation  
properties

“Most” Noetherian domains are good:

## Theorem

*Let  $R$  be a Noetherian domain.*

*If  $R$  is not local Henselian, then  $R$  is good.*

What about other Noetherian rings?

What about the Henselian case?



# Other good Noetherian rings:

Positive-  
existential  
definability

Laurent  
Moret-Bailly

(Positive-)  
existential sets

The results

The methods

Approximation  
properties

## Proposition

*Let  $R$  be a Noetherian ring.*

# Other good Noetherian rings:

Positive-  
existential  
definability

Laurent  
Moret-Bailly

(Positive-)  
existential sets

The results

The methods

Approximation  
properties

## Proposition

*Let  $R$  be a Noetherian ring.*

*Assume that **every quotient domain** of  $R$  is good.*

# Other good Noetherian rings:

Positive-  
existential  
definability

Laurent  
Moret-Bailly

(Positive-)  
existential sets

The results

The methods

Approximation  
properties

## Proposition

*Let  $R$  be a Noetherian ring.*

*Assume that every quotient domain of  $R$  is good.*

*Then  $R$  is good. More generally, every ring of fractions  $S^{-1}R$  is good.*

Positive-  
existential  
definability

Laurent  
Moret-Bailly

(Positive-)  
existential sets

The results

The methods

Approximation  
properties

## Corollary

*Artin rings are good.*

## Corollary

*Let  $R$  be a Noetherian Jacobson ring*

## Corollary

*Artin rings are good.*

Proof: every quotient domain of an Artin ring is a field.

## Corollary

Let  $R$  be a Noetherian *Jacobson ring*

## Corollary

*Artin rings are good.*

Proof: every quotient domain of an Artin ring is a field.

## Corollary

Let  $R$  be a Noetherian *Jacobson ring*.

## Corollary

*Artin rings are good.*

Proof: every quotient domain of an Artin ring is a field.

## Corollary

*Let  $R$  be a Noetherian Jacobson ring  
(every prime ideal is an intersection of maximal ideals).*

## Corollary

*Artin rings are good.*

Proof: every quotient domain of an Artin ring is a field.

## Corollary

*Let  $R$  be a Noetherian Jacobson ring.*

*Then **every ring of fractions**  $S^{-1}R$  is good.*



## Corollary

*Artin rings are good.*

Proof: every quotient domain of an Artin ring is a field.

## Corollary

*Let  $R$  be a Noetherian Jacobson ring.*

*Then every ring of fractions  $S^{-1}R$  is good.*

*In particular, if  $k$  is a field, every  $k$ -algebra essentially of finite type is good.*

# Local Henselian rings

Positive-  
existential  
definability

Laurent  
Moret-Bailly

(Positive-)  
existential sets

The results

The methods

Approximation  
properties

Let  $R$  be local with maximal ideal  $\mathfrak{m}$ .

Recall that  $R$  is **Henselian** if:

# Local Henselian rings

Positive-  
existential  
definability

Laurent  
Moret-Bailly

(Positive-)  
existential sets

The results

The methods

Approximation  
properties

Let  $R$  be local with maximal ideal  $\mathfrak{m}$ .

Recall that  $R$  is **Henselian** if:

for every  $F \in R[X]$ , every **simple** root of  $F$  in  $R/\mathfrak{m}$  lifts to a (unique) root of  $F$  in  $R$ .

# Local Henselian rings

Positive-  
existential  
definability

Laurent  
Moret-Bailly

(Positive-)  
existential sets

The results

The methods

Approximation  
properties

Let  $R$  be local with maximal ideal  $\mathfrak{m}$ .

Recall that  $R$  is **Henselian** if:

for every  $F \in R[X]$ , every simple root of  $F$  in  $R/\mathfrak{m}$  lifts to a (unique) root of  $F$  in  $R$ .

Examples:

# Local Henselian rings

Positive-  
existential  
definability

Laurent  
Moret-Bailly

(Positive-)  
existential sets

The results

The methods

Approximation  
properties

Let  $R$  be local with maximal ideal  $\mathfrak{m}$ .

Recall that  $R$  is **Henselian** if:

for every  $F \in R[X]$ , every simple root of  $F$  in  $R/\mathfrak{m}$  lifts to a (unique) root of  $F$  in  $R$ .

Examples:

- complete local rings (by Hensel's lemma)

# Local Henselian rings

Positive-  
existential  
definability

Laurent  
Moret-Bailly

(Positive-)  
existential sets

The results

The methods

Approximation  
properties

Let  $R$  be local with maximal ideal  $\mathfrak{m}$ .

Recall that  $R$  is **Henselian** if:

for every  $F \in R[X]$ , every simple root of  $F$  in  $R/\mathfrak{m}$  lifts to a (unique) root of  $F$  in  $R$ .

Examples:

- complete local rings (by Hensel's lemma)
- $\tilde{\mathbb{Q}} \cap \mathbb{Z}_p$ .

# Local Henselian rings tend to be bad:

Positive-  
existential  
definability

Laurent  
Moret-Bailly

(Positive-)  
existential sets

**The results**

The methods

Approximation  
properties

# Local Henselian rings tend to be bad:

Assume  $R$  is Noetherian, local and Henselian (not necessarily a domain).

Positive-  
existential  
definability

Laurent  
Moret-Bailly

(Positive-)  
existential sets

The results

The methods

Approximation  
properties



# Local Henselian rings tend to be bad:

Assume  $R$  is Noetherian, local and Henselian (not necessarily a domain).

If  $\dim R = 0$  then  $R$  is good, so we assume  $\dim R > 0$ .

Positive-  
existential  
definability

Laurent  
Moret-Bailly

(Positive-)  
existential sets

The results

The methods

Approximation  
properties

# Local Henselian rings tend to be bad:

Assume  $R$  is Noetherian, local and Henselian (not necessarily a domain).

If  $\dim R = 0$  then  $R$  is good, so we assume  $\dim R > 0$ .

Then:

## Theorem

Positive-  
existential  
definability

Laurent  
Moret-Bailly

(Positive-)  
existential sets

The results

The methods

Approximation  
properties

# Local Henselian rings tend to be bad:

Assume  $R$  is Noetherian, local and Henselian (not necessarily a domain).

If  $\dim R = 0$  then  $R$  is good, so we assume  $\dim R > 0$ .

Then:

## Theorem

*If  $R$  is **excellent**, then  $R$  is bad.*

Positive-  
existential  
definability

Laurent  
Moret-Bailly

(Positive-)  
existential sets

The results

The methods

Approximation  
properties

# Local Henselian rings tend to be bad:

Assume  $R$  is Noetherian, local and Henselian (not necessarily a domain).

If  $\dim R = 0$  then  $R$  is good, so we assume  $\dim R > 0$ .

Then:

## Theorem

*If  $R$  is **excellent**, then  $R$  is bad.*

## Remarks:

- All complete local rings, and all Noetherian rings “occurring naturally” in algebraic geometry and number theory, are excellent.

Positive-  
existential  
definability

Laurent  
Moret-Bailly

(Positive-)  
existential sets

The results

The methods

Approximation  
properties

# Local Henselian rings tend to be bad:

Assume  $R$  is Noetherian, local and Henselian (not necessarily a domain).

If  $\dim R = 0$  then  $R$  is good, so we assume  $\dim R > 0$ .

Then:

## Theorem

*If  $R$  is **excellent**, then  $R$  is bad.*

## Remarks:

- All complete local rings, and all Noetherian rings “occurring naturally” in algebraic geometry and number theory, are excellent.
- There is a (non-excellent) Henselian discrete valuation ring which is good.

# Rings of analytic functions:

Positive-  
existential  
definability

Laurent  
Moret-Bailly

(Positive-)  
existential sets

The results

The methods

Approximation  
properties

## Theorem

*Let  $X$  be a reduced irreducible Stein analytic space.*

# Rings of analytic functions:

Positive-  
existential  
definability

Laurent  
Moret-Bailly

(Positive-)  
existential sets

The results

The methods

Approximation  
properties

## Theorem

*Let  $X$  be a reduced irreducible Stein analytic space  
(e.g. a polydisk)*

# Rings of analytic functions:

Positive-  
existential  
definability

Laurent  
Moret-Bailly

(Positive-)  
existential sets

The results

The methods

Approximation  
properties

## Theorem

*Let  $X$  be a reduced irreducible Stein analytic space.*

*Then the ring  $\mathcal{H}(X)$  of holomorphic functions on  $X$  is good.*



# Some elementary facts:

Positive-  
existential  
definability

Laurent  
Moret-Bailly

(Positive-)  
existential sets

The results

The methods

Approximation  
properties

- If  $I$  is a finitely generated ideal of  $R$  and  $R/I$  is good, then  $R \setminus I$  is positive-existential in  $R$ .
- (“Weil restriction”) If some nonzero finite free  $R$ -algebra is good, then  $R$  is good.

# Some elementary facts:

Positive-  
existential  
definability

Laurent  
Moret-Bailly

(Positive-)  
existential sets

The results

The methods

Approximation  
properties

- If  $I$  is a finitely generated ideal of  $R$  and  $R/I$  is good, then  $R \setminus I$  is positive-existential in  $R$ .
- (“Weil restriction”) If some nonzero **finite free**  $R$ -algebra is good, then  $R$  is good.

# The “Two Ideals” Lemma

(generalizing results of A. Shlapentokh and J. Demeyer)

## Lemma

*Let  $R$  be a Noetherian domain, and let  $\mathfrak{p}$  and  $\mathfrak{q}$  be two prime ideals of  $R$ . Assume that:*

*Then  $R$  is good.*

Positive-  
existential  
definability

Laurent  
Moret-Bailly

(Positive-)  
existential sets

The results

The methods

Approximation  
properties

# The “Two Ideals” Lemma

Positive-  
existential  
definability

Laurent  
Moret-Bailly

(Positive-)  
existential sets

The results

The methods

Approximation  
properties

(generalizing results of A. Shlapentokh and J. Demeyer)

## Lemma

*Let  $R$  be a Noetherian domain, and let  $\mathfrak{p}$  and  $\mathfrak{q}$  be two prime ideals of  $R$ . Assume that:*

- $\mathfrak{p} \cap \mathfrak{q}$  *contains no nonzero prime.*

*Then  $R$  is good.*

# The “Two Ideals” Lemma

Positive-  
existential  
definability

Laurent  
Moret-Bailly

(Positive-)  
existential sets

The results

The methods

Approximation  
properties

(generalizing results of A. Shlapentokh and J. Demeyer)

## Lemma

*Let  $R$  be a Noetherian domain, and let  $\mathfrak{p}$  and  $\mathfrak{q}$  be two prime ideals of  $R$ . Assume that:*

- $\mathfrak{p} \cap \mathfrak{q}$  *contains no nonzero prime*  
(e.g.  $\mathfrak{p}$  has height 1 and  $\mathfrak{p} \not\subseteq \mathfrak{q}$ ).

*Then  $R$  is good.*

# The “Two Ideals” Lemma

Positive-  
existential  
definability

Laurent  
Moret-Bailly

(Positive-)  
existential sets

The results

The methods

Approximation  
properties

(generalizing results of A. Shlapentokh and J. Demeyer)

## Lemma

*Let  $R$  be a Noetherian domain, and let  $\mathfrak{p}$  and  $\mathfrak{q}$  be two prime ideals of  $R$ . Assume that:*

- $\mathfrak{p} \cap \mathfrak{q}$  *contains no nonzero prime.*
- $R/\mathfrak{p}$  *and*  $R/\mathfrak{q}$  *are good.*

*Then  $R$  is good.*

# The “Two Ideals” Lemma

Positive-  
existential  
definability

Laurent  
Moret-Bailly

(Positive-)  
existential sets

The results

The methods

Approximation  
properties

(generalizing results of A. Shlapentokh and J. Demeyer)

## Lemma

*Let  $R$  be a Noetherian domain, and let  $\mathfrak{p}$  and  $\mathfrak{q}$  be two prime ideals of  $R$ . Assume that:*

- $\mathfrak{p} \cap \mathfrak{q}$  *contains no nonzero prime.*
- $R/\mathfrak{p}$  and  $R/\mathfrak{q}$  *are good.*

*Then  $R$  is good.*

Explicitly, for  $t \in R$ , we have  $t \neq 0$  if and only if

$(\text{some multiple of } t) = (\text{some } x \notin \mathfrak{p})(\text{some } y \notin \mathfrak{q})$

# The “Two Ideals” Lemma

Positive-  
existential  
definability

Laurent  
Moret-Bailly

(Positive-)  
existential sets

The results

The methods

Approximation  
properties

(generalizing results of A. Shlapentokh and J. Demeyer)

## Lemma

*Let  $R$  be a Noetherian domain, and let  $\mathfrak{p}$  and  $\mathfrak{q}$  be two prime ideals of  $R$ . Assume that:*

- $\mathfrak{p} \cap \mathfrak{q}$  contains no nonzero prime.
- $R/\mathfrak{p}$  and  $R/\mathfrak{q}$  are good.

*Then  $R$  is good.*

Explicitly, for  $t \in R$ , we have  $t \neq 0$  if and only if  
(some multiple of  $t$ ) = (some  $x \notin \mathfrak{p}$ )(some  $y \notin \mathfrak{q}$ )  
and the conditions  $x \notin \mathfrak{p}$  and  $y \notin \mathfrak{q}$  are positive-existential.



## Corollary

*If  $k$  is a good (Noetherian) domain, then  $k[X]$  is good.*

Proof: Apply the lemma with  $R = k[X]$ ,  $\mathfrak{p} = (X)$ ,  
 $\mathfrak{q} = (X - 1)$ : then

- $\mathfrak{p} \cap \mathfrak{q} = X(X - 1)R$  contains no nonzero prime,
- $R/\mathfrak{p}$  and  $R/\mathfrak{q}$  are both isomorphic to  $k$ .

Remark: the Noetherian assumption is in fact not needed.

## Corollary

*If  $k$  is a good (Noetherian) domain, then  $k[X]$  is good.*

Proof: Apply the lemma with  $R = k[X]$ ,  $\mathfrak{p} = (X)$ ,  
 $\mathfrak{q} = (X - 1)$ : then

- $\mathfrak{p} \cap \mathfrak{q} = X(X - 1)R$  contains no nonzero prime,
- $R/\mathfrak{p}$  and  $R/\mathfrak{q}$  are both isomorphic to  $k$ .

Remark: the Noetherian assumption is in fact not needed.

## Corollary

*If  $k$  is a good (Noetherian) domain, then  $k[X]$  is good.*

Proof: Apply the lemma with  $R = k[X]$ ,  $\mathfrak{p} = (X)$ ,  
 $\mathfrak{q} = (X - 1)$ : then

- $\mathfrak{p} \cap \mathfrak{q} = X(X - 1)R$  contains no nonzero prime,
- $R/\mathfrak{p}$  and  $R/\mathfrak{q}$  are both isomorphic to  $k$ .

Remark: the Noetherian assumption is in fact not needed.

One cannot apply the “Two Ideals” lemma directly if (for example)  $R$  is a **one-dimensional local domain**.

In such cases, one can try to replace  $R$  by a finite free  $R$ -algebra which has “more” primes.

For instance, if  $R = \mathbb{Z}_{(2)}$ , the ring  $S = R[X]/(X^2 + X + 2)$  is free of rank 2 over  $R$  and has two maximal ideals ( $X^2 + X + 2$  has two simple roots mod 2).

The lemma then implies that  $S$  is good, hence so is  $R$  by Weil restriction.

One cannot apply the “Two Ideals” lemma directly if (for example)  $R$  is a one-dimensional local domain.

In such cases, one can try to replace  $R$  by a finite free  $R$ -algebra which has “more” primes.

For instance, if  $R = \mathbb{Z}_{(2)}$ , the ring  $S = R[X]/(X^2 + X + 2)$  is free of rank 2 over  $R$  and has two maximal ideals ( $X^2 + X + 2$  has two simple roots mod 2).

The lemma then implies that  $S$  is good, hence so is  $R$  by Weil restriction.

One cannot apply the “Two Ideals” lemma directly if (for example)  $R$  is a **one-dimensional local domain**.

In such cases, one can try to replace  $R$  by a finite free  $R$ -algebra which has “more” primes.

For instance, if  $R = \mathbb{Z}_{(2)}$ , the ring  $S = R[X]/(X^2 + X + 2)$  is free of rank 2 over  $R$  and has two maximal ideals ( $X^2 + X + 2$  has two simple roots mod 2).

The lemma then implies that  $S$  is good, hence so is  $R$  by Weil restriction.

One cannot apply the “Two Ideals” lemma directly if (for example)  $R$  is a one-dimensional local domain.

In such cases, one can try to replace  $R$  by a finite free  $R$ -algebra which has “more” primes.

For instance, if  $R = \mathbb{Z}_{(2)}$ , the ring  $S = R[X]/(X^2 + X + 2)$  is free of rank 2 over  $R$  and has two maximal ideals ( $X^2 + X + 2$  has two simple roots mod 2).

The lemma then implies that  $S$  is good, hence so is  $R$  by Weil restriction.

One cannot apply the “Two Ideals” lemma directly if (for example)  $R$  is a one-dimensional local domain.

In such cases, one can try to replace  $R$  by a finite free  $R$ -algebra which has “more” primes.

For instance, if  $R = \mathbb{Z}_{(2)}$ , the ring  $S = R[X]/(X^2 + X + 2)$  is free of rank 2 over  $R$  and has **two maximal ideals** ( $X^2 + X + 2$  has two simple roots mod 2).

The lemma then implies that  $S$  is good, hence so is  $R$  by Weil restriction.



One cannot apply the “Two Ideals” lemma directly if (for example)  $R$  is a one-dimensional local domain.

In such cases, one can try to replace  $R$  by a finite free  $R$ -algebra which has “more” primes.

For instance, if  $R = \mathbb{Z}_{(2)}$ , the ring  $S = R[X]/(X^2 + X + 2)$  is free of rank 2 over  $R$  and has two maximal ideals ( $X^2 + X + 2$  has two simple roots mod 2).

The lemma then implies that  $S$  is good, hence so is  $R$  by Weil restriction.

One cannot apply the “Two Ideals” lemma directly if (for example)  $R$  is a one-dimensional local domain.

In such cases, one can try to replace  $R$  by a finite free  $R$ -algebra which has “more” primes.

For instance, if  $R = \mathbb{Z}_{(2)}$ , the ring  $S = R[X]/(X^2 + X + 2)$  is free of rank 2 over  $R$  and has two maximal ideals ( $X^2 + X + 2$  has two simple roots mod 2).

The lemma then implies that  $S$  is good, hence so is  $R$  by Weil restriction.

Note: the trick **does not work** if  $R = \mathbb{Z}_2$

One cannot apply the “Two Ideals” lemma directly if (for example)  $R$  is a one-dimensional local domain.

In such cases, one can try to replace  $R$  by a finite free  $R$ -algebra which has “more” primes.

For instance, if  $R = \mathbb{Z}_{(2)}$ , the ring  $S = R[X]/(X^2 + X + 2)$  is free of rank 2 over  $R$  and has two maximal ideals ( $X^2 + X + 2$  has two simple roots mod 2).

The lemma then implies that  $S$  is good, hence so is  $R$  by Weil restriction.

Note: the trick **does not work** if  $R = \mathbb{Z}_2$  because  $S$  is no longer a domain!

One cannot apply the “Two Ideals” lemma directly if (for example)  $R$  is a one-dimensional local domain.

In such cases, one can try to replace  $R$  by a finite free  $R$ -algebra which has “more” primes.

For instance, if  $R = \mathbb{Z}_{(2)}$ , the ring  $S = R[X]/(X^2 + X + 2)$  is free of rank 2 over  $R$  and has two maximal ideals ( $X^2 + X + 2$  has two simple roots mod 2).

The lemma then implies that  $S$  is good, hence so is  $R$  by Weil restriction.

Note: the trick **does not work** if  $R = \mathbb{Z}_2$  because  $S$  is no longer a domain!

Of course, this method can be used in other situations:

# The “Doubling Lemma”

Positive-  
existential  
definability

Laurent  
Moret-Bailly

(Positive-)  
existential sets

The results

The methods

Approximation  
properties

## Lemma

*Let  $R$  be a Noetherian domain with fraction field  $K$ . Let  $\mathfrak{p} \subset R$  be a nonzero prime ideal.*

*Exclude the case where  $R$  is local with maximal ideal  $\mathfrak{p}$ .*

*Then there exists a polynomial*

$$F = X^2 + aX + b \in R[X]$$

*such that  $a \notin \mathfrak{p}$ ,  $b \in \mathfrak{p}$ , and  $F$  is irreducible in  $K[X]$ .*

*In particular, the  $R$ -algebra  $S := R[X]/(F)$  has the following properties:*

- *$S$  is a domain,*
- *$S$  is free of rank 2 as an  $R$ -module,*
- *$S$  has two prime ideals above  $\mathfrak{p}$ , with quotients both isomorphic to  $R/\mathfrak{p}$ .*

# The “Doubling Lemma”

Positive-  
existential  
definability

Laurent  
Moret-Bailly

(Positive-)  
existential sets

The results

The methods

Approximation  
properties

## Lemma

*Let  $R$  be a Noetherian domain with fraction field  $K$ . Let  $\mathfrak{p} \subset R$  be a nonzero prime ideal.*

*Exclude the case where  $R$  is local with maximal ideal  $\mathfrak{p}$ .*

*Then there exists a polynomial*

$$F = X^2 + aX + b \in R[X]$$

*such that  $a \notin \mathfrak{p}$ ,  $b \in \mathfrak{p}$ , and  $F$  is irreducible in  $K[X]$ .*

*In particular, the  $R$ -algebra  $S := R[X]/(F)$  has the following properties:*

- *$S$  is a domain,*
- *$S$  is free of rank 2 as an  $R$ -module,*
- *$S$  has two prime ideals above  $\mathfrak{p}$ , with quotients both isomorphic to  $R/\mathfrak{p}$ .*

# The “Doubling Lemma”

Positive-  
existential  
definability

Laurent  
Moret-Bailly

(Positive-)  
existential sets

The results

The methods

Approximation  
properties

## Lemma

Let  $R$  be a Noetherian domain with fraction field  $K$ . Let  $\mathfrak{p} \subset R$  be a nonzero prime ideal.

Exclude the case where  $R$  is local with maximal ideal  $\mathfrak{p}$ .

Then there exists a polynomial

$$F = X^2 + aX + b \in R[X]$$

such that  $a \notin \mathfrak{p}$ ,  $b \in \mathfrak{p}$ , and  $F$  is irreducible in  $K[X]$ .

In particular, the  $R$ -algebra  $S := R[X]/(F)$  has the following properties:

- $S$  is a **domain**,
- $S$  is free of rank 2 as an  $R$ -module,
- $S$  has two prime ideals above  $\mathfrak{p}$ , with quotients both isomorphic to  $R/\mathfrak{p}$ .

# The “Doubling Lemma”

## Lemma

*Let  $R$  be a Noetherian domain with fraction field  $K$ . Let  $\mathfrak{p} \subset R$  be a nonzero prime ideal.*

*Exclude the case where  $R$  is local with maximal ideal  $\mathfrak{p}$ .*

*Then there exists a polynomial*

$$F = X^2 + aX + b \in R[X]$$

*such that  $a \notin \mathfrak{p}$ ,  $b \in \mathfrak{p}$ , and  $F$  is irreducible in  $K[X]$ .*

*In particular, the  $R$ -algebra  $S := R[X]/(F)$  has the following properties:*

- *$S$  is a domain,*
- *$S$  is **free of rank 2** as an  $R$ -module,*
- *$S$  has two prime ideals above  $\mathfrak{p}$ , with quotients both isomorphic to  $R/\mathfrak{p}$ .*



# The “Doubling Lemma”

Positive-  
existential  
definability

Laurent  
Moret-Bailly

(Positive-)  
existential sets

The results

The methods

Approximation  
properties

## Lemma

*Let  $R$  be a Noetherian domain with fraction field  $K$ . Let  $\mathfrak{p} \subset R$  be a nonzero prime ideal.*

*Exclude the case where  $R$  is local with maximal ideal  $\mathfrak{p}$ .*

*Then there exists a polynomial*

$$F = X^2 + aX + b \in R[X]$$

*such that  $a \notin \mathfrak{p}$ ,  $b \in \mathfrak{p}$ , and  $F$  is irreducible in  $K[X]$ .*

*In particular, the  $R$ -algebra  $S := R[X]/(F)$  has the following properties:*

- *$S$  is a domain,*
- *$S$  is free of rank 2 as an  $R$ -module,*
- *$S$  has **two prime ideals above  $\mathfrak{p}$ , with quotients both isomorphic to  $R/\mathfrak{p}$ .***

# The non-local case

Positive-  
existential  
definability

Laurent  
Moret-Bailly

(Positive-)  
existential sets

The results

The methods

Approximation  
properties

Combining the Two Ideals Lemma, the Doubling Lemma, and an induction on dimension, one obtains:

## Proposition

*Let  $R$  be a Noetherian domain,  $\mathfrak{p}$  a prime ideal of  $R$ .*

*Exclude the case where  $R$  is local with maximal ideal  $\mathfrak{p}$ .*

*If  $R/\mathfrak{p}$  is good, then  $R$  is good.*

## Corollary

*Every **non-local** Noetherian domain is good.*

Proof: apply the proposition to any maximal ideal of  $R$ .

# The non-local case

Positive-  
existential  
definability

Laurent  
Moret-Bailly

(Positive-)  
existential sets

The results

The methods

Approximation  
properties

Combining the Two Ideals Lemma, the Doubling Lemma, and an induction on dimension, one obtains:

## Proposition

*Let  $R$  be a Noetherian domain,  $\mathfrak{p}$  a prime ideal of  $R$ .*

*Exclude the case where  $R$  is local with maximal ideal  $\mathfrak{p}$ .*

*If  $R/\mathfrak{p}$  is good, then  $R$  is good.*

## Corollary

*Every **non-local** Noetherian domain is good.*

Proof: apply the proposition to any maximal ideal of  $R$ .

# The non-local case

Positive-  
existential  
definability

Laurent  
Moret-Bailly

(Positive-)  
existential sets

The results

The methods

Approximation  
properties

Combining the Two Ideals Lemma, the Doubling Lemma, and an induction on dimension, one obtains:

## Proposition

*Let  $R$  be a Noetherian domain,  $\mathfrak{p}$  a prime ideal of  $R$ .*

*Exclude the case where  $R$  is local with maximal ideal  $\mathfrak{p}$ .*

*If  $R/\mathfrak{p}$  is good, then  $R$  is good.*

## Corollary

*Every **non-local** Noetherian domain is good.*

Proof: apply the proposition to any maximal ideal of  $R$ .

# The non-Henselian case

Positive-  
existential  
definability

Laurent  
Moret-Bailly

(Positive-)  
existential sets

The results

The methods

Approximation  
properties

If  $R$  is a local, non-Henselian Noetherian domain, there exists a finite  $R$ -algebra  $S$  which is a non-local domain, hence good.

# The non-Henselian case

Positive-  
existential  
definability

Laurent  
Moret-Bailly

(Positive-)  
existential sets

The results

The methods

Approximation  
properties

If  $R$  is a local, **non-Henselian** Noetherian domain, there exists a finite  $R$ -algebra  $S$  which is a non-local domain, hence good.

# The non-Henselian case

Positive-  
existential  
definability

Laurent  
Moret-Bailly

(Positive-)  
existential sets

The results

The methods

Approximation  
properties

If  $R$  is a local, non-Henselian Noetherian domain, there exists a **finite  $R$ -algebra  $S$  which is a non-local domain**, hence good.

# The non-Henselian case

Positive-  
existential  
definability

Laurent  
Moret-Bailly

(Positive-)  
existential sets

The results

The methods

Approximation  
properties

If  $R$  is a local, non-Henselian Noetherian domain, there exists a finite  $R$ -algebra  $S$  which is a non-local domain, hence good.

Using Weil restriction, one concludes that  $R$  is also good.



# The non-Henselian case

Positive-  
existential  
definability

Laurent  
Moret-Bailly

(Positive-)  
existential sets

The results

The methods

Approximation  
properties

If  $R$  is a local, non-Henselian Noetherian domain, there exists a finite  $R$ -algebra  $S$  which is a non-local domain, hence good.

Using Weil restriction, one concludes that  $R$  is also good.

(Some care is needed because  $S$  is not necessarily a free  $R$ -module).

Positive-  
existential  
definability

Laurent  
Moret-Bailly

(Positive-)  
existential sets

The results

The methods

Approximation  
properties

# Approximation properties and the Henselian case

## Notation:

### Assume

- $R$  is a ring,
- $S$  is a finite system of polynomial equations with coefficients in  $R$ ,
- $A$  is an  $R$ -algebra.

Then we denote by  $\text{sol}(S, A)$  the set of  $A$ -valued solutions of  $S$ .

## Notation:

### Assume

- $R$  is a ring,
- $S$  is a finite system of polynomial equations with coefficients in  $R$ ,
- $A$  is an  $R$ -algebra.

Then we denote by  $\text{sol}(S, A)$  the set of  $A$ -valued solutions of  $S$ .

Let  $R$  be a ring and  $I$  an ideal of  $R$ . We say that  $(R, I)$  satisfies the **infinitesimal Hasse principle** (IHP) if:

For each polynomial system  $S$  as before,

if  $\text{sol}(S, R/I^q) \neq \emptyset$  for each  $q \geq 0$ ,

then  $\text{sol}(S, R) \neq \emptyset$ .

Let  $R$  be a ring and  $I$  an ideal of  $R$ . We say that  $(R, I)$  satisfies the infinitesimal Hasse principle (IHP) if:

For each polynomial system  $S$  as before,

if  $\text{sol}(S, R/I^q) \neq \emptyset$  for each  $q \geq 0$ ,

then  $\text{sol}(S, R) \neq \emptyset$ .

# Remarks on IHP:

Positive-  
existential  
definability

Laurent  
Moret-Bailly

(Positive-)  
existential sets

The results

The methods

Approximation  
properties

Assume  $R$  is local and Noetherian, with maximal ideal  $I$ , and  $\widehat{R}$  is the  $I$ -adic completion of  $R$ .

Then (IHP) is equivalent to either of:

- the approximation property: for each system  $S$ ,  $\text{sol}(S, R)$  is  $I$ -adically dense in  $\text{sol}(S, \widehat{R})$ ,
- the strong approximation property (Pfister-Popescu; Becker-Denef-Lipshitz-van den Dries).

# Remarks on IHP:

Positive-  
existential  
definability

Laurent  
Moret-Bailly

(Positive-)  
existential sets

The results

The methods

Approximation  
properties

Assume  $R$  is local and Noetherian, with maximal ideal  $I$ , and  $\widehat{R}$  is the  $I$ -adic completion of  $R$ .

Then (IHP) is equivalent to either of:

- the **approximation property**: for each system  $S$ ,  $\text{sol}(S, R)$  is  $I$ -adically dense in  $\text{sol}(S, \widehat{R})$ ,
- the strong approximation property (Pfister-Popescu; Becker-Denef-Lipshitz-van den Dries).



# Remarks on IHP:

Positive-  
existential  
definability

Laurent  
Moret-Bailly

(Positive-)  
existential sets

The results

The methods

Approximation  
properties

Assume  $R$  is local and Noetherian, with maximal ideal  $I$ , and  $\widehat{R}$  is the  $I$ -adic completion of  $R$ .

Then (IHP) is equivalent to either of:

- the approximation property: for each system  $S$ ,  $\text{sol}(S, R)$  is  $I$ -adically dense in  $\text{sol}(S, \widehat{R})$ ,
- the **strong approximation property** (Pfister-Popescu; Becker-Denef-Lipshitz-van den Dries).

# Remarks on IHP:

Positive-  
existential  
definability

Laurent  
Moret-Bailly

(Positive-)  
existential sets

The results

The methods

Approximation  
properties

Assume  $R$  is local and Noetherian, with maximal ideal  $I$ , and  $\widehat{R}$  is the  $I$ -adic completion of  $R$ .

Then (IHP) is equivalent to either of:

- the approximation property: for each system  $S$ ,  $\text{sol}(S, R)$  is  $I$ -adically dense in  $\text{sol}(S, \widehat{R})$ ,
- the strong approximation property (Pfister-Popescu; Becker-Denef-Lipshitz-van den Dries).

Moreover, **these properties are satisfied if  $R$  is excellent** (Popescu).

# The connection with bad rings:

Positive-  
existential  
definability

Laurent  
Moret-Bailly

(Positive-)  
existential sets

The results

The methods

Approximation  
properties

## Proposition

*Let  $R$  be a Noetherian ring,  $I$  an ideal of  $R$ . The following are equivalent:*

- 1  $(R, I)$  satisfies the IHP,
- 2 for all  $n$  in  $\mathbb{N}$ , every **positive-existential** subset of  $R^n$  is  **$I$ -adically closed**.

(The proof is easy, directly from the definitions).

# The connection with bad rings:

Positive-  
existential  
definability

Laurent  
Moret-Bailly

(Positive-)  
existential sets

The results

The methods

Approximation  
properties

## Proposition

*Let  $R$  be a Noetherian ring,  $I$  an ideal of  $R$ . The following are equivalent:*

- 1  $(R, I)$  satisfies the IHP,
- 2 for all  $n$  in  $\mathbb{N}$ , every *positive-existential* subset of  $R^n$  is  *$I$ -adically closed*.

(The proof is easy, directly from the definitions).

## Corollary

*Let  $R$  be a Noetherian ring,  $I$  an ideal of  $R$ . Assume that  $(R, I)$  satisfies the IHP and  $I$  is not nilpotent. Then  $R$  is bad.*

## Corollary

*Let  $R$  be a Noetherian ring,  $I$  an ideal of  $R$ . Assume that  $(R, I)$  satisfies the IHP and  $I$  is not nilpotent. Then  $R$  is bad.*

Proof: since  $I$  is not nilpotent,

## Corollary

*Let  $R$  be a Noetherian ring,  $I$  an ideal of  $R$ . Assume that  $(R, I)$  satisfies the IHP and  $I$  is not nilpotent. Then  $R$  is bad.*

Proof: since  $I$  is not nilpotent,  
the  $I$ -adic topology on  $R$  is not discrete.

## Corollary

*Let  $R$  be a Noetherian ring,  $I$  an ideal of  $R$ . Assume that  $(R, I)$  satisfies the IHP and  $I$  is not nilpotent. Then  $R$  is bad.*

Proof: since  $I$  is not nilpotent,  
the  $I$ -adic topology on  $R$  is not discrete.  
Hence,  $R \setminus \{0\}$  is not closed,



## Corollary

*Let  $R$  be a Noetherian ring,  $I$  an ideal of  $R$ . Assume that  $(R, I)$  satisfies the IHP and  $I$  is not nilpotent. Then  $R$  is bad.*

Proof: since  $I$  is not nilpotent,  
the  $I$ -adic topology on  $R$  is not discrete.  
Hence,  $R \setminus \{0\}$  is not closed,  
and therefore not positive-existential.

## Corollary

*Assume  $R$  is*

- *Noetherian,*
- *local,*
- *Henselian,*
- *positive-dimensional (i.e. not Artinian),*
- *excellent.*

*Then  $R$  is bad.*