

This paper demonstrates that the following  $\Sigma_0^b$ -replacement axioms:

$$\forall i < |x| \exists x < a \phi(i, x) \longrightarrow \exists w \forall i < |a| \phi(i, [w]_i)$$

for sharply bounded formulas  $\phi$  are unlikely to be provable in three weak arithmetic theories. The first theory considered is a second order theory called  $\mathbf{V}^0$  which has the usual number axioms for  $0, 1, +, \cdot, \leq$ , together with induction axioms and comprehension axioms for formulas which use only first order quantifiers. This theory is used to model reasoning about uniform  $\mathbf{AC}^0$  circuits, (constant depth, unbounded fan-in AND, OR, NOT circuits). The theory  $\mathbf{V}^0$  is  $\forall\exists\Sigma_0^B$ -conservative under  $\mathbf{V}^0$  together with second order analogs of the replacement axiom. This paper uses the provability of a parity principle to show the two theories are not equal. The next theory considered is  $\Delta_1^b$ -CR which consists of BASIC axioms for the symbols  $\{0, 1, +, \cdot, <, |x|, (x)_i, [x]_i, x\#y\}$  together with a comprehension rule which allows one to derive

$$\exists w \forall i < |a| (w)_i = 1 \Leftrightarrow \phi(i),$$

provided  $\phi$  is a  $\Sigma_1^b$ -formula which has been proven equivalent to a  $\Pi_1^b$ -formula. Here  $(x)_i$  projects out the  $i$ th bit of  $x$  and  $[x]_i$  projects out the  $i$ th sequence element of  $x$ . This language is slightly different from what was used in the original formulation of  $\Delta_1^b$ -CR given by Johannsen and Pollett [1]. The theory  $\Delta_1^b$ -CR is RSUV isomorphic to a theory  $\mathbf{VTC}^0$  which strictly contains  $\mathbf{V}^0$ . The theory  $\mathbf{VTC}^0$  is typically used to model reasoning about uniform, constant-depth, threshold circuits – the class  $\mathbf{TC}^0$ . This paper shows that  $\Delta_1^b$ -CR cannot prove the  $\Delta_1^b$ -comprehension axioms (as opposed to rules) unless the RSA cryptographic scheme is insecure. As the  $\Sigma_1^b$ -replacement axioms over  $\Delta_1^b$ -CR imply the  $\Delta_1^b$ -comprehension axioms, this implies that  $\Sigma_1^b$ -replacement is unlikely to be provable in  $\Delta_1^b$ -CR. The proof of this result actually shows that the theory  $\mathbf{PV}$ , which is stronger than  $\Delta_1^b$ -CR, cannot prove the  $\Delta_1^b$ -comprehension nor the  $\Sigma_0^b$ -unique replacement axioms unless RSA is insecure. The theory  $\mathbf{PV}$  is an equational theory with axioms designed to capture reasoning about polynomial time. It is not equal to  $\Delta_1^b$ -CR unless polynomial time is equal to uniform  $\mathbf{TC}^0$ . The theory  $\mathbf{PV}$  is the last theory considered by the paper. It is shown that  $\mathbf{PV}$  cannot prove the  $\Sigma_0^b$ -replacements axioms unless factoring is easy. The main proof technique used in the results of this paper is to take the replacement axioms for some hard to invert function  $f$ . Applying the KPT Witnessing Theorem (a variant of Herbrand's Theorem) to this axiom for the graph of  $f$ , gives a finite disjunction of statements from

which an algorithm to invert  $f$  can be extracted. This technique seems likely to be useful in future results.

## References

- [1] J. Johannsen and C. Pollett. On the  $\Delta_1^b$ -bit comprehension rule. Proceedings of Logic Colloquium 1998. edited by S.R. Buss, P. Hajek, P. Pudlak pp.262–270, A.K.Peters and ASL, 2000.