

# Families of sets and their degree spectra

Kalimullin I.Sh.

Kazan Federal University  
e-mail: Iskander.Kalimullin@ksu.ru

Computability, Complexity and Randomness,  
Buenos Aires, June 10, 2013

## The degree spectra for families

- ▶ A countable family of sets  $\mathcal{F} \subseteq 2^\omega$  is (uniformly)  $\mathbf{x}$ -c.e. if for  $X \in \mathbf{x}$  and some computable function  $f$  we have

$$\mathcal{F} = \{W_{f(n)}^X \mid n \in \omega\}.$$

## The degree spectra for families

- ▶ A countable family of sets  $\mathcal{F} \subseteq 2^\omega$  is (uniformly)  $\mathbf{x}$ -c.e. if for  $X \in \mathbf{x}$  and some computable function  $f$  we have

$$\mathcal{F} = \{W_{f(n)}^X \mid n \in \omega\}.$$

- ▶ The **degree spectrum** of  $\mathcal{F}$  is the collection  $\mathbf{Sp}(\mathcal{F})$  of all Turing degrees  $\mathbf{x}$  such that  $\mathcal{F}$  is  $\mathbf{x}$ -c.e.

## The results

- ▶ There is a family  $\mathcal{F}$  such that  
**Sp** ( $\mathcal{F}$ ) = the non-superlow degrees ( $K.$ , 2007).

## The results

- ▶ There is a family  $\mathcal{F}$  such that  
 $\mathbf{Sp}(\mathcal{F}) =$  the non-superlow degrees(*K.*, 2007).
- ▶ There is a family  $\mathcal{F}$  such that  
 $\mathbf{Sp}(\mathcal{F}) =$  the non- $K$ -trivial degrees(*Faizrahmanov*, 2012).

## A general lemma

Lemma. Let

$$\mathcal{F} = \{\{n\} \oplus F \mid F \text{ is finite and } \Phi^{F \oplus \emptyset'}(n) \downarrow\}.$$

Let  $Y$  be an  $X$ -c.e. set such that for every  $Z =^* Y$  we have

$$(\forall n)[\Phi^{Z \oplus \emptyset'}(n) \downarrow].$$

Then  $\mathcal{F}$  is  $X$ -c.e.

## An easy example

**Theorem** (Wehner). If

$$\mathcal{F} = \{\{n\} \oplus F \mid F \text{ is finite and } F \neq W_n\}.$$

Then  $\mathcal{F}$  is  $X$ -c.e  $\iff X$  is not computable, i.e.

$$\mathbf{Sp}(\mathcal{F}) = \{\mathbf{x} \mid \mathbf{x} > \mathbf{0}\}.$$

## An easy example

**Theorem** (Wehner). If

$$\mathcal{F} = \{\{n\} \oplus F \mid F \text{ is finite and } F \neq W_n\}.$$

Then  $\mathcal{F}$  is  $X$ -c.e.  $\iff X$  is not computable, i.e.

$$\mathbf{Sp}(\mathcal{F}) = \{\mathbf{x} \mid \mathbf{x} > \mathbf{0}\}.$$

**Proof** ( $\Leftarrow$ ). If  $X$  is not computable then there is a  $Y$  such that  $Y$  is  $X$ -c.e. but  $Y$  is not c.e. so that for each  $Z =^* Y$  we have

$$(\forall n)[Z \neq W_n].$$



## An easy example

**Theorem** (Wehner). If

$$\mathcal{F} = \{\{n\} \oplus F \mid F \text{ is finite and } F \neq W_n\}.$$

Then  $\mathcal{F}$  is  $X$ -c.e  $\iff X$  is not computable, i.e.

$$\mathbf{Sp}(\mathcal{F}) = \{\mathbf{x} \mid \mathbf{x} > \mathbf{0}\}.$$

## An easy example

**Theorem** (Wehner). If

$$\mathcal{F} = \{\{n\} \oplus F \mid F \text{ is finite and } F \neq W_n\}.$$

Then  $\mathcal{F}$  is  $X$ -c.e.  $\iff X$  is not computable, i.e.

$$\mathbf{Sp}(\mathcal{F}) = \{\mathbf{x} \mid \mathbf{x} > \mathbf{0}\}.$$

**Proof** ( $\implies$ ). If  $X$  is computable and  $\mathcal{F}$  is  $X$ -c.e. then for every  $n$  we can uniformly enumerate a set  $W_{f(n)}$  such that

$$W_{f(n)} \neq W_n.$$

## The non-superlow degrees, a difficult way

- ▶  $X$  is not superlow  $\iff X' >_{tt} \emptyset'$

## The non-superlow degrees, a difficult way

- ▶  $X$  is not superlow  $\iff X' >_{tt} \emptyset' \iff \iff$  there is an  $X$ -c.e.  $Y \notin \Delta_\omega^{-1}$ .

## The non-superlow degrees, a difficult way

- ▶  $X$  is not superlow  $\iff X' >_{tt} \emptyset' \iff \iff$  there is an  $X$ -c.e.  $Y \notin \Delta_\omega^{-1}$ .
- ▶ Let  $\{V_n\}_{n \in \omega}$  be a  $\emptyset'$ -computable listing of all  $\Delta_\omega^{-1}$  sets. Set

$$\mathcal{F} = \{\{n\} \oplus F \mid F \text{ is finite and } F \neq V_n\}.$$

## The non-superlow degrees, a difficult way

- ▶  $X$  is not superlow  $\iff X' >_{tt} \emptyset' \iff \iff$  there is an  $X$ -c.e.  $Y \notin \Delta_\omega^{-1}$ .
- ▶ Let  $\{V_n\}_{n \in \omega}$  be a  $\emptyset'$ -computable listing of all  $\Delta_\omega^{-1}$  sets. Set

$$\mathcal{F} = \{\{n\} \oplus F \mid F \text{ is finite and } F \neq V_n\}.$$

- ▶ By the general lemma we have  $X$  is non-superlow  $\implies \mathcal{F}$  is  $X$ -c.e.

## The non-superlow degrees, a difficult way

- ▶  $X$  is not superlow  $\iff X' >_{tt} \emptyset' \iff \iff$  there is an  $X$ -c.e.  $Y \notin \Delta_\omega^{-1}$ .
- ▶ Let  $\{V_n\}_{n \in \omega}$  be a  $\emptyset'$ -computable listing of all  $\Delta_\omega^{-1}$  sets. Set

$$\mathcal{F} = \{\{n\} \oplus F \mid F \text{ is finite and } F \neq V_n\}.$$

- ▶ By the general lemma we have  $X$  is non-superlow  $\implies \mathcal{F}$  is  $X$ -c.e.
- ▶ For the reverse implication we need have a Recursion Theorem for  $\{V_n\}_{n \in \omega}$  which can do not hold.

## The non-superlow degrees, a difficult way

- ▶  $X$  is not superlow  $\iff X' >_{tt} \emptyset' \iff \iff$  there is an  $X$ -c.e.  $Y \notin \Delta_\omega^{-1}$ .
- ▶ Let  $\{V_n\}_{n \in \omega}$  be a  $\emptyset'$ -computable listing of all  $\Delta_\omega^{-1}$  sets. Set

$$\mathcal{F} = \{\{n\} \oplus F \mid F \text{ is finite and } F \neq V_n\}.$$

- ▶ By the general lemma we have  $X$  is non-superlow  $\implies \mathcal{F}$  is  $X$ -c.e.
- ▶ For the reverse implication we need have a Recursion Theorem for  $\{V_n\}_{n \in \omega}$  which can do not hold.
- ▶ For a specific  $\{V_n\}_{n \in \omega}$  some weak version of Recursion Theorem holds that allows to prove the reverse implication.



## The non-superlow degrees, an easy way

- ▶ (Faizrahmanov, 2010)  $X' \in \Pi_\omega^{-1} \iff X' \in \Delta_\omega^{-1}$ , so that  $X$  is not superlow  $\iff$  there is an  $X$ -c.e.  $Y \notin \Pi_\omega^{-1}$ .

## The non-superlow degrees, an easy way

- ▶ (Faizrahmanov, 2010)  $X' \in \Pi_\omega^{-1} \iff X' \in \Delta_\omega^{-1}$ , so that  $X$  is not superlow  $\iff$  there is an  $X$ -c.e.  $Y \notin \Pi_\omega^{-1}$ .
- ▶ Let  $\{V_n\}_{n \in \omega}$  be the Gödel  $\emptyset'$ -numbering of all  $\Pi_\omega^{-1}$  sets. Set
$$\mathcal{F} = \{\{n\} \oplus F \mid F \text{ is finite and } F \neq V_n\}.$$

## The non-superlow degrees, an easy way

- ▶ (Faizrahmanov, 2010)  $X' \in \Pi_\omega^{-1} \iff X' \in \Delta_\omega^{-1}$ , so that  $X$  is not superlow  $\iff$  there is an  $X$ -c.e.  $Y \notin \Pi_\omega^{-1}$ .
- ▶ Let  $\{V_n\}_{n \in \omega}$  be the Gödel  $\emptyset'$ -numbering of all  $\Pi_\omega^{-1}$  sets. Set
$$\mathcal{F} = \{\{n\} \oplus F \mid F \text{ is finite and } F \neq V_n\}.$$
- ▶ By the general lemma we have  $X$  is non-superlow  $\implies \mathcal{F}$  is  $X$ -c.e.

## The non-superlow degrees, an easy way

- ▶ (Faizrahmanov, 2010)  $X' \in \Pi_\omega^{-1} \iff X' \in \Delta_\omega^{-1}$ , so that  $X$  is not superlow  $\iff$  there is an  $X$ -c.e.  $Y \notin \Pi_\omega^{-1}$ .
- ▶ Let  $\{V_n\}_{n \in \omega}$  be the Gödel  $\emptyset'$ -numbering of all  $\Pi_\omega^{-1}$  sets. Set

$$\mathcal{F} = \{\{n\} \oplus F \mid F \text{ is finite and } F \neq V_n\}.$$

- ▶ By the general lemma we have  $X$  is non-superlow  $\implies \mathcal{F}$  is  $X$ -c.e.
- ▶ Suppose  $X$  is superlow and  $\mathcal{F}$  is  $X$ -c.e. Then for every  $n$  we can uniformly enumerate  $W_{f(n)}^X$  such that  $W_{f(n)}^X \neq V_n$ . But since  $X$  is superlow we can effectively translate  $W_{f(n)}^X$  to  $V_{g(n)}$  so that

$$V_{g(n)} \neq V_n.$$

For Gödel numbering this is impossible.

## The non- $K$ -trivial degrees

- ▶  $X$  is not  $K$ -trivial  $\iff$  for each  $n \in \omega$  we have

$$(\exists m)[K(X \upharpoonright m) > K(m) + n].$$

## The non- $K$ -trivial degrees

- ▶  $X$  is not  $K$ -trivial  $\iff$  for each  $n \in \omega$  we have

$$(\exists m)[K(X \upharpoonright m) > K(m) + n].$$

- ▶ Set

$$\mathcal{F} = \{\{n\} \oplus \text{graph}(\sigma) \mid (\exists m \leq |\sigma|)[K(\sigma \upharpoonright m) > K(m) + n]\},$$

where  $\sigma$  runs over  $2^{<\omega}$ .

## The non- $K$ -trivial degrees

- ▶  $X$  is not  $K$ -trivial  $\iff$  for each  $n \in \omega$  we have

$$(\exists m)[K(X \upharpoonright m) > K(m) + n].$$

- ▶ Set

$$\mathcal{F} = \{\{n\} \oplus \text{graph}(\sigma) \mid (\exists m \leq |\sigma|)[K(\sigma \upharpoonright m) > K(m) + n]\},$$

where  $\sigma$  runs over  $2^{<\omega}$ .

- ▶ By the general lemma we have  $X$  is non- $K$ -trivial  $\implies \mathcal{F}$  is  $X$ -c.e.

## The reverse direction

Suppose  $X$  is  $K$ -trivial and the family  $\mathcal{F}$  is  $X$ -c.e. Let  $\sigma_n$  be the first enumerated string such that

$$(\exists m \leq |\sigma_n|)[K(\sigma_n \upharpoonright m) > K(m) + n].$$



## The reverse direction

Suppose  $X$  is  $K$ -trivial and the family  $\mathcal{F}$  is  $X$ -c.e. Let  $\sigma_n$  be the first enumerated string such that

$$(\exists m \leq |\sigma_n|)[K(\sigma_n \upharpoonright m) > K(m) + n].$$

Then  $X$  is low for  $K$  so that for some  $k \in \omega$  we have

$$K(\sigma) \leq K^X(\sigma) + k - 1.$$

## The reverse direction

Suppose  $X$  is  $K$ -trivial and the family  $\mathcal{F}$  is  $X$ -c.e. Let  $\sigma_n$  be the first enumerated string such that

$$(\exists m \leq |\sigma_n|)[K(\sigma_n \upharpoonright m) > K(m) + n].$$

Then  $X$  is low for  $K$  so that for some  $k \in \omega$  we have

$$K(\sigma) \leq K^X(\sigma) + k - 1.$$

Using Recursion Theorem we can find an index  $n$  such that

$$\Phi_n^X(\tau) = \begin{cases} \sigma_{n+k} \upharpoonright U(\tau), & \text{if } U(\tau) \downarrow \leq |\sigma_{n+k}|; \\ \uparrow & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

where  $U$  is the optimal prefix-free operator

## The reverse direction

Suppose  $X$  is  $K$ -trivial and the family  $\mathcal{F}$  is  $X$ -c.e. Let  $\sigma_n$  be the first enumerated string such that

$$(\exists m \leq |\sigma_n|)[K(\sigma_n \upharpoonright m) > K(m) + n].$$

Then  $X$  is low for  $K$  so that for some  $k \in \omega$  we have

$$K(\sigma) \leq K^X(\sigma) + k - 1.$$

Using Recursion Theorem we can find an index  $n$  such that

$$\Phi_n^X(\tau) = \begin{cases} \sigma_{n+k} \upharpoonright U(\tau), & \text{if } U(\tau) \downarrow \leq |\sigma_{n+k}|; \\ \uparrow & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

where  $U$  is the optimal prefix-free operator, so that for every  $m \leq |\sigma_{n+k}|$  we have

$$K_{\Phi_n^X}(\sigma_{n+k} \upharpoonright m) = K(m).$$

## The reverse direction

Now it follows

$$K(\sigma_{n+k} \upharpoonright m) \leq K^X(\sigma_{n+k} \upharpoonright m) + k - 1 \leq K_{\Phi_n}^X(\sigma_{n+k} \upharpoonright m) + n + k$$

for every  $m \leq |\sigma_{n+k}|$ .

## The reverse direction

Now it follows

$$K(\sigma_{n+k} \upharpoonright m) \leq K^X(\sigma_{n+k} \upharpoonright m) + k - 1 \leq K(m) + n + k$$

for every  $m \leq |\sigma_{n+k}|$ .