

# Ordinals and recursively defined functions on the reals

Gabriel Nivasch\*, Lior Shiboli†

## Abstract

Given a function  $f : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , call a decreasing sequence  $x_1 > x_2 > x_3 > \dots$   $f$ -bad if  $f(x_1) > f(x_2) > f(x_3) > \dots$ , and call the function  $f$  *ordinal decreasing* if there exist no infinite  $f$ -bad sequences. We prove the following result, which generalizes results of Erickson et al. (2022) and Bufetov et al. (2024): Given ordinal decreasing functions  $f, g_1, \dots, g_k, s$  that are everywhere larger than 0, define the recursive algorithm “ $M(x)$ : if  $x < 0$  return  $f(x)$ , else return  $g_1(-M(x - g_2(-M(x - \dots - g_k(-M(x - s(x))) \dots))))$ ”. Then  $M(x)$  halts and is ordinal decreasing for all  $x \in \mathbb{R}$ .

More specifically, given an ordinal decreasing function  $f$ , denote by  $o(f)$  the ordinal height of the root of the tree of  $f$ -bad sequences. Then we prove that, for  $k \geq 2$ , the function  $M(x)$  defined by the above algorithm satisfies  $o(M) \leq \varphi_{k-1}(\gamma + o(s) + 1)$ , where  $\gamma$  is the smallest ordinal such that  $\max\{o(s), o(f), o(g_1), \dots, o(g_k)\} < \varphi_{k-1}(\gamma)$ .

Keywords: Ordinal, recursive algorithm, ordinal decreasing function, fusible number, Veblen function.

## 1 Introduction

Erickson, Nivasch and Xu [6, 7, 10] studied the following recursive algorithm  $M$ :

$$M(x) = \begin{cases} -x, & \text{if } x < 0; \\ \frac{M(x - M(x-1))}{2}, & \text{if } x \geq 0. \end{cases} \quad (1)$$

For example it can be checked that  $M(1) = \frac{M(1-M(0))}{2} = \frac{1}{8}$ ,  $M(\frac{3}{2}) = \frac{1}{32}$ ,  $M(2) = 2^{-10}$ ,  $M(\frac{5}{2}) = 2^{-31}$  and  $M(3) = 2^{-1,541,023,937}$  (see Figure 1).

Erickson, Nivasch and Xu [6, 7, 10] proved that  $M$  terminates on all real inputs, although Peano Arithmetic cannot prove that  $M$  terminates on all natural inputs. PA-independence was shown by proving that  $\frac{1}{M(n)}$  grows as fast as  $F_{\varepsilon_0}(n-7)$  for integers  $n \geq 8$ .

The motivation for algorithm  $M$  lies in the set of *fusible numbers*. As Erickson et al. [6] showed,  $M(x)$  returns the distance between  $x$  and the smallest “tame fusible number” larger than  $x$ . However, algorithm  $M$  is worth studying on its own right, since it is a simple algorithm for which its termination is not so easy to prove. In a follow-up paper, Bufetov, Nivasch and Pakhomov [3] studied a generalization of fusible numbers to  $n$ -fusible numbers and a corresponding generalization of algorithm  $M$  to the following algorithm  $M_n$ :

$$M_n(x) = \begin{cases} -x, & \text{if } x < 0; \\ \frac{M_n(x - M_n(x - \dots - M_n(x-1) \dots))}{n}, & \text{if } x \geq 0; \end{cases} \quad (2)$$

where  $M_n(x - \dots)$  repeats  $n$  times. They showed that for every  $n \geq 1$ ,  $M_n$  terminates on all real inputs.

In this paper we study the following question: Which modifications can be done to algorithm  $M$ , or to its generalization  $M_n$ , such that they will still halt on all real inputs? For example, what would happen if, in (1), we change the denominator 2 to 3? What would happen if we change the “ $-1$ ” to something depending on  $x$ ?

In this paper we identify a large class of algorithms that generalize  $M_n$  and halt on all real inputs. The description of the algorithms, as well as the proof that they halt on all real inputs, involve a property of real-valued functions, which we call *ordinal decreasing*.

\*Ariel University, Ariel, Israel. [gabrieln@ariel.ac.il](mailto:gabrieln@ariel.ac.il)

†Ariel University, Ariel, Israel. [lior12sh@gmail.com](mailto:lior12sh@gmail.com) research was supported by ISF grant 1065/20




Figure 1: The graph of  $M(x)$  up to  $x = 2.1$ .




Figure 2: Examples of ordinal decreasing functions.

## 1.1 Ordinal decreasing functions

**Definition 1.1.** Given a function  $f : D \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  for some  $D \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ , we call a descending sequence  $x_1 > x_2 > x_3 > \dots$  in  $D$  *f-bad* if  $f(x_1) > f(x_2) > f(x_3) > \dots$ . We call the function  $f$  *ordinal decreasing* if there exist no infinite *f-bad* sequences. We call  $f$  *ordinal decreasing up to a* if it is ordinal decreasing in the interval  $(-\infty, a] \subseteq D$ .

Some examples of ordinal decreasing functions are:

1. Every nonincreasing function.
2. A function  $f$  in the domain  $[0, 1)$  that is divided into a sequence of intervals  $\{I_n\}$  where  $I_n = [1 - 2^{-n}, 1 - 2^{-(n+1)})$  and where  $f$  is decreasing in each interval (see Figure 2, left).
3. A function  $f$  in the domain  $(0, 1]$  that is divided into a sequence of intervals  $\{I_n\}$  where  $I_n = (2^{-(n+1)}, 2^{-n}]$ , such that  $f$  is decreasing in each  $I_n$  but such that for each  $n$  there exist only finitely many  $n < m$  such that  $f(2^{-m}) > \lim_{x \rightarrow (2^{-n})^+} (f(x))$  (see Figure 2, right).

The notion of an *f-bad* sequence is analogous to the notion of a bad sequence in a well partial order (see Section 2.4 below for background on well partial orders). We can naturally extend the analogy, and define the ordinal type  $o(f)$  of an ordinal decreasing function  $f$ , as follows:

Given an ordinal decreasing function  $f$ , define the *tree of f-bad sequences*  $T_f$  as the (possibly infinite) tree that contains a vertex  $v_f(\bar{x})$  for each *f-bad* sequence  $\bar{x} = \langle x_1 > \dots > x_n \rangle$ , and contains an edge connecting each  $v_f(\langle x_1 > \dots > x_n \rangle)$ ,  $n \geq 1$  to its parent  $v_f(\langle x_1 > \dots > x_{n-1} \rangle)$ . The *root* of the tree is  $v_f(\langle \rangle)$ , corresponding to the empty sequence.

Since  $T_f$  contains no infinite path, there exists a unique way to assign to each vertex  $v \in T_f$  an ordinal height  $o(v)$ , such that  $o(v) = \lim_{w \text{ child of } v} (o(w) + 1)$  for all  $v \in T_f$ . We define the *ordinal type*  $o(f)$  of the function  $f$  to be the ordinal height of the root of  $T_f$ , meaning  $o(f) = o(v_f(\langle \rangle))$ .

Given  $x \in D$ , we define  $o_f$  to be the function from the reals to the ordinals recursively given by  $o_f(x) = \lim_{x' < x, f(x') < f(x)} (o_f(x') + 1)$ . Then it is easy to verify that  $o(f) = \lim_{x \in \mathbb{R}} (o_f(x) + 1)$ .

Given an interval  $D \subset \mathbb{R}$ , let  $o(f|_D)$  denote the ordinal type of the restriction of  $f$  to  $D$ .

## 1.2 Our results

Now we can state the main results of our paper.

**Theorem 1.2.** *Consider the recursive algorithm:*

$$M(x) = \begin{cases} f(x) & \text{if } x < 0; \\ g_1(-M(x - g_2(-M(x - \dots - g_k(-M(x - s(x))) \dots)))) & \text{if } x \geq 0; \end{cases} \quad (3)$$

where the functions  $s(x)$ ,  $f(x)$  and  $g_i(x)$  for all  $i$  are all ordinal decreasing and larger than 0 for every  $x$  in the appropriate ranges:  $(-\infty, 0)$  for  $f, g_i$ , and  $[0, \infty)$  for  $s$ .

Then  $M(x)$  halts and is ordinal decreasing for all  $x \in \mathbb{R}$ .

Note that Theorem 1.2 covers the cases mentioned above, by taking  $k = n$ ,  $g_1(x) = -\frac{x}{n}$ ,  $g_i(x) = -x$  for  $2 \leq i \leq n$  and  $s(x) = 1$ .

We also prove the following upper bounds on  $o(M)$  in terms of  $k$  and  $o(f), o(s), o(g_1), \dots, o(g_k)$ .

**Theorem 1.3.** *Let  $M$  be the function computed by the algorithm of Theorem 1.2. If  $k = 1$ , then let  $\gamma$  satisfy  $\max\{o(f), o(s), o(g_1)\} < \omega^{\omega^\gamma}$ . Then  $o(M) \leq \omega^{\omega^{\gamma+1}(o(s)+1)}$ . For  $k \geq 2$ , let  $\gamma$  satisfy  $\max\{o(f), o(s), o(g_1), \dots, o(g_k)\} < \varphi_{k-1}(\gamma)$ . Then  $o(M) \leq \varphi_{k-1}(\gamma + o(s) + 1)$ .*

By comparison, the specific function  $M$  of Erickson et al. [7] satisfies  $o(M) = \varphi_1(0) = \varepsilon_0$ , and the generalization of Bufetov et al. [3] satisfies  $o(M) = \varphi_{n-1}(0)$ . (See Section 2.2 below for the definition of the  $\varphi$  notation.)

## 2 Background

### 2.1 Real induction

In this paper we will use the following result, which is called *real induction* (see Clark [4] for a survey).

**Lemma 2.1.** *Let  $S \subset \mathbb{R}$  be a set that satisfies:*

- (R1) *There exists  $a \in \mathbb{R}$  such that  $(-\infty, a) \subset S$ .*
  - (R2) *For all  $x \in \mathbb{R}$ , if  $(-\infty, x) \subset S$ , then  $x \in S$ .*
  - (R3) *For all  $x \in S$ , there exists  $y > x$  such that  $(x, y) \subset S$ .*
- Then  $S = \mathbb{R}$ .

*Proof.* Suppose  $S \neq \mathbb{R}$ . Let  $a = \inf(\mathbb{R} \setminus S)$ . By (R1)  $a \neq -\infty$ . Therefore by (R2),  $a \in S$ . Therefore (R3) yields a contradiction.  $\square$

It is worth noting for our purposes that since Peano Arithmetic is built upon the natural numbers, we cannot use real induction within Peano Arithmetic, but must rely on Second Order Arithmetic.

### 2.2 Veblen functions

The finite Veblen functions  $\varphi_n$ ,  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  are a sequence of functions from ordinals to ordinals, defined by starting with  $\varphi_0(\alpha) = \omega^\alpha$ , and for each  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , letting

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi_{n+1}(0) &= \lim_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \varphi_n^{(k)}(0); \\ \varphi_{n+1}(\alpha + 1) &= \lim_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \varphi_n^{(k)}(\varphi_{n+1}(\alpha) + 1); \\ \varphi_{n+1}(\alpha) &= \lim_{\beta < \alpha} \varphi_{n+1}(\beta), \quad \alpha \text{ limit.} \end{aligned}$$

Here  $f^{(k)} = \underbrace{f \circ f \circ \dots \circ f}_k$  denotes  $k$ -fold application of  $f$ . Ordinals of the form  $\varphi_1(\alpha)$  are called *epsilon numbers*, and are denoted  $\varepsilon_\alpha = \varphi_1(\alpha)$ .

## 2.3 Natural sum and product of ordinals

Given ordinals  $\alpha, \beta$  with Cantor Normal Forms

$$\begin{aligned}\alpha &= \omega^{\alpha_1} + \dots + \omega^{\alpha_n}, & \text{with } \alpha_1 \geq \dots \geq \alpha_n, \\ \beta &= \omega^{\beta_1} + \dots + \omega^{\beta_m}, & \text{with } \beta_1 \geq \dots \geq \beta_m;\end{aligned}$$

their *natural sum*  $\alpha \oplus \beta$  is given by  $\omega^{\gamma_1} + \dots + \omega^{\gamma_{n+m}}$ , where  $\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_{n+m}$  are  $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n, \beta_1, \dots, \beta_m$  sorted in nonincreasing order. The *natural product* of  $\alpha, \beta$  is given by

$$\alpha \otimes \beta = \bigoplus_{\substack{1 \leq i \leq n \\ 1 \leq j \leq m}} \omega^{\alpha_i \oplus \beta_j}.$$

(See e.g. de Jongh and Parikh [5].)

The natural sum and natural product operations are commutative and associative, and natural product distributes over natural sum. These operations are also monotonic, in the sense that if  $\alpha < \beta$  then  $\alpha \oplus \gamma < \beta \oplus \gamma$ , if  $\alpha \leq \beta$  then  $\alpha \otimes \gamma \leq \beta \otimes \gamma$ , and if  $\alpha < \beta$  and  $\gamma > 0$  then  $\alpha \otimes \gamma < \beta \otimes \gamma$ . Furthermore,  $\alpha + \beta \leq \alpha \oplus \beta$  and  $\alpha\beta \leq \alpha \otimes \beta$ .

Recall that if  $\alpha = \omega^{\alpha_1} + \dots + \omega^{\alpha_k}$  is in CNF, then  $\alpha\omega = \lim_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \alpha n = \omega^{\alpha_1+1}$ , and  $\alpha^\omega = \lim_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \alpha^n = \omega^{\alpha_1\omega}$ . Then the following properties are readily checked:

- $\underbrace{\alpha \oplus \dots \oplus \alpha}_n = \alpha \otimes n$ ,  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ ;
- $\lim_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \alpha \oplus n = \alpha + \omega$  (not  $\alpha \oplus \omega!$ );
- if  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  are limit ordinals, then  $\alpha \oplus \beta = \lim_{\alpha' < \alpha, \beta' < \beta} (\alpha' \oplus \beta')$ ;
- $\lim_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \alpha \otimes n = \alpha\omega$  (not  $\alpha \otimes \omega!$ );
- if both  $\alpha < \omega^\gamma$  and  $\beta < \omega^\gamma$  then  $\alpha \oplus \beta < \omega^\gamma$ ;
- if both  $\alpha < \omega^{\omega^\gamma}$  and  $\beta < \omega^{\omega^\gamma}$  then  $\alpha \otimes \beta < \omega^{\omega^\gamma}$ .

Define the repeated natural product by transfinite induction, by letting  $\alpha^{[0]} = 1$ ,  $\alpha^{[\beta+1]} = \alpha^{[\beta]} \otimes \alpha$ , and  $\alpha^{[\beta]} = \lim_{\gamma < \beta} \alpha^{[\gamma]}$  for limit  $\beta$ . It can be checked that

$$\alpha^{[\omega]} = \lim_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \alpha^{[n]} = \lim_{n \in \mathbb{N}} (\alpha \otimes \dots \otimes \alpha) = \alpha^\omega.$$

In general, for limit  $\beta$  we have  $\alpha^{[\beta]} = \alpha^\beta$ , as can be shown by ordinal induction on  $\beta$ . It can also be shown by ordinal induction on  $\beta$  that  $(\omega^{\omega^\alpha})^{[\beta]} = (\omega^{\omega^\alpha})^\beta$ . (See also Altman [1].)

## 2.4 Well partial orders

Given a set  $A$  partially ordered by  $\preceq$ , a *bad sequence* is a sequence  $a_1, a_2, a_3 \dots$  of elements of  $A$  such that there exist no indices  $i < j$  for which  $a_i \preceq a_j$ . Then  $\preceq$  is said to be a *well partial order* (WPO) if there exist no infinite bad sequences of elements of  $A$ . The *ordinal type* of  $A$ , denoted  $o(A)$ , is the ordinal height of the root of the tree of bad sequences of  $A$ . It also equals the maximal order type of a linear order  $\leq$  extending  $\preceq$  (Blass and Gurevich [2], see also de Jongh and Parikh [5]).

Given WPOs  $A$  and  $B$ , their disjoint union  $A \sqcup B$  can be well partially ordered by letting  $x \preceq y$  if and only if  $x, y \in A$  and  $x \preceq_A y$  or  $x, y \in B$  and  $x \preceq_B y$ . Then  $o(A \sqcup B) = o(A) \oplus o(B)$  [5]. Also, their Cartesian product  $A \times B$  can be well partially ordered by letting  $(a, b) \preceq (a', b')$  if and only if  $a \preceq_A a'$  and  $b \preceq_B b'$ . Then  $o(A \times B) = o(A) \otimes o(B)$  [5].

### 3 Proof of Theorem 1.2

We start by proving some properties of ordinal decreasing functions.

**Lemma 3.1.** *Suppose  $f : D \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is ordinal decreasing. Then for every infinite decreasing sequence  $\{x_n\}$  in  $D$  there is an infinite subsequence  $\{x'_n\}$  for which  $\{f(x'_n)\}$  is nondecreasing.*

*Proof.* By the infinite Ramsey's theorem [8]. Define an infinite complete graph in which there is a vertex for each  $x_i$  and color each edge  $\{x_i, x_j\}, i < j$  red if  $f(x_i) > f(x_j)$  and green otherwise.

Since  $f(x)$  is ordinal decreasing up to  $y$  our graph cannot contain a monochromatic red infinite complete subgraph. Therefore there exists a monochromatic green infinite subgraph, and thus the original sequence contains an infinite nondecreasing subsequence (comprised of all the vertices in the subgraph).  $\square$

**Lemma 3.2.** *Suppose  $g(x)$  is ordinal decreasing in  $D$  and  $f(x)$  is ordinal decreasing up to  $\sup_{x \in D}(-g(x))$ . Then  $f(-g(x))$  is ordinal decreasing in  $D$ .*

*Proof.* Consider an infinite decreasing sequence  $\{x_n\}$  in  $D$ . By Lemma 3.1, there exists a nondecreasing subsequence of  $\{g(x_n)\}$ . If this subsequence is not strictly increasing, there exists  $i < j$  such that  $g(x_i) = g(x_j)$ , and so is  $f(-g(x_i)) = f(-g(x_j))$ . Otherwise we have a strictly decreasing sequence of  $-g(x)$ , and since  $f(x)$  is ordinal decreasing up to  $\sup_{x \in D}(-g(x))$ , we can find  $f(-g(x_j)) \geq f(-g(x_i))$ , and we are done.  $\square$

**Lemma 3.3.** *Suppose  $f(x)$  and  $g(x)$  are ordinal decreasing in  $D$ . Then  $f(x) + g(x)$  is ordinal decreasing in  $D$ .*

*Proof.* By Lemma 3.1, for every strictly decreasing sequence  $\{x_n\}$  in  $D$  we can find a subsequence  $\{x'_n\}$  such that  $\{f(x'_n)\}$  is nondecreasing. For that subsequence we can find by definition  $i < j$  such that  $g(x'_j) \geq g(x'_i)$ . Hence,  $f(x'_j) + g(x'_j) \geq f(x'_i) + g(x'_i)$  as desired.  $\square$

(In this paper we only use Lemma 3.3 for the special case  $g(x) = -x$ .)

**Lemma 3.4.** *Let  $\beta > 0$ , and suppose  $f(x)$  is ordinal decreasing in  $D = (y, y + \beta)$  and larger than 0. Then there exists an  $0 < \varepsilon < \beta$  such that for every  $y < x < y + \varepsilon$  we have  $x - f(x) < y$ .*

*Proof.* Suppose for a contradiction that for every  $0 < \varepsilon < \beta$  we have a counterexample  $x \in (y, y + \varepsilon)$  with  $x - f(x) \geq y$ . Then, we have an infinite sequence  $\{x_n\}$  of such counterexamples with  $\lim(x_n) = y$ , but because  $0 < f(x_n) \leq x_n - y$  there exists an infinite subsequence  $\{x'_n\}$  for which  $f(x'_n)$  is decreasing, in contradiction to  $f(x)$  being ordinal decreasing in  $D$ .  $\square$

We are ready to prove our main result.

*Proof of Theorem 1.2.* Consider the recursive algorithm

$$M(x) = \begin{cases} f(x), & \text{if } x < 0 \\ g_1(-M(x - g_2(-M(x - \dots - g_k(-M(x - s(x))) \dots)))) & \text{if } x \geq 0 \end{cases} \quad (4)$$

where  $s(x)$ ,  $f(x)$  and  $g_i(x)$  for all  $i$  are all ordinal decreasing and larger than 0 for every  $x$  in the appropriate ranges:  $(-\infty, 0)$  for  $f, g_i$ , and  $[0, \infty)$  for  $s$ .

We claim that  $M(x)$  halts and is ordinal decreasing for every  $x$ . We will prove this by real induction (Lemma 2.1).

Assuming otherwise, let

$$S = \{x \mid M \text{ is defined and ordinal decreasing up to } x\}.$$

Since for  $x < 0$   $M(x)$  is defined by  $M(x) = f(x)$ , we have  $(-\infty, 0) \in S$ . Hence,  $S$  satisfies property (R1).

Next, suppose that  $(-\infty, y) \subseteq S$ . Then note that  $M(y)$  is defined, since for every  $i$   $M(y - g_i(-M(y - \dots - g_k(-M(y - s(y))) \dots))))$  is defined by induction, since functions  $g_i$  and  $s$  have output larger than 0. Hence,  $M(x)$  is ordinal decreasing up to  $y$  itself. Hence  $y \in S$  as well, so  $S$  satisfies property (R2).

Finally suppose  $y \in S$ . We will show that  $(y, y + \varepsilon) \subseteq S$  for some  $\varepsilon > 0$ , meaning  $S$  satisfies property (R3).




Figure 3: An ordinal decreasing function (solid line) induces a partition of the  $x$ -axis into a transfinite number of intervals (dotted lines).

In order to do that, we will show by induction on  $i = k, \dots, 1$  that  $M_i(x) = g_i(-M(x - \dots - g_k(-M(x - s(x))) \dots))$  is defined and ordinal decreasing up to  $y + \varepsilon_i$  for some  $\varepsilon_i > 0$ . Let us start with the base case  $i = k$ . In this case  $M_k(x) = g_k(-M(x - s(x)))$ . By Lemma 3.3,  $-x + s(x)$  is an ordinal decreasing function in  $[0, \infty)$ , hence by Lemma 3.4 on  $s(x)$ , there is an  $\varepsilon_k$  such that  $x - s(x) < y$  for every  $y < x < y + \varepsilon_k$ . Hence, by assumption and Lemma 3.2,  $M(-(-x + s(x))) = M(x - s(x))$  is ordinal decreasing and defined up to  $y + \varepsilon_k$  and so is  $g_k(-M(x - s(x)))$ , as desired. For the induction step, suppose  $M_i(x)$  is ordinal decreasing and defined up to  $y + \varepsilon_i$ . By Lemma 3.3,  $-x + M_i(x)$  is ordinal decreasing and defined up to  $y + \varepsilon_i$ . Furthermore, by Lemma 3.4 there exists some  $\varepsilon_{i-1}$  such that  $x - M_i(x) < y$  for every  $y < x < y + \varepsilon_{i-1}$ . Hence, by assumption and Lemma 3.2  $M(x - M_i(x))$  is defined and ordinal decreasing up to  $y + \varepsilon_{i-1}$ . Hence, so is  $M_{i-1} = g_{i-1}(-M(x - M_i(x)))$ . Hence by Lemma 2.1 we have  $S = \mathbb{R}$ .  $\square$

## 4 Proof of Theorem 1.3

Let  $f : D \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be an ordinal decreasing function that is positive in some interval  $D = [x_1, x_2)$ ,  $x_1 \neq -\infty$ . By Lemma 3.4, the function  $f$  induces a partition of  $D$  into maximal intervals as follows. Define the endpoints  $p_\alpha$  by

$$\begin{aligned} p_0 &= x_1; \\ p_{\alpha+1} &= \max \{y \leq x_2 : x - f(x) < p_\alpha \text{ for all } x < y\}; \\ p_\alpha &= \lim_{\beta < \alpha} p_\beta, \quad \alpha \text{ limit.} \end{aligned}$$

Then define the intervals  $I_\alpha = [p_\alpha, p_{\alpha+1})$  for ordinals  $\alpha$ . These intervals form a partition of  $D$ . Figure 3 shows how the intervals  $I_\alpha$  can be computed graphically: Starting at  $x_1$  on the  $x$ -axis, we move up-right in a straight line with slope 1, until we encounter the graph of  $f$  or pass above the graph. At that point, we descend to the  $x$ -axis, mark a new endpoint  $p_\alpha$ , and start this process again.

**Lemma 4.1.** *The ordinal number of intervals  $I_\alpha$  into which  $D$  is partitioned is at most  $\omega \cdot (o(f|_D) + 1)$ .*

*Proof.* Recall that  $f$  is positive for all  $x \in D$ . Call  $x \in D$  a *near-root* of  $f$  if there exists an infinite increasing sequence  $y_1, y_2, y_3, \dots \in D$  such that  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} y_n = x$  and  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} f(y_n) = 0$ . Let  $L_f \subset \mathbb{R}$  be the set of near-roots of  $f$ . The set  $L_f$  is well-ordered in  $\mathbb{R}$ , since from an infinite decreasing sequence of near-roots we could construct an infinite  $f$ -bad sequence. More precisely, denoting the ordinal type of  $L_f$  by  $o(L_f)$ , we have  $o(L_f) \leq o(f)$ .

Call a near-root  $z \in L_f$  *limit* if there exist near-roots  $z_1, z_2, z_3, \dots \in L_f$  that converge to  $z$ ; otherwise call  $z$  *non-limit*.

**Observation 4.2.** *Let  $z \in D$ . Then there exists an infinite sequence of  $\omega$  consecutive intervals  $I_\alpha, I_{\alpha+1}, I_{\alpha+2}, \dots$  that converge to  $z$  if and only if  $z$  is a non-limit near-root of  $f$ .*

*Proof.* Suppose first that  $z$  is not a near-root of  $f$ . Then there exists an  $0 < \varepsilon < x_2 - z$  such that  $f(x) \geq \varepsilon$  for all  $z - \varepsilon \leq x \leq z + \varepsilon$  (where the part  $z - \varepsilon \leq x \leq z$  follows from the fact that  $z$  is not a near-root, and the part  $z \leq x \leq z + \varepsilon$  follows from the fact that  $f$  is ordinal decreasing). Therefore, an interval  $I_\alpha$  whose left endpoint is in  $(z - \varepsilon, z)$  must contain  $z$  in its interior. Hence, there are not  $\omega$ -many intervals converging to  $z$ .

Now suppose  $z$  is a near-root of  $f$ . Then no interval  $I_\alpha$  whose left endpoint is left of  $z$  can contain  $z$  in its interior. If  $z$  is a non-limit near-root of  $f$ , then there exists an  $\varepsilon > 0$  such that  $(z - \varepsilon, z)$  contains no near-roots of  $f$ . Hence, for every  $\varepsilon' < \varepsilon$ , the interval  $(z - \varepsilon, z - \varepsilon')$  contains only finitely many intervals  $I_\alpha$ . And therefore, there exist  $\omega$ -many consecutive intervals  $I_\alpha$  converging to  $z$ . If, on the other hand, the near-root  $z$  is itself a limit of near-roots of  $f$ , then some left-neighborhood of  $z$  contains at least  $\omega^2$ -many intervals  $I_\alpha$ .  $\square$

Hence, there is a one-to-one correspondence between non-limit elements of  $L_f$  and sequences of  $\omega$ -many consecutive intervals  $I_\alpha$ , except for a possible final sequence after the last element of  $L_f$ . Lemma 4.1 follows.  $\square$

**Lemma 4.3.** *Let  $J \subseteq \mathbb{R}$  be an interval, and let  $J_1, J_2$  be a partition of  $J$  into two intervals, with  $J_1$  left of  $J_2$ . Then  $o(f|_J) \leq o(f|_{J_1}) + o(f|_{J_2})$ .*

*Proof.* Every  $f$ -bad sequence in  $J$  can be partitioned into an  $f$ -bad sequence in  $J_2$  followed by an  $f$ -bad sequence in  $J_1$  (though the converse is not necessarily true). Hence, the tree of  $f$ -bad sequences  $T_{(f|_J)}$  is a subtree of the tree formed by attaching a copy of  $T_{(f|_{J_1})}$  to each leaf of  $T_{(f|_{J_2})}$ . The ordinal type of this latter tree is  $o(f|_{J_1}) + o(f|_{J_2})$ , so the claim follows.  $\square$

**Lemma 4.4.** *Let  $f$  be ordinal decreasing, and let  $g(x) = f(x) - x$  (which is ordinal decreasing by Lemma 3.3). Then  $o(g) \leq o(f)$ .*

*Proof.* Every  $g$ -bad sequence is also  $f$ -bad, hence  $T_g \subseteq T_f$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 4.5.** *Suppose  $g(x)$  is ordinal decreasing up to  $y$  and  $f(x)$  is ordinal decreasing up to  $y' = \sup_{x < y} (-g(x))$ . Let  $h(x) = f(-g(x))$  (which is ordinal decreasing up to  $y$  by Lemma 3.2). Then  $o(h|_y) \leq o(g|_y) \otimes o(f|_{y'})$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $A = o(g|_y) \otimes o(f|_{y'})$  be WPO by the standard product order mentioned in Section 2.4. Given  $x \leq y$ , let  $E(x) = (o_g(x), o_f(-g(x))) \in A$ .

**Lemma 4.6.** *If  $x > x'$  and  $E(x) \leq E(x')$  then  $h(x) \leq h(x')$ . (Hence,  $E$  is analogous to what Rathjen and Weiermann [9] call a quasi-embedding.)*

*Proof.* We have  $x > x'$  and  $o_g(x) \leq o_g(x')$ . Hence,  $g(x) \leq g(x')$  (because  $x > x'$  and  $g(x) > g(x')$  would imply  $o_g(x) > o_g(x')$ ). If  $g(x) = g(x')$  then  $h(x) = h(x')$  and we are done. Otherwise,  $g(x) < g(x')$ , so  $-g(x) > -g(x')$ . We also have  $o_f(-g(x)) \leq o_f(-g(x'))$ . Hence,  $h(x) = f(-g(x)) \leq f(-g(x')) = h(x')$ , as desired.  $\square$

Hence, if  $x_1 > x_2 > \dots > x_n$  is an  $h$ -bad sequence then  $E(x_1), E(x_2), \dots, E(x_n)$  is a bad sequence in  $A$ . Therefore,  $o(h|_y) \leq o(A) = o(g|_y) \otimes o(f|_{y'})$ .  $\square$

The following lemma is not actually used in this paper, but it might be of independent interest:

**Lemma 4.7.** *Suppose  $f$  and  $g$  are ordinal decreasing, and let  $h(x) = f(x) + g(x)$  (which is ordinal decreasing by Lemma 3.3). Then  $o(h) \leq o(f) \otimes o(g)$ .*

*Proof.* The claim follows by considering the quasi-embedding  $E(x) = (o_f(x), o_g(x))$ .  $\square$

#### 4.1 The case $k = 1$

When  $k = 1$  the algorithm is

$$M(x) = \begin{cases} f(x), & x < 0; \\ g(-M(x - s(x))), & x \geq 0. \end{cases}$$

Consider the partition of  $[0, \infty)$  into intervals induced by  $s$ . Namely, let

$$\begin{aligned} p_0 &= 0; \\ p_{\alpha+1} &= \max \{y : x - s(x) < p_\alpha \text{ for all } x < y\}, \quad \text{for } \alpha \geq 1; \\ p_\alpha &= \lim_{\beta < \alpha} p_\beta, \quad \text{for } \alpha \text{ limit.} \end{aligned}$$

Then define the intervals  $I_{-1} = (-\infty, 0)$  and  $I_\alpha = [p_\alpha, p_{\alpha+1})$  for ordinals  $\alpha$ .

Denote  $\tau_\alpha = o(M|_{(-\infty, p_\alpha)})$ . We will compute  $\tau_\alpha$  by ordinal induction. The base case is  $\alpha = 0$ , for which  $p_0 = 0$ , and thus  $\tau_0 = o(M|_{I_{-1}}) = o(f)$ .

If  $x \in I_\alpha = [p_\alpha, p_{\alpha+1})$  then  $x - s(x) < p_\alpha$ , and hence  $o_M(x - s(x)) < \tau_\alpha$ . Therefore, by Lemma 4.3, Lemma 4.4, and two applications of Lemma 4.5,

$$\begin{aligned} \tau_{\alpha+1} &= o(M|_{(-\infty, p_{\alpha+1})}) \leq o(M|_{(-\infty, p_\alpha)}) + o(M|_{I_\alpha}) \\ &\leq \tau_\alpha + \tau_\alpha \otimes o(s) \otimes o(g). \end{aligned}$$

Let  $\gamma$  be large enough such that  $\max \{o(f), o(g), o(s)\} < \omega^{\omega^\gamma}$ . Then  $\tau_0 = o(f) \leq \omega^{\omega^\gamma}$ , and it follows by ordinal induction on  $\alpha$  that  $\tau_\alpha \leq \omega^{\omega^{\gamma(1+\alpha)}}$ . By Lemma 4.1, we conclude that  $o(M) \leq \omega^{\omega^{\gamma+1}(o(s)+1)}$ , as desired.

#### 4.2 The case $k = 2$

When  $k = 2$  the algorithm is

$$M(x) = \begin{cases} f(x), & x < 0; \\ g_1(-M(x - g_2(-M(x - s(x))))), & x \geq 0. \end{cases}$$

Denote  $M_2(x) = g_2(-M(x - s(x)))$ , and  $M(x) = M_1(x) = g_1(-M(x - M_2(x)))$ . Define the points  $p_\alpha$  and the intervals  $I_\alpha$  as above, based on the function  $s$ .

Partition each interval  $I_\alpha$  into subintervals  $I_{\alpha,\beta}$  based on the function  $M_2$ , as follows. Define points  $p_{\alpha,\beta}$  by

$$\begin{aligned} p_{\alpha,0} &= p_\alpha; \\ p_{\alpha,\beta+1} &= \max \{y \leq p_{\alpha+1} : x - M_2(x) < p_{\alpha,\beta} \text{ for all } x < y\}, \quad \text{for } \beta \geq 1; \\ p_\beta &= \lim_{\beta' < \beta} p_{\beta'}, \quad \text{for } \beta \text{ limit.} \end{aligned}$$

Then define the subintervals  $I_{\alpha,\beta} = [p_{\alpha,\beta}, p_{\alpha,\beta+1})$ .

Denote  $\tau_\alpha = o(M|_{(-\infty, p_\alpha)})$  and  $\tau_{\alpha,\beta} = o(M|_{(-\infty, p_{\alpha,\beta})})$ . Also denote  $\sigma_\alpha = o(M_2|_{I_\alpha})$ .

**Lemma 4.8.** *We have  $\tau_{\alpha,0} = \tau_\alpha$  and  $\tau_{\alpha,\beta+1} \leq \tau_{\alpha,\beta} + \tau_{\alpha,\beta} \otimes \tau_\alpha \otimes o(s) \otimes o(g_2) \otimes o(g_1)$ .*

*Proof.* The first claim follows by definition. The second one follows by Lemmas 4.3, 4.4, and 4.5, since for  $x \in I_{\alpha,\beta}$  we have  $x - s(x) < p_\alpha$  and  $x - M_2(x) < p_{\alpha,\beta}$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 4.9.** *We have  $\sigma_\alpha \leq \tau_\alpha \otimes o(s) \otimes o(g_2)$ .*

*Proof.* Similarly.  $\square$



We have  $\tau_0 = o(f)$ . By Lemma 4.1, the ordinal number of subintervals into which interval  $I_\alpha$  is partitioned is  $\omega \cdot (\sigma_\alpha + 1)$ .

From Lemma 4.8 it follows, by transfinite induction on  $\beta$ , that  $\tau_{\alpha,\beta} \leq \tau_\alpha \otimes (\tau_\alpha \otimes o(s) \otimes o(g_2) \otimes o(g_1))^{[\beta]}$ . Hence,

$$\tau_{\alpha+1} \leq (\tau_\alpha \otimes o(s) \otimes o(g_2) \otimes o(g_1))^{[\omega \cdot (\tau_\alpha \otimes o(s) \otimes o(g_2) + 2)]}.$$

Let  $\gamma$  be smallest such that  $\max\{o(f), o(g_1), o(g_2), o(s)\} < \varepsilon_\gamma$ . Applying the above equation  $\omega$  many times, we obtain that, if  $\gamma < \tau_\alpha$ , then  $\tau_{\alpha+\omega}$  is bounded by an infinite exponential tower of  $\tau_\alpha$ . Hence, it follows by ordinal induction on  $\beta$  that  $\tau_{\omega\beta} \leq \varepsilon_{\gamma+\beta}$ . By Lemma 4.1, the ordinal number of intervals  $I_\alpha$  is at most  $\omega \cdot (o(s) + 1)$ . Hence,  $o(M) \leq \varepsilon_{\gamma+o(s)+1}$ , as desired.

### 4.3 The general case

The algorithm for general  $k$  for  $x \geq 0$  is

$$\begin{aligned} M(x) &= M_1(x) = g_1(-M(x - M_2(x))), \quad \text{where} \\ M_2(x) &= g_2(-M(x - M_3(x))), \quad \text{where} \\ &\vdots \\ M_{k-1}(x) &= g_{k-1}(-M(x - M_k(x))), \quad \text{where} \\ M_k(x) &= g_k(-M(x - s(x))). \end{aligned}$$

Define the endpoints  $p_{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_i}$  for  $1 \leq i \leq k$  by

$$\begin{aligned} p_{\alpha_1+1} &= \max\{y : x - s(x) < p_{\alpha_1} \text{ for all } x < y\}; \\ p_{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{i-1}, \alpha_i+1} &= \max\{y \leq p_{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{i-1}} : x - M_{k-i+2}(x) < p_{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_i} \text{ for all } x < y\}, \quad 2 \leq i \leq k. \end{aligned}$$

For  $1 \leq i \leq k$ , define the intervals  $I_{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_i} = [p_{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_i}, p_{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{i-1}, \alpha_i+1})$ .

For  $1 \leq i \leq k$ , define the ordinals  $\tau_{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_i} = o(M|_{(-\infty, p_{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_i})})$ .

For  $1 \leq i \leq k-1$ , define the ordinals  $\sigma_{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_i} = o(M_{k-i+1}|_{I_{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_i}})$ .

**Lemma 4.10.** *We have*

$$\sigma_{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_i} \leq o(s) \otimes o(g_k) \otimes \cdots \otimes o(g_{k-i+1}) \otimes \tau_{\alpha_1} \otimes \cdots \otimes \tau_{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_i}.$$

**Lemma 4.11.** *We have*

$$\begin{aligned} \tau_{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{k-1}, 0} &= \tau_{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{k-1}}, \\ \tau_{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{k-1}, \alpha_k+1} &\leq \tau_{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k} + \tau_{\alpha_1} \otimes \cdots \otimes \tau_{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k} \otimes o(s) \otimes o(g_1) \otimes \cdots \otimes o(g_k). \end{aligned}$$

**Corollary 4.12.** *We have*

$$\tau_{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k} \leq \tau_{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{k-1}} \otimes (\tau_{\alpha_1} \otimes \cdots \otimes \tau_{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{k-1}} \otimes o(s) \otimes o(g_1) \otimes \cdots \otimes o(g_k))^{[\alpha_k]}.$$

*Proof.* By transfinite induction on  $\alpha_k$ . □

Denote  $\delta = o(f) \otimes o(s) \otimes o(g_1) \otimes \cdots \otimes o(g_k)$ .

**Lemma 4.13.** *Let  $2 \leq i \leq k$ . Given  $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{k-i}$ , let  $\rho$  be sufficiently large such that*

$$\max\{\tau_{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{k-i}}, \delta\} \leq \varphi_{i-1}(\rho).$$

*Then*

$$\tau_{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{k-i}, \omega\beta} \leq \varphi_{i-1}(\rho + \beta) \quad \text{for every } \beta.$$

*Proof.* By induction on  $i$ , and for each  $i$  by ordinal induction on  $\beta$ . The case  $\beta = 0$  for every  $i$  follows since  $\tau_{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{k-i}, 0} = \tau_{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{k-i}}$ .

Suppose first that  $i = 2$ . By Lemma 4.1, the interval  $I_{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{k-1}}$  is partitioned into at most  $\omega \cdot (\sigma_{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{k-1}} + 1)$  subintervals. Substituting this value into  $\alpha_k$  in Corollary 4.12, and applying Lemma 4.10, we obtain

$$\tau_{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{k-2}, \alpha_{k-1}+1} \leq (\delta \otimes (\tau_{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{k-1}})^{[k-1]})^{\omega \cdot (\delta \otimes (\tau_{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{k-1}})^{[k-1]} + 2)}.$$

Applying the above equation  $\omega$  many times, we obtain that  $\tau_{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{k-2}, \alpha_{k-1}+\omega}$  is bounded by an infinite exponential tower of  $\tau_{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{k-2}, \alpha_{k-1}}$ . Hence, it follows by ordinal induction on  $\beta$  that

$$\tau_{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{k-2}, \omega\beta} \leq \varphi_1(\rho + \beta),$$

as desired.

Now let  $i \geq 3$ , and suppose the claim is true for  $i - 1$ . Hence, for sufficiently large  $\rho$ , we have

$$\tau_{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{k-i+1}, \omega\beta} \leq \varphi_{i-2}(\rho + \beta) \quad \text{for every } \beta. \quad (5)$$

By Lemma 4.1, the interval  $I_{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{k-i+1}}$  is partitioned into at most  $\omega\beta$  subintervals for  $\beta = \sigma_{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{k-i+1}} + 1$ . Substituting this value of  $\beta$  in (5) and using the bound of Lemma 4.10,

$$\tau_{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{k-i}, \alpha_{k-i+1}+1} \leq \varphi_{i-2}(\rho + \delta \otimes (\tau_{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{k-i+1}})^{[k-i+1]} + 1).$$

Applying the above equation  $\omega$  many times, we obtain that  $\tau_{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{k-i}, \alpha_{k-i+1}+\omega}$  is bounded by  $\omega$  many applications of  $\varphi_{i-2}$  on  $\tau_{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{k-i}, \alpha_{k-i+1}}$ . Hence, it follows by ordinal induction on  $\beta$  that

$$\tau_{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{k-i}, \omega\beta} \leq \varphi_{i-1}(\rho + \beta),$$

as desired. □

Taking  $i = k$  in Lemma 4.13, we get  $\tau_{\omega\beta} \leq \varphi_{k-1}(\gamma + \beta)$  for  $\gamma$  large enough such that  $\delta < \varphi_{k-1}(\gamma)$ . Since the number of intervals  $I_{\alpha_1}$  is at most  $\omega \cdot (o(s) + 1)$ , we conclude that  $o(M) \leq \varphi_{k-1}(\gamma + o(s) + 1)$ , as desired.

**Acknowledgements.** Thanks to the reviewers of a previous version for their helpful comments.

## References

- [1] Harry J. Altman. Intermediate arithmetic operations on ordinal numbers. *Mathematical Logic Quarterly*, 63(3-4):228–242, 2017.
- [2] Andreas Blass and Yuri Gurevich. Program termination and well partial orderings. *ACM Trans. Comput. Logic*, 9(3), 2008.
- [3] Alexander I. Bufetov, Gabriel Nivasch, and Fedor Pakhomov. Generalized fusible numbers and their ordinals. *Annals of Pure and Applied Logic*, 175(1, Part A), 2024.
- [4] Pete L. Clark. The instructor’s guide to real induction, 2012. arXiv e-prints, math.HO, 1208.0973.
- [5] Dick H. J. de Jongh and Rohit Parikh. Well-partial orderings and hierarchies. *Indagationes Mathematicae*, 39:195–206, 1977.
- [6] Jeff Erickson. Fusible numbers. <https://www.mathpuzzle.com/fusible.pdf>.
- [7] Jeff Erickson, Gabriel Nivasch, and Junyan Xu. Fusible numbers and Peano Arithmetic. *Logical Methods in Computer Science*, 18(3), 2022.
- [8] F. P. Ramsey. On a problem of formal logic. *Proc. Lond. Math. Soc.*, S2–30:264–286, 1930.
- [9] Michael Rathjen and Andreas Weiermann. Proof-theoretic investigations on Kruskal’s theorem. *Annals of Pure and Applied Logic*, 60(1):49–88, 1993.
- [10] Junyan Xu. Survey on fusible numbers, 2012. arXiv e-prints, math.CO, 1202.5614.