

Combining Determinism and Non-Determinism

Michael Stephen Fiske

September 1, 2020

Abstract

Our goal is to construct mathematical operations that combine non-determinism measured from quantum randomness with computational determinism so that non-mechanistic behavior is preserved in the computation. Formally, some results about operations applied to computably enumerable (c.e.) and bi-immune sets are proven here, where the objective is for the operations to preserve bi-immunity. While developing rearrangement operations on the natural numbers, we discovered that the bi-immune rearrangements generate an uncountable subgroup of the symmetric group on the natural numbers. The structure of this new subgroup is unknown.

1 Introduction

In [2], a lemma about the symmetric difference operator applied to a computably enumerable (c.e.) set and bi-immune set is stated without proof. Herein lemma 2.2 provides a proof; this helps characterize procedure 2's non-mechanistic behavior in [3]. Moreover, the preservation of bi-immunity by the symmetric difference operator helped motivate the conception of rearrangement operations.

1.1 Notation and Conventions

\mathbb{N} is the non-negative integers. $\mathbb{E} = \{2n : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ denotes the even, non-negative integers. Let $a_0 a_1 \dots \in \{0, 1\}^{\mathbb{N}}$ be a binary sequence. The sequence $a_0 a_1 \dots$ induces a set $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathbb{N}$, where the identification of \mathcal{A} with the sequence means $k \in \mathcal{A}$ if and only if $a_k = 1$. $\overline{\mathcal{A}}$ is the complement of set \mathcal{A} . The relative complement is $\mathcal{A} - \mathcal{B} = \{x \in \mathcal{A} : x \notin \mathcal{B}\}$. \oplus is exclusive-or: $0 \oplus 0 = 1 \oplus 1 = 0$ and $1 \oplus 0 = 0 \oplus 1 = 1$. Due to the identification between a binary sequence and a subset of \mathbb{N} , the symmetric difference of \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{B} is represented as $\mathcal{A} \oplus \mathcal{B} = (\mathcal{A} - \mathcal{B}) \cup (\mathcal{B} - \mathcal{A})$, instead of the usual Δ . Herein symbol \oplus never represents the *join* operation as used in [1].

2 Preserving Non-Mechanistic Behavior

Our goal is to construct operations that combine non-determinism measured from quantum randomness [4] with computational determinism [6] so that the non-mechanistic behavior (bi-immunity) is preserved.

Recall the definition of an immune and bi-immune set [5].

Definition 2.1. Set $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathbb{N}$ is *immune* if conditions (i) and (ii) hold.

(i) \mathcal{A} is infinite.

(ii) For all $\mathcal{B} \subset \mathbb{N}$, (\mathcal{B} is infinite and computably enumerable) $\implies \mathcal{B} \cap \overline{\mathcal{A}} \neq \emptyset$

Set \mathcal{A} is *bi-immune* if both \mathcal{A} and $\overline{\mathcal{A}}$ are immune.

Lemma 2.1. *Suppose \mathcal{A} is bi-immune. Let \mathcal{R} be a finite set. Then $\mathcal{A} \cup \mathcal{R}$ and $\mathcal{A} - \mathcal{R}$ are both bi-immune.*

Proof. Set $\mathcal{A}^+ = \mathcal{A} \cup \mathcal{R}$ and $\mathcal{A}^- = \mathcal{A} - \mathcal{R}$. From definition 2.1, \mathcal{A}^+ and \mathcal{A}^- are still infinite because a finite number of elements have been added to or removed from \mathcal{A} , respectively. For condition (ii), suppose there exists a computably enumerable set \mathcal{B} such that $\mathcal{B} \cap \overline{\mathcal{A}^+} = \emptyset$. Then $\mathcal{B} \cap \overline{\mathcal{A}^+}$ and $\mathcal{B} \cap \overline{\mathcal{A}}$ only differ on a finite number of elements which implies that a c.e. set \mathcal{B}' can be constructed from \mathcal{B} such that $\mathcal{B}' \cap \overline{\mathcal{A}} = \emptyset$. Contradiction. The same argument holds for \mathcal{A}^- . \square

Lemma 2.1 does not hold if \mathcal{R} is an infinite, computable set. $\mathcal{A} \cup \mathbb{E}$ is not immune as $\mathbb{E} \cap \overline{(\mathcal{A} \cup \mathbb{E})} = \emptyset$. Also, $\overline{\mathcal{A}} - \mathbb{E}$ is not immune as $\mathbb{E} \cap (\overline{\mathcal{A}} - \mathbb{E}) = \emptyset$. While the isolated operations of union and relative complement do not preserve bi-immunity, the symmetric difference operation preserves bi-immunity.

Lemma 2.2. *If \mathcal{R} is c.e. and \mathcal{A} is bi-immune, then $\mathcal{A} \oplus \mathcal{R}$ is bi-immune.*

Proof. Condition (i). Verify that $\mathcal{A} \oplus \mathcal{R}$ is infinite. For the case that \mathcal{R} is finite, let K be the largest element in \mathcal{R} . Then $\mathcal{A} \oplus \mathcal{R}$ is the disjoint union of the finite set $\{x \in \mathcal{A} \oplus \mathcal{R} : x \leq K\}$ and the infinite set $\{x \in \mathcal{A} : x > K\}$ since \mathcal{A} is bi-immune.

Otherwise, \mathcal{R} is infinite. By contradiction, suppose $\mathcal{A} \oplus \mathcal{R}$ is finite. \mathcal{A} is the disjoint union of $\mathcal{A} - \mathcal{R}$ and $\mathcal{A} \cap \mathcal{R}$, so \mathcal{A} 's bi-immunity implies $\mathcal{A} \cap \mathcal{R}$ is infinite. Also, let $\mathcal{R} - \mathcal{A} = \{r_1, r_2, \dots, r_m\}$ since it is finite.

Claim: $\mathcal{A} \cap \mathcal{R}$ is c.e. Consider Turing machine M that enumerates \mathcal{R} . Whenever M halts, concatenate machine N to execute after machine M :

- Machine N does not halt if M halts with r_k in $\mathcal{R} - \mathcal{A}$.
- For all other outputs where M halts, after machine N checks that M 's output is not in $\mathcal{R} - \mathcal{A}$, then N immediately halts.

Hence, $\mathcal{A} \cap \mathcal{R}$ is infinite and c.e., contradicting \mathcal{A} 's bi-immunity, so $\mathcal{A} \oplus \mathcal{R}$ must be infinite.

Condition (ii). Set $\mathcal{Q} = \mathcal{A} \oplus \mathcal{R}$.

By contradiction, suppose there exists an infinite, c.e. set \mathcal{B} with $\mathcal{B} \cap \overline{\mathcal{Q}} = \emptyset$. Then $\mathcal{B} \subset \mathcal{Q}$. Also, $\mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{R}$ is c.e. Now $\mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{R} \subset \mathcal{R} - \mathcal{A} \subset \overline{\mathcal{A}}$ which contradicts that \mathcal{A} is bi-immune, if $\mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{R}$ is infinite. Otherwise, $\mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{R}$ is finite. Set $K = \max(\mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{R})$. Then $\mathcal{B} \cap (\mathcal{A} - \mathcal{R})$ is infinite. Define the infinite, c.e. set $\mathcal{B}' = \{x \in \mathcal{B} : x > K\}$. Thus, $\mathcal{B}' \subset \mathcal{A}$ contradicts \mathcal{A} 's bi-immunity.

Similarly, by contradiction, suppose there exists infinite, c.e. set \mathcal{B} with $\mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{Q} = \emptyset$. Then $\mathcal{B} \subset \overline{\mathcal{Q}}$. Also, $\mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{R}$ is c.e. Thus, $\mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{R} \subset \mathcal{A} \cap \mathcal{R}$ which contradicts that \mathcal{A} is bi-immune if $\mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{R}$ is infinite. Otherwise, $\mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{R}$ is finite. Set $K = \max(\mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{R})$. Define the infinite, c.e. set $\mathcal{B}' = \{x \in \mathcal{B} : x > K\}$. Thus, $\mathcal{B}' \subset \overline{\mathcal{A}}$, which contradicts \mathcal{A} 's bi-immunity. \square

2.1 Rearrangements of Subsets of \mathbb{N}

This subsection continues to explore how to preserve non-mechanistic behavior with operations based on permutations. First, some definitions and results are developed about rearrangements of \mathbb{N} , induced by subsets of \mathbb{N} . These results are useful for understanding how to preserve bi-immunity. Finally, it is worth noting that the bi-immune rearrangements also generate an uncountable subgroup of the symmetric group on \mathbb{N} .

Let $k \in \mathbb{N}$. A permutation $\sigma_{(k)} : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ is generated from the identity permutation $\sigma_{\emptyset} = (0, 1, 2, 3, \dots)$ by transposing the k th entry and $k+1$ th entry of σ_{\emptyset} . Thus, $\sigma_{(k)}(x) = x$ when $x \notin \{k, k+1\}$ and $\sigma_{(k)}(k) = k+1$ and $\sigma_{(k+1)}(k) = k$.

This can be repeated on $\sigma_{(k)}$ where $\sigma_{(k,k+1)}$ is generated from transposing the $k+1$ and $k+2$ entries of $\sigma_{(k)}$. Thus, $\sigma_{(k,k+1)}(x) = x$ when $x \notin \{k, k+1, k+2\}$. Otherwise, $\sigma_{(k,k+1)}(k) = k+1$, $\sigma_{(k,k+1)}(k+1) = k+2$, and $\sigma_{(k,k+1)}(k+2) = k$. This leads to the simple observation that $\sigma_{(k+1)} \circ \sigma_{(k)} = \sigma_{(k,k+1)}$.

Consider the segment $[m, n] = (m, m+1, \dots, n)$ where $m < n$. Starting with σ_{\emptyset} , apply the aforementioned transposition step $n - m + 1$ times. Thus, $\sigma_{(m,m+1,\dots,n)}(x) = x$ when $x < m$ or $x > n+1$. Otherwise, $\sigma_{(m,m+1,\dots,n)}(k) = k+1$ when $m \leq k \leq n$ and $\sigma_{(m,m+1,\dots,n)}(n+1) = m$. From the prior observation, it is apparent that $\sigma_{(m,m+1,\dots,n)} = \sigma_{(n)} \cdots \circ \sigma_{(m+1)} \circ \sigma_{(m)}$. As examples, $\sigma_{(0,1)} = (1, 2, 0, 3, 4, 5, \dots)$ and $\sigma_{(4,5,6)} = (0, 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 4, 8, 9, 10, \dots)$.

It will be helpful to represent inverses with the same construction. First, $\sigma_{(k)}$ is its own inverse. $\sigma_{(k)} \circ \sigma_{(k)}(k) = \sigma_{(k)}(k+1) = k$ and $\sigma_{(k)} \circ \sigma_{(k)}(k+1) = \sigma_{(k)}(k) = k+1$. Also $\sigma_{(k)}(x) = x$ when $x \notin \{k, k+1\}$. Thus, $\sigma_{(k)} \circ \sigma_{(k)}(x) = x$ when $x \notin \{k, k+1\}$. Since function composition is associative, $(\sigma_{(x)} \circ \sigma_{(y)}) \circ (\sigma_{(y)} \circ \sigma_{(x)}) = \sigma_{(x)} \circ (\sigma_{(y)} \circ \sigma_{(y)}) \circ \sigma_{(x)} = \sigma_{\emptyset}$. It was already verified that $\sigma_{(k+1)} \circ \sigma_{(k)} = \sigma_{(k,k+1)}$.

Observe that $\sigma_{(0,1)} = (1, 2, 0, 3, 4, 5, \dots) \neq (2, 0, 1, 3, 4, 5, \dots) = \sigma_{(1,0)}$. It is helpful to know when $\sigma_{(x)}$ and $\sigma_{(y)}$ commute. Lemma 2.3 helps explain why commutativity fails for more complicated permutations such as $\sigma_{(5,7,2,11,4,729)}$.

Lemma 2.3. *If $|x - y| > 1$, then $\sigma_{(y)} \circ \sigma_{(x)} = \sigma_{(x)} \circ \sigma_{(y)}$.*

Proof. W.L.O.G., suppose $x + 1 < y$. From above, $\sigma_{(y)}$ is the identity map outside of $\{y, y + 1\}$ and $\sigma_{(x)}$ is the identity map outside of $\{x, x + 1\}$. Thus, $\sigma_{(y)} \circ \sigma_{(x)}(k) = k = \sigma_{(x)} \circ \sigma_{(y)}(k)$ when $k \notin \{x, x + 1, y, y + 1\}$. When $k = x$, $\sigma_{(y)} \circ \sigma_{(x)}(x) = \sigma_{(y)}(x + 1) = x + 1$ because $x + 1 < y$. Also, $\sigma_{(x)} \circ \sigma_{(y)}(x) = \sigma_{(x)}(x) = x + 1$ because $x + 1 < y$. Similarly, $\sigma_{(y)} \circ \sigma_{(x)}(x + 1) = \sigma_{(y)}(x) = x = \sigma_{(x)} \circ \sigma_{(y)}(x + 1) = \sigma_{(x)} \circ \sigma_{(y)}(x + 1)$ because $x + 1 < y$. The remaining verifications hold for y and $y + 1$ because $x + 1 < y$. \square

When $x < y$, the previous proof and $\sigma_{(k,k+1)} = \sigma_{(k+1)} \circ \sigma_{(k)}$ together imply that $\sigma_{(y)} \circ \sigma_{(x)} = \sigma_{(x,y)}$. Although sequences with repeats won't be considered here, it is helpful to notice that $\sigma_{(x)} \circ \sigma_{(x)} = \sigma_{(x,x)} = \sigma_{\emptyset}$. In some later constructions, it will be useful to know when $\sigma_{(x,y)} = \sigma_{(y)} \circ \sigma_{(x)}$, and similarly when $\sigma_{(a_0,a_1,\dots,a_n)} = \sigma_{(a_n)} \cdots \circ \sigma_{(a_1)} \circ \sigma_{(a_0)}$.

Lemma 2.4. *If $x \leq y$, then $\sigma_{(x,y)} = \sigma_{(y)} \circ \sigma_{(x)}$.*

If $a_0 < a_1 < \cdots < a_n$, then $\sigma_{(a_0,a_1,\dots,a_n)} = \sigma_{(a_n)} \cdots \circ \sigma_{(a_1)} \circ \sigma_{(a_0)}$.

Proof. If $x \leq y$, then $\sigma_{(x,y)} = \sigma_{(y)} \circ \sigma_{(x)}$ was just verified. This covers the base case for $\sigma_{(a_0,a_1)} = \sigma_{(a_1)} \circ \sigma_{(a_0)}$. By induction, suppose $\sigma_{(a_0,a_1,\dots,a_{k-1})} = \sigma_{(a_{k-1})} \cdots \circ \sigma_{(a_1)} \circ \sigma_{(a_0)}$. Observe that $\sigma_{(a_k)} \circ \sigma_{(a_{k-1})} \cdots \circ \sigma_{(a_1)} \circ \sigma_{(a_0)}$ is generated by swapping the a_k entry and the $a_k + 1$ entry in $\sigma_{(a_{k-1})} \cdots \circ \sigma_{(a_1)} \circ \sigma_{(a_0)}$. Furthermore, $a_0 < a_1 < \cdots < a_{k-1} < a_k$. These two properties imply that $\sigma_{(a_k)} \circ \sigma_{(a_0,a_1,\dots,a_{k-1})} = \sigma_{(a_0,a_1,\dots,a_k)}$. Lastly, the induction hypothesis implies that $\sigma_{(a_0,a_1,\dots,a_k)} = \sigma_{(a_k)} \circ \sigma_{(a_{k-1})} \cdots \circ \sigma_{(a_1)} \circ \sigma_{(a_0)}$. \square

In general, $\sigma_{(y)} \circ \sigma_{(x)} \neq \sigma_{(x,y)}$ when $x > y$. When does equality hold? Consider the case $x > y + 1$. Similar to the proof in lemma 2.3, during the construction of $\sigma_{(x,y)}$, the first step swaps the x entry and $x + 1$ entry. When the second step swaps the y and $y + 1$ entry, this swap doesn't move the x and $x + 1$ entries because $x > y + 1$. Thus, if $x > y + 1$, then $\sigma_{(y)} \circ \sigma_{(x)} = \sigma_{(x,y)}$.

The remaining case is $\sigma_{(k)} \circ \sigma_{(k+1)}$. Both $\sigma_{(k)} \circ \sigma_{(k+1)}$ and $\sigma_{(k+1,k)}$ are the identity map outside of $\{k, k + 1, k + 2\}$. However, $\sigma_{(k)} \circ \sigma_{(k+1)} \neq \sigma_{(k+1,k)}$ on $\{k, k + 1, k + 2\}$, as shown in table 1.

Table 1: $\sigma_{(k)} \circ \sigma_{(k+1)}$ and $\sigma_{(k+1,k)}$

x	$\sigma_{(k+1)}(x)$	$\sigma_{(k)}(x)$	$\sigma_{(k)} \circ \sigma_{(k+1)}(x)$	$\sigma_{(k+1,k)}(x)$
k	k	$k + 1$	$k + 1$	$k + 2$
$k + 1$	$k + 2$	k	$k + 2$	k
$k + 2$	$k + 1$	$k + 2$	k	$k + 1$

Definition 2.2. *Sequence Rearrangement*

Let $\mathcal{A} = (a_0, a_1, \dots, a_k \dots)$ be a sequence of elements from \mathbb{N} , where there are no repeats i.e., $j \neq k$ implies that $a_j \neq a_k$. To construct $\sigma_{\mathcal{A}} : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$, start with $\sigma_{\emptyset} = (0, 1, 2, 3, \dots)$ where σ_{\emptyset} is the identity permutation. Similar to the above,

$\sigma_{\mathcal{A}}$ is constructed iteratively using each element of \mathcal{A} to generate a transposition. For a_0 swap the a_0 entry and the $a_0 + 1$ entry of σ_{\emptyset} . Thus, $\sigma_{(a_0)}(n) = n$ when $n \notin \{a_0, a_0 + 1\}$. Also, $\sigma_{(a_0)}(a_0) = a_0 + 1$ and $\sigma_{(a_0)}(a_0 + 1) = a_0$. Inductively, suppose $\sigma_{(a_0, a_1, \dots, a_{k-1})} = (b_0, b_1, b_2, \dots, b_k, \dots)$. Then to construct $\sigma_{(a_0, a_1, \dots, a_{k-1}, a_k)}$ from $\sigma_{(a_0, a_1, \dots, a_{k-1})}$ swap b_{a_k} and b_{a_k+1} .

Define $\sigma_{\mathcal{A}} = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sigma_{(a_0, a_1, \dots, a_{n-1}, a_n)}$. Since the elements of \mathcal{A} are distinct, this implies that for any m , there exists an N such that all elements $a_j \in \mathcal{A}$ and $a_j \leq m$ implies $j \leq N$. In other words, the $a_j \leq m$ have already appeared. Thus, there will be no more swaps for entries $\leq m$, so the $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sigma_{(a_0, a_1, \dots, a_{n-1}, a_n)}(m)$ exists for each m .

Lemma 2.5. *Let sequence $\mathcal{A} = (a_0, a_1, \dots, a_k \dots)$ with no repeats. Construct (b_0, b_1, \dots, b_n) , such that $b_k < b_{k+1}$, as a rearrangement of (a_0, a_1, \dots, a_n) . That is, as sets $\{b_0, b_1, \dots, b_n\} = \{a_0, a_1, \dots, a_n\}$. If $|a_j - a_k| > 1$ for each pair $j \neq k$, then $\sigma_{(a_0, a_1, \dots, a_n)} = \sigma_{(a_n)} \cdots \sigma_{(a_1)} \circ \sigma_{(a_0)} = \sigma_{(b_n)} \cdots \sigma_{(b_1)} \circ \sigma_{(b_0)} = \sigma_{(b_0, b_1, \dots, b_n)}$ for each n .*

Proof. The order of (a_0, a_1, \dots, a_n) can be rearranged so that the transpositions $\sigma_{(b_k)}$ are applied in increasing order $b_k < b_{k+1}$. Lemma 2.3 implies that $\sigma_{(a_n)} \cdots \sigma_{(a_1)} \circ \sigma_{(a_0)} = \sigma_{(b_n)} \cdots \sigma_{(b_1)} \circ \sigma_{(b_0)}$. Lemma 2.4 implies $\sigma_{(b_0, b_1, \dots, b_n)} = \sigma_{(b_n)} \cdots \sigma_{(b_1)} \circ \sigma_{(b_0)}$. Definition 2.2 and $|a_j - a_k| > 1$ for each pair $j \neq k$ implies that $\sigma_{(a_0, a_1, \dots, a_n)} = \sigma_{(a_n)} \cdots \sigma_{(a_1)} \circ \sigma_{(a_0)}$. \square

Definition 2.3. *Set Rearrangement*

Instead of starting with a sequence, a set $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathbb{N}$ is ordered into a sequence $(a_0, a_1, \dots, a_k \dots)$ according to $a_k < a_{k+1}$. This means a_0 is the least element of \mathcal{A} ; a_1 is the least element of $\mathcal{A} - \{a_0\}$; inductively, a_{k+1} is the least element of $\mathcal{A} - \{a_0, a_1, \dots, a_k\}$. Define $\prod_{k=0}^n \sigma_{a_k} = \sigma_{a_n} \circ \cdots \circ \sigma_{a_1} \circ \sigma_{a_0}$. Define $\sigma_{\mathcal{A}} = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \prod_{k=0}^n \sigma_{a_k}$. For the same reason as in definition 2.2, this limit exists and hence $\sigma_{\mathcal{A}}$ is well-defined. If \mathcal{A} is an infinite set, lemma 2.4 implies $\sigma_{\mathcal{A}} = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sigma_{(a_0, a_1, \dots, a_{n-1}, a_n)}$. As an example, $\sigma_{\mathbb{E}} = (1, 0, 3, 2, 5, 4, 7, 6, \dots)$.

$\sigma_{\mathcal{A}} : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ is one-to-one. $\sigma_{\mathbb{N}} = (1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, \dots)$ so $\sigma_{\mathcal{A}}$ is not always onto. \mathcal{A} is called a *tail set* if there exists an N such that $m \geq N$ implies $m \in \mathcal{A}$. Thus \mathcal{A} is a tail set if and only if $\sigma_{\mathcal{A}} : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ is not onto. Any tail set \mathcal{A} is Turing computable as shown in remark 2.1.

Remark 2.1. *A Turing Machine that computes a Tail Set*

Let n consecutive 1's on the tape, followed by a blank, correspond to the non-negative integer n . The machine starts in state q_0 . If the machine reads a 1, when in state q_k when $k < M$, then it moves one tape square to the right and moves to state q_{k+1} . If the machine reads a blank in state q_k , then if $k \in \mathcal{A}$, then it writes a 1 in this tape square and halts. Otherwise, $k \notin \mathcal{A}$ and the machine writes a 0 in the tape square and halts. If the machine reaches state q_M , then it stays in state q_M while still reading a 1 and moves one tape square to the right. If it reads a blank while in state q_M , then it writes a 1 and halts.

If \mathcal{A} is a bi-immune set, then \mathcal{A} is not a tail set and definition 2.3 implies that $\sigma_{\mathcal{A}} : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ is onto. $\sigma_{\mathcal{A}}$ is called a *bi-immune rearrangement*.

Remark 2.2. If \mathcal{A} is a bi-immune set, then $\sigma_{\mathcal{A}} : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ is a permutation.

Let $\mathcal{S}_{\mathbb{N}}$ be the symmetric group on \mathbb{N} . Set $\mathfrak{B} = \{\sigma_{\mathcal{A}} : \mathcal{A} \text{ is bi-immune}\}$. Set $\mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{B}} = \{H : H \supseteq \mathfrak{B} \text{ and } H \text{ is a subgroup of } \mathcal{S}_{\mathbb{N}}\}$. The bi-immune rearrangements \mathfrak{B} generate a subgroup $\mathfrak{S}_{\mathfrak{B}}$ of $\mathcal{S}_{\mathbb{N}}$. Namely,

$$\mathfrak{S}_{\mathfrak{B}} = \bigcap_{H \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathfrak{B}}} H \quad (1)$$

An interesting research question: what is the structure of $\mathfrak{S}_{\mathfrak{B}}$ inside of $\mathcal{S}_{\mathbb{N}}$? Since the bi-immune sets are uncountable, $\mathfrak{S}_{\mathfrak{B}}$ is uncountable. What are the conjugacy classes of $\mathfrak{S}_{\mathfrak{B}}$?

Definition 2.4. *Eventually Commutative*

Suppose set \mathcal{A} is ordered as $\mathcal{A} = \{a_0, a_1, \dots\}$ where $a_k < a_{k+1}$. Set \mathcal{A} is eventually commutative if there exists M such that for any $j \neq k$ where $j, k \geq M$ implies that $|a_j - a_k| > 1$.

Observe that if set \mathcal{A} is eventually commutative, then $\sigma_{\mathcal{A}} \circ \sigma_{\mathcal{A}} = \sigma_{(r_0, r_1, \dots, r_n)}$. Lemma 2.5 implies that the σ_j and σ_k with $j, k \geq M$ can be swapped with each element in $\sigma_{\mathcal{A}}$ until σ_j is next to σ_k .

In contrast to lemma 2.1, lemma 2.6 shows that $\sigma_R(\mathcal{A})$ is bi-immune when \mathcal{A} is bi-immune and R is a computable set.

Lemma 2.6. *If R is computable and \mathcal{A} is bi-immune, then $\sigma_R(\mathcal{A})$ is bi-immune.*

Proof. $\sigma_R(\mathcal{A})$ is infinite because σ_R is one-to-one. Let $Q = \sigma_R(\mathcal{A})$. It remains to show that Q and \overline{Q} satisfy condition (ii). By contradiction, suppose $B \cap Q = \emptyset$ for some c.e. set B . Note that σ_R^{-1} is Turing computable because σ_R is Turing computable. Thus, $\sigma_R^{-1}(B)$ is c.e. Now $\sigma_R^{-1}(B) \cap \mathcal{A} = \emptyset$ because σ_R^{-1} is one-to-one and $\sigma_R^{-1}(Q) = \mathcal{A}$. This contradicts that \mathcal{A} is bi-immune.

A similar argument holds for \overline{Q} . By contradiction, suppose $B \cap \overline{Q} = \emptyset$ for some c.e. set B . Then $B \subset Q$. Since $\sigma_R^{-1}(Q) = \mathcal{A}$, then $\sigma_R^{-1}(B) \subset \mathcal{A}$, which implies that $\sigma_R^{-1}(B) \cap \overline{\mathcal{A}} = \emptyset$. This contradicts that \mathcal{A} is bi-immune. \square

Definition 2.5. A permutation $\sigma : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ is *finite* if there exists $M \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\sigma(x) = x$ when $x > M$. σ is called a *consecutive cycle* if it is finite and $\sigma = (m, m+1, \dots, n)$. In other words, $\sigma(k) = k+1$ when $m \leq k < n$, $\sigma(n) = m$ and $\sigma(x) = x$ when $x < m$ or $x > n$. Consider consecutive cycles $(m_1 \dots n_1)$ and $(m_2 \dots n_2)$. Suppose $n_1 < n_2$. These cycles are *disconnected* if $m_2 - n_1 > 1$. Consecutive cycles as a composition $\dots (m_k \dots n_k) \circ \dots \circ (m_2 \dots n_2) \circ (m_1 \dots n_1)$ are *increasing* if $m_{j+1} > m_j$ for each $j \geq 1$.

Lemma 2.7. *If \mathcal{A} is bi-immune, then $\sigma_{\mathcal{A}}$ is an infinite composition of disconnected, increasing, consecutive cycles.*

Proof. Lemma 2.7 follows from the previous definitions and lemmas. \square

Remark 2.3. If \mathcal{A} is bi-immune, then $\sigma_{\mathcal{A}}(\mathbb{E})$ is Borel-1 normal.

\mathbb{E} equals $(1010\dots)$ when identified as a binary sequence, so this remark follows from lemma 2.7.

References

- [1] Rodney Downey and Denis Hirschfeldt. *Algorithmic Randomness and Complexity*. Springer-Verlag. 2010.
- [2] Michael Stephen Fiske. Quantum Random Active Element Machine. *Unconventional Computation and Natural Computation*. LNCS 7956. Springer, 2013, 252–254.
- [3] Michael Stephen Fiske. Turing Incomputable Computation. *Turing-100 Proceedings: The Alan Turing Centenary*. EasyChair. **10**, 2012, 69–91.
- [4] Miguel Herrero-Collantes and Juan Carlos Garcia-Escartin. Quantum random number generators. *Reviews of Modern Physics*. **89**(1), 015004, APS, Feb. 22, 2017.
- [5] Hartley Rogers, Jr. *Theory of Recursive Functions and Effective Computability*. MIT Press. 1987.
- [6] Alan M. Turing. On computable numbers, with an application to the Entscheidungsproblem. *Proceedings of the London Mathematical Society*. Series 2 **42** (Parts 3 and 4), 1936, 230–265.