

Reverse Mathematics of the uncountability of \mathbb{R}^*

Sam Sanders¹

Department of Philosophy II, RUB Bochum, Germany
sasander@me.com
<https://sasander.wixsite.com/academic>

Abstract. In his first set theory paper (1874), Cantor establishes the uncountability of \mathbb{R} . We study the latter in Kohlenbach’s *higher-order* Reverse Mathematics, motivated by the observation that one cannot study concepts like ‘arbitrary mappings from \mathbb{R} to \mathbb{N} ’ in second-order Reverse Mathematics. Now, it was recently shown that the statement

NIN : *there is no injection from $[0, 1]$ to \mathbb{N}*

is *hard to prove* in terms of conventional comprehension. In this paper, we show that NIN is *robust* by establishing equivalences between NIN and NIN restricted to mainstream function classes, like: bounded variation, semi-continuity, and Borel. Thus, the aforementioned hardness of NIN is **not** due to the quantification over *arbitrary* $\mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ -functions in NIN . Finally, we also study NBI , the restriction of NIN to *bijections*, and the connection to Cousin’s lemma and Jordan’s decomposition theorem.

1 Introduction and preliminaries

1.1 Aim and motivation

In a nutshell, we study the *the uncountability of \mathbb{R}* from the point of view of *Reverse Mathematics*. We now explain the aforementioned italicised notions.

First of all, Reverse Mathematics (RM hereafter) is a program in the foundations of mathematics initiated by Friedman ([11, 12]) and developed extensively by Simpson and others ([34, 35]); an introduction to RM for the ‘mathematician in the street’ is in [36]. In a nutshell, RM seeks to identify the minimum axioms needed to prove theorems of ordinary, i.e. non-set theoretic, mathematics. We assume basic familiarity with RM, including Kohlenbach’s *higher-order* RM introduced in [18], with more recent results -including our own- in [26–29, 31, 32].

Now, the biggest difference between ‘classical’ RM and higher-order RM is that the former makes use of L_2 , the language of *second-order* arithmetic, while the latter uses L_ω , the language of *higher-order* arithmetic. Thus, higher-order

* This research was supported by the *Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft* (DFG) via the grant *Reverse Mathematics beyond the Gödel hierarchy* (SA3418/1-1). I thank Ulrich Kohlenbach and Dag Normann for all helpful advise regarding Section 2.1. I also thank the anonymous referees for their many helpful suggestions.

objects are only indirectly available via so-called codes or representations in classical RM. In particular, L_2 cannot talk about ‘arbitrary mappings from \mathbb{R} to \mathbb{N} ’. Thus, Simpson (only) proves that the real numbers \mathbb{R} cannot be enumerated as a sequence in classical RM (see [35, II.4.9]). Hence, the higher-order RM of the *uncountability of \mathbb{R}* , discussed next, is a natural (wide-open) topic of study.

Secondly, the uncountability of \mathbb{R} was established in 1874 by Cantor in his *first* set theory paper [6], which even has its own Wikipedia page, namely [39]. We will study the uncountability of \mathbb{R} in the guise of the following principles:

- **NIN**: *there is no injection from $[0, 1]$ to \mathbb{N} ,*
- **NBI**: *there is no bijection from $[0, 1]$ to \mathbb{N} .*

It was established in [29] that **NIN** and **NBI** are *hard* to prove in terms of (conventional) comprehension, as explained in detail in Remark 1. One obvious way of downplaying these results is to simply attribute the hardness of **NIN** to the fact that one quantifies over *arbitrary* third-order objects, namely $\mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ -functions.

In this paper, we establish RM-equivalences involving **NIN** and **NBI**, where some are straightforward (Section 2.1) and others advanced or surprising (Section 2.2). We also study the connection between **NIN** and *Cousin’s lemma* and *Jordan’s decomposition theorem* (Section 2.3). In particular, we show that **NIN** is equivalent to the statement that there is no injection from $[0, 1]$ to \mathbb{Q} that enjoys ‘nice’ mainstream properties like *bounded variation*, *semi-continuity*, and related notions. Hence, the aforementioned hardness of **NIN** and **NBI** is not due to the latter quantifying over arbitrary third-order functions as *exactly* the same hardness is observed for *mathematically natural* subclasses. A recent FOM-discussion initiated by Friedman via [13], brought about this insight, while our results establish that **NIN** is *robust* in the sense of Montalbán, as follows.

[...] gaining a greater understanding of [the big five] phenomenon is currently one of the driving questions behind reverse mathematics. To study the big five phenomenon, one distinction that I think is worth making is the one between robust systems and non-robust systems. A system is *robust* if it is equivalent to small perturbations of itself. This is not a precise notion yet, but we can still recognize some robust systems. All the big five systems are very robust. [...] Apart from those systems, weak weak König’s Lemma (WWKL_0) is also robust, and we know no more than one or two other systems that may be robust. ([23, p. 432])

Thirdly, as to the structure of this paper, we introduce some essential axioms and definitions in Section 1.2 while our main results may be found in Section 2. We note that some of our results are proved using IND_0 , a non-trivial fragment of the induction axiom from Section 1.2.1. It is a natural RM-question, posed previously by Hirschfeldt (see [23, §6.1]), whether these extra axioms are needed for the reversal. Neeman provides an example of the necessary use of extra induction in a reversal in [24]. We finish this introductory section with a conceptual remark.

Remark 1 (Conventional comprehension) First of all, the goal of RM is to find the minimal axioms that prove a given theorem. In second-order RM,

these minimal axioms are fragments of the comprehension axiom (and related notions), i.e. the statement that the set $\{n \in \mathbb{N} : \varphi(n)\}$ exists for a certain class of L_2 -formulas. Higher-order RM similarly makes use of ‘comprehension functionals’, i.e. *third-order* objects that decide formulas in a certain sub-class of L_2 . Examples include Kleene’s quantifier \exists^2 and the Suslin functional S^2 , to be found in Section 1.2.1. We are dealing with *conventional* comprehension here, i.e. only first- and second-order objects are allowed as parameters.

Secondly, second-order arithmetic Z_2 has two natural higher-order formulations Z_2^ω and Z_2^{Ω} based on comprehension functionals, both to be found in Section 1.2.1. The systems Z_2 , Z_2^ω , and Z_2^{Ω} prove the same second-order sentences by [15, Cor. 2.6]. Nonetheless, the system Z_2^ω **cannot** prove NIN or NBI, while Z_2^{Ω} proves both. Here, Z_2^ω and NIN can be formulated in the language of third-order arithmetic, i.e. there is no ‘type mismatch’. The previous negative result is why we (feel obliged/warranted to) say that *the principle NIN is hard to prove in terms of conventional comprehension*. Finally, NIN and NBI seem to be the weakest natural third-order principles with this hardness property.

1.2 Preliminaries

We introduce axioms and definitions from RM needed below. We refer to [18, §2] or [26, §2] for Kohlenbach’s base theory RCA_0^ω , and basic definitions like the real numbers \mathbb{R} in RCA_0^ω . As in second-order RM (see [35, II.4.4]), real numbers are represented by fast-converging Cauchy sequences. To avoid the details of coding real numbers and sets, we often assume the axiom (\exists^2) from Section 1.2.1, which can however sometimes be avoided, as discussed in Remark 10.

1.2.1 Some axioms of higher-order arithmetic First of all, the functional φ in (\exists^2) is clearly discontinuous at $f = 11\dots$; in fact, (\exists^2) is equivalent to the existence of $F : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that $F(x) = 1$ if $x >_{\mathbb{R}} 0$, and 0 otherwise ([18, §3]).

$$(\exists \varphi^2 \leq_2 1)(\forall f^1)[(\exists n)(f(n) = 0) \leftrightarrow \varphi(f) = 0]. \quad (\exists^2)$$

Related to (\exists^2) , the functional μ^2 in (μ^2) is also called *Feferman’s μ* ([18]).

$$(\exists \mu^2)(\forall f^1)[((\exists n)(f(n) = 0) \rightarrow [f(\mu(f)) = 0 \wedge (\forall i < \mu(f))(f(i) \neq 0)]) \quad (\mu^2) \\ \wedge [(\forall n)(f(n) \neq 0) \rightarrow \mu(f) = 0]].$$

Intuitively, μ^2 is the least-number-operator, i.e. $\mu(f)$ provides the least $n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $f(n) = 0$, if such number exists. We have $(\exists^2) \leftrightarrow (\mu^2)$ over RCA_0^ω and $\text{ACA}_0^\omega \equiv \text{RCA}_0^\omega + (\exists^2)$ proves the same L_2 -sentences as ACA_0 by [15, Theorem 2.5]. Working in ACA_0^ω , one readily defines a functional $\eta : [0, 1] \rightarrow 2^{\mathbb{N}}$ that converts real numbers to their¹ binary representation.

Secondly, we sometimes need more induction than is available in RCA_0^ω . The connection between ‘finite comprehension’ and induction is well-known from second-order RM (see [35, X.4.4]).

¹ In case there are two binary representations, we choose the one with a tail of zeros.

Principle 2 (IND₀) Let Y^2 satisfy $(\forall n \in \mathbb{N})(\exists \text{ at most one } f \in 2^{\mathbb{N}})(Y(f, n) = 0)$. For $k \in \mathbb{N}$, there is w^{1^*} such that for any $m \leq k$, we have

$$(\exists i < |w|)((w(i) \in 2^{\mathbb{N}} \wedge Y(w(i), m) = 0) \leftrightarrow (\exists f \in 2^{\mathbb{N}})(Y(f, m) = 0)).$$

Thirdly, the Suslin functional S^2 is defined in [18] as follows:

$$(\exists S^2 \leq_2 1)(\forall f^1)[(\exists g^1)(\forall n^0)(f(\bar{g}n) = 0) \leftrightarrow S(f) = 0]. \quad (S^2)$$

The system $\Pi_1^1\text{-CA}_0^\omega \equiv \text{RCA}_0^\omega + (S^2)$ proves the same Π_3^1 -sentences as $\Pi_1^1\text{-CA}_0$ by [32, Theorem 2.2]. By definition, the Suslin functional S^2 can decide whether a Σ_1^1 -formula as in the left-hand side of (S^2) is true or false. We similarly define the functional S_k^2 which decides the truth or falsity of Σ_k^1 -formulas from L_2 ; we also define the system $\Pi_k^1\text{-CA}_0^\omega$ as $\text{RCA}_0^\omega + (S_k^2)$, where (S_k^2) expresses that S_k^2 exists. We note that the operators ν_n from [5, p. 129] are essentially S_n^2 strengthened to return a witness (if existant) to the Σ_n^1 -formula at hand.

Finally, second-order arithmetic Z_2 readily follows from $\cup_k \Pi_k^1\text{-CA}_0^\omega$, or from:

$$(\exists E^3 \leq_3 1)(\forall Y^2)[(\exists f^1)(Y(f) = 0) \leftrightarrow E(Y) = 0], \quad (E^3)$$

and we therefore define $Z_2^\Omega \equiv \text{RCA}_0^\omega + (E^3)$ and $Z_2^\omega \equiv \cup_k \Pi_k^1\text{-CA}_0^\omega$, which are conservative over Z_2 by [15, Cor. 2.6]. Despite this close connection, Z_2^ω and Z_2^Ω can behave quite differently, as discussed in Remark 1. The functional from (E^3) is also called ‘ E^3 ’, and we use the same convention for other functionals.

1.2.2 Some basic definitions We introduce the higher-order definitions of ‘set’ and ‘countable’, as can be found in e.g. [27, 29, 31].

First of all, open sets are represented in second-order RM as countable unions of basic open sets ([35, II.5.6]), and we refer to such sets as ‘RM-open’. By [35, II.7.1], one can effectively convert between RM-open sets and (RM-codes for) continuous characteristic functions. Thus, a natural extension of the notion of ‘open set’ is to allow *arbitrary* (possibly discontinuous) characteristic functions, as is done in e.g. [27, 31]. To make sure (basic) RM-open sets have characteristic functions, we shall always assume ACA_0^ω when necessary.

Definition 3 [Subsets of \mathbb{R}] We let $Y : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ represent subsets of \mathbb{R} as follows: we write ‘ $x \in Y$ ’ for ‘ $Y(x) = 1$ ’.

The notion of ‘subset of $2^{\mathbb{N}}$ or $\mathbb{N}^{\mathbb{N}}$ ’ now has an obvious definition. Having introduced our notion of set, we now turn to countable sets.

Definition 4 [Enumerable sets of reals] A set $A \subset \mathbb{R}$ is *enumerable* if there exists a sequence $(x_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ such that $(\forall x \in \mathbb{R})(x \in A \leftrightarrow (\exists n \in \mathbb{N})(x =_{\mathbb{R}} x_n))$.

This definition reflects the RM-notion of ‘countable set’ from [35, V.4.2]. Note that given Feferman’s μ^2 , we can remove all elements from a sequence of reals $(x_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ that are not in a given set $A \subset \mathbb{R}$.

The definition of ‘countable set of reals’ is now as follows in RCA_0^ω , while the associated definitions for Baire space are obvious.

Definition 5 [Countable subset of \mathbb{R}] A set $A \subset \mathbb{R}$ is *countable* if there exists $Y : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ such that $(\forall x, y \in A)(Y(x) =_0 Y(y) \rightarrow x =_{\mathbb{R}} y)$. The functional Y is called *injective* on A or *an injection* on A . If $Y : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ is also *surjective*, i.e. $(\forall n \in \mathbb{N})(\exists x \in A)(Y(x) = n)$, we call A *strongly countable*. The functional Y is then called *bijective* on A or *a bijection* on A .

The first part of Definition 5 is from Kunen’s set theory textbook ([20, p. 63]) and the second part is taken from Hrbacek-Jech’s set theory textbook [14] (where the term ‘countable’ is used instead of ‘strongly countable’). According to Veldman ([38, p. 292]), Brouwer studied set theory based on injections. Hereafter, ‘strongly countable’ and ‘countable’ shall exclusively refer to Definition 5.

Finally, note that the principles NIN and NBI from Section 1 have now been defined. We have previously studied the RM of cocode_i for $i = 0, 1$ in [29, 31], where the index $i = 0$ expresses that a countable set in the unit interval can be enumerated (for $i = 1$, we restrict to strongly countable sets).

2 Main results

We establish the results sketched in Section 1.1. We generally assume (\exists^2) from Section 1.2.1 to avoid the technical details involved in the representation of sets and real numbers. Given that NIN cannot be proved in Z_2^ω by Remark 1, this seems like a weak assumption.

2.1 Basic robustness results

In this section, we show that NIN, NBI, and related principles are relatively robust when it comes to the domain of the mappings therein.

First of all, let NIN^X express that there is no injection $Y : X \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$, for X equal to either the reals \mathbb{R} , Cantor space $2^{\mathbb{N}}$ (also denoted as C), or Baire space $\mathbb{N}^{\mathbb{N}}$.

Theorem 6 *The system ACA_0^ω proves $\text{NIN} \leftrightarrow \text{NIN}^C \leftrightarrow \text{NIN}^{\mathbb{N}^{\mathbb{N}}} \leftrightarrow \text{NIN}^{\mathbb{R}}$.*

Proof. First of all, $\text{NIN} \rightarrow \text{NIN}^{\mathbb{R}}$ and $\text{NIN}^C \rightarrow \text{NIN}^{\mathbb{N}^{\mathbb{N}}}$ are trivial, while $\text{NIN}^{\mathbb{R}} \rightarrow \text{NIN}$ follows by considering the injection $\frac{1}{2}(1 + \frac{x}{1+|x|})$ from \mathbb{R} to $(0, 1)$.

Secondly, assume NIN and use the usual interval-halving technique (using \exists^2) to obtain $\eta : [0, 1] \rightarrow 2^{\mathbb{N}}$ such that $\eta(x)$ is the binary representation of $x \in [0, 1]$, choosing a tail of zeros in the non-unique case. Fix $Y : 2^{\mathbb{N}} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ and define $Z : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ as $Z(x) := Y(\eta(x))$, which satisfies the axiom of extensionality² on \mathbb{R} by definition. By NIN, there are $x, y \in [0, 1]$ with $x \neq_{\mathbb{R}} y$ and $Z(x) = Z(y)$. Clearly, $\eta(x) \neq_1 \eta(y)$ and $Y(\eta(x)) = Y(\eta(y))$, and NIN^C follows.

Thirdly, assume NIN^C , fix $Z : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ and let $(q_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a list of all rational numbers with non-unique binary representation. Define $Y : 2^{\mathbb{N}} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$

² Functions $F : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ are represented by $\Phi : \mathbb{N}^{\mathbb{N}} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}^{\mathbb{N}}$ mapping equal reals to equal reals, i.e. extensionality as in $(\forall x, y \in \mathbb{R})(x =_{\mathbb{R}} y \rightarrow \Phi(x) =_{\mathbb{R}} \Phi(y))$ (see [18, p. 289]).

as follows: $Y(f) := 3Z(\mathfrak{r}(f))$ in case $\mathfrak{r}(f) := \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{f(n)}{2^{n+1}}$ has a unique binary representation, $Y(f) := 3n + 1$ in case $\mathfrak{r}(f) = q_n$ and f has a tail of zeros, and $Y(f) = 3n + 2$ in case $\mathfrak{r}(f) = q_n$ and f has a tail of ones. By NIN^C , there are $f, g \in 2^{\mathbb{N}}$ such that $f \neq_1 g$ and $Y(f) = Y(g)$. Clearly, this is only possible in the first case of the definition of Z , i.e. we have $Y(f) = 3Z(\mathfrak{r}(f)) = 3Z(\mathfrak{r}(g)) = Y(g)$. Since also $\mathfrak{r}(f) \neq_{\mathbb{R}} \mathfrak{r}(g)$, NIN follows and we obtain $\text{NIN} \leftrightarrow \text{NIN}^C$.

Finally, let $Y : 2^{\mathbb{N}} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ be an injection. For $f \in \mathbb{N}^{\mathbb{N}}$, define its graph $X_f := \{(n, f(n)) : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ in \mathbb{N}^2 and code the latter as a binary sequence \tilde{X}_f . Note that $f(n) := (\mu m)[(n, m) \in X_f]$ recovers the function f from its graph X_f . Modulo this coding, define $Z : \mathbb{N}^{\mathbb{N}} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ as $Z(f) := Y(\tilde{X}_f)$. By the assumption on Y , $Z(f) =_0 Z(g)$ for $f, g \in \mathbb{N}^{\mathbb{N}}$ implies $\tilde{X}_f =_1 \tilde{X}_g$, which implies $f =_1 g$, by the definition of X_f . Hence, $\neg \text{NIN}^C \rightarrow \neg \text{NIN}^{\mathbb{N}^{\mathbb{N}}}$, and we are done. \square

Similarly, cocode_0^X is the statement that any countable subset of X can be enumerated, while cocode_1^X is the restriction to strongly countable sets.

Theorem 7 (ACA_0^ω) For $i = 0, 1$, we have $\text{cocode}_i \leftrightarrow \text{cocode}_i^{\mathbb{R}} \leftrightarrow \text{cocode}_i^C$.

Proof. The implication $\text{cocode}_i^{\mathbb{R}} \rightarrow \text{cocode}_i$ is trivial while the (rescaled) arctangent function is a bijection from \mathbb{R} to $(0, 1)$, which readily yields the reversal.

Now assume cocode_0^C and let $Z : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ be injective on $A \subset [0, 1]$. The functional $Y : 2^{\mathbb{N}} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ defined by $Y(f) := Z(\mathfrak{r}(f))$ is clearly injective on $B := \{\eta(x) : x \in A\}$ where η is as in the proof of Theorem 6. Let $(f_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a list of all elements in B and note that $(\mathfrak{r}(f_n))_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is a list of all elements in A , i.e. cocode_0 follows. Note that if Z is bijective on A , then Y is bijective on B by definition, i.e. $\text{cocode}_1^C \rightarrow \text{cocode}_1$.

Next, assume cocode_0 , let $Y : 2^{\mathbb{N}} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ be injective on $A \subset 2^{\mathbb{N}}$, and define $Z(x) := Y(\eta(x))$. Then $Z : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ witnesses that $B = \{\mathfrak{r}(f) : f \in A\}$ is countable, and let $(x_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be an enumeration of B . This list is readily converted to a list of all elements in A via η and by noting that μ^2 can list all $f \in A$ such that $\mathfrak{r}(f)$ has a non-unique binary representation; we thus have cocode_0^C .

We now prove $\text{cocode}_1^{\mathbb{R}} \rightarrow \text{cocode}_1^C$. Let $Y : 2^{\mathbb{N}} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ be bijective on $A \subset 2^{\mathbb{N}}$ and let $(f_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be the list of all $f \in A$ such that $\mathfrak{r}(f)$ has a non-unique binary representation. Now define $D \subset \mathbb{R}$ as: $x \in D$ if either of the following holds:

- $x \in [0, 1]$, x has a unique binary representation, and $\eta(x) \in A$,
- there is $n \in \mathbb{N}$ with $x \in (n, n+1, n+2]$ and $x - (n+1) =_{\mathbb{R}} \mathfrak{r}(f_n)$.

Define $W : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ as $W(x) := Y(\eta(x))$ if $x \in [0, 1]$ and $W(x) := Y(f_n)$ in case $|x| \in (n+1, n+2]$ as in the second case of the definition of D . Then W is a bijection on D since Y is a bijection on A . The list provided by $\text{cocode}_1^{\mathbb{R}}$ for D now readily yields the list required for A as in cocode_1^C . \square

Finally, NBI^X is the statement that there is no bijection from X to \mathbb{N} , where X is e.g. \mathbb{R} or $\mathbb{N}^{\mathbb{N}}$. We have the following theorem.

Theorem 8 The system ACA_0^ω proves $\text{NBI} \leftrightarrow \text{NBI}^{\mathbb{R}}$ and $\text{NBI} \rightarrow \text{NBI}^{\mathbb{N}^{\mathbb{N}}}$.

Proof. The implication $\text{NBI} \rightarrow \text{NBI}^{\mathbb{R}}$ is immediate as the (rescaled) tangent function provides a bijection from $(0, 1)$ to \mathbb{R} . The inverse of tangent, called *arctangent*, yields a bijection in the other direction (also with rescaling), i.e. the first equivalence is immediate, as well as $\text{NBI} \leftrightarrow \text{NBI}^{\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}}$. We now define a (continuous) bijection from $\mathbb{N}^{\mathbb{N}}$ to $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ based on *continued fractions*. Intuitively, a sequence $(a_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ of natural numbers is mapped to the real $x \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ via the following (generalised) continued fraction:

$$x = a_0 + \frac{1}{1 + \frac{1}{a_1 + \frac{1}{1 + \frac{1}{a_2 + \ddots}}}} \quad (\text{CF})$$

The real $x \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ in (CF) exists in ACA_0^ω in the sense that there is an explicit function $F : (\mathbb{N}^{\mathbb{N}} \times \mathbb{N}) \rightarrow \mathbb{Q}$ such that $x =_{\mathbb{R}} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} F(f)(n)$, where $F(f)(n) \in \mathbb{Q}$ is essentially the continued fraction in (CF) ‘broken off’ after encountering a_n . The definition of F can be found in e.g. [22, Ch.1, p. 7-9]. One readily shows that the mapping defined by (CF) is a bijection from $\mathbb{N}^{\mathbb{N}}$ to $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ in ACA_0^ω . \square

We could prove similar results for *a countable set in the unit interval has measure³ zero*, which is intermediate between cocode_0 and NIN , which is shown in [31] as an illustration how weak NIN is. Nonetheless, we have the following result.

Theorem 9 (ACA_0^ω) *A countable set $A \subset [0, 1]$ has weak⁴ measure zero.*

Proof. Fix $A \subset [0, 1]$ and $Y : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ injective on A . For $\varepsilon > 0$, define $\varepsilon_n := \frac{\varepsilon}{2^{n+1}}$, $B := \{(a, b) \in \mathbb{R}^2 : \frac{a+b}{2} \in A \wedge |b-a| = 2^{-Y(\frac{a+b}{2})}\}$, and $Z((a, b)) := Y(\frac{a+b}{2})$. Clearly, this shows that A has weak measure zero, as required. \square

We say that a property holds *weakly almost everywhere* (wae) in case it holds outside a set of weak measure zero as in Footnote 4.

We finish this section with a conceptual remark regarding our base theory.

Remark 10 We have used ACA_0^ω as the base theory for the above results, since our notion of ‘set-as-characteristic function’ as in Definition 3 is poorly behaved in the absence of (\exists^2) . One *can* obtain equivalences over RCA_0^ω , and let us establish $\text{NIN}^{\mathbb{N}^{\mathbb{N}}} \rightarrow \text{NIN}^C$ over RCA_0^ω as an example via the following steps.

³ For $A \subset \mathbb{R}$, let ‘ A has measure zero’ mean that for any $\varepsilon > 0$, there is a sequence of closed intervals $(I_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ covering A and such that $\varepsilon > \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} |J_n|$ for $J_0 := I_0$ and $J_{i+1} := I_{i+1} \setminus \cup_{j \leq i} I_j$. This follows from the usual definition as used in mathematics.

⁴ For $A \subset \mathbb{R}$, let ‘ A has weak measure zero’ mean that for any $\varepsilon > 0$, there is a sequence $(\varepsilon_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$, a set B of closed intervals, and $Z : \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ injective on B , such that $(\forall a \in A)(\exists(b, c) \in B)(a \in (b, c))$ and $(\forall(b, c) \in B, \forall n \in \mathbb{N})(Z((b, c)) = n \rightarrow |b - c| \leq \varepsilon_n)$ and $\varepsilon \geq \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \varepsilon_n$. Given cocode_0 , this is the same as ‘measure zero’.

- Fix any $Y : 2^{\mathbb{N}} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$, which may or may not be continuous.
- In case Y is *continuous*, it is immediate that $Y(00\dots) = Y(00\dots 00*11\dots)$ for enough instances of 0 on the right.
- In case Y is *discontinuous*, use the results in [18, §3] to derive (\exists^2) over RCA_0^ω . We can now use the proof of Theorem 6 in ACA_0^ω .

The above proof of course heavily relies on the law of excluded middle.

2.2 Advanced robustness results

In this section, we show that NIN is equivalent to various restrictions involving notions from mainstream mathematics, like semi-continuity and bounded variation; we first introduce the latter.

First of all, an important weak continuity notion is *semi-continuity*, introduced by Baire in [2] around 1899. By [2, §84, p. 94-95], the notion of quasi-continuity goes back to Volterra; any cliquish function is the sum of two quasi-continuous functions. Moreover, while the limits in the following definition may not exist in RCA_0^ω , the associated inequalities always make sense.

Definition 11 [Weak continuity]

- $f : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is *upper semi-continuous* if for all $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}$, $f(x_0) \geq_{\mathbb{R}} \limsup_{x \rightarrow x_0} f(x)$.
- $f : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is *lower semi-continuous* if for all $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}$, $f(x_0) \leq_{\mathbb{R}} \liminf_{x \rightarrow x_0} f(x)$.
- $f : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is *quasi-continuous* (resp. *cliquish*) at $x \in X$ if for any $\epsilon > 0$ and any open neighbourhood U of x , there is a non-empty open ball $G \subset U$ with $(\forall y \in G)(|f(x) - f(y)| < \epsilon)$ (resp. $(\forall y, z \in G)(|f(z) - f(y)| < \epsilon)$).

Secondly, Jordan introduces the notion of *bounded variation* in [16] around 1881, also studied in second-order RM ([19, 25]). Moreover, Jordan proves in [17, §105] that functions of bounded variation are exactly those for which the notion of ‘length of the graph’ makes sense; the latter boast⁵ an even ‘earlier’ history. What is more, Lakatos in [21, p. 148] claims that Jordan did not invent or introduce the notion of bounded variation in [16], but rather discovered it in Dirichlet’s 1829 paper [8].

Definition 12 [Bounded variation] Any $f : [a, b] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ has *bounded variation* on $[a, b]$ if there is $k_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $k_0 \geq \sum_{i=0}^n |f(x_i) - f(x_{i+1})|$ for any partition $x_0 = a < x_1 < \dots < x_{n-1} < x_n = b$.

Functions of bounded variation have only got countably many points of discontinuity (see e.g. [1, Ch. 1]); Dag Normann and the author study this property in higher-order computability theory in [30]. In the latter, we also study regulated functions (called ‘regular’ in [1]), defined as follows (say in ACA_0^ω).

⁵ The notion of arc length was studied for discontinuous regulated functions in 1884 ([33, §1-2]), where it is also claimed to be essentially equivalent to Duhamel’s 1866 approach from [10, Ch. VI]. Around 1833, Dirksen, the PhD supervisor of Jacobi and Heine, provides a definition of arc length that is (very) similar to the modern one (see [9, §2, p. 128]), but with some conceptual problems as discussed in [7, §3].

Definition 13 [Regulated function] A function $f : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is *regulated* if for every $x_0 \in [0, 1]$, the ‘left’ and ‘right’ limit $f(x_0-) = \lim_{x \rightarrow x_0-} f(x)$ and $f(x_0+) = \lim_{x \rightarrow x_0+} f(x)$ exist.

Thirdly, Borel functions are defined in Definition 14; the usual definition of Borel set makes sense in ACA_0^ω , where (\exists^2) is used to define countable unions.

Definition 14 [Borel function] Any $f : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a Borel function in case $f^{-1}((a, +\infty)) := \{x \in [0, 1] : f(x) > a\}$ is a Borel set for any $a \in \mathbb{R}$.

Fourth, recall the induction axiom IND_0 from Section 1.2.2. Let Y be any property such that ‘ $f : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ satisfies Y ’ follows from ‘ f has bounded variation on $[0, 1]$ ’ and where this implication can be established over (say) ACA_0^ω .

Theorem 15 ($\text{ACA}_0^\omega + \text{IND}_0$) *The following are equivalent to NIN:*

- NIN_{bv} : *there is no injection from $[0, 1]$ to \mathbb{Q} that has bounded variation,*
- NIN_Y : *there is no injection from $[0, 1]$ to \mathbb{Q} that has property Y ,*
- $\text{NIN}_{\text{Riemann}}$: *there is no injection from $[0, 1]$ to \mathbb{Q} that is Riemann integrable,*
- $\text{NIN}_{\text{Borel}}$: *there is no Borel function that is an injection from $[0, 1]$ to \mathbb{Q} ,*
- NIN_{reg} : *there is no injection from $[0, 1]$ to \mathbb{Q} that is regulated,*
- NIN_{cliq} : *there is no injection from $[0, 1]$ to \mathbb{Q} that is cliquish,*
- NIN_{semi} : *there is no upper semi-continuous injection from $[0, 1]$ to \mathbb{Q} ,*
- $\text{NIN}'_{\text{semi}}$: *there is no lower semi-continuous injection from $[0, 1]$ to \mathbb{Q} .*

Only the implications involving the final five items require the use of IND_0 .

Proof. As there is an injection from \mathbb{Q} to \mathbb{N} in RCA_0 , we only need to prove that $\text{NIN}_{\text{bv}} \rightarrow \text{NIN}$ over ACA_0^ω for the first equivalence. To this end, let $Y : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ be an injection and define $W : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{Q}$ by $W(x) := \frac{1}{2^{Y(x)+1}}$. Then W has bounded variation with upper bound 2. Indeed, since Y is an injection on $[0, 1]$, any sum $\sum_{i=0}^n |W(x_i) - W(x_{i+1})|$ is at most $\sum_{i=0}^n \frac{1}{2^{i+1}}$. By NIN_{bv} , there are $x, y \in [0, 1]$ with $x \neq_{\mathbb{R}} y$ and $W(x) =_{\mathbb{Q}} W(y)$. This implies the contradiction $Y(x) =_0 Y(y)$, and $\text{NIN} \leftrightarrow \text{NIN}_{\text{bv}}$ follows. For $\text{NIN}_{\text{Riemann}} \rightarrow \text{NIN}$, the function W is Riemann integrable following the ε - δ -definition. Indeed, fix $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ and find $k_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\frac{1}{2^{k_0}} < \varepsilon_0$. Since Y is an injection, if P is a partition of $[0, 1]$ consisting of $|P|$ -many points and with mesh $\|P\| \leq \frac{1}{2^{k_0}}$, it is immediate that the Riemann sum $S(W, P)$ is smaller than $\frac{1}{2^{k_0}} \sum_{n=0}^{|P|} \frac{1}{2^{n+1}}$, which is at most $\frac{1}{2^{k_0}}$.

For the implication $\text{NIN}_{\text{semi}} \rightarrow \text{NIN}$, consider the same $W : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and note that $[\limsup_{x \rightarrow x_0} W(x)] =_{\mathbb{R}} 0 <_{\mathbb{R}} W(x_0)$ for any $x_0 \in [0, 1]$ in case $Y : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ is an injection. Hence, $W(x)$ is upper semi-continuous and $Z(x) := 1 - W(x)$ is similarly *lower* semi-continuous, since $[\liminf_{x \rightarrow x_0} Z(x)] =_{\mathbb{R}} 1 >_{\mathbb{R}} Z(x_0)$ for any $x_0 \in [0, 1]$. The finite sequences provided by IND_0 seem essential to establish these semi-continuity claims. One proves $\text{NIN}_{\text{cliq}} \rightarrow \text{NIN}$ in the same way, namely using IND_0 to exclude the finitely many ‘too large’ function values. For the implication $\text{NIN}_{\text{Borel}} \rightarrow \text{NIN}$, note that for an injection $Y : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ the above function $W(x)$ is Borel as $W^{-1}((a, +\infty))$ for any $a \in \mathbb{R}$ is either finite or $[0, 1]$, and that these are Borel sets is immediate in $\text{ACA}_0^\omega + \text{IND}_0$. For

the implication $\text{NIN}_{\text{reg}} \rightarrow \text{NIN}$, consider the same $W : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and note that $W(0+) = W(1-) = W(x+) = W(x-) = 0$ for $x \in (0, 1)$ in the same way as for the semi-continuity of W . Thus, W is regulated and we are done. \square

As noted above, a function has bounded variation iff it has finite arc length. The proof of this equivalence ([1, Prop. 3.28]) goes through in RCA_0^ω , i.e. we may replace ‘bounded variation’ by ‘finite arc length’ in the previous theorem.

Fifth, we say that a function has *total variation equal to* $a \in \mathbb{R}$ in case the supremum over all partitions of $\sum_{i=0}^n |f(x_i) - f(x_{i+1})|$ in Def. 12 equals a .

Corollary 16 ($\text{ACA}_0^\omega + \text{IND}_0$) *The following are equivalent to NBI:*

- $\text{NBI}_{\text{Riemann}}$: *there is no bijection from $[0, 1]$ to \mathbb{Q} that is Riemann integrable,*
- NBI_{bv} : *there is no injection from $[0, 1]$ to \mathbb{Q} that has total variation 1,*
- $\text{NBI}_{\text{Borel}}$: *there is no Borel function that is a bijection from $[0, 1]$ to \mathbb{Q} ,*
- NBI_{cliq} : *there is no bijection from $[0, 1]$ to \mathbb{Q} that is cliquish,*
- NBI_{semi} : *there is no upper semi-continuous bijection from $[0, 1]$ to \mathbb{Q} ,*
- $\text{NBI}'_{\text{semi}}$: *there is no lower semi-continuous bijection from $[0, 1]$ to \mathbb{Q} .*

Only the implications involving the final four items require the use of IND_0 .

Proof. For the first equivalence, $W : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ from the proof has total variation *exactly* 1 in case Y is also surjective. The other equivalences are now immediate by the proof of the theorem. \square

As an intermediate conclusion, one readily proves that there are no *continuous* injections from \mathbb{R} to \mathbb{Q} (say over ACA_0^ω). However, Theorem 15 and Corollary 16 show that admitting countably many points of discontinuity, one obtains principles that are extremely hard to prove following Remark 1.

Finally, one can greatly generalise Theorem 15 based on Remark 17. Indeed, there are many spaces intermediate between bounded variation and regulated, each of which yields a natural and equivalent restriction of NIN .

Remark 17 (Intermediate spaces) The following spaces are intermediate between bounded variation and regulated; all details may be found in [1]. Wiener spaces from mathematical physics are based on *p-variation*, which amounts to replacing ‘ $|f(x_i) - f(x_{i+1})|$ ’ by ‘ $|f(x_i) - f(x_{i+1})|^p$ ’ in the definition of variation. Young generalises this to *ϕ -variation* which instead involves $\phi(|f(x_i) - f(x_{i+1})|)$ for so-called Young functions ϕ , yielding the Wiener-Young spaces. Perhaps a simpler construct is the Waterman variation, which involves $\lambda_i |f(x_i) - f(x_{i+1})|$ and where $(\lambda_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is a sequence of reals with nice properties; in contrast to bounded variation, any continuous function is included in the Waterman space ([1, Prop. 2.23]). Combining ideas from the above, the *Schramm variation* involves $\phi_i(|f(x_i) - f(x_{i+1})|)$ for a sequence $(\phi_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ of well-behaved ‘gauge’ functions. As to generality, the union (resp. intersection) of all Schramm spaces yields the space of regulated (resp. bounded variation) functions, while all other aforementioned spaces are Schramm spaces ([1, Prop. 2.43 and 2.46]). In contrast to bounded variation and the Jordan decomposition theorem, these generalised

notions of variation have no known ‘nice’ decomposition theorem. The notion of *Korenblum variation* does have such a theorem (see [1, Prop. 2.68]) and involves a distortion function acting on the *partition*, not on the function values.

2.3 Connections to mainstream mathematics

We establish the connection between NIN and two theorems from mainstream mathematics, namely *Cousin’s lemma* and *Jordan’s decomposition theorem*.

First of all, our results have significant implications for the RM of Cousin’s lemma. Indeed, as shown in [26], Z_2^ω cannot prove Cousin’s lemma as follows:

$$(\forall \Psi : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+)(\exists y_0, \dots, y_k \in [0, 1])([0, 1] \subset \cup_{i \leq k} B(y_i, \Psi(y_i))), \quad (\text{HBU})$$

which expresses that the *canonical covering* $\cup_{x \in [0, 1]} B(x, \Psi(x))$ has a finite sub-covering, namely given by $y_0, \dots, y_k \in [0, 1]$. In [4], it is shown that HBU formulated using *second-order codes* for Borel functions is provable in ATR_0 plus some induction. We now show that this result from [4] is entirely due to the presence of second-order codes. Indeed, by Theorem 18, the restriction of HBU to Borel functions still implies NIN, which is not provable in Z_2^ω by Remark 1. To this end, let HBU_{semi} (resp. $\text{HBU}_{\text{Borel}}$) be HBU restricted to $\Psi : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ that are upper semi-continuous (resp. Borel) as in Definition 11 (resp. Def. 14).

Theorem 18 ($\text{ACA}_0^\omega + \text{IND}_0$) *NIN follows from HBU_{semi} and from $\text{HBU}_{\text{Borel}}$; extra induction is only needed in the first case.*

Proof. Let $Y : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ be an injection and consider $\Psi(x) := \frac{1}{2^{Y(x)+3}}$, which is upper semi-continuous and Borel by the proof of Theorem 15. Now consider the uncountable covering $\cup_{x \in [0, 1]} B(x, \frac{1}{2^{Y(x)+3}})$ of $[0, 1]$. Since Y is an injection, we have $\sum_{i \leq k} |B(x_i, \frac{1}{2^{Y(x_i)+3}})| \leq \sum_{i \leq k} \frac{1}{2^{i+2}} \leq \frac{1}{2}$ for any finite sequence x_0, \dots, x_k of distinct reals in $[0, 1]$. In this light, HBU_{semi} and $\text{HBU}_{\text{Borel}}$ are false. We note that the required basic measure theory (for finite sequences of intervals) can be developed in RCA_0 ([35, X.1]). \square

We now show that we can replace ‘Borel’ by ‘Baire class 2’ in Theorem 18, assuming the right (equivalent) definition. Now, *Baire classes* go back to Baire’s 1899 dissertation ([2]) and a function is ‘Baire class 0’ if it is continuous and ‘Baire class $n + 1$ ’ if it is the pointwise limit of Baire class n functions. Baire’s *characterisation theorem* ([3, p. 127]) expresses that a function is Baire class 1 iff there is a point of continuity of the induced function on each perfect set.

Now let B2 be the class of all $g : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that $g = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} g_n$ on $[0, 1]$ and where for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and perfect $P \subset [0, 1]$, the restriction $g_n \upharpoonright P$ has a point of continuity on P . We have the following corollary.

Corollary 19 ($\text{ACA}_0^\omega + \text{IND}_0$) *We have $\text{HBU}_{\text{B2}} \rightarrow \text{NIN}$ where the former is the restriction of HBU to $\Psi : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ in B2 .*

Proof. Fix $A \subset [0, 1]$ and $Y : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ with Y is injective on A . Define $\Psi : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ as follows: $\Psi(x)$ is $\frac{1}{2^{Y(x)+5}}$ in case $x \in A$, and $1/8$ otherwise. Define Ψ_n as Ψ with the condition ' $Y(x) \leq n+5$ ' in the first case. Clearly $\Psi = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \Psi_n$ and $\Psi \in \mathbf{B2}$, as Ψ_n only has at most $n+5$ points of discontinuity (the set of which is not perfect in $\mathbf{ACA}_0^\omega + \mathbf{IND}_0$). For a finite sub-covering $x_0, \dots, x_k \in [0, 1]$ of $\cup_{x \in [0, 1]} B(x, \Psi(x))$, there must be $j \leq k$, with $x_j \notin A$. Indeed, the measure of $\cup_{i \leq k} B(x_i, \Psi(x_i))$ is otherwise below $\sum_{n=0}^k \frac{1}{2^{i+5}} < 1$, a contradiction as the required basic measure theory can be developed in \mathbf{RCA}_0 ([35, X.1]). \square

Secondly, Jordan proves the following fundamental theorem about functions of bounded variation around 1881 in [16].

Theorem 20 (Jordan decomposition theorem) *Any $f : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ of bounded variation is the difference of two non-decreasing functions $g, h : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$.*

Formulated using second-order codes, Theorem 20 is provable in \mathbf{ACA}_0 (see [19, 25]); we now show that the third-order version is *hard to prove* as in Remark 1.

Theorem 21 (\mathbf{ACA}_0^ω) *Each item implies the one below it.*

- *The Jordan decomposition theorem for the unit interval.*
- \mathbf{HBU}_{bv} , i.e. \mathbf{HBU} restricted to $\Psi : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ of bounded variation.
- \mathbf{NIN} : there is no injection from $[0, 1]$ to \mathbb{N} .

Assuming \mathbf{IND}_0 , we may replace the principle \mathbf{HBU}_{bv} by the following one:

- *For $f : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ of bounded variation, there is $x \in [0, 1]$ such that f is continuous (or: quasi-continuous) at x .*

Proof. The points of discontinuity of a non-decreasing function can be enumerated in \mathbf{ACA}_0^ω by [30, Lemma 3.3]. Now assume the Jordan decomposition theorem and fix some $\Psi : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ of bounded variation. If $(x_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ enumerates all the points of discontinuity of Ψ , then the following also covers $[0, 1]$.

$$\cup_{q \in \mathbb{Q} \cap [0, 1]} B(q, \Psi(q)) \cup \cup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} B(x_n, \Psi(x_n)).$$

The second-order Heine-Borel theorem (provable in \mathbf{WKL}_0 by [35, IV.1]) now yields a finite sub-covering, and \mathbf{HBU}_{bv} follows. Now assume the latter and suppose $Y : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ is an injection. Define $\Psi : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ as $\Psi(x) := \frac{1}{2^{Y(x)+3}}$. As in the proof of Corollary 19, any finite sub-covering of $\cup_{x \in [0, 1]} B(x, \Psi(x))$ must have measure at most $1/2$, a contradiction; \mathbf{NIN} follows and the first part is done.

For the second part of the theorem, we use the first part of the proof, namely that for $f : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ of bounded variation, the points of discontinuity can be enumerated, say by $(x_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$. By [35, II.4.9], the unit interval cannot be enumerated, i.e. there is $y \in [0, 1]$ such that $(\forall n \in \mathbb{N})(x_n \neq y)$. By definition, f is continuous at y . For the final implication, consider $\Psi : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ from the first part of the proof. The function Ψ is everywhere discontinuous in case Y is an injection; one seems to need \mathbf{IND}_0 to prove this. Similarly, Ψ is not quasi-continuous at any $x \in [0, 1]$, and we are done. \square

In conclusion, basic third-order theorems like Cousin’s lemma and Jordan’s decomposition theorem are ‘hard to prove’ in terms of conventional comprehension following Remark 1. Rather than measuring logical strength in terms of the one-dimensional scale provided by conventional comprehension, we propose an alternative *two-dimensional* scale, where the first dimension is based on conventional comprehension and the second dimension is based on the *neighbourhood function principle NFP* (see e.g. [37]). Thus, higher-order RM should seek out the minimal axioms needed to prove a given theorem of third-order arithmetic **and** these minimal axioms are in general a pair, namely a fragment of conventional comprehension and a fragment of NFP. This two-dimensional picture already exists in set theory where one studies which fragment of ZF and which fragments of AC are needed for proving a given theorem of ZFC. Note that ZF proves NFP as the choice functions in the latter are *continuous*.

Bibliography

- [1] Appell, Jürgen, Banaś, Józef, and Merentes, Nelson, *Bounded variation and around*, Vol. 17, De Gruyter, Berlin, 2014.
- [2] Baire, René, *Sur les fonctions de variables réelles*, Ann. di Mat. (1899), 1–123.
- [3] ———, *Leçons sur les fonctions discontinues*, Les Grands Classiques Gauthier-Villars, Éditions Jacques Gabay, 1995. Reprint of the 1905 original.
- [4] Barrett, Jordan, Downey, Rodney, and Greenberg, Noam, *Cousin’s lemma in second-order arithmetic*, Preprint, arxiv: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2105.02975> (2021).
- [5] Buchholz, Wilfried, Feferman, Solomon, Pohlers, Wolfram, and Sieg, Wilfried, *Iterated inductive definitions and subsystems of analysis*, LNM 897, Springer, 1981.
- [6] Cantor, Georg, *Ueber eine eigenschaft des inbegriffs aller reellen algebraischen zahlen*, J. Reine Angew. Math. **77** (1874), 258–262.
- [7] Coolidge, J. L., *The lengths of curves*, Amer. Math. Monthly **60** (1953), 89–93.
- [8] Dirichlet, L. P. G., *Über die darstellung ganz willkürlicher funktionen durch sinus- und cosinusreihen*, Repertorium der physik, bd. 1, 1837.
- [9] Dirksen, Enno, *Ueber die anwendung der analysis auf die rectification der curven*, Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin (1833), 123–168.
- [10] Dunham, J. M. C., *Application des méthodes générales à la science des nombres et à la science de l’étendue*, Vol II, Gauthier-Villars, 1866.
- [11] Friedman, Harvey, *Some systems of second order arithmetic and their use*, 1975, pp. 235–242.
- [12] ———, *Systems of second order arithmetic with restricted induction, i & ii (abstracts)*, Journal of Symbolic Logic **41** (1976), 557–559.
- [13] ———, *Remarks on reverse mathematics /1*, FOM mailing list (Sept. 21st, 2021). Website: <https://cs.nyu.edu/pipermail/fom/2021-September/022875.html>.
- [14] Hrbacek, Karel and Jech, Thomas, *Introduction to set theory*, 3rd ed., Monographs and Textbooks in Pure and Applied Mathematics, vol. 220, Marcel Dekker, 1999.
- [15] Hunter, James, *Higher-order reverse topology*, ProQuest LLC, Ann Arbor, MI, 2008. Thesis (Ph.D.)—The University of Wisconsin - Madison.
- [16] Jordan, Camille, *Sur la série de fourier*, Comptes rendus de l’Académie des Sciences, Paris, Gauthier-Villars **92** (1881), 228–230.

- [17] ———, Éditions Jacques Gabay, 1991. Reprint of the third (1909) edition; first edition: 1883.
- [18] Kohlenbach, Ulrich, *Higher order reverse mathematics*, 2005, pp. 281–295.
- [19] Kreuzer, Alexander P., *Bounded variation and the strength of helly’s selection theorem*, Log. Methods Comput. Sci. **10** (2014), no. 4, 4:16, 15.
- [20] Kunen, Kenneth, *Set theory*, Studies in Logic, vol. 34, College Publications, 2011.
- [21] Lakatos, Imre, 2015.
- [22] Lorentzen, Lisa and Waadeland, Haakon, *Continued fractions with applications*, Studies in Computational Mathematics, vol. 3, North-Holland, 1992.
- [23] Montalbán, Antonio, *Open questions in reverse mathematics*, Bull. Sym. Logic **17** (2011), no. 3, 431–454.
- [24] Neeman, Itay, *Necessary use of Σ_1^1 induction in a reversal*, J. Symbolic Logic **76** (2011), no. 2, 561–574.
- [25] Nies, André, Triplett, Marcus A., and Yokoyama, Keita, *The reverse mathematics of theorems of jordan and lebesgue*, The Journal of Symbolic Logic (2021), 1–18.
- [26] Normann, Dag and Sanders, Sam, *On the mathematical and foundational significance of the uncountable*, Journal of Mathematical Logic (2019).
- [27] ———, *Open sets in reverse mathematics and computability theory*, Journal of Logic and Computation **30** (2020), no. 8, pp. 40.
- [28] ———, *Pincherle’s theorem in reverse mathematics and computability theory*, Ann. Pure Appl. Logic **171** (2020), no. 5, 102788, 41.
- [29] ———, *On robust theorems due to Bolzano, Weierstrass, and Cantor in reverse mathematics*, Submitted, see <https://arxiv.org/abs/2102.04787> (2021), pp. 30.
- [30] ———, *Betwixt turing and kleene*, LNCS 13137, Proceedings of LFCS2022 (2022), pp. 18.
- [31] ———, *On the uncountability of \mathbb{R}* , To appear in the Journal of Symbolic Logic, arxiv: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2007.07560> (2022), pp. 40.
- [32] Sakamoto, Nobuyuki and Yamazaki, Takeshi, *Uniform versions of some axioms of second order arithmetic*, MLQ Math. Log. Q. **50** (2004), no. 6, 587–593.
- [33] Scheeffer, Ludwig, *Allgemeine untersuchungen über rectification der curven*, Acta Math. **5** (1884), no. 1, 49–82 (German).
- [34] Simpson, Stephen G. (ed.), *Reverse mathematics 2001*, Lecture Notes in Logic, vol. 21, ASL, La Jolla, CA, 2005.
- [35] ———, *Subsystems of second order arithmetic*, 2nd ed., Perspectives in Logic, Cambridge University Press, 2009.
- [36] Stillwell, John, *Reverse mathematics, proofs from the inside out*, Princeton Univ. Press, 2018.
- [37] Troelstra, Anne S. and van Dalen, Dirk, *Constructivism in mathematics i*, Studies in Logic and the Foundations of Mathematics, vol. 121, North-Holland, 1988.
- [38] Veldman, Wim, *Understanding and using brouwer’s continuity principle*, 2001, pp. 285–302.
- [39] Wikipedia, The Free Encyclopedia, *Cantor’s first set theory article*, Website: https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Cantor%27s_first_set_theory_article (2022).