

# HIGH STATIONARITY AND DERIVED TOPOLOGIES ON $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$

M. CATALINA TORRES

ABSTRACT. Let  $\kappa$  be an uncountable regular cardinal,  $\kappa \subseteq A$ . We study a notion of  $n$ -stationarity on  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$ . We construct a sequence of topologies  $\langle \tau_0, \tau_1, \dots \rangle$  on  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$  characterising the simultaneous reflection of a pair of  $n$ -stationary sets in terms of elements in the base of  $\tau_n$ . This result constitutes a complete generalisation to the context of  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$  of Bagaria's prior characterisation of  $n$ -simultaneous reflection in terms of derived topologies on ordinals.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

The study of combinatorial properties of  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa\lambda = \{x \subseteq \lambda : |x| < \kappa\}$  where  $\kappa$  denotes an uncountable regular cardinal and  $\kappa \leq \lambda$ , has a long history. Originating as a natural generalisation of combinatorial properties on a cardinal  $\kappa$  within the context of large cardinal notions (see [15, 16, 21]); considering strongly compact and supercompact cardinals as extensions of weakly compact and measurable cardinals, respectively, allows to generalise certain properties from a single cardinal,  $\kappa$ , to the pair of cardinals,  $\kappa$  and  $\lambda$ , and consequently to  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa\lambda$ . And leading later to the study of various related topics, including ideals, filters, stationary sets, and stationary reflection on  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa\lambda$  (see, e.g., [17, 7, 8, 13, 14, 19]). Therefore, the investigation of appropriate formulations for generalising properties from ordinals to the case of  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa\lambda$  is undertaken, aiming to yield compelling results with possible significantly higher levels of consistency strength.

In [1], Bagaria introduced the following iterated notion of stationary reflection for a given limit ordinal  $\alpha$ :  $A \subseteq \alpha$  is *0-stationary* in  $\alpha$  if and only if it is unbounded in  $\alpha$ . For  $\xi > 0$ ,  $A \subseteq \alpha$  is  $\xi$ -stationary in  $\alpha$  if and only if, for every  $\zeta < \xi$  and every  $S$   $\zeta$ -stationary in  $\alpha$ , there is  $\beta < \alpha$  such that  $S \cap \beta$  is  $\zeta$ -stationary in  $\beta$ . In [2], Bagaria, Magidor and Sakai showed that this stronger form of stationarity was tightly related with the notion of indescribability. They proved that in  $L$ , a regular cardinal is  $n + 1$ -stationary if and only if it is  $\Pi_n^1$  indescribable. Later on, in [3], Bagaria revisited  $n$ -stationarity on ordinals, this time in a stronger version. Given limit ordinal  $\alpha$ :  $A \subseteq \alpha$  is *0-simultaneously-stationary* (0-s-stationary for short) in  $\alpha$  if and only if it is unbounded in  $\alpha$ . For  $\xi > 0$ ,  $A \subseteq \alpha$  is  $\xi$ -simultaneously-stationary ( $\xi$ -s-stationary for short) in  $\alpha$  if and only if for every  $\zeta < \xi$  and every  $S, T$   $\zeta$ -stationary in  $\alpha$ , there is  $\beta < \alpha$  such that  $S \cap \beta$  and  $T \cap \beta$  are both  $\zeta$ -stationary in  $\beta$ . This yields a characterisation of  $\xi$ -simultaneous stationarity in

terms of the discreteness of derived topologies on ordinals.

Given a topological space  $(X, \tau)$ , the Cantor derivative operator is the map  $d_\tau : \mathcal{P}(X) \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(X)$  such that  $d_\tau(A) := \{x \in X : x \text{ is a limit point of } A \text{ in } \tau\}$ . For an ordinal  $\delta$ , the set  $\mathcal{B}_0 := \{0\} \cup \{(\alpha, \beta) : \alpha < \beta \leq \delta\}$  constitutes a base for a topology  $\tau_0$  in  $\delta$ , namely the interval topology. In [3] Bagaria constructed an increasing sequence of topologies  $\langle \tau_0, \tau_1 \dots, \tau_\xi \dots \rangle$  on  $\delta$  by means of successive applications of Cantor's derivative operator on the topological space  $(\delta, \tau_0)$ . The sets  $d_\xi(A) := d_{\tau_\xi}(A)$  for  $A \subseteq \delta$  are considered as new open sets at step  $\xi + 1$ , and unions are taken at limit stages. That is,  $\tau_{\xi+1}$  is defined to be the topology generated by  $\mathcal{B}_{\xi+1} := \mathcal{B}_\xi \cup \{d_\xi(A) : A \subseteq \delta\}$ , and  $\tau_\xi$  is defined to be the one generated by  $\mathcal{B}_\xi := \bigcup_{\zeta < \xi} \mathcal{B}_\zeta$  when  $\xi$  is limit ordinal.

Bagaria proved various properties of  $d_\xi$  acting on sets of ordinals, particularly on simultaneous stationary sets. He showed that for all  $A \subseteq \delta$ ,  $d_\xi(A) = \{\alpha : A \text{ is } \xi\text{-s-stationary in } \alpha\}$ . This result led to two of the main results of his paper: (*Theorem 2.11 in [3]*) *For every  $\xi$ , an ordinal  $\alpha < \delta$  is not isolated in the  $\tau_\xi$  topology on  $\delta$  if and only if  $\alpha$  is  $\xi$ -s-stationary in  $\alpha$ .* And (*Theorem 3.1 in [3]*) *For every  $\xi$ , an ordinal  $\alpha$  is  $\xi$ -s-stationary in  $\alpha$  if and only if  $\mathcal{I}_\alpha^\xi = \{x \subseteq \alpha : x \text{ is not s-stationary}\}$  is a proper ideal.* As a consequence, Bagaria also established a correlation between this new notion of stationarity and the completeness of **GLP** logics [3, 5, 6], underscoring its significance beyond the realm of set theory.

The investigation into higher stationarity on ordinals of [1, 2, 3] prompted an inaugural effort to define higher stationarity within  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$ . In [23], H. Brickhill, S. Fuchino and H. Sakai proposed a definition of  $n$ -stationarity in  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$ , where  $\kappa$  is a regular cardinal and  $\kappa \subseteq A$ . Additionally, they suggested the concept of indescribability in  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$ , given by Baumgartner in [4], as a potential means of capturing the equivalence (in  $L$ ) between indescribability and high stationary reflection -as demonstrated for the ordinal case in [2] and [3]- within  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$ . However, it was noted in [23] that, with this proposal, the consistency of this equivalence remained unknown. The authors also suggested in [23] an investigation into the consistency strength of  $n$ -stationarity in  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$ . Specifically, they asserted that if  $\kappa$  is  $\lambda$ -supercompact, then  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa \lambda$  is  $n$ -stationary for all  $n < \omega$ , leaving its converse as an open question.

In this paper, our focus lies on exploring the definition of  $n$ -stationarity proposed in [23], with the aim of extending the results obtained in [3] concerning derived topologies on ordinals to the context of  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$ . Specifically, we examine an equivalent version of this notion and establish that  $\kappa$  being weakly Mahlo is both a sufficient and necessary condition for demanding the 1-stationarity of  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$ . Furthermore, we observe that a similar condition for 2-stationarity may

require a jump in complexity on  $\kappa$ , illustrating the first analogy with the ordinal case. Our exploration reveals that  $n$ -stationary sets in  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$  exhibit connections among themselves and with club, stationary, and unbounded sets, mirroring the connections observed in the ordinal case. The only apparent exception is that a stationary subset of  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$  may not necessarily be 1-stationary, which, as we will later emphasise, does not constitute a significant obstacle to our purpose. Nevertheless, we found that 1-stationarity aligns with another form of stationarity: strong stationarity.

We extend the notion of simultaneous stationarity to  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$ , defining for each  $T \subseteq \mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$ , the set  $d_n^s(T)$  of points in  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$  where  $T$  is  $n$ -simultaneously-stationary. We prove that these sets behave exactly like the derivative sets in the ordinal case. Particularly, we establish an analogue of *Proposition 2.10* in [3], which served as the key to proving one of Bagaria's main results in [3]. This exploration sheds light on how to define a starting topology for  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$ . Therefore, we define a sequence of topologies on  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$  for which the sets  $d_n^s(T)$  coincide with the actual derivative sets on  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$ . These findings are summarised in Theorem 3.23 and Theorem 4.8, providing evidence for our successful and comprehensive attempt to generalise *Theorems 2.11 and 3.1* in [3] mentioned above.

In the last section, we present a sufficient condition for  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(\kappa)$  to be  $n$ -stationary for all  $n < \omega$ , namely,  $\kappa$  being totally indescribable. Recall that in the ordinal case, if  $\kappa$  is totally indescribable, it implies that  $\kappa$  is  $\xi$ -simultaneously stationary on  $\kappa$  for all  $\xi$ . Thus, our proof on  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$  serves as corroboration that  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$ , in the context of high stationarity, is also a general form of  $\kappa$  by identifying  $\kappa$  and  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(\kappa)$ . Finally, we provide a proof of the assertion made in [23], claiming that  $\kappa$  being  $\lambda$ -supercompact is a sufficient condition for  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa^\lambda$  to be  $n$ -stationary for all  $n < \omega$ .

We want to acknowledge that, simultaneously and independently, Cody, Lambie-Hanson and Zhang [10] defined a sequence of two-cardinal derived topologies and obtained results similar to those in Section 3 and 4 of the present article involving the relationship between various two-cardinal notions of  $\xi$ -s-stationarity and two-cardinal derived topologies.

## 2. NOTATION AND FRAMEWORK

Everywhere in the sequel  $\kappa$  denotes an uncountable regular cardinal, and  $A$  any set such that  $\kappa \subseteq A$ . Recall that  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$  denotes the set  $\{x \subseteq A : |x| < \kappa\}$ . In [15, 16, 17], Jech defined the following well-known notions for a set  $S \subseteq \mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$ ; (i)  $S$  is *unbounded* ( $\subseteq$ -*cofinal*) in  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$  iff for any  $x \in \mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$  there is some  $y \in S$  such that  $x \subseteq y$ . (ii)  $S$  is *closed* in  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$  iff for any  $\{x_\xi : \xi < \beta\} \subseteq S$  with  $\beta < \kappa$  and  $x_\xi \subseteq x_\zeta$  for  $\xi \leq \zeta < \beta$ ,  $\bigcup_{\xi < \beta} x_\xi \in S$ . (iii)  $S$  is *club* in  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$  iff  $S$  is closed and

cofinal in  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$ . And (iv)  $S$  is *stationary* in  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$  iff for any  $C$  club in  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$ ,  $S \cap C \neq \emptyset$ .

Originally, Jech employed the term “unbounded” for definition (i); however, in the present work, we opt for the terminology “ $\subseteq$ -cofinal” or simply “cofinal” to avoid confusion with the condition that  $S$  has the property that for any  $x \in \mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$  there is some  $y \in S$  such that  $y \not\subseteq x$ . While in the ordinal case these conditions happen to be equivalent, in the context of  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$  -due to a lack of total order- we do not have this correspondence.

The following are some well-known facts that can be found easily in the literature [17, 18, 20]. For every  $x \in \mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$ , the sets  $x \uparrow = \{y \in \mathcal{P}_\kappa(A) : x \subseteq y\}$  and  $\mathcal{C}_\kappa := \{x \in \mathcal{P}_\kappa(A) : x \cap \kappa \text{ is a regular cardinal}\}$  are club subsets of  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$ .  $C$  is a closed set of  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$  if and only if for every directed set  $T \subseteq C$  of cardinality  $< \kappa$ ,  $\bigcup T \in C$ . A set  $S \subseteq \kappa$  is unbounded (or closed, or stationary) in the sense of  $\kappa$  if and only if, it is cofinal (or closed, or stationary) in the sense of  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(\kappa)$ . Club subsets of  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$  generate a filter, the *club filter on  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$*  and we denote its corresponding dual ideal by  $NS_{\kappa,A}$ .

As mentioned in the introduction, Bagaria, in [3], employed the symbol “ $d$ ” to represent the Cantor derivative operator, which extracts from a given set the set of its limit points in a specific topology. However, for the sake of our presentation, we adopt the symbol “ $\partial$ ” for this operation. More precisely, for a topological space  $(X, \tau)$  and a subset  $A \subseteq X$ , we define  $\partial$  as  $\partial_\tau(A) := \{x \in X : x \text{ is a limit point of } A \text{ in the topology } \tau\}$ . This choice of notation allows us to reserve the symbol “ $d$ ” for denoting the set of higher stationary sets that we aim to equate with  $\partial_\tau(A)$ .”

### 3. HIGHER STATIONARY SUBSETS OF $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$

Bagaria’s definition of higher stationarity can be viewed as an iterative process, akin to the reflection of certain sets. The resemblance to an iteration of the notion of stationarity in ordinals arises because  $S$  is a stationary in an ordinal  $\alpha$  of uncountable cofinality if and only if, for all unbounded subset  $T$  of  $\alpha$ , there is some  $\beta \in S$  such that  $T \cap \beta$  is unbounded in  $\beta$ . This condition is referred to as 1-stationarity. Similarly, 2-stationarity corresponds to the reflection of 1-stationary sets or, equivalently, as the reflection of standard stationary sets. In this context, the concept of 2-stationarity holds notable significance, resonating with the extensive study of stationary reflection on ordinals. However, its implications, as elucidated in [3], primarily emerges from a novel approach: the iterative reflection of specific sets.

Reflection of stationary sets in  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$ , where  $A$  is an ordinal, has also been deeply studied by authors such as Jech, Sakai and Shelah [25, 19, 14, 24, 12]. Given that

any form of reflection in  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$  involves at least two parameters, namely  $\kappa$  and  $A$ , multiple definitions have been proposed. The proposal of extending the iterative process of reflecting certain sets within  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$  was introduced relatively recently by H. Brickhill, S. Fuchino, and H. Sakai, as presented in [23]. This particular concept is the one that captures our focus, as it closely relates to the aspect of [3] we aim to generalise.

**Definition 3.1.** (*H. Brickhill, S. Fuchino and H. Sakai [23]*) *Let  $n < \omega$  and  $\kappa$  be a regular limit cardinal such that  $\kappa \subseteq A$ .*

- (1)  $S \subseteq \mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$  is **0-stationary** (BFS) in  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$  iff  $S$  is cofinal in  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$ .
- (2)  $S \subseteq \mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$  is  **$n$ -stationary** (BFS) in  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$  iff for all  $m < n$  and all  $T \subseteq \mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$   $m$ -stationary in  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$ , there is  $x \in S$  such that
  - $\mu := x \cap \kappa$  is regular cardinal.
  - $T \cap \mathcal{P}_\mu(x)$  is  $m$ -stationary in  $\mathcal{P}_\mu(x)$ .

Here, the stipulation on  $\mu := x \cap \kappa$  is characterised by being a regular cardinal. In our contribution below, we introduce a refinement by requiring instead  $\mu := |x \cap \kappa|$  to be a regular limit cardinal. As a result, the converse of Proposition 3.8 also holds, thereby laying the groundwork for the ensuing results in this section. This modification does not constitute a significant change; almost everywhere in  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$  -inside a set of points of  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$  which complement is non-stationary- and for  $\kappa$  interesting enough, both definitions are equivalent, as we will demonstrate later in Proposition 3.10.

**Definition 3.2.** *Let  $n < \omega$  and  $\kappa$  be a regular limit cardinal such that  $\kappa \subseteq A$ .*

- (1)  $S \subseteq \mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$  is **0-stationary** in  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$  iff  $S$  is cofinal in  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$ .
- (2)  $S \subseteq \mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$  is  **$n$ -stationary** in  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$  iff for all  $m < n$  and all  $T \subseteq \mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$   $m$ -stationary in  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$ , there is  $x \in S$  such that
  - $\mu := |x \cap \kappa|$  is regular limit cardinal.
  - $T \cap \mathcal{P}_\mu(x)$  is  $m$ -stationary in  $\mathcal{P}_\mu(x)$ .

**Definition 3.3.** *For any  $T \subseteq \mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$ ,  $d_n(T) := \{x \in \mathcal{P}_\kappa(A) : \mu := |x \cap \kappa| \text{ is a regular limit cardinal and } T \cap \mathcal{P}_\mu(x) \text{ is } n\text{-stationary in } \mathcal{P}_\mu(x)\}$ .*

For the sake of readability, we will use the shorthand “ $S$  is  $n$ -stationary” instead of “ $S$  is  $n$ -stationary in  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$ ” whenever the context is evident.

**Lemma 3.4.** *If  $S \subseteq \mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$  is 1-stationary in  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$ , then  $S$  is cofinal in  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$ .*

**Proof :** Suppose  $S \subseteq \mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$  is 1-stationary and let  $y \in \mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$ . The set  $y \uparrow = \{z \in \mathcal{P}_\kappa(A) : y \subseteq z\}$  is club and in particular cofinal in  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$ . By 1-stationarity of  $S$ , there is  $x \in S$  such that  $\mu := |x \cap \kappa|$  is regular limit cardinal and  $y \uparrow \cap \mathcal{P}_\mu(x)$  is cofinal in  $\mathcal{P}_\mu(x)$ . Then  $\bigcup(y \uparrow \cap \mathcal{P}_\mu(x)) = x$ , and so  $y \subseteq x$ .  $\square$

**Definition 3.5.** Let  $n < \omega$  and  $\kappa$  be a regular limit cardinal such that  $\kappa \subseteq A$ .

- (1)  $S \subseteq \mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$  is **0-simultaneously-stationary** in  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$  iff  $S$  is cofinal in  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$ .
- (2)  $S \subseteq \mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$  is  **$n$ -simultaneously-stationary** ( $n$ -s-stationary for short) in  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$  iff for every  $m < n$  and every  $T_1, T_2 \subseteq \mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$   $m$ -s-stationary in  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$ , there is some  $x \in S$  such that
  - $\mu := |x \cap \kappa|$  is regular limit cardinal.
  - $T_1 \cap \mathcal{P}_\mu(x)$  and  $T_2 \cap \mathcal{P}_\mu(x)$  are both  $m$ -s-stationary in  $\mathcal{P}_\mu(x)$ .
- (3) For any  $T \subseteq \mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$ ,  $d_n^s(T) := \{x \in \mathcal{P}_\kappa(A) : \mu := |x \cap \kappa| \text{ is a regular limit cardinal and } T \cap \mathcal{P}_\mu(x) \text{ is } n\text{-s-stationary in } \mathcal{P}_\mu(x)\}$ .

Notice that, from the definitions above we get  $S \subseteq \mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$  is  $n$ -stationary in  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$  if and only if for all  $m < n$  and all  $T$   $m$ -stationary in  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$ ,  $S \cap d_m(T) \neq \emptyset$ . And,  $S \subseteq \mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$  is  $n$ -s-stationary in  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$  if and only if for all  $m < n$  and all  $T_1, T_2$   $m$ -s-stationary in  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$ ,  $S \cap d_m^s(T_1) \cap d_m^s(T_2) \neq \emptyset$ .

Simultaneous  $n$ -stationarity is evidently a stronger notion than  $n$ -stationarity; that is, if  $S \subseteq \mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$  is  $n$ -s-stationary in  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$ , then  $S$  is also  $n$ -stationary in  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$ . For the case  $n = 0$ , they are, in fact, the same. So, for any  $A \subseteq \mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$ ,  $d_0(A) = d_0^s(A)$ . A simple but very useful remark is that if  $S \subseteq \mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$  is  $n$ -s-stationary ( $n$ -stationarity) in  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$  and  $S \subseteq S^*$ , then  $S^*$  is also  $n$ -s-stationary ( $n$ -stationarity) in  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$ . Another useful and straightforward fact to prove is that for any  $U, V \subseteq \mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$  and  $n < \omega$ , we have  $d_n(U \cap V) \subseteq d_n(U) \cap d_n(V)$  and  $d_n^s(U \cap V) \subseteq d_n^s(U) \cap d_n^s(V)$ .

**Lemma 3.6.** If  $S \subseteq \mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$  is  $n$ -s-stationary in  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$ , then  $S$  is  $m$ -s-stationary in  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$  for all  $m < n$ . Consequently, for any  $U \subseteq \mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$  and every  $m < n < \omega$ ,  $d_n^s(U) \subseteq d_m^s(U)$ .

**Proof :** By induction. The case  $n = 1$  is trivial from above. Suppose we have the result for all  $k < n$ , take  $S \subseteq \mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$   $n$ -s-stationary and fix  $m < n$ . Let  $T_1, T_2 \subseteq \mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$  be  $l$ -stationary for some  $l < m$ . Since  $S$  is  $n$ -s-stationary and  $l < m \leq n$ , there is some  $x \in S$  such that  $\mu := |x \cap \kappa|$  is regular and  $T_1 \cap \mathcal{P}_\mu(x)$ ,  $T_2 \cap \mathcal{P}_\mu(x)$  are  $l$ -stationary in  $\mathcal{P}_\mu(x)$ . Therefore,  $S$  is  $m$ -s-stationary in  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$ .  $\square$

**Proposition 3.7.** ([23]) If  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$  is 1-stationary (BFS) in  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$ , then  $\kappa$  is weakly Mahlo.

**Proof :** Suppose that  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$  is 1-stationary (BFS) in  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$ . We will prove that  $R := \{\mu < \kappa : \mu \text{ is a regular limit cardinal}\}$  is stationary in  $\kappa$ . Let  $C$  be a club subset of  $\kappa$ , and consider the set  $T_C := \{y \in \mathcal{P}_\kappa(A) : \exists \alpha \in C \text{ such that } y \cap \kappa \subsetneq \alpha \leq |y|\}$ .

-  $T_C$  is cofinal in  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$  : Suppose  $y \in \mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$  and let  $\alpha \in C$  be such that  $y \cap \kappa \subsetneq \alpha$ . Consider  $\tilde{\alpha} := \{\delta \setminus \{0\} : \delta \in \alpha\}$ ; clearly,  $\tilde{\alpha} \cap \kappa = \{\emptyset\}$ . Now let  $z := y \cup \{\tilde{\alpha}\}$ ; then  $z \cap \kappa = (y \cup \{\tilde{\alpha}\}) \cap \kappa = (y \cap \kappa) \cup (\{\tilde{\alpha}\} \cap \kappa) = y \cap \kappa \subsetneq \alpha$ .

Moreover,  $\alpha \leq |\alpha| = |\tilde{\alpha}| \leq |y \cup \tilde{\alpha}| = |z|$ , whence  $z \in T$ . Hence, for every  $y \in \mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$ , there is  $z \in T$  such that  $y \subseteq z$ .

Hence, by 1-stationary (BFS) of  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$ , there is  $x \in \mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$  such that  $\mu := x \cap \kappa$  is a regular cardinal ( $\mu \in R$ ) and  $T_C \cap \mathcal{P}_\mu(x)$  is 0-stationary in  $\mathcal{P}_\mu(x)$ .

-  $C \cap \mu$  is unbounded in  $\mu$  : Let  $\gamma < \mu$ . Then,  $\gamma \in \mu = x \cap \kappa \subseteq x$ , and since  $\mu$  is regular cardinal,  $|\gamma| < \mu$ , whence  $\gamma \in \mathcal{P}_\mu(x)$ . Therefore, there is  $y \in T_C \cap \mathcal{P}_\mu(x)$  such that  $\gamma \subseteq y$  (and thus  $\gamma \subseteq y \cap \kappa$ ). As  $y \in T$ , there is some  $\alpha \in C$  such that  $y \cap \kappa \subsetneq \alpha \leq |y|$ . But then,  $\gamma \subsetneq y \cap \kappa \subsetneq \alpha \leq |y| < \mu$ . This is,  $\alpha \in C \cap \mu$  and  $\gamma < \alpha$ .

Now, since  $C$  is closed and  $C \cap \mu$  is unbounded in  $\mu$ , then  $\mu \in C$ . Therefore,  $\mu \in C \cap R$ , and so  $R = \{\mu < \kappa : \mu \text{ is a regular cardinal}\}$  is stationary in  $\kappa$ .  $\square$

**Corollary 1.** *If  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$  is 1-stationary in  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$ , then  $\kappa$  is weakly Mahlo.*

**Proof :** Analogous to the previous one. Since  $|x \cap \kappa| \subseteq x \cap \kappa$ , the fact that  $\mu := |x \cap \kappa|$  can be analogously used to prove that  $C \cap \mu$  is unbounded in  $\mu$ , and therefore  $\mu \in C \cap R$ .  $\square$

In the ordinal case, having uncountable cofinality was not only a necessary but also a sufficient condition for 1-stationarity. Consequently, when seeking an analogy in  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$ , the question arises: Can being  $\kappa$  weakly Mahlo be not only a necessary condition but also a sufficient condition for  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$  to be 1-stationary?

**Proposition 3.8.** *If  $\kappa$  is weakly Mahlo, then  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$  is 1-stationary in  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$ .*

**Proof :** Suppose that  $\kappa$  is weakly Mahlo. Then, the set  $R = \{\mu < \kappa : \mu \text{ is a regular limit cardinal}\}$  is stationary in  $\kappa$ . Take  $T \subseteq \mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$  be 0-stationary in  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$ , and construct the following transfinite sequence;

- $x_0 \in T$ .
- $x_{\alpha+1} \in T$ , such that  $x_{\alpha+1} \supsetneq x_\alpha \cup \alpha$ .
- $x_\gamma \in T$ , such that  $x_\gamma \supsetneq \bigcup_{\alpha < \gamma} [x_\alpha \cup \alpha]$ , for  $\gamma < \kappa$  limit.

This sequence is well defined; Successor and limit step may be performed since  $T$  is cofinal and  $\kappa$  is regular. Both  $|x_\alpha|$  and  $|\alpha| < \kappa$  implying  $x_\alpha \cup \alpha \in \mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$ . Moreover, since  $\gamma < \kappa$ , we get  $\bigcup_{\alpha < \gamma} [x_\alpha \cup \alpha] \in \mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$ . So defined,  $\langle x_\alpha : \alpha < \kappa \rangle \subseteq T$  is strictly increasing. Consider now the set  $U := \{\alpha < \kappa : \exists \beta < \kappa \text{ s.t. } |x_\beta| = \alpha\}$ .

-  $U$  is unbounded in  $\kappa$  : Let  $\delta < \kappa$ . As  $\kappa$  is a regular limit cardinal,  $|\delta|^+ < \kappa$ . Then,  $x_{|\delta|^+} \supsetneq x_{|\delta|} \cup |\delta|^+$ . Note that  $\delta < |\delta|^+ \leq |x_{|\delta|^+}| < \kappa$ . Then, for  $\alpha := |x_{|\delta|^+}| < \kappa$ , there exists  $\beta := |\delta|^+ + 1 < \kappa$  such that  $|x_\beta| = \alpha > \delta$ . Thus,  $\alpha \in U$  and  $\delta < \alpha < \kappa$ .

Now, since  $R$  is stationary in  $\kappa$ , there is  $\mu \in R$  such that  $U \cap \mu$  is unbounded in  $\mu$ . Then, we may construct a subsequence  $\langle x_{\beta_\alpha} : \alpha < \mu \rangle \subseteq \langle x_\alpha : \alpha < \kappa \rangle$  as follows; Pick a sequence  $\langle \delta_\alpha : \alpha < \mu \rangle$  of elements of  $U \cap \mu$  cofinal in  $\mu$ . For each  $\delta_\alpha$  with  $\alpha < \mu$  we fix  $\beta_\alpha < \kappa$  to be such that  $|x_{\beta_\alpha}| = \delta_\alpha$ . Notice that, since  $\langle \delta_\alpha : \alpha < \mu \rangle$  is

strictly increasing,  $\alpha < \alpha' < \mu$  implies  $\delta_\alpha = |x_{\beta_\alpha}| < |x_{\beta_{\alpha'}}| = \delta_{\alpha'}$  and so  $\beta_\alpha < \beta_{\alpha'}$ . Consequently, the sequence  $\langle \beta_\alpha : \alpha < \mu \rangle$  is also strictly increasing.

Define  $x := \bigcup_{\alpha < \mu} x_{\beta_\alpha}$ . Notice that  $x$  is the union of  $\mu$  many distinct sets, each of cardinality less than  $\mu$ , then,  $|x| = \mu$ . To conclude the proof, we will show that  $x$  is as expected:

- $\mu = |x \cap \kappa|$  : Since  $\langle \beta_\alpha : \alpha < \mu \rangle$  is strictly increasing,  $\mu \leq \bigcup_{\alpha < \mu} \beta_\alpha$ . Then,  $\mu \subseteq \bigcup_{\alpha < \mu} \beta_\delta \subseteq \bigcup_{\alpha < \mu} x_{\beta_\delta} = x$ , and so  $\mu \subseteq |x \cap \kappa|$ . Hence  $\mu \leq |x \cap \kappa| \leq |x| = \mu$ .
- $T \cap \mathcal{P}_\mu(x)$  is cofinal in  $\mathcal{P}_\mu(x)$  : Let  $y \in \mathcal{P}_\mu(x)$ . Then,  $y \subseteq \bigcup_{\alpha < \mu} x_{\beta_\alpha}$  and  $|y| < \mu$ . As  $|x| = \mu$  is regular,  $y$  is not cofinal in  $x$ . Then  $y \subseteq x_{\beta_\alpha}$  for some  $\alpha < \mu$ . But  $x_{\beta_\alpha} \subseteq \bigcup_{\alpha < \mu} x_{\beta_\alpha} = x$  and  $|x_{\beta_\alpha}| < \mu$ . Thus, there is  $x_{\beta_\alpha} \in T \cap \mathcal{P}_\mu(x)$  such that  $y \subseteq x_{\beta_\alpha}$ .  $\square$

Therefore, from Proposition 3.7 and Proposition 3.8, we get a complete characterisation of 1-stationarity for  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$ .

**Theorem 3.9.**  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$  is 1-stationary in  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$  if and only if  $\kappa$  is weakly Mahlo.  $\square$

Notice that, in the proof of Proposition 3.8 we can in fact start the sequence  $\langle x_\alpha : \alpha < \kappa \rangle$  with  $x_0 \supseteq y$  for any given  $y \in \mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$ . Thus at the end of the proof we will get  $y \subseteq x$  and  $|x \cap \kappa|$  is regular limit cardinal. Therefore, if  $\kappa$  is weakly Mahlo and  $T \subseteq \mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$  is cofinal in  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$ , the set  $\tilde{W} := \{x \in \mathcal{P}_\kappa(A) : \mu := |x \cap \kappa| \text{ is regular limit cardinal and } T \cap \mathcal{P}_\mu(x) \text{ is cofinal in } \mathcal{P}_\mu(x)\}$  is cofinal in  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$ . In particular  $R_\kappa := \{x \in \mathcal{P}_\kappa(A) : \mu := |x \cap \kappa| \text{ is regular limit cardinal}\}$  is cofinal in  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$ .

Furthermore, in the context of Proposition 3.8, assume that  $T \subseteq \mathcal{C}_\kappa = \{x \in \mathcal{P}_\kappa(A) : x \cap \kappa \text{ is a cardinal}\}$ . Since  $x = \bigcup_{\alpha < \mu} x_{\beta_\alpha}$  with  $x_{\beta_\alpha} \in T$  for all  $\alpha < \mu$ , we get that  $x \cap \kappa = \bigcup_{\alpha < \mu} x_{\beta_\alpha} \cap \kappa$  is a limit of cardinals, therefore a limit cardinal. Hence, if  $\kappa$  is weakly Mahlo and  $T \subseteq \mathcal{C}_\kappa$ , we also have that  $W := \{x \in \mathcal{P}_\kappa(A) : \mu := |x \cap \kappa| \text{ is regular limit cardinal and } T \cap \mathcal{P}_\mu(x) \text{ is cofinal in } \mathcal{P}_\mu(x)\}$  is cofinal in  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$ .

Given that  $\mathcal{C}_\kappa$  is a club subset of  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$  (and consequently, its complement is non-stationary), the subsequent proposition establishes the previously mentioned equivalence between Definition 3.1 and Definition 3.2.

**Proposition 3.10.** Let  $\kappa$  be weakly Mahlo and  $S \subseteq \mathcal{C}_\kappa$ . Then, the following are equivalent:

- (i) For all  $T \subseteq \mathcal{C}_\kappa$  cofinal in  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$ , there is  $x \in S$  such that  $\mu := |x \cap \kappa|$  is regular uncountable and  $T \cap \mathcal{P}_\mu(x)$  is cofinal in  $\mathcal{P}_\mu(x)$ .
- (ii) For all  $T \subseteq \mathcal{C}_\kappa$  cofinal in  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$ , there is  $x \in S$  such that  $\mu := |x \cap \kappa|$  is regular limit cardinal and  $T \cap \mathcal{P}_\mu(x)$  is cofinal in  $\mathcal{P}_\mu(x)$ .



(iii) For all  $T \subseteq \mathcal{C}_\kappa$  cofinal in  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$ , there is  $x \in S$  such that  $\mu := |x \cap \kappa|$  is regular limit cardinal and  $T \cap \mathcal{P}_\mu(x)$  is cofinal in  $\mathcal{P}_\mu(x)$ .

**Proof :** The proof of (ii) implies (i) and (ii) implies (iii) is immediate. Since  $x \in S \subseteq \mathcal{C}_\kappa$ , we have  $x \cap \kappa = |x \cap \kappa|$ , and so, (iii) implies (ii). We are left to prove (i) implies (ii): Assume that (i) holds, and suppose  $T \subseteq \mathcal{C}_\kappa$  is cofinal in  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$ . Then,  $W := \{y \in \mathcal{P}_\kappa(A) : \gamma := y \cap \kappa \text{ is regular limit cardinal and } T \cap \mathcal{P}_\gamma(y) \text{ is cofinal in } \mathcal{P}_\gamma(y)\}$  is cofinal in  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$ . By (i), there exists  $x \in S$  such that  $\mu := x \cap \kappa$  is regular uncountable, and  $W \cap \mathcal{P}_\mu(x)$  is cofinal in  $\mathcal{P}_\mu(x)$ . We will prove that condition (ii) is satisfied with  $x$  serving as a witness.

-  $\mu$  is regular limit cardinal : Suppose it is not, then  $\mu = \delta^+$  for some cardinal  $\delta$ . Since  $|\delta + 1| < \delta^+$ , then  $\delta + 1 \in \mathcal{P}_\mu(x)$ . Thus, there is  $y \in W \cap \mathcal{P}_\mu(x)$  such that  $\delta + 1 \subseteq y$ . But then,  $y \cap \kappa$  is a regular limit cardinal and  $y \cap \kappa < \mu$ . So that,  $\delta < \delta + 1 \leq y \cap \kappa < \mu = \delta^+$ , which is a contradiction since there are not limit cardinals between  $\delta$  and  $\delta^+$ .

-  $T \cap \mathcal{P}_\mu(x)$  is cofinal in  $\mathcal{P}_\mu(x)$  : Let  $z \in \mathcal{P}_\mu(x)$ , as  $\mu$  is limit  $z \cup |z|^+ \in \mathcal{P}_\mu(x)$ , then, there is  $y \in W \cap \mathcal{P}_\mu(x)$  such that  $z \cup |z|^+ \subseteq y$ . Then  $|z| < |z|^+ < |y \cap \kappa|$  and so  $z \in \mathcal{P}_{y \cap \kappa}(y)$ . Also, from  $y \in W$  we get  $\gamma := y \cap \kappa$  is regular limit cardinal and  $T \cap \mathcal{P}_\gamma(y)$  is cofinal in  $\mathcal{P}_\gamma(y)$ . Then, there is  $w \in T \cap \mathcal{P}_\gamma(y)$  such that  $z \subseteq w$ .  $\square$

**Proposition 3.11.** *Let  $\kappa$  be weakly Mahlo. If  $C$  be a club of  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$ , then  $d_0^s(C) = d_0(C) \subseteq C$ .*

**Proof :** Let  $x \in d_0(C)$ , then  $\mu := |x \cap \kappa|$  is a regular limit cardinal and  $C \cap \mathcal{P}_\mu(x)$  is 0-stationary in  $\mathcal{P}_\mu(x)$ . Then, for each  $a \in x$ , there is some  $y_a \in C \cap \mathcal{P}_\mu(x)$  such that  $\{a\} \subseteq y_a$ . As well, for each couple  $z = \{y, y'\}$  of elements of  $C$ , there is an element  $w \in C \cap \mathcal{P}_\mu(x)$  such that  $y, y' \subseteq w$ . Using axiom of choice, we may pick one of these  $w$  for each pair  $z$ . We will denote this choice by  $y_z$ .

We construct a sequence of subsets of  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$ . Let  $T_0 := \{y_a : a \in x\}$ , then  $|T_0| = |x| < \kappa$ .  $T_1 := T_0 \cup \{y_z : z \in [T_0]^2\}$ , then  $|T_1| = \max\{|T_0|, |\{y_z : z \in [T_0]^2\}|\} = \max\{|x|, |[T_0]^2|\} = \max\{|x|, |x|\} = |x| < \kappa$ . Suppose that for each  $i \in 0, \dots, n-1$  the set  $T_{i+1} = T_i \cup \{y_z : z \in [T_i]^2\}$  is such that  $|T_{i+1}| < \kappa$ . Then  $T_n := \{y_z : z \in [T_{n-1}]^2\}$  and clearly  $|T_n| = \max\{|T_{n-1}|, |\{y_z : z \in [T_{n-1}]^2\}|\} = \max\{|T_{n-1}|, |[T_{n-1}]^2|\} = |T_{n-1}| < \kappa$ .

Now, consider  $T := \bigcup_{n < \omega} T_n$ , then  $|T| = \sup\{|T_n| : n < \omega\}$ . Since each  $|T_n| < \kappa$  and  $\kappa$  has uncountable cofinality, we conclude that  $|T| < \kappa$ . Moreover, by the way we constructed  $T$ , it is straightforward that it is finitely directed. Since  $C$  is a closed subset of  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$  and  $T$  is finitely directed, we have that  $\bigcup T \in C$ .

We claim that  $\bigcup T = x$ . If  $a \in \bigcup T$ , then  $a \in y_z$  for some  $y_z \in T_n$  and  $n < \omega$ . But since  $y_z \in \mathcal{P}_\mu(x)$ ,  $a \in y_z \subseteq x$ . Also, if  $a \in x$ , there is  $y_a \in T_0 \subseteq T$  such that  $\{a\} \subseteq y_a$ , this is,  $a \in \bigcup T$ . Therefore  $x \in C$ .  $\square$

**Corollary 2.** *If  $S \subseteq \mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$  is 1-stationary in  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$ , then  $S$  is stationary in  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$ .*

**Proof :** Suppose that  $S$  is 1-stationary in  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$ , and let  $C$  be a club subset of  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$ . In particular  $C$  is cofinal in  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$ , and so, there is some  $x \in S \cap d_0(C)$ . But by Proposition 3.11,  $x \in S \cap d_0(C) \subseteq S \cap C$ . That is,  $S \cap C \neq \emptyset$ .  $\square$

In the ordinal case the equivalence between 1-stationarity and stationarity holds true. Unfortunately, this correspondence does not extend to  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$ . However, we will see that 1-stationary in  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$  is equivalent to another form of stationarity explored in [11], known as strongly stationarity. Consequently the concept of  $n$ -stationarity, when considered as an iterative process, does not correspond with the iteration of the standard notion of stationarity in  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$ ; to the iteration of the standard notion of stationarity in  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$ ; instead it might correspond to the iteration of strongly stationarity. The latest assertion arose as a conjecture proposed by Sakai during a research stay undertaken by the authors.

**Proposition 3.12.**  *$S \subseteq \mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$  being stationary in  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$  does not imply  $S$  is 1-stationary in  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$ .*

**Proof :** It is easy to see that  $S = \{x \in \mathcal{P}_\kappa(A) : \text{cof}(|x \cap \kappa|) < |x \cap \kappa|\}$  is a stationary subset of  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$ . Let  $C$  be a club of  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$  and  $x_0 \in C$  be such that  $|x_0 \cap \kappa| > \omega$ . Pick an increasing sequence  $\langle x_n : n < \omega \rangle$  of elements of  $C$ . Then  $\langle |x_n \cap \kappa| : n < \omega \rangle$  is an increasing sequence of cardinals greater than  $\omega$ , and so  $\omega = \text{cof}(\bigcup_{n < \omega} (|x_n \cap \kappa|)) < \bigcup_{n < \omega} (|x_n \cap \kappa|)$ . Hence  $\bigcup_{n < \omega} x_n \in C \cap S$ . And clearly, given any cofinal  $T \subseteq \mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$ , if  $x \in d_0(T)$  then  $x \notin S$ . This is  $d_0(T) \cap S = \emptyset$ .  $\square$

**Proposition 3.13.** *If  $\kappa$  is weakly Mahlo, then  $C \subseteq \mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$  club implies  $C$  is 1-stationary.*

**Proof :** Suppose that  $\kappa$  is weakly Mahlo, we may then perform a similar proof to the one we did for Proposition 3.8. For each cofinal  $T$  of  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$ , we will however, construct the main sequence as follows:

- $x_0 \in T$ . And  $y_0 \in C$  such that  $x_0 \subseteq y_0$ .
- $x_{\alpha+1} \in T$  is such that  $x_{\alpha+1} \supsetneq x_\alpha \cup \alpha \cup y_\alpha$ . And  $y_{\alpha+1} \in C$  such that  $x_{\alpha+1} \subseteq y_{\alpha+1}$ .
- $x_\gamma \in T$  is such that  $x_\gamma \supsetneq \bigcup_{\alpha < \gamma} [x_\alpha \cup \alpha \cup y_\alpha]$  for  $\gamma < \kappa$  limit.

Thus, completely analogous to Proposition 3.8 we get  $x := \bigcup_{\alpha < \mu} x_{\beta_\alpha} \in \mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$  such that  $\mu := |x \cap \kappa|$  is regular limit cardinal and  $T \cap \mathcal{P}_\mu(x)$  is cofinal in  $\mathcal{P}_\mu(x)$ .

We are left to prove that  $x \in C$ . First, we will prove that  $\bigcup_{\alpha < \mu} x_{\beta_\alpha} = \bigcup_{\alpha < \mu} y_{\beta_\alpha}$ . Let  $a \in \bigcup_{\alpha < \mu} x_{\beta_\alpha}$ , this is  $a \in x_{\beta_\alpha}$  for some  $\alpha < \mu$ . By construction  $x_{\beta_\alpha} \subseteq y_{\beta_\alpha}$ , then  $a \in y_{\beta_\alpha} \subseteq \bigcup_{\alpha < \mu} y_{\beta_\alpha}$ . Conversely, if  $a \in \bigcup_{\alpha < \mu} y_{\beta_\alpha}$  then  $a \in y_{\beta_\alpha}$  for some  $\alpha < \mu$ . Since for all  $\alpha < \mu$ ,  $x_{\beta_\alpha} \subsetneq x_{\beta_{\alpha+1}}$ , we have  $x_{\beta_{\alpha+1}} \subseteq x_{\beta_{\alpha+1}}$ . Moreover,

by construction (successor step) we have that  $y_{\beta_\alpha} \subseteq x_{\beta_{\alpha+1}} \subseteq x_{\beta_{\alpha+1}}$ . Therefore  $a \in x_{\beta_{\alpha+1}}$  and so  $a \in \bigcup_{\alpha < \mu} x_{\beta_\alpha}$ . Now,  $\langle y_{\beta_\alpha} : \alpha < \mu \rangle$  is clearly an ascending sequence of elements of  $C$ . Then, as  $C$  is closed, we get that  $\bigcup_{\alpha < \mu} y_{\beta_\alpha} \in C$ . Hence,  $x = \bigcup_{\alpha < \mu} x_{\beta_\alpha} = \bigcup_{\alpha < \mu} y_{\beta_\alpha} \in C$ .  $\square$

**Proposition 3.14.** *Let  $\kappa$  be weakly Mahlo, and let  $T, T_1, \dots, T_l$  be cofinal in  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$  for some  $l < \omega$ . Then  $d_0(T_1) \cap \dots \cap d_0(T_l)$  is 1-stationary in  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$  and  $d_0(d_0(T)) \subseteq d_0(T)$ .*

**Proof :** To prove that  $d_0(T_1) \cap \dots \cap d_0(T_l)$  is 1-stationary in  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$  we will prove that for any  $T_0$  cofinal in  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$  we have  $d_0(T_0) \cap d_0(T_1) \cap \dots \cap d_0(T_l) \neq \emptyset$ . As  $\kappa$  is weakly Mahlo, we can perform an analogous proof of the one we did for Proposition 3.8, with  $T = T_0$  and splitting the successor step in such a way that for  $\alpha + m$  with  $m \leq l$ ,  $X_\alpha \in T_m$ . Therefore  $B = \bigcup_{\alpha < \mu} X_{\beta_\alpha} = \bigcup_{\alpha < \mu} X_{\beta_\alpha + m}$  for all  $m \leq l$  and so  $B \in d_0(T_1) \cap \dots \cap d_0(T_l)$ .

It remains to prove that  $d_0(d_0(T)) \subseteq d_0(T)$ . Let  $x \in d_0(d_0(T))$ , this is,  $\mu := |x \cap \kappa|$  is regular limit cardinal and  $d_0(T) \cap \mathcal{P}_\mu(x)$  is cofinal in  $\mathcal{P}_\mu(x)$ . Let  $y \in \mathcal{P}_\mu(x)$ , as  $\mu$  is limit cardinal  $|y|^+ < \mu$  and so  $y \cup |y|^+ \in \mathcal{P}_\mu(x)$ . Then, there is some  $z \in d_0(T) \cap \mathcal{P}_\mu(x)$  such that  $y \cup |y|^+ \subseteq z$ . But from  $z \in d_0(T)$  we get that  $\gamma := |z \cap \kappa|$  is regular limit cardinal and  $T \cap \mathcal{P}_\gamma(z)$  is cofinal in  $\mathcal{P}_\gamma(z)$ . Then  $y \in \mathcal{P}_\gamma(z)$ , and so there is some  $w \in T \cap \mathcal{P}_\gamma(z) \subseteq T \cap \mathcal{P}_\mu(x)$  such that  $y \subseteq w$ . Whence  $T \cap \mathcal{P}_\mu(x)$  is cofinal in  $\mathcal{P}_\mu(x)$ , and so  $x \in d_0(T)$ .  $\square$

**Proposition 3.15.** *If  $S \subseteq \mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$  is 1-stationary and  $T_1, \dots, T_l \subseteq \mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$  are cofinal in  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$ , then  $S \cap d_0(T_1) \cap \dots \cap d_0(T_l)$  is 1-stationary in  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$ .*

**Proof :** By Proposition 3.14,  $d_0(T_1) \cap \dots \cap d_0(T_l)$  is 1-stationary in  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$ , in particular cofinal. We will prove that for any  $T_0$  cofinal in  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$ ,  $d_0(T_0) \cap (S \cap d_0(T_1) \cap \dots \cap d_0(T_l)) \neq \emptyset$ . But since  $S \subseteq \mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$  is 1-stationary  $\emptyset \neq S \cap d_0(d_0(T_0) \cap d_0(T_1) \cap \dots \cap d_0(T_l)) \subseteq S \cap d_0(d_0(T_0)) \cap d_0(d_0(T_1)) \cap \dots \cap d_0(d_0(T_l)) \subseteq S \cap d_0(T_0) \cap d_0(T_1) \cap \dots \cap d_0(T_l)$ .  $\square$

**Corollary 3.** *If  $\kappa$  is weakly Mahlo and  $S \subseteq \mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$  is cofinal and  $d_0(S) \subseteq S$ , then  $S$  is 1-stationary.  $\square$*

**Proposition 3.16.**  *$S \subseteq \mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$  is 1-stationary in  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$  if and only if  $S$  is 1-s-stationary in  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$ . And so, for any  $X \subseteq \mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$ ,  $d_1(X) = d_1^s(X)$ .*

**Proof :** The implication from right to the left follows immediately. Suppose now that  $S$  is 1-stationary in  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$  and let  $T_1, T_2$  be  $m$ -stationary subsets of  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$  for some  $m < n$ . By Proposition 3.14 we know that  $d_0(T_1) \cap d_0(T_2)$  is in particular cofinal in  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$ . Then  $\emptyset \neq S \cap d_0(d_0(T_1) \cap d_0(T_2)) \subseteq S \cap d_0(T_1) \cap d_0(T_2) = S \cap d_0(T_1) \cap d_0(T_2) = S \cap d_0^s(T_1) \cap d_0^s(T_2)$ , this is,  $S$  is 1-s-stationary in  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$ .  $\square$

Notice that, by Proposition 3.14, for any  $X \subseteq \mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$ ,  $d_1(d_0(X)) \subseteq d_0(d_0(X)) \subseteq d_0(X)$ . Thus, for any  $X \subseteq \mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$ ,  $d_1(d_0(X)) \subseteq d_0(X)$ . Proposition 3.16 is telling

us that we can actually see as results on 0 and 1 stationarity as results on 0 and 1 simultaneously stationarity. This is; i)  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$  is 1-s-stationary in  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$  if and only if  $\kappa$  is weakly Mahlo. ii) If  $\kappa$  is weakly Mahlo, then  $C \subseteq \mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$  club implies  $C$  is 1-s-stationary. iii) Let  $\kappa$  be weakly Mahlo, and let  $T, T_1, \dots, T_l$  be cofinal in  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$  for some  $l < \omega$ . Then  $d_0^s(T_1) \cap \dots \cap d_0^s(T_l)$  is 1-stationary in  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$  and  $d_0^s(d_0^s(T)) \subseteq d_0^s(T)$ . iv) If  $S \subseteq \mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$  is 1-s-stationary and  $T_1, \dots, T_k \subseteq \mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$  are cofinal in  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$ , then  $S \cap d_0^s(T_1) \cap \dots \cap d_0^s(T_l)$  is 1-s-stationary in  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$ . And v) For any  $X \subseteq \mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$ ,  $d_1^s(d_0^s(X)) \subseteq d_0^s(X)$ .

From the above results, we observe that the analogy with 1-stationarity in ordinals holds when the minimal condition of weak Mahloness is met for  $\kappa$ , ensuring 1-stationarity in  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa\lambda$ . Notably, despite not precisely corresponding to the conventional stationarity in  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$ , this lack of equivalence poses no issue for our objectives. As mentioned before, our primary focus is on the iterative nature of reflection rather than stationarity itself. Curiously, we have discovered (Proposition 3.19) that the concept of 1-stationarity in  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$  does aligns -for  $\kappa$  Mahlo- with an existing combinatorial notion in  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$  known as strongly-stationarity.

**Definition 3.17.** *Let  $\kappa$  be a Mahlo cardinal, we say that  $S \subseteq \mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$  is strongly stationary if and only if for all  $f : \mathcal{P}_\kappa(A) \rightarrow \mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$ , there is  $x \in S$  such that  $\mu := |x \cap \kappa|$  is limit regular cardinal and  $f[\mathcal{P}_\mu(x)] \subseteq \mathcal{P}_\mu(x)$ .*

**Lemma 3.18.** *Let  $\kappa$  be a Mahlo cardinal,  $f : \mathcal{P}_\kappa(A) \rightarrow \mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$  and  $T_f := \{x \in \mathcal{P}_\kappa(A) : \mu := |x \cap \kappa| \text{ is a regular limit cardinal and } f[\mathcal{P}_\mu(x)] \subseteq \mathcal{P}_\mu(x)\}$ . Then, i)  $d_0(T_f) \subseteq T_f$  and ii)  $T_f$  is cofinal in  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$ .*

**Proof :** i) Let  $x \in d_0(T_f)$ , then  $\mu := |x \cap \kappa|$  is a regular limit cardinal and  $T_f \cap \mathcal{P}_\mu(x)$  is cofinal in  $\mathcal{P}_\mu(x)$ . We are left to prove that  $f[\mathcal{P}_\mu(x)] \subseteq \mathcal{P}_\mu(x)$ . Let  $y \in \mathcal{P}_\mu(x)$ , then, there is  $z \in T_f \cap \mathcal{P}_\mu(x)$  such that  $y \cup |y|^+ \subseteq z$ . Then,  $y \in \mathcal{P}_{|z \cap \kappa|}(z)$  and so  $f(y) \in f[\mathcal{P}_{|z \cap \kappa|}(z)] \subseteq \mathcal{P}_{|z \cap \kappa|}(z) \subseteq \mathcal{P}_\mu(x)$ . Thus  $f(y) \in \mathcal{P}_\mu(x)$  and so  $x \in T_f$ .

ii) Recall that  $\tilde{R}_\kappa := \{x \in \mathcal{P}_\kappa(A) : |x \cap \kappa| \text{ is a regular limit cardinal}\}$  is cofinal in  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$ . Let  $y_0 \in \mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$  and  $x_0 \in \tilde{R}_\kappa$  such that  $y_0 \subseteq x_0$ . Consider the following sequence for  $\alpha < \kappa$ , where  $\mu_\alpha := x_\alpha \cap \kappa$

- $y_1 := x_0 \cup \bigcup f[\mathcal{P}_{\mu_0}(x_0)] \cup |0|$  and  $x_1 \in \tilde{R}_\kappa$  such that  $y_1 \subsetneq x_1$ .
- $y_{\alpha+1} := x_\alpha \cup \bigcup f[\mathcal{P}_{\mu_\alpha}(x_\alpha)] \cup |\alpha|$  and  $x_{\alpha+1} \in \tilde{R}_\kappa$  such that  $y_{\alpha+1} \subsetneq x_{\alpha+1}$ .
- $y_\alpha := \bigcup_{\beta < \alpha} (x_\beta \cup \bigcup f[\mathcal{P}_{\mu_\beta}(x_\beta)] \cup |\beta|)$  and  $x_\alpha \in \tilde{R}_\kappa$  such that  $y_\alpha \subsetneq x_\alpha$ , for  $\alpha$  limit less than  $\kappa$ .

As  $\kappa$  is Mahlo  $\bigcup f[\mathcal{P}_{\mu_\alpha}(x_\alpha)] \in \mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$  and so the sequence is a well defined increasing sequence. In analogy to the proof of Proposition 3.8, we may construct an increasing subsequence  $\langle x_{\beta_\alpha} : \alpha < \mu \rangle$  of  $\langle x_\alpha : \alpha < \kappa \rangle$  such that  $x^* := \bigcup_{\alpha < \mu} x_{\beta_\alpha} \in \mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$ ,  $|x^*| = \mu$  and  $|x^* \cap \kappa| = \mu$ .

Since  $y_0 \subseteq x^*$ , proving that  $x^* \in T_f$ , will conclude the prove that  $T_f$  is cofinal in  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$ . So let us prove that fact. By construction we already have that  $\mu = |x^* \cap \kappa|$  is a regular limit cardinal. Now, let us prove that  $f[\mathcal{P}_\mu(x^*)] \subseteq \mathcal{P}_\mu(x^*)$ . Let  $z \in \mathcal{P}_\mu(x^*)$ , then  $|z|^+ < \mu$  and so  $z \cup |z|^+ \in \mathcal{P}_\mu(x^*)$ . Thus  $z \cup |z|^+ \subseteq x_{\beta_\alpha}$  for some  $\alpha < \mu$ . But also by construction  $x_{\beta_\alpha} \in \tilde{R}_\kappa$  then  $|z| < |z|^+ \leq |x_{\beta_\alpha} \cap \kappa| = \mu_{\beta_\alpha}$ , whence  $z \in \mathcal{P}_{\mu_{\beta_\alpha}}(x_{\beta_\alpha})$ . Hence  $f(z) \in f[\mathcal{P}_{\mu_{\beta_\alpha}}(x_{\beta_\alpha})]$  and so  $f(z) \subseteq \bigcup f[\mathcal{P}_{\mu_{\beta_\alpha}}(x_{\beta_\alpha})] \subseteq x_{\beta_{\alpha+1}} \subseteq x^*$ . Also  $|f(z)| \leq |x_{\beta_{\alpha+1}}| < \mu$ , therefore  $f(z) \in \mathcal{P}_\mu(x^*)$  and so  $x^* \in T_f$ .  $\square$

**Corollary 4.** *Let  $\kappa$  be a Mahlo cardinal, and  $f : \mathcal{P}_\kappa(A) \rightarrow \mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$ , then  $T_f$  is 1-stationary on  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$ .  $\square$*

**Proposition 3.19.** *If  $\kappa$  is Mahlo, then  $S \subseteq \mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$  is 1-stationary in  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$  if and only if  $S$  is strongly-stationary in  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$ .*

**Proof :**  $\Rightarrow$ ) Suppose that  $S$  is 1-stationary, and let  $f : \mathcal{P}_\kappa(A) \rightarrow \mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$ . By Lemma 3.18  $T_f$  is cofinal and then  $S \cap d_0(T_f) \neq \emptyset$ . But again using Lemma 3.18 we get  $\emptyset \neq S \cap d_0(T_f) \subseteq S \cap T_f$ . Therefore, there is  $x \in S \cap T_f$ , i.e., there is  $x \in S$  such that such that  $\mu := |x \cap \kappa|$  is limit regular cardinal and  $f[\mathcal{P}_\mu(x)] \subseteq \mathcal{P}_\mu(x)$ . Whence  $S$  is strongly stationary in  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$ .

$\Leftarrow$ ) Suppose now that  $S$  is strongly stationary and let  $T \subseteq \mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$  cofinal in  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$ . For all  $y \in \mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$ , fix an  $X_y \in T$  such that  $y \subseteq X_y$  and define  $f : \mathcal{P}_\kappa(A) \rightarrow \mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$  such that  $f(y) := X_y$ . By strongly stationarity of  $S$ , there is some  $x \in S$  such that  $\mu := |x \cap \kappa|$  is limit regular cardinal and  $f[\mathcal{P}_\mu(x)] \subseteq \mathcal{P}_\mu(x)$ . We claim that  $T \cap \mathcal{P}_\mu(x)$  is cofinal in  $\mathcal{P}_\mu(x)$ . To prove that, take  $y \in \mathcal{P}_\mu(x)$ , then  $y \subseteq f(y) = X_y \in T$  and  $f(y) \in f[\mathcal{P}_\mu(x)] \subseteq \mathcal{P}_\mu(x)$ . Then,  $X_y \in T \cap \mathcal{P}_\mu(x)$  is such that  $y \subseteq X_y$ .  $\square$

As previous mentioned, this last result is result also extends to simultaneous stationarity, i.e., if  $\kappa$  is Mahlo, then  $S \subseteq \mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$  is 1-s-stationary in  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$  if and only if  $S$  is strongly-stationary in  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$ . Now that we have established a reasonably reliable correspondence within the base cases 0 and 1, we turn our attention to the problem in the general case.

**Lemma 3.20.** *For every  $X, Y \subseteq \mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$  and every  $m \leq n$*

- (1)  $d_n^s(X \cap Y) \subseteq d_n^s(X) \cap d_n^s(Y)$ .
- (2)  $d_n^s(X) \subseteq d_m^s(X)$ .
- (3)  $d_n^s(d_m^s(X)) \subseteq d_m^s(X)$ .
- (4)  $C \subseteq \mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$  club, implies  $d_n^s(C) \subseteq C$ .

**Proof:** (1) and (2) are immediate, and (4) follows from (3). As for (3), the cases  $n = 0$  and  $n = 1$  are immediate. So suppose  $n \geq 2$ . If  $m = 0$ , then by (2)  $d_n^s(d_0^s(X)) \subseteq d_0^s(d_0^s(X)) \subseteq d_0^s(X)$ . Suppose then  $m \geq 1$ . Take  $x \in d_n^s(d_m^s(X))$ , this is  $\mu := |x \cap \kappa|$  regular limit cardinal and  $d_m^s(X) \cap \mathcal{P}_\mu(x)$  is  $n$ -s-stationary in  $\mathcal{P}_\mu(x)$ . We want to prove that  $x \in d_m^s(X)$ . Since  $m \geq 1$ , we can equivalently prove that for every  $l < m$  and every  $T_1, T_2$   $l$ -s-stationary in  $\mathcal{P}_\mu(x)$  it holds that

$\emptyset \neq X \cap d_l^s(T_1) \cap d_l^s(T_2)$ . Thus, let  $l < m$  and  $T_1, T_2$  be  $l$ -s-stationary in  $\mathcal{P}_\mu(x)$ . By  $n$ -s-stationarity of  $d_m^s(X) \cap \mathcal{P}_\mu(x)$ , there is some  $y \in d_m^s(X) \cap \mathcal{P}_\mu(x)$  such that  $\gamma := |y \cap \kappa|$  regular limit cardinal and  $T_1 \cap \mathcal{P}_\gamma(y)$  and  $T_2 \cap \mathcal{P}_\gamma(y)$  are  $l$ -stationary in  $\mathcal{P}_\gamma(y)$ . Also, from  $y \in d_m^s(X)$  we have that  $X \cap \mathcal{P}_\gamma(y)$  is  $m$ -s-stationary in  $\mathcal{P}_\gamma(y)$ , then, since  $l < m$  we have  $\emptyset \neq X \cap \mathcal{P}_\gamma(y) \cap d_l^s(T_1 \cap \mathcal{P}_\gamma(y)) \cap d_l^s(T_2 \cap \mathcal{P}_\gamma(y)) \subseteq X \cap \mathcal{P}_\gamma(y) \cap d_l^s(T_1) \cap d_l^s(\mathcal{P}_\gamma(y)) \cap d_l^s(T_2) \cap d_l^s(\mathcal{P}_\gamma(y)) \subseteq X \cap \mathcal{P}_\gamma(y) \cap d_l^s(T_1) \cap d_l^s(T_2) \subseteq X \cap d_l^s(T_1) \cap d_l^s(T_2)$ .  $\square$

**Corollary 5.** *Let  $n < \omega$ . If  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$  is  $n$ -s-stationary and  $C$  is club, then,  $C$  is also  $n$ -s-stationary.  $\square$*

**Proposition 3.21.** *Let  $n < \omega$ ,  $\kappa$  a regular limit cardinal and  $\lambda \geq \kappa$ .*

- (1) *If  $S \subseteq \mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$  is  $n$ -s-stationary and  $X_i \subseteq \mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$  is  $m_i$ -s-stationary for  $m_i < n$  and  $i \in \{0, \dots, k-1\}$ , then  $S \cap d_{m_0}^s(X_0) \cap \dots \cap d_{m_{k-1}}^s(X_{k-1})$  is  $n$ -s-stationary in  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$ .*
- (2) *If  $S \subseteq \mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$  is  $(n+1)$ -s-stationary in  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$ , then, for all  $m \leq n$  and all  $T_1, T_2 \subseteq \mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$   $m$ -s-stationary in  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$ ,  $S \cap d_m^s(T_1) \cap d_m^s(T_2)$  is  $m$ -s-stationary in  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$ .*

**Proof :** We prove (1) and (2) simultaneously by induction on  $n < \omega$ :

- (n=0) (1) Nothing to prove, because there is no  $m_i < 0$ .  
 (2) Suppose  $S \subseteq \mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$  is 1-s-stationary in  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$ , and let  $T_1, T_2 \subseteq \mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$  be 0-s-stationary (cofinal) in  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$ . Then  $\kappa$  is weakly Mahlo, and so  $S \cap d_0^s(T_1) \cap d_0^s(T_2)$  is 1-stationary (equivalently 1-s-stationary) in  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$ . In particular  $S \cap d_0^s(T_1) \cap d_0^s(T_2)$  is 0-s-stationary in  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$ .
- (n=1) (1) Suppose  $S \subseteq \mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$  is 1-s-stationary in  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$ , and  $X_i \subseteq \mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$  is 0-s-stationary in  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$  for  $i \in \{0, \dots, k-1\}$ . Then  $\kappa$  is weakly Mahlo, and so  $S \cap d_0^s(X_0) \cap \dots \cap d_0^s(X_{k-1})$  is 1-s-stationary in  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$ .  
 (2) (m=0) Suppose  $S \subseteq \mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$  is 2-s-stationary in  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$ , and let  $T_1, T_2 \subseteq \mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$  be 0-s-stationary in  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$ . Then  $S$  is 1-s-stationary in  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$ . Thus, by (1) for the case  $n = 0$ , we have  $S \cap d_0^s(T_1) \cap d_0^s(T_2)$  is 0-s-stationary in  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$ .  
 (m=1) Suppose  $S \subseteq \mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$  is 2-s-stationary in  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$ , and let  $T_1, T_2 \subseteq \mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$  be 1-s-stationary in  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$ . Let  $U$  be cofinal in  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$ , we need to prove that  $d_0^s(U) \cap S \cap d_1^s(T_1) \cap d_1^s(T_2) \neq \emptyset$ . Since  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$  is 2-s-stationary,  $\kappa$  is weakly Mahlo. Then  $d_0^s(U) \cap T_1$  and  $d_0^s(U) \cap T_2$  are both 1-stationary in  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$ . Now, by 2-s-stationarity of  $S$ , we have  $\emptyset \neq S \cap d_1^s(d_0^s(U) \cap T_1) \cap d_1^s(d_0^s(U) \cap T_2)$ . But  $S \cap d_1^s(d_0^s(U) \cap T_1) \cap d_1^s(d_0^s(U) \cap T_2) \subseteq S \cap d_1^s(d_0^s(U)) \cap d_1^s(T_1) \cap d_1^s(d_0^s(U)) \cap d_1^s(T_2) \subseteq S \cap d_0^s(U) \cap d_1^s(T_1) \cap d_0^s(U) \cap d_1^s(T_2) \subseteq d_0^s(U) \cap S \cap d_1^s(T_1) \cap d_1^s(T_2)$  hence  $\emptyset \neq d_0^s(U) \cap S \cap d_1^s(T_1) \cap d_1^s(T_2)$ .

Suppose now that (1) and (2) hold for  $n$ , and let us prove then for  $n+1$ :

(n+1) (1) Suppose  $S \subseteq \mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$  is  $(n+1)$ -s-stationary in  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$  and  $X_i \subseteq \mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$  is  $m_i$ -s-stationary for  $m_i < n+1$  and  $i \in \{0, \dots, k-1\}$ . We will prove, by induction on  $k$ , that for every  $l < n+1$  and every  $T_1, T_2$   $l$ -s-stationary in  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$

$$S \cap d_{m_0}^s(X_0) \cap \dots \cap d_{m_{k-1}}^s(X_{k-1}) \cap d_l^s(T_1) \cap d_l^s(T_2) \neq \emptyset.$$

(k=1) Notice that  $m_0, l \leq n$ . We will consider three cases;

( $m_0 > l$ ): By induction hypothesis on (2) we have that  $S \cap d_{m_0}^s(X_0) = S \cap d_{m_0}^s(X_0) \cap d_{m_0}^s(X_0)$  is  $m_0$ -s-stationary in  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$ . Then, since  $l < m_0$  and  $T_1, T_2$  are  $l$ -s-stationary in  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$ , we have

$$S \cap d_{m_0}^s(X_0) \cap d_l^s(T_1) \cap d_l^s(T_2) \neq \emptyset.$$

( $m_0 = l$ ): By induction hypothesis on (2) we have that  $S \cap d_l^s(T_1) \cap d_l^s(T_2)$  is  $l$ -s-stationary in  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$ , in particular  $d_l^s(T_1) \cap d_l^s(T_2)$  is  $l$ -s-stationary in  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$ . But also  $X_0$  is  $l$ -s-stationary in  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$ . Then by  $n+1$ -s-stationarity of  $S$  we get  $\emptyset \neq S \cap d_l^s(X_0) \cap d_l^s(d_l^s(T_1) \cap d_l^s(T_2)) \subseteq S \cap d_l^s(X_0) \cap d_l^s(T_1) \cap d_l^s(T_2)$ . Since  $l = m_0$ , this yields

$$S \cap d_{m_0}^s(X_0) \cap d_l^s(T_1) \cap d_l^s(T_2) \neq \emptyset.$$

( $m_0 < l$ ): Notice that  $S$  is in particular  $n$ -s-stationary in  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$ , and  $m_0 < n$ . Then, by induction hypothesis on (1) we have that  $S \cap d_{m_0}^s(X_0)$  is  $n$ -s-stationary in  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$ , in particular  $d_{m_0}^s(X_0)$  is  $n$ -s-stationary in  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$ . On the other hand, by induction hypothesis on (2),  $d_l^s(T_1) \cap d_l^s(T_2)$  is  $l$ -s-stationary in  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$ . But also  $d_{m_0}^s(X_0)$  is  $l$ -s-stationary in  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$ . Then, by  $n+1$ -s-stationarity of  $S$  we get  $\emptyset \neq S \cap d_l^s(d_{m_0}^s(X_0)) \cap d_l^s(d_l^s(T_1) \cap d_l^s(T_2)) \subseteq S \cap d_{m_0}^s(X_0) \cap d_l^s(T_1) \cap d_l^s(T_2)$ , and so

$$S \cap d_{m_0}^s(X_0) \cap d_l^s(T_1) \cap d_l^s(T_2) \neq \emptyset.$$

Suppose now that (1) holds for  $k-1$ , and let us prove it for  $k > 1$ :

(k) By the induction hypothesis,  $S^* := S \cap d_{m_0}^s(X_0) \cap \dots \cap d_{m_{k-2}}^s(X_{k-2})$  is  $(n+1)$ -s-stationary in  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$ . Also, by induction hypothesis on (2),  $d_l^s(T_1) \cap d_l^s(T_2)$  is  $l$ -s-stationary in  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$ , and so, by induction hypothesis for the case  $k=1$ ,  $S \cap d_l^s(d_l^s(T_1) \cap d_l^s(T_2))$  is  $(n+1)$ -s-stationary in  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$ . Whence  $d_l^s(d_l^s(T_1) \cap d_l^s(T_2))$  is  $n$ -s-stationary in  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$ . But  $X_{k-1}$  is  $m_{k-1}$ -s-stationary for  $m_{k-1} < n+1$ . Thus, if  $n^* = \max\{m_{k-1}, n\}$  then  $l, m_{k-1}, n \leq n^*$  and by  $n+1$ -s-stationarity of  $S^*$  we get  $\emptyset \neq S^* \cap d_{n^*}^s(X_{k-1}) \cap d_{n^*}^s(d_l^s(d_l^s(T_1) \cap d_l^s(T_2))) \subseteq S^* \cap d_{m_{k-1}}^s(X_{k-1}) \cap d_l^s(d_l^s(T_1) \cap d_l^s(T_2)) \subseteq S^* \cap d_{m_{k-1}}^s(X_{k-1}) \cap d_l^s(T_1) \cap d_l^s(T_2)$ .

This yields  $S \cap d_{m_0}^s(X_0) \cap \dots \cap d_{m_{k-2}}^s(X_{k-2}) \cap d_{m_{k-1}}^s(X_{k-1}) \cap d_l^s(T_1) \cap d_l^s(T_2) = S \cap d_{m_0}^s(X_0) \cap \dots \cap d_{m_{k-1}}^s(X_{k-1}) \cap d_l^s(T_1) \cap d_l^s(T_2) \neq \emptyset$ .

(2) Suppose  $S \subseteq \mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$  is  $n + 2$ -s-stationary in  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$  and let  $m \leq n + 1$  and  $T_1, T_2 \subseteq \mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$  be  $m$ -s-stationary in  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$ , we will prove that  $S \cap d_m^s(T_1) \cap d_m^s(T_2)$  is  $m$ -s-stationary in  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$ , namely we will show that for every  $l < m$  and every  $U_1, U_2 \subseteq \mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$   $l$ -s-stationary in  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$ ,  $S \cap d_m^s(T_1) \cap d_m^s(T_2) \cap d_l^s(U_1) \cap d_l^s(U_2) \neq \emptyset$ . Consider two cases:

( $m < n + 1$ ): Since  $S \subseteq \mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$  is in particular  $(n + 1)$ -s-stationary in  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$ , by induction hypothesis on (2),  $S \cap d_m^s(T_1) \cap d_m^s(T_2)$  is  $m$ -s-stationary in  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$ .

( $m = n + 1$ ): Let  $l < n + 1$  and let  $U_1, U_2$  be  $l$ -s-stationary in  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$ . Then, by induction hypothesis on (1)  $T_1 \cap d_l^s(U_1)$  and  $T_2 \cap d_l^s(U_2)$  are both  $(n + 1)$ -s-stationary in  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$ . Then by  $n + 2$ -s-stationarity of  $S$  we get  $\emptyset \neq S \cap d_{n+1}^s(T_1 \cap d_l^s(U_1)) \cap d_{n+1}^s(T_2 \cap d_l^s(U_2)) \subseteq S \cap d_{n+1}^s(T_1) \cap d_l^s(U_1) \cap d_{n+1}^s(T_2) \cap d_l^s(U_2)$ , and so

$$S \cap d_{n+1}^s(T_1) \cap d_{n+1}^s(T_2) \cap d_l^s(U_1) \cap d_l^s(U_2) \neq \emptyset. \quad \square$$

Proposition 3.21 mirrors two of the results presented by Bagaria in [3] (Proposition 2.10). Its successful generalisation to the case of  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$  is a key factor that enabled us to extend Bagaria's findings related to topologies and ideals. In the following, we elucidate the process of these generalisations.

**Proposition 3.22.** *For every  $n < \omega$ , the set  $NsS_\kappa^n(A) := \{N \subseteq \mathcal{P}_\kappa(A) : N \text{ is not } n\text{-s-stationary in } \mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)\}$  is an ideal on  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$ .*

**Proof:** It is clear that  $\emptyset \in NsS_\kappa^n(A)$ , for all  $n < \omega$ . Also, if  $N_1 \subseteq N_2$  and  $N_2 \in NsS_\kappa^n(A)$  then  $N_1 \in NsS_\kappa^n(A)$ , for all  $n < \omega$ . So we are left to prove that if  $n < \omega$  and  $N_1, N_2 \in NsS_\kappa^n(A)$  then  $N_1 \cup N_2 \in NsS_\kappa^n(A)$ . We will prove this by induction on  $n$ .

( $n = 0$ ) Suppose  $N_1, N_2 \subseteq \mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$  are not cofinal in  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$ , then, there is  $X_i \in \mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$  such that for all  $Y \in N_i$ ,  $X_i \not\subseteq Y$ . Towards a contradiction, assume that  $N_1 \cup N_2$  is cofinal in  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$ . Then, there is  $Y_1 \in N_1 \cup N_2$  such that  $X_1 \subseteq Y_1$ . Notice that  $Y_1 \notin N_1$ . Also by our assumption, there is  $Y_2 \in N_1 \cup N_2$  such that  $Y_1 \cup X_2 \subseteq Y_2$ . Then  $X_1 \subseteq Y_1 \cup X_2 \subseteq Y_2$ . Now, if  $Y_2 \in N_1$  then  $X_1 \subseteq Y_2$  contradicts that for all  $Y \in N_1$ ,  $X_1 \not\subseteq Y$ . Similarly if  $Y_2 \in N_2$  then  $X_2 \subseteq Y_2$  contradicts that for all  $Y \in N_2$ ,  $X_2 \not\subseteq Y$ . Hence  $Y_2 \notin N_1 \cup N_2$ , which yields a contradiction.

Now, assume the proposition holds for  $n$  and let us prove it for  $n + 1$ :

( $n + 1$ ) Suppose  $N_1, N_2 \subseteq \mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$  are not  $(n + 1)$ -s-stationary in  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$ . If  $N_1, N_2$  are not  $n$ -s-stationary in  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$  then by induction hypothesis  $N_1 \cup N_2$  is not  $n$ -s-stationary in  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$ . Now, suppose  $N_1, N_2$  are  $n$ -s-stationary in  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$ . Since  $N_1, N_2$  are not  $(n + 1)$ -s-stationary, there are  $T_1, U_1$  and  $T_2, U_2$   $n$ -s-stationary subsets of  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$  such that  $d_n^s(T_1) \cap d_n^s(U_1) \cap N_1 \neq \emptyset$  and



$d_n^s(T_2) \cap d_n^s(U_2) \cap N_2 \neq \emptyset$  ( $\dagger$ ). Then, by Proposition 3.21 (1) we get that  $d_n^s(T_1) \cap d_n^s(U_1) \cap d_n^s(T_2) \cap d_n^s(U_2)$  is  $n$ -s-stationary in  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$ . Towards a contradiction, suppose that  $N_1 \cup N_2$  is  $n+1$ -s-stationary in  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$ . Then there is some  $x \in d_n^s(d_n^s(T_1) \cap d_n^s(U_1) \cap d_n^s(T_2) \cap d_n^s(U_2)) \cap (N_1 \cup N_2) \subseteq d_n^s(T_1) \cap d_n^s(U_1) \cap d_n^s(T_2) \cap d_n^s(U_2) \cap (N_1 \cup N_2)$ . Then, either  $x \in N_1$  or  $x \in N_2$ , but for  $i = 1, 2$ , if  $x \in N_i$  then  $x \in d_n^s(T_i) \cap d_n^s(U_i) \cap N_i$ , and this contradicts ( $\dagger$ ).  $\square$

Notice from previous proof that, in fact,  $NsS_\kappa^n(A)$  is proper if and only if  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$  is  $n$ -stationary. This result offers the analogue to Theorem 3.1 in [3].

**Theorem 3.23.** *For every  $n < \omega$ , the set  $NsS_\kappa^n(A) = \{N \subseteq \mathcal{P}_\kappa(A) : N \text{ is not } n\text{-s-stationary in } \mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)\}$  is a proper ideal on  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$  if and only if  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$  is  $n$ -stationary in  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$ .  $\square$*

An intriguing question arises regarding the consistency strength of  $n$ -stationarity in  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$ . While we have addressed this question for  $n = 1$  through Proposition 3.8, the situation becomes more intricate for  $n \geq 2$ . In the ordinal case, 1-stationarity only demanded an ordinal with uncountable cofinality. However, for 2-stationarity, the ordinal  $\alpha$  needed to be either inaccessible or the successor of a singular cardinal [3]. We will conclude this section by demonstrating that, similarly, for  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$  to exhibit 2-stationarity, a notable increase in the complexity of  $\kappa$  is required.

**Definition 3.24.** *Suppose  $\kappa \subseteq B \subseteq A$ ,  $X \subseteq \mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$  and  $Y \subseteq \mathcal{P}_\kappa(B)$ . Then  $X \upharpoonright_B := \{z \cap B \in \mathcal{P}_\kappa(B) : z \in X\}$  and  $Y^A := \{z \in \mathcal{P}_\kappa(A) : z \cap B \in Y\}$ .*

It is easy to see that with the setting of Definition 3.24  $(X \upharpoonright_B)^A \supseteq X$  and  $(Y^A) \upharpoonright_B = Y$ .

**Proposition 3.25. (Menas)** *Suppose  $\kappa \subseteq B \subseteq A$ , then*

- *If  $S \subseteq \mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$  is stationary in  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$ , then  $S \upharpoonright_B$  is stationary in  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(B)$ .*
- *If  $S \subseteq \mathcal{P}_\kappa(B)$  is stationary in  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(B)$ , then  $S^A$  is stationary in  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$ .*

**Corollary 6.**  *$S$  is stationary in  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$  implies  $S \upharpoonright_\kappa$  is stationary in  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(\kappa)$  if and only if  $S \upharpoonright_\kappa$  is stationary in  $\kappa$ .*

**Lemma 3.26.** *If  $\kappa$  is weakly Mahlo and  $E \subseteq \{\alpha < \kappa : \alpha \text{ regular limit cardinal}\} \subseteq \kappa$  is stationary in  $\kappa$ , then  $E^* := \{x \in \mathcal{P}_\kappa(A) : |x \cap \kappa| \in E\}$  is 1 stationary in  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$ .*

**Proof :** Let  $T$  be cofinal in  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$ , we have to prove that  $d_0(T) \cap E^* \neq \emptyset$ . As  $\kappa$  is weakly Mahlo, we may perform an analogous proof to the one of Proposition 3.8, obtaining  $x \in d_0(T)$  such that  $\mu := |x \cap \kappa| \in E$ . Hence  $x \in d_0(T) \cap E^*$ .  $\square$

Recall that for all  $n < \omega$ , we say that  $\kappa$  is  $(n+1)$ -weakly-Mahlo if and only if  $W_n := \{\alpha < \kappa : \alpha \text{ is } n\text{-weakly-Mahlo}\}$  is stationary in  $\kappa$ . Then,  $\kappa$  is 1-weakly-Mahlo if and only if  $\kappa$  is weakly Mahlo. Notice that for all  $n < \omega$  we have

$W_n \subseteq \{\alpha < \kappa : \alpha \text{ is a regular limit cardinal}\}$ . Finally, note that for all  $n < \omega$ ,  $x \cap \kappa \in W_{n-1}$  if and only if  $|x \cap \kappa| \in W_{n-1}$ , this is,  $(W_{n-1})^* = \{x \in \mathcal{P}_\kappa(A) : |x \cap \kappa| \in W_{n-1}\} = (W_{n-1})^A = \{x \in \mathcal{P}_\kappa(A) : x \cap \kappa \in W_{n-1}\}$ .

**Corollary 7.** *If  $\kappa$  is  $n$ -weakly-Mahlo for  $0 < n < \omega$ , then,  $(W_{n-1})^A = (W_{n-1})^*$  is 1-stationary in  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$ .  $\square$*

**Proposition 3.27.** *If  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$  is 2-stationary then  $\kappa$  is  $n$ -weakly-Mahlo for all  $n < \omega$ .*

**Proof :** We proceed by contradiction. Clearly  $\kappa$  is 1-weakly-Mahlo. So, let  $n+1$  be the least such that  $\kappa$  is  $n$ -weakly-Mahlo and  $\kappa$  is not  $(n+1)$ -weakly-Mahlo.

Since  $\kappa$  is not  $(n+1)$ -weakly-Mahlo,  $W_n$  is not stationary in  $\kappa$  and by Proposition 3.25 this implies  $(W_n)^A$  not stationary in  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$ . Then, there is some club  $C$  such that  $C \cap (W_n)^A = \emptyset$ .

On the other hand, since  $\kappa$  is  $n$ -weakly-Mahlo,  $(W_{n-1})^A$  is 1-stationary in  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$ . Then  $C \cap (W_{n-1})^A$  is also 1-stationary in  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$ . Now, as  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$  is 2-stationary, there is  $B \in \mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$  such that  $\mu := B \cap \kappa$  is a regular limit cardinal and  $C \cap (W_{n-1})^A \cap \mathcal{P}_\mu(B)$  is 1-stationary in  $\mathcal{P}_\mu(B)$ . Whence  $(W_{n-1})^A \cap \mathcal{P}_\mu(B)$  is stationary in  $\mathcal{P}_\mu(B)$ . But  $(W_{n-1})^A \cap \mathcal{P}_\mu(B) = (W_{n-1} \cap \mu)^B$ , then  $(W_{n-1} \cap \mu)^B$  is stationary in  $\mathcal{P}_\mu(B)$ , and so,  $W_{n-1} \cap \mu$  is stationary in  $\mu$ . Then  $\mu = B \cap \kappa$  is  $n$ -weakly-Mahlo, and so  $B \in (W_n)^A$ . But  $B \in d_1(C \cap (W_{n-1})^A) \subseteq d_1(C) \subseteq C$  and  $C \cap (W_n)^A = \emptyset$ , so we have arrived to a contradiction.  $\square$

#### 4. A TOPOLOGY FOR $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$

Now, we direct our attention to establishing a correspondence between  $n$ -stationarity in  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$  and a topology for  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$ . A primary challenge arises due to  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$  not being a total order, eliminating the possibility of establishing a natural order topology as a starting point. Nonetheless, the study of  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$  has introduced an alternative ordering, distinct from “ $\subseteq$ ,” which has proven more suitable for addressing certain aspects of  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$  (See [8, 9, 22]). For every  $x, y \in \mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$

$$x <^* y \text{ if and only if } x \subseteq y \text{ and } |x| < |y \cap \kappa|$$

Then, we may also define for  $x, y \in \mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$  the interval  $(x, y) := \{z \in \mathcal{P}_\kappa(A) : x <^* z <^* y\}$ . Relying in our established results, considering order  $<^*$ , and keeping in view our aim for the limit points of this new topology to align with points showing simultaneous stationary reflection, we arrive at the following definition

**Definition 4.1.** *Let  $y \in \mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$  such that  $\mu = y \cap \kappa$  is a regular limit cardinal and  $x <^* y$ , then,  $U_x(y) := (x, y) \cup \{y\}$ . We define  $\mathcal{S}_0 := \{\emptyset\} \cup \{\{x\} : x \in \mathcal{P}_\kappa(A) \text{ and } |x \cap \kappa| \text{ is not limit regular}\} \cup \{U_x(y) = (x, y) \cup \{y\} : |y \cap \kappa| \text{ is limit regular and } x <^* y\}$ . And  $\tau_0$  to be the topology generated by  $\mathcal{S}_0$ .*

**Proposition 4.2.**  $\mathcal{S}_0$  is a base for a topology in  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$ .

**Proof :** Let  $x \in \mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$ , if  $|x \cap \kappa|$  is not regular limit cardinal, then  $x \in \{x\} \in \mathcal{S}_0$ . If not, then  $x \in (z, x) \cup \{x\} = U_z(x) \in \mathcal{S}_0$ , for any  $z$  such that  $z \subseteq x$  and  $|z| < |x \cap \kappa|$ . Then  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(A) \subseteq \bigcup \mathcal{S}_0$ . Suppose now that  $z \in U_x(y) \cap U_{x'}(y')$ , we shall show that there is  $V \in \mathcal{S}_0$  such that  $z \in V \subseteq U_x(y) \cap U_{x'}(y')$ . let us consider two cases:

- i)  $z = y$  or  $z = y'$  : W.l.g. suppose  $z = y$ . If  $z \in \{y'\}$  then  $y = y'$  and then  $x, x' <^* y$ , whence  $x \cup x' <^* y$ . Then,  $z \in U_{x \cup x'}(y)$  and if  $w \neq z = y$  and  $w \in U_{x \cup x'}(y)$  then  $x \cup x' <^* w <^* y$  and so  $w \in U_x(y) \cap U_{x'}(y)$ . This is  $z \in U_{x \cup x'}(y) \subseteq U_x(y) \cap U_{x'}(y')$ . If  $z \in (x', y')$ , then  $z = y \in U_{x \cup x'}(y)$ , and if  $w \neq y$  and  $w \in U_{x \cup x'}(y)$  then  $x \cup x' <^* w <^* y <^* y'$  and so  $w \in U_x(y) \cap U_{x'}(y')$ . This is  $z \in U_{x \cup x'}(y) \subseteq U_x(y) \cap U_{x'}(y')$ .
- ii)  $z \in (x, y) \cap (x', y')$  : If  $|z \cap \kappa|$  is not regular limit cardinal, then  $z \in \{z\} \subseteq U_x(y) \cap U_{x'}(y')$  with  $\{z\} \in \mathcal{S}_0$ . If  $|z \cap \kappa|$  is regular limit cardinal, then  $z \in U_{x \cup x'}(z)$ . Moreover if  $w \in U_{x \cup x'}(z)$  then  $x \cup x' <^* w <^* z <^* y, y'$  and so  $w \in U_x(y) \cap U_{x'}(y')$ . This is  $z \in U_{x \cup x'}(z) \subseteq U_x(y) \cap U_{x'}(y')$ .  $\square$

Recall that in the introduction, we established our preferred notation for Cantor's Derivative operator. Given a topology  $\tau$  in  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$  and  $X \subseteq \mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$ , we denote  $\partial_\tau(X) := \{x \in \mathcal{P}_\kappa(A) : x \text{ is a limit point of } X \text{ in } \tau\}$ .

**Proposition 4.3.** *For any  $S \subseteq \mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$ ,  $d_0^s(S) = \partial_{\tau_0}(S)$ .*

**Proof :**  $\subseteq$ ) Suppose  $x \in d_0^s(S)$ . Let  $U$  be a basic set containing  $x$ , clearly  $U \neq \{x\}$  because  $\mu := |x \cap \kappa|$  is regular limit cardinal. Then  $x \in U = U_z(y)$  for some  $y, z \in \mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$  such that  $|y \cap \kappa|$  is a regular limit cardinal and  $|z| < |y \cap \kappa|$ . In particular  $x \in U_z(x) \subseteq U_z(y)$ . Since  $z$  is such that  $z \subseteq x$  and  $|z| < |x \cap \kappa| = \mu$  then  $z \in \mathcal{P}_\mu(x)$ . And also  $z \cup |z|^+ \subseteq x$  and  $|z \cup |z|^+| = |z|^+ < \mu$  then there is  $z_0 \in S \cap \mathcal{P}_\mu(x)$  such that  $z \cup |z|^+ \subseteq z_0$ . This is  $z \subseteq z_0$  and  $|z| < |z|^+ = |(z \cup |z|^+) \cap \kappa| \leq |z_0 \cap \kappa|$ . Whence  $z_0 \in (z, y)$  and so  $z_0 \in U \cap (S \setminus \{x\})$ .

$\supseteq$ ) Suppose  $x$  is a limit point of  $S$  in the topology  $\tau_0$ . Notice that  $\mu := |x \cap \kappa|$  is regular limit cardinal, otherwise  $\{x\} \in \tau_0$  contradicting  $x$  is limit point. Let  $y \in \mathcal{P}_\mu(x)$ , then  $|y| < \mu = |x \cap \kappa|$  and so  $x \in U_y(x) \in \mathcal{S}_0$ . Hence  $U_y(x) \cap (S \setminus \{x\}) \neq \emptyset$ . This is, there is  $z \in (y, x) \cap S$ . Thus  $z \in S \cap \mathcal{P}_\mu(x)$  and  $y \subseteq z$ , therefore  $S \cap \mathcal{P}_\mu(x)$  is cofinal in  $\mathcal{P}_\mu(x)$ .  $\square$

Therefore, for the case of  $n = 0$ , our constructed topology emulates the behaviour of the order topology in ordinals concerning 0-stationary reflection. Consequently, we select  $\tau_0$  as the initial topology for our intended sequence of topologies  $\langle \tau_0, \tau_1, \dots \rangle$  on  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$ . As in [3], given  $\tau_n$  for  $n < \omega$  we define  $\partial_{\tau_n}$  to be the Cantor's derivative operator  $\partial_{\tau_n}(S) := \{x \in \mathcal{P}_\kappa(A) : x \text{ is a limit point of } S \text{ in the topology } \tau_n\}$ .

$\tau_n\}$ . Set  $\mathcal{B}_0 := \mathcal{S}_0$  and  $\mathcal{B}_{n+1} := \mathcal{B}_n \cup \{\partial_{\tau_n}(S) : S \subseteq \mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)\}$ . Finally, define  $\tau_{n+1}$  to be the topology generated by  $\mathcal{B}_{n+1}$ . This is  $\tau_{n+1} := \langle \mathcal{B}_{n+1} \rangle$ .

**Definition 4.4.** For every  $n < \omega$ , we define  $\mathcal{S}_{n+1} := \mathcal{S}_n \cup \mathcal{D}_n$  where  $\mathcal{D}_n := \{d_n^s(S_1) \cap d_n^s(S_2) \cap U_z(y) : S_1, S_2 \subseteq \mathcal{P}_\kappa(A), z <^* y \text{ and } y \in d_n^s(S_1) \cap d_n^s(S_2)\}$ .

**Proposition 4.5.** For every  $n < \omega$ ,  $\mathcal{S}_{n+1}$  is a base for a topology in  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$

**Proof:** To prove that  $\mathcal{S}_{n+1}$  is a base for a topology in  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$  we need to prove (i)  $\bigcup \mathcal{S}_{n+1} = \mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$  and (ii) for every  $x \in \mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$  and  $U, V \in \mathcal{S}_{n+1}$ , if  $x \in U \cap V$ , there is  $W \in \mathcal{S}_{n+1}$  such that  $x \in W \subseteq U \cap V$ .

First, for (i), recall that  $\mathcal{S}_0$  is a base and  $\mathcal{S}_0 \subseteq \mathcal{S}_{n+1}$  for all  $n < \omega$ . Then,  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(A) = \bigcup \mathcal{S}_0 \subseteq \bigcup \mathcal{S}_{n+1}$ . Now, let  $x \in U \cap V$  with  $U, V \in \mathcal{S}_{n+1}$ . Notice that  $\mathcal{S}_{n+1} = \mathcal{S}_0 \cup \bigcup_{i=0}^n \mathcal{D}_i$ . We will consider three cases (i)  $U, V \in \mathcal{S}_0$ , (ii)  $U \in \mathcal{S}_0$  and  $V \in \bigcup_{i=0}^n \mathcal{D}_i$ , and (iii)  $U, V \in \bigcup_{i=0}^n \mathcal{D}_i$ .

- (i) This case is clear because  $\mathcal{S}_0$  is already a base for a topology. ( Proposition 4.2.)
- (ii) If  $U \in \mathcal{S}_0$  and  $V \in \mathcal{D}_m$  for some  $m \leq n$ . Then,  $U = U_{z'}(y')$  for some  $y'$  such that  $|y' \cap \kappa|$  is a regular limit cardinal and  $z' <^* y$  and  $x \in V = d_m^s(S_1) \cap d_m^s(S_2) \cap U_{z''}(y'')$ . From  $x \in d_m^s(S_1)$  we get that  $|x \cap \kappa|$  is a regular limit cardinal. Now,  $x \in U \cap V = U_{z'}(y') \cap d_m^s(S_1) \cap d_m^s(S_2) \cap U_{z''}(y'')$ , hence  $x \in U_{z'}(y') \cap U_{z''}(y'')$ . Then,  $x \in U_z(x) \subseteq U_{z'}(y') \cap U_{z''}(y'')$  where  $z := z' \cup z'' <^* x$ . Hence,  $x \in W := U_z(x) \cap d_m^s(S_1) \cap d_m^s(S_2) \subseteq U_{z'}(y') \cap U_{z''}(y'') \cap d_m^s(S_1) \cap d_m^s(S_2) = U \cap V$ , and  $W \in \mathcal{D}_m$ .
- (iii) If  $U \in \mathcal{D}_l$  and  $V \in \mathcal{D}_m$  for some  $l, m \leq n$ , then  $x \in (d_l^s(T_1) \cap d_l^s(T_2) \cap U_{z'}(y')) \cap (d_m^s(S_1) \cap d_m^s(S_2) \cap U_{z''}(y''))$ . Proceeding as in (ii) we can find  $z <^* x$  such that  $x \in U_z(x) \subseteq U_{z'}(y') \cap U_{z''}(y'')$ . From  $x \in d_l^s(T_1) \cap d_l^s(T_2) \cap d_m^s(S_1) \cap d_m^s(S_2)$  we get that  $T_i \cap \mathcal{P}_\mu(x)$  is  $l$ -stationary in  $\mathcal{P}_\mu(x)$  and  $S_i \cap \mathcal{P}_\mu(x)$  is  $m$ -stationary in  $\mathcal{P}_\mu(x)$  where  $\mu := |x \cap \kappa|$  and  $i = 1, 2$ . W.l.g. we may assume  $m \geq l$ . Then, from  $S_1 \cap \mathcal{P}_\mu(x) \subseteq \mathcal{P}_\mu(x)$  we get that  $\mathcal{P}_\mu(x)$  is also  $m$ -s-stationary.

By Proposition 3.21 (1)  $d_l^s(T_1 \cap \mathcal{P}_\mu(x)) \cap d_l^s(T_2 \cap \mathcal{P}_\mu(x)) \cap d_m^s(S_1 \cap \mathcal{P}_\mu(x)) \cap d_m^s(S_2 \cap \mathcal{P}_\mu(x))$  is  $m$ -s-stationary in  $\mathcal{P}_\mu(x)$ . Whence  $d_l^s(T_1) \cap d_l^s(T_2) \cap d_m^s(S_1) \cap d_m^s(S_2) \cap \mathcal{P}_\mu(x)$  is  $m$ -s-stationary in  $\mathcal{P}_\mu(x)$ , that is,  $x \in d_m^s(d_l^s(T_1) \cap d_l^s(T_2) \cap d_m^s(S_1) \cap d_m^s(S_2))$ . Therefore  $W := U_z(x) \cap d_m^s(d_l^s(T_1) \cap d_l^s(T_2) \cap d_m^s(S_1) \cap d_m^s(S_2)) \in \mathcal{D}_m$ . Now  $d_m^s(d_l^s(T_1) \cap d_l^s(T_2) \cap d_m^s(S_1) \cap d_m^s(S_2)) \subseteq d_m^s(d_l^s(T_1)) \cap d_m^s(d_l^s(T_2)) \cap d_m^s(d_m^s(S_1)) \cap d_m^s(d_m^s(S_2)) \subseteq d_l^s(T_1) \cap d_l^s(T_2) \cap d_m^s(S_1) \cap d_m^s(S_2)$ . In the last expression we used the fact that  $l \leq m$  and Lemma 3.20 (3).

Then  $x \in W = U_z(x) \cap d_m^s(d_l^s(T_1) \cap d_l^s(T_2) \cap d_m^s(S_1) \cap d_m^s(S_2)) \subseteq U_{z'}(y') \cap U_{z''}(y'') \cap d_l^s(T_1) \cap d_l^s(T_2) \cap d_m^s(S_1) \cap d_m^s(S_2) = U \cap V$ .  $\square$

From the previous, it is easy to see that if  $\mathcal{B}_0^* := \mathcal{S}_0$  and  $\mathcal{B}_{n+1}^* := \mathcal{B}_n^* \cup \{d_n^s(S) : S \subseteq \mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)\}$ . Then, for all  $n < \omega$ ,  $\mathcal{B}_n^*$  is a subbase for a topology in  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$ . Moreover,  $\mathcal{B}_n^*$  and  $\mathcal{S}_n$  generates the same topology over  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$ .

**Definition 4.6.** For every  $n < \omega$ , define  $\tau_n^*$  to be the topology generated by  $\mathcal{S}_n$ . Also for any  $S \subseteq \mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$  let us write  $\partial_n(S)$  for  $\partial_{\tau_n^*}(S)$ .

**Proposition 4.7.** If  $n < \omega$  and  $S \subseteq \mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$ , then,  $d_n^s(S) = \partial_n(S)$ .

**Proof:** Proceed by induction on  $n$ . For  $n = 0$  it is clear by Propositions 4.3. So, suppose it holds for  $n$  and let us prove it for  $n + 1$ .

( $\subseteq$ ) Let  $x \in d_{n+1}^s(S)$ . Thus,  $S \cap \mathcal{P}_\mu(x)$  is  $(n + 1)$ -s-stationary in  $\mathcal{P}_\mu(x)$ . Let  $U \in \mathcal{S}_{n+1} = \mathcal{S}_n \cup \mathcal{D}_n$  such that  $x \in U$ , we aim to prove that  $U \cap (S \setminus \{x\})$ .

- If  $U \in \mathcal{S}_n$ , then as  $x \in d_{n+1}^s(S) \subseteq d_n^s(S)$ , by induction hypothesis we have  $x \in d_n^s(S) = \partial_n(S)$ . That is,  $x$  is a limit point of  $S$  in  $\tau_n$ , whence  $U \cap (S \setminus \{x\}) \neq \emptyset$ .
- If  $U \in \mathcal{D}_n$  then  $x \in U = d_n^s(S_1) \cap d_n^s(S_2) \cap U_z(y)$  for some  $S_1, S_2 \subseteq \mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$ ,  $z <^* y$  and  $y \in d_n^s(S_1) \cap d_n^s(S_2)$ . Then,  $S_1 \cap \mathcal{P}_\mu(x)$  and  $S_2 \cap \mathcal{P}_\mu(x)$  are  $n$ -s-stationary in  $\mathcal{P}_\mu(x)$ , and since  $S \cap \mathcal{P}_\mu(x)$  is  $(n + 1)$ -s-stationary in  $\mathcal{P}_\mu(x)$  by Proposition 3.21 we get that  $S \cap \mathcal{P}_\mu(x) \cap d_n^s(S_1 \cap \mathcal{P}_\mu(x)) \cap d_n^s(S_2 \cap \mathcal{P}_\mu(x)) \subseteq S \cap \mathcal{P}_\mu(x) \cap d_n^s(S_1) \cap d_n^s(S_2)$  is  $n$ -s-stationary in  $\mathcal{P}_\mu(x)$ . In particular  $S \cap \mathcal{P}_\mu(x) \cap d_n^s(S_1) \cap d_n^s(S_2)$  is cofinal in  $\mathcal{P}_\mu(x)$ . Let  $w \in U_z(x) \subseteq U_z(y)$ . Then  $w \in \mathcal{P}_\mu(x)$  and so there is  $w' \in S \cap \mathcal{P}_\mu(x) \cap d_n^s(S_1) \cap d_n^s(S_2)$  such that  $z \subseteq w \cup |w|^+ \subseteq w'$ . Also notice that  $w \cap \kappa \subseteq (w \cup |w|^+) \cap \kappa \subseteq w' \cap \kappa$ , and  $|z| \leq |w| < |w|^+ = |(w \cup |w|^+) \cap \kappa| \leq |w' \cap \kappa|$ . Therefore,  $w' \in U_z(y) \cap S \cap \mathcal{P}_\mu(x) \cap d_n^s(S_1) \cap d_n^s(S_2) \subseteq U_z(y) \cap S \cap d_n^s(S_1) \cap d_n^s(S_2) = U \cap S$ . Notice that  $w' \neq x$ , because  $w' \in \mathcal{P}_\mu(x)$ . Hence  $U \cap (S \setminus \{x\}) \neq \emptyset$  and so  $x \in \partial_{n+1}(S)$ .

( $\supseteq$ ) Let  $x \in \partial_{n+1}(S)$ . Then  $x$  is limit point of  $S$  in  $\tau_{n+1}$ . If  $|x \cap \kappa|$  is not a regular limit cardinal, then  $\{x\} \in \mathcal{S}_0 \subseteq \mathcal{S}_{n+1}$  and so  $x$  cannot be a limit point of  $S$  in  $\tau_{n+1}$ . Then,  $\mu := |x \cap \kappa|$  is regular limit cardinal, we will consider two cases;

- i)  $\mathcal{P}_\mu(x)$  is not  $(n + 1)$ -s-stationary in  $\mathcal{P}_\mu(x)$ : Then, there are  $T_1, T_2 \subseteq \mathcal{P}_\mu(x)$   $m$ -s-stationary in  $\mathcal{P}_\mu(x)$  for some  $m \leq n$  such that  $d_m^s(T_1) \cap d_m^s(T_2) \cap \mathcal{P}_\mu(x) \neq \emptyset$ . Recall that  $U_z(x) \subseteq \mathcal{P}_\mu(x) \cup \{x\}$  and  $x \in d_m^s(T_1) \cap d_m^s(T_2)$ . Then  $U_z(x) \cap d_m^s(T_1) \cap d_m^s(T_2) \subseteq (\mathcal{P}_\mu(x) \cup \{x\}) \cap d_m^s(T_1) \cap d_m^s(T_2) = (\mathcal{P}_\mu(x) \cap d_m^s(T_1) \cap d_m^s(T_2)) \cup (\{x\} \cap d_m^s(T_1) \cap d_m^s(T_2)) = \emptyset \cup \{x\} = \{x\}$ . This is,  $\{x\} = U_z(x) \cap d_m^s(T_1) \cap d_m^s(T_2) \in \mathcal{S}_{n+1}$ . Thus, in this case,  $x$  cannot be a limit point of  $S$  in  $\tau_{n+1}$ .
- ii) If  $\mathcal{P}_\mu(x)$  is  $(n + 1)$ -s-stationary in  $\mathcal{P}_\mu(x)$ : We aim to prove that  $x \in d_{n+1}^s(S)$ , namely,  $S \cap \mathcal{P}_\mu(x)$  is  $n + 1$ -s-stationary in  $\mathcal{P}_\mu(x)$ . So let  $m < n + 1$  and  $T_1, T_2 \subseteq \mathcal{P}_\mu(x)$  be  $m$ -s-stationary in  $\mathcal{P}_\mu(x)$ . Then  $x \in d_m^s(T_1) \cap d_m^s(T_2)$ . Also, there is some  $z <^* x$  such that  $x \in U_z(x) \cap d_m^s(T_1) \cap d_m^s(T_2) \in \mathcal{S}_{n+1}$ . But  $x$  is a limit point of  $S$  in  $\tau_{n+1}$ . Then  $\emptyset \neq (U_z(x) \cap d_m^s(T_1) \cap d_m^s(T_2)) \cap (S \setminus \{x\}) \subseteq ((\mathcal{P}_\mu(x) \cup \{x\}) \cap d_m^s(T_1) \cap d_m^s(T_2)) \cap (S \setminus \{x\}) \subseteq \mathcal{P}_\mu(x) \cap d_m^s(T_1) \cap d_m^s(T_2) \cap S$ . Whence  $\emptyset \neq d_m^s(T_1) \cap d_m^s(T_2) \cap S \cap \mathcal{P}_\mu(x)$ , and so  $S \cap \mathcal{P}_\mu(x)$  is  $n + 1$ -s-stationary in  $\mathcal{P}_\mu(x)$ .  $\square$

**Corollary 8.** *Suppose  $S, T \subseteq \mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$  and  $m \leq n < \omega$ . Then,  $d_m^s(S) \cap d_n^s(T) = d_n^s(d_m^s(S) \cap T)$ .*

**Proof :**  $\subseteq$ ) Let  $x \in d_m^s(S) \cap d_n^s(T)$ . Then, by Proposition 4.7  $x$  is a limit point of  $T$  in the topology  $\tau_n$ . Moreover  $x \in d_m^s(S) \cap U_y(x) \in \tau_m \subseteq \tau_n$  for some  $y <^* x$ . To prove that  $x \in d_n^s(d_m^s(S) \cap T)$ , we will prove that  $x$  is a limit point of  $d_m^s(S) \cap T$  in  $\tau_n$ . Let  $U \in \tau_n$  be such that  $x \in U$ , then  $x \in U \cap d_m^s(S) \cap U_y(x) \in \tau_n$ . Then  $\emptyset \neq U \cap d_m^s(S) \cap U_y(x) \cap (T \setminus \{x\}) \subseteq U \cap ((d_m^s(S) \cap T) \setminus \{x\})$ . This is,  $x$  is a limit point of  $d_m^s(S) \cap T$  in  $\tau_n$ , and so  $x \in \partial_n(d_m^s(S) \cap T) = d_n^s(d_m^s(S) \cap T)$ .

$\supseteq$ ) Using Lemma 3.20 we get  $d_n^s(d_m^s(S) \cap T) \subseteq d_n^s(d_m^s(S)) \cap d_n^s(T) \subseteq d_m^s(S) \cap d_n^s(T)$ .  $\square$

Now, notice that  $\langle \mathcal{S}_0 \rangle = \langle \mathcal{B}_0^* \rangle = \langle \mathcal{B}_0 \rangle$ , then  $\tau_0 = \tau_0^*$ . Hence, by an easy induction and by Proposition 4.7, we have that,  $\langle \mathcal{S}_{n+1} \rangle = \langle \mathcal{B}_{n+1}^* \rangle = \langle \{d_n^s(S) : S \subseteq \mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)\} \rangle = \langle \{\partial_n(S) : S \subseteq \mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)\} \rangle = \langle \{\partial_{\tau_n}(S) : S \subseteq \mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)\} \rangle = \langle \mathcal{B}_{n+1} \rangle$ . This confirms that our sequence of topologies is indeed the sequence of derived topologies on  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$  obtained by means of Cantor's derivative operator. Hence, we arrived to the complete correspondence between limit points of derived topologies and  $n$ -stationary reflection, analogous to Theorem 2.11 in [3], namely

**Theorem 4.8.** *For every  $n < \omega$ , an point  $x \in \mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$  is not isolated in the  $\tau_n$  topology on  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$  if and only if  $x$  is such that  $\mu := |x \cap \kappa|$  is regular limit cardinal and  $\mathcal{P}_\mu(x)$  is  $n$ -stationary in  $\mathcal{P}_\mu(x)$ . Thus  $\mathcal{B}_n$  generates a non-discrete topology on  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$  if and only if some  $x$  is such that  $\mu := |x \cap \kappa|$  is regular limit cardinal and  $\mathcal{P}_\mu(x)$  is  $n$ -stationary in  $\mathcal{P}_\mu(x)$ .  $\square$*

## 5. A SUFFICIENT CONDITION FOR $n$ -STATIONARITY IN $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$

Notice that when  $|A| = |B|$ , then  $\langle \mathcal{P}_\kappa(A), \subseteq \rangle$  is isomorphic to  $\langle \mathcal{P}_\kappa(B), \subseteq \rangle$ . Then, the study of  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(A)$  is analogous to that of  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa\lambda$  (usually written as  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa\lambda$ ), where  $|A| = \lambda \geq \kappa$ . In this section we will expose two sufficient conditions for  $n$ -stationarity, in  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa\lambda$ . First one (Corollary 5.2), actually in  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(\kappa)$  is precisely as expected, since  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(\kappa)$  emulates the behaviour of  $\kappa$ , and in the ordinal case this proposition holds [2, 3]. The second one (Proposition 5.3), considering the more general case  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa\lambda$ , was stated by Sakai in [23], we provide a proof of the same.

**Lemma 5.1.** *Let  $\kappa$  be a regular cardinal. Then, (i) the formula  $\varphi_n(S) : "S \subseteq \mathcal{P}_\kappa(\kappa)$  is  $n$ -stationary in  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(\kappa)"$  is  $\Pi_n^1$  over  $\langle V_\kappa, \in, S \rangle$ . And (ii) if  $x \in \mathcal{P}_\kappa(\kappa)$ , then  $\varphi'_n(T) : "T \subseteq \mathcal{P}_{|x \cap \kappa|}(x)$  is  $n$ -stationary in  $\mathcal{P}_{|x \cap \kappa|}(x)"$  is a  $\Pi_0^1$  sentence over  $\langle V_\kappa, \in \rangle$ , in the parameters  $T, x$ .*

**Proof :** First we will show that  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(\kappa) \in V_{\kappa+1} \setminus V_\kappa$  and  $\mathcal{P}_{|x \cap \kappa|}(x) \in V_\kappa$ . If  $y \in \mathcal{P}_\kappa(\kappa)$ , then  $y \subseteq \alpha$  for some  $\alpha < \kappa$ . So we have  $\text{rank}(y) \leq \text{rank}(\alpha) < \text{rank}(\kappa) = \kappa$ , this is  $y \in \{z : \text{rank}(z) < \kappa\} = V_\kappa$ , whence  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(\kappa) \subseteq V_\kappa$  and so  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(\kappa) \in V_{\kappa+1}$ . Since

$\kappa \subseteq \mathcal{P}_\kappa(\kappa)$ ,  $\kappa = \text{rank}(\kappa) \leq \text{rank}(\mathcal{P}_\kappa(\kappa))$ , and this implies  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(\kappa) \notin V_\kappa$ . Moreover, if  $x \in S \subseteq \mathcal{P}_\kappa(\kappa) \subseteq V_\kappa$ ,  $x \in V_\alpha$  for some  $\alpha < \kappa$ . So that  $\mathcal{P}(x) \in V_{\alpha+1} \subseteq V_\kappa$ , and so  $\mathcal{P}_{|x \cap \kappa|}(x) \in V_\kappa$ .

Notice that,  $y \in \mathcal{P}_\kappa(\kappa)$  if and only if  $\langle V_\kappa, \in \rangle \models \psi(y)$ , where  $\psi(y) : \exists \alpha (OR(\alpha) \wedge y \subseteq \alpha)$ . So defined,  $\psi(y)$  is a  $\Pi_0^1$  formula. In fact,  $\psi(y)$  is a  $\Sigma_1$  formula with  $y$  as a free variable.

We will now prove both parts of the lemma simultaneously by induction. Proving explicitly the two first base cases  $n = 0$  and  $n = 1$ .

( $n = 0$ ):(i)  $S \subseteq \mathcal{P}_\kappa(\kappa)$  is 0-stationary in  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(\kappa)$  if and only if  $\langle V_\kappa, \in \rangle \models \varphi_0(S)$ , where

$$\varphi_0(S) : \forall y (\psi(y) \rightarrow \exists Y \in S (y \subseteq Y)).$$

Here,  $y$  is a first-order variable, because it ranges over elements of  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(\kappa) \subseteq V_\kappa$ . Then,  $\varphi_0(S)$  is first order, i.e.,  $\Pi_0^1$ .

(ii) Given  $x \in \mathcal{P}_\kappa(\kappa)$ , such that  $|x \cap \kappa|$  is a regular cardinal, we have that  $T \subseteq \mathcal{P}_{|x \cap \kappa|}(x)$  is 0-stationary in  $\mathcal{P}_{|x \cap \kappa|}(x)$  if and only if  $\langle V_\kappa, \in \rangle \models \varphi'_0(T, x)$ , where

$$\varphi'_0(T, x) : \forall y (y \in \mathcal{P}_{|x \cap \kappa|}(x) \rightarrow \exists Y \in T (y \subseteq Y)).$$

Since  $T \subseteq \mathcal{P}_{|x \cap \kappa|}(x) \in V_\kappa$  and  $y \in \mathcal{P}_{|x \cap \kappa|}(x) \in V_\kappa$ , then  $\varphi'_0(T; x)$  is a  $\Pi_1$  formula. Thus, it is  $\Pi_0^1$  in the parameters  $T$  and  $x$ .

( $n = 1$ ): (i) Let  $Reg(\delta)$  be the formula “ $\delta$  is a regular cardinal”. We have that  $S \subseteq \mathcal{P}_\kappa(\kappa)$  is 1-stationary in  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(\kappa)$  if and only if  $\langle V_\kappa, \in \rangle \models \varphi_1(S)$ , where

$$\varphi_1(S) : \forall y \phi_1(S, y)$$

$$\phi_1(S, y) : (\forall Z (Z \in y \rightarrow \psi(Z)) \wedge \varphi_0(S)) \rightarrow \sigma_1(S, y)$$

$$\sigma_1(S, y) : \exists x (x \in S \wedge Reg(|x \cap \kappa|) \wedge \varphi'_0(y \cap \mathcal{P}_{|x \cap \kappa|}(x))).$$

Here,  $y$  is a second order variable because its possible values are subsets of  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(\kappa)$ . Note that  $Z$  ranges over elements of  $V_\kappa$ ;  $y \in V_{\kappa+1}$  and  $Z \in y$ , implies  $Z \in V_\kappa$ . Then, as  $\varphi'_0(y \cap \mathcal{P}_{|x \cap \kappa|}(x))$  is  $\Pi_0^1$ , so is  $\sigma_1(S, y)$ . Together with the fact that  $\psi(Z)$  and  $\varphi_0(S)$  are also  $\Pi_0^1$ , we get that  $\varphi_1(S)$  is  $\Pi_1^1$ .

(ii) Given  $x \in \mathcal{P}_\kappa(\kappa)$  such that  $|x \cap \kappa|$  is a regular cardinal, we have that  $T \subseteq \mathcal{P}_{|x \cap \kappa|}(x)$  is 1-stationary in  $\mathcal{P}_{|x \cap \kappa|}(x)$  if and only if  $\langle V_\kappa, \in \rangle \models \varphi'_1(T; x)$  where

$$\varphi'_1(T; x) : \forall y \phi'_1(y, T; x)$$

$$\phi'_1(T; x) : (y \subseteq \mathcal{P}_{|x \cap \kappa|}(x) \wedge \varphi'_0(y; x)) \rightarrow \sigma'_1(T, y)$$

$$\sigma'_1(T, y) : \exists x' (x' \in T \wedge Reg(|x' \cap \kappa|) \wedge \varphi'_0(y \cap \mathcal{P}_{x' \cap \kappa}(x'); x')).$$

Here,  $y$  is a first-order variable because its possible values are subsets of  $\mathcal{P}_{|x \cap \kappa|}(x) \in V_\kappa$ . Also,  $\varphi'_0(y; x)$ ,  $\varphi'_0(y \cap \mathcal{P}_{x' \cap \kappa}(x'); x')$  are  $\Pi_1$  formulas. Then,  $\sigma'_1(T, y)$  is a  $\Sigma_2$  formula. Therefore,  $\varphi'_1(T; x)$  is a  $\Pi_3$  formula and so a  $\Pi_0^1$  formula.

(n): (i) Suppose now, that  $S \subseteq \mathcal{P}_\kappa(\kappa)$  is  $m$ -stationary in  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(\kappa)$  if and only if  $\langle V_\kappa, \in \rangle \models \varphi_m(S)$ , where  $\varphi_m(S)$  is a  $\Pi_m^1$  formula for all  $m < n$ . And let us prove the result for  $n$ .

$\varphi_m(S)$  is of the form  $\forall \mathbf{Y}_1^m \exists \mathbf{Y}_2^m \dots Q \mathbf{Y}_m^m \phi_m(S, \mathbf{Y}_1^m, \dots, \mathbf{Y}_m^m)$  where  $Q = \forall$  if  $m$  is odd,  $Q = \exists$  if  $m$  is even,  $\mathbf{Y}_j^m = Y_1, \dots, Y_{k_j}$  for  $j \in \{1, \dots, n\}$  and  $\phi_m(S, \mathbf{Y}_1^m, \dots, \mathbf{Y}_m^m)$  is a  $\Pi_0^1$  formula. We have,  $S \subseteq \mathcal{P}_\kappa(\kappa)$  is  $n$ -stationary in  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(\kappa)$  if and only if  $\langle V_\kappa, \in \rangle \models \varphi_n(S)$ , where

$$\varphi_n(S) : \varphi_{n-1}(S) \wedge \forall y((\forall Z(Z \in y \rightarrow \psi(Z)) \wedge \varphi_{n-1}(S)) \rightarrow \sigma_n(S, y))$$

From the inductive hypothesis, we know that  $\varphi_{n-1}(S)$  is of the form  $\forall \mathbf{Y}_1^{n-1} \exists \mathbf{Y}_2^{n-1} \dots Q \mathbf{Y}_{n-1}^{n-1} \phi_{n-1}(S, \mathbf{Y}_1^{n-1}, \dots, \mathbf{Y}_{n-1}^{n-1})$ , and so, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \forall y((\forall Z(Z \in y \rightarrow \psi(Z)) \wedge \varphi_{n-1}(S)) \rightarrow \sigma_n(S, y)) &\equiv \forall y \exists \mathbf{Y}_1^{n-1} \forall \mathbf{Y}_2^{n-1} \dots \\ &\bar{Q} \mathbf{Y}_{n-1}^{n-1}((\forall Z(Z \in y \rightarrow \psi(Z)) \wedge \phi_{n-1}(S, \mathbf{Y}_1^{n-1}, \dots, \mathbf{Y}_{n-1}^{n-1})) \rightarrow \sigma_n(S, y)) \end{aligned}$$

where  $\bar{Q} = \forall$  if  $Q = \exists$ ,  $\bar{Q} = \exists$  if  $Q = \forall$ , and  $\sigma_n$  is the first order formula

$$\sigma_n(S, y) : \exists x(x \in S \wedge \text{Reg}(|x \cap \kappa|) \wedge \varphi'_{n-1}(y \cap \mathcal{P}_{|x \cap \kappa|}(x)))$$

Therefore, if  $(\mathbf{y}_1 := y, \mathbf{Y}_1^1, \dots, \mathbf{Y}_1^{n-1}), \dots, (\mathbf{y}_i := \mathbf{Y}_i^i, \dots, \mathbf{Y}_i^{n-1}, \mathbf{Y}_{i-1}^{n-1}), \dots, (\mathbf{y}_n := \mathbf{Y}_{n-1}^{n-1})$ , we may write  $\varphi_n(S)$  in the following form:

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi_n(S) &\equiv \forall \mathbf{y}_1 \exists \mathbf{y}_2 \forall \mathbf{y}_3 \dots \bar{Q} \mathbf{y}_n (\phi_1(S, \mathbf{Y}_1) \wedge \phi_2(S, \mathbf{Y}_1, \mathbf{Y}_2) \\ &\quad \wedge \dots \wedge \phi_{n-1}(S, \mathbf{Y}_1, \dots, \mathbf{Y}_{n-1}) \wedge \\ &\quad \wedge ((\forall Z(Z \in y \rightarrow \psi(Z)) \wedge \phi_{n-1}(S, \mathbf{Y}_1, \dots, \mathbf{Y}_{n-1})) \rightarrow \sigma_n(S, y)) ) \end{aligned}$$

Since  $\phi_j(S, \mathbf{Y}_1, \dots, \mathbf{Y}_i)$  and  $\sigma_n(S, y)$  are  $\Pi_0^1$  formulas for  $j \in \{1, \dots, n-1\}$ , we get that  $\varphi_n(S)$  is a  $\Pi_n^1$  formula.

(ii) Suppose now, that for  $x \in \mathcal{P}_\kappa(\kappa)$ ,  $T \subseteq \mathcal{P}_{|x \cap \kappa|}(x)$  is  $m$ -stationary in  $\mathcal{P}_{|x \cap \kappa|}(x)$  if and only if  $\langle V_\kappa, \in \rangle \models \varphi'_m(T, x)$ , where  $\varphi'_m(T, x)$  is a  $\Pi_0^1$  formula for all  $m < n$ . Then,  $\varphi'_m(T, x)$  is of the form “ $T \subseteq \mathcal{P}_{|x \cap \kappa|}(x)$  is  $n$ -stationary in  $\mathcal{P}_{|x \cap \kappa|}(x)$  if and only if  $\langle V_\kappa, \in \rangle \models \varphi'_n(T, x)$ ”, where

$$\varphi'_n(T, x) : \varphi'_{n-1}(T, x) \wedge \forall y((y \subseteq \mathcal{P}_{|x \cap \kappa|}(x) \wedge \varphi'_{n-1}(y, x)) \rightarrow \sigma'_n(T, y))$$

and where

$$\sigma'_n(T, y) : \exists x'(x' \in T \wedge \text{Reg}(|x' \cap \kappa|) \wedge \varphi'_{n-1}(y \cap \mathcal{P}_{|x' \cap \kappa|}(x'); x'))$$

Here,  $y$  is a first-order variable because its possible values are subsets of  $\mathcal{P}_{|x \cap \kappa|}(x) \in V_\kappa$ , and  $\varphi'_{n-1}(y \cap \mathcal{P}_{|x' \cap \kappa|}(x), x')$  and  $\sigma'_n(T, y)$  are first-order formulas. Then  $\varphi'_n(T, x)$  is a first-order formula and so it is  $\Pi_0^1$ .  $\square$

**Theorem 5.2.** *Let  $n < \omega$ . If  $\kappa$  is  $\Pi_n^1$  indescribable, then  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(\kappa)$  is  $n+1$  stationary.*



**Proof :** Suppose  $\kappa$  is  $\Pi_n^1$  indescribable. Let  $S \subseteq \mathcal{P}_\kappa(\kappa)$  be  $m$ -stationary, some  $m < n + 1$ . Consider the  $\Pi_m^1$  sentence  $\varphi_m(S)$  in  $\langle V_\kappa, \in, S \rangle$ . Then, we have

$$\langle V_\kappa, \in, S \rangle \models \varphi_m(S).$$

As  $\kappa$  is  $\Pi_n^1$  indescribable and  $m \leq n$ , there is some  $\mu < \kappa$  regular such that

$$\langle V_\mu, \in, S \cap V_\mu \rangle \models \varphi_m(S \cap V_\mu).$$

Now, note that  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(\kappa) \cap V_\mu = \mathcal{P}_\mu(\mu)$ . For if  $X \in \mathcal{P}_\kappa(\kappa) \cap V_\mu$  then  $X \subseteq \kappa \cap V_\mu = \mu$ . Also  $|X| < \mu$ , otherwise,  $\text{rank}(X) = \mu$  and so  $X \notin V_\mu$ . Hence  $X \in \mathcal{P}_\mu(\mu)$ .

Thus, since  $S = S \cap \mathcal{P}_\kappa(\kappa)$ , we have that  $S \cap V_\mu = S \cap \mathcal{P}_\kappa(\kappa) \cap V_\mu = S \cap \mathcal{P}_\mu(\mu)$ . Therefore, we have  $\langle V_\mu, \in, S \cap \mathcal{P}_\mu(\mu) \rangle \models \varphi_m(S \cap \mathcal{P}_\mu(\mu))$ , and so  $S \cap \mathcal{P}_\mu(\mu)$  is  $m$ -stationary in  $\mathcal{P}_\mu(\mu)$ .  $\square$

**Corollary 9.** *If  $\kappa$  is totally indescribable, then  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(\kappa)$  is  $n$ -stationary for any  $n < \omega$ .*  $\square$

Now, we will provide a proof for the the assertion made by Sakai in [23], showing thereof a sufficient condition to have  $n$ -stationarity in  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa\lambda$ . Recall that if  $|\lambda| = |\delta|$ , then there is a natural bijection  $f$  from  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa\lambda$  to  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa\delta$ , which is in fact an isomorphism between  $\langle \mathcal{P}_\kappa\lambda, \subseteq \rangle$  and  $\langle \mathcal{P}_\kappa\delta, \subseteq \rangle$ . Then,  $S \subseteq \mathcal{P}_\kappa\lambda$  is  $m$ -stationary in  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa\lambda$  if and only if  $f[S]$  is  $m$ -stationary in  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa\delta$ . The proof of this fact is follows immediately form definition of  $n$ -stationarity in  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa\lambda$ .

**Theorem 5.3.** ([23]) *If  $\kappa$  is  $\lambda$ -supercompact and  $\lambda^{<\kappa} = \lambda$  then  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa\lambda$  is  $n$ -stationary for any  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ .*

**Proof :** Let  $n < \omega$  and take  $S \subseteq \mathcal{P}_\kappa\lambda$  be  $m$ -stationary for a given  $m < n$ . Suppose that  $\kappa$  is  $\lambda$ -supercompact, this is, there is an elementary embedding  $j : V \preceq M$  such that  $\text{crit}(j) = \kappa$ ,  $\lambda < j(\kappa)$  and  ${}^\lambda M \subseteq M$ , where  $M$  is transitive.

Recall that  $j^{\ulcorner x \urcorner} = \{j^{\ulcorner y \urcorner} : y \in x\}$ , we claim that  $j^{\ulcorner \alpha \urcorner} \in M$ , for all  $\alpha \leq \lambda$ . We prove this by induction on  $OR$ ,  $j^{\ulcorner 0 \urcorner} = 0 \in M$  because  $j \upharpoonright_\kappa = Id \upharpoonright_\kappa$ . If  $j^{\ulcorner \alpha \urcorner} \in M$  for  $\alpha < \lambda$ , then  $j^{\ulcorner \alpha + 1 \urcorner} = j^{\ulcorner \alpha \urcorner} \cup \{j^{\ulcorner \alpha \urcorner}\} \in M$ . And if  $\alpha \leq \lambda$  limit and  $j^{\ulcorner \beta \urcorner} \in M$  for all  $\beta < \alpha$  then  $j^{\ulcorner \alpha \urcorner} = \{j^{\ulcorner \beta \urcorner} : \beta < \alpha\}$  which is a sequence of  $\alpha \leq \lambda$  elements of  $M$ , whence  $j^{\ulcorner \alpha \urcorner} \in {}^\lambda M \subseteq M$ .

Since  $j \upharpoonright_\kappa = Id \upharpoonright_\kappa$ , we have that,  $j^{\ulcorner \kappa \urcorner} = \{j^{\ulcorner \alpha \urcorner} : \alpha < \kappa\} = \{\alpha : \alpha < \kappa\} = \kappa \in M$ . Then, it follows that  $\mathcal{P}_{j^{\ulcorner \kappa \urcorner}}(j^{\ulcorner \lambda \urcorner}) = \mathcal{P}_\kappa(j^{\ulcorner \lambda \urcorner}) \subseteq M$ . Moreover, as  $|j^{\ulcorner \lambda \urcorner}| = |\lambda|$ , then  $|\mathcal{P}_\kappa(j^{\ulcorner \lambda \urcorner})| = |j^{\ulcorner \lambda \urcorner}|^{<\kappa} = \lambda^{<\kappa} = \lambda$ , and so  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(j^{\ulcorner \lambda \urcorner}) \in M$ . Now, notice that there is an isomorphism  $f$  between  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa\lambda$  and  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(j^{\ulcorner \lambda \urcorner})$  given by  $X \mapsto j^{\ulcorner X \urcorner}$ .

By hypothesis, we have that  $S \subseteq \mathcal{P}_\kappa\lambda$  is  $m$ -stationary in  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa\lambda$ , and so  $f[S] = j^{\ulcorner S \subseteq \mathcal{P}_\kappa(j^{\ulcorner \lambda \urcorner}) \urcorner}$  is  $m$ -stationary in  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(j^{\ulcorner \lambda \urcorner})$ . Therefore, as  $j^{\ulcorner S \subseteq \mathcal{P}_\kappa(j^{\ulcorner \lambda \urcorner}) \urcorner} \subseteq j^{\ulcorner S \subseteq \mathcal{P}_\kappa(j^{\ulcorner \lambda \urcorner}) \urcorner}$  we have that

$$V \models \text{“ } j^{\ulcorner S \subseteq \mathcal{P}_\kappa(j^{\ulcorner \lambda \urcorner}) \urcorner} \text{ is } m\text{-stationary in } \mathcal{P}_\kappa(j^{\ulcorner \lambda \urcorner}) \text{”}.$$

Since  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(j^{\text{“}\lambda\text{”}}) \in M$ , we have that  $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{P}_\kappa(j^{\text{“}\lambda\text{”}})) \subseteq M$ . Therefore, since being  $m$ -stationary depends only on the subsets of  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(j^{\text{“}\lambda\text{”}})$ , we also have

$$M \models \text{“} j(S) \cap \mathcal{P}_\kappa(j^{\text{“}\lambda\text{”}}) \text{ is } m\text{-stationary in } \mathcal{P}_\kappa(j^{\text{“}\lambda\text{”}}) \text{”}.$$

In  $M$  we have that  $\kappa$  is regular and such that  $\kappa < j(\kappa)$ . If we define  $x := j^{\text{“}\lambda\text{”}}$ , then  $\kappa = j^{\text{“}\kappa\text{”}} \subseteq j^{\text{“}\lambda\text{”}} = x$ , and so  $\kappa \subseteq x \cap j(\kappa)$ . In fact  $\kappa = x \cap j(\kappa) = |x \cap j(\kappa)|$ ; if  $\alpha \in (x \cap j(\kappa)) \setminus \kappa$ , then  $\alpha = j(\beta)$  for some  $\kappa < \beta < \lambda$  and  $\alpha < j(\kappa)$ , but  $\kappa < \beta$  implies  $j(\kappa) < j(\beta) = \alpha$ , and this is a contradiction. Besides, as  $|j^{\text{“}\lambda\text{”}}| = \lambda < j(\kappa)$ , we have that  $x \in \mathcal{P}_{j(\kappa)}(j(\lambda))$ .

Hence the following line holds, witnessed by  $\mu = \kappa$  and  $x = j^{\text{“}\lambda\text{”}}$

$$M \models \exists x( \text{Reg}(|x \cap j(\kappa)|) \wedge x \in \mathcal{P}_{j(\kappa)}(j(\lambda)) \wedge$$

$$\text{“} j(S) \cap \mathcal{P}_{|x \cap j(\kappa)|}(x) \text{ is } m\text{-stationary in } \mathcal{P}_{|x \cap j(\kappa)|}(x) \text{”} ).$$

As  $j$  is an elementary embedding, we get that

$$V \models \exists x( \text{Reg}(|x \cap j^{-1}(j(\kappa))|) \wedge x \in \mathcal{P}_{j^{-1}(j(\kappa))}(j^{-1}(j(\lambda))) \wedge$$

$$\text{“} j^{-1}(j(S)) \cap \mathcal{P}_{|x \cap j^{-1}(j(\kappa))|}(x) \text{ is } m\text{-stationary in } \mathcal{P}_{|x \cap j^{-1}(j(\kappa))|}(x) \text{”} ).$$

and since  $j^{-1}(j(\kappa)) = \kappa$ ,  $j^{-1}(j(\lambda)) = \lambda$  and  $j^{-1}(j(S)) = S$ , we conclude that

$$V \models \exists x( \text{Reg}(|x \cap \kappa|) \wedge x \in \mathcal{P}_\kappa \lambda \wedge \text{“} S \cap \mathcal{P}_{|x \cap \kappa|}(x) \text{ is } m\text{-stationary in } \mathcal{P}_{|x \cap \kappa|}(x) \text{”} ).$$

Therefore, for each  $m < n$  if  $S \subseteq \mathcal{P}_\kappa \lambda$  is  $m$ -stationary, there is  $x \in \mathcal{P}_\kappa \lambda$  such that  $\mu := |x \cap \kappa|$  is regular and  $S \cap \mathcal{P}_\mu(x)$  is  $m$ -stationary in  $\mathcal{P}_\mu(x)$ . And this is precisely to say that  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa \lambda$  is  $n$ -stationary.  $\square$

#### ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

In compiling this research paper, I am grateful for the insightful discussions and invaluable guidance provided by my advisor, Professor Joan Bagaria. Their expertise and thoughtful suggestions have significantly contributed to the development of this work. Additionally, I extend my thanks to Professors Sakaé Fuchino and Hiroshi Sakai for engaging and enlightening discussions during my research stay at Kobe. Their perspectives and input have been instrumental in shaping the ideas presented in this paper.

#### REFERENCES

1. Joan Bagaria. *Topologies on Ordinals and the Completeness of Polymodal Provability Logics*, Circulated manuscript (2011).
2. Joan Bagaria. *Derived Topologies On Ordinals and Stationary Reflection*. Trans. Amer. Math. Soc., (2019), 371(3):1981–2002.
3. Joan Bagaria, Menachem Magidor, and Hiroshi Sakai. *Reflection and indescribability in the constructible universe*, Israel J. Math. 208 (2015), no. 1, 1–11.
4. J. Baumgartner. *Ineffability properties of cardinals I*, Infinite and finite sets, Volume I, Proceedings of a Colloquium held at Keszthely, June 25 July 1, (1973) pp. 109–130.
5. Lev Beklemishev and David Gabelaia. *Topological completeness of the provability logic GLP*, Ann. Pure Appl. Logic 164 (2013), no. 12, 1201–1223.

6. Lev Beklemishev and David Gabelaia. *Topological interpretations of provability logic*, Leo Esakia on duality in modal and intuitionistic logics, Outst. Contrib. Log., vol. 4, Springer, Dordrecht, 2014, pp. 257–290.
7. Donna M. Carr. *The minimal normal filter on  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa\lambda$* , Proc. Amer. Math. Soc., 86 (1982), 316–320.
8. Donna M. Carr, Jean-Pierre Levinski, and Donald H. Pelletier *On the existence of strongly normal ideals over  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa\lambda$* . Arch. Math. Log. 30 (1) (1990) 59–72
9. Donna M. Carr  *$\mathcal{P}_\kappa\lambda$  partition relations*. Fund. Math. 128, (1987) 181–195
10. Brent Cody and Chris Lambie-Hanson and Jing Zhang. *Two-cardinal derived topologies, indescribability and Ramseyness*, arXiv, (2024) 2401.00266
11. Brent Cody. *Characterizations of the weakly compact ideal on  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa\lambda$* , Annals of Pure and Applied Logic, Vol 171, Issue 6, (2020) 102791
12. Sean Cox and Hiroshi Sakai. *Martin's Maximum and the Diagonal Reflection Principle*, RIMS Kokyuroku no.2141, pp.29–36, 2020.
13. H.-D. Donder, P. Koepke and J.-P. Levinski *Some stationary subsets of  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa\lambda$* , Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. 102 (1988), 1000–1004.
14. M. Foreman, M. Magidor and S. Shelah. *Martin's Maximum, saturated ideals and non-regular ultrafilters*, Annals Math. 127 (1988), 1–47
15. Thomas Jech. *The closed unbounded filter over  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(\lambda)$* . Notices Am. Math. Soc. 18 (1971) 663.
16. Thomas Jech. *Some combinatorial problems concerning uncountable cardinals*, Ann. Math. Logic 5 (1972/1973), no.3, 165–198.
17. Thomas Jech. *Stationary sets, Handbook of set theory*. Vols. 1, 2, 3, Springer, Dordrecht, 2010, pp. 93–128.
18. Thomas Jech. *Set theory, Springer Monographs in Mathematics*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2003. The third millennium edition, revised and expanded.
19. Thomas Jech and Saharon Shelah *On reflection of stationary sets in  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa\lambda$* , Transactions of the American Mathematical Society, Volume 352, Issue 6, 2000, Pages 2507–2515
20. Péter Komjáth, Vilmos Totik. *Problems and Theorems in Classical Set Theory*, Springer New York, NY, 2006. - Problem Books in Mathematics 978-0-387-36219-9
21. D. W. Kueker. *Countable approximations and Löwenheim-Skolem theorem*. Ann. Math. Logic 11 (1977), no. 1, 57–103.
22. M. Magidor. *On the singular cardinal problem I*, Israel Journal of Mathematics Vol 28 (1977) 1–31
23. Hiroshi Sakai. *On generalized notion of higher stationarity*, Reflections on Set Theoretic Reflection 2018, November 16–19. [Slides] <http://www.ub.edu/RSTR2018/slides/Sakai.pdf>
24. Hiroshi Sakai. *Stationary reflection principles and two cardinal tree properties*, Journal of the Institute of Mathematics of Jussieu, Vol 14 (2013)
25. Saharon Shelah and Masahiro Shioya. *Nonreflecting stationary sets in  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa\lambda$* , Advances in Mathematics, Volume 199, Issue 1, 2006, Pages 185–191

DEPARTAMENT DE MATEMÀTIQUES I INFORMÀTICA, UNIVERSITAT DE BARCELONA. GRAN VIA DE LES CORTS CATALANES, 585, 08007 BARCELONA, CATALONIA.  
*Email address:* mactorrespa@gmail.com