

THE BEHAVIOR OF HIGHER PROOF THEORY I: CASE Σ_2^1

HANUL JEON

ABSTRACT. The current ordinal analysis provides the proof-theoretic ordinal of a theory, which calibrates the robustness of the Π_1^1 -consequences of the theory. We can ask whether there is an ordinal characteristic capturing more complex consequences, and it turns out that we can define the Σ_2^1 -proof-theoretic ordinal capturing the robustness of the Σ_2^1 -consequences of a theory. In this paper, we study the behavior of Σ_2^1 -proof-theoretic ordinal, and it turns out that Σ_2^1 -proof-theoretic ordinal also follows an analogue of Walsh’s characterization of proof-theoretic ordinal.

1. INTRODUCTION

One of the important phenomena in the foundation of mathematics is the connection between the strength of theories and their consequences, and the well-orderedness of the strength of theories. While Gödel’s incompleteness theorem showed the failure of Hilbert’s plan on building mathematics over a formal theory proving its own consistency, this theorem also shed light on the hierarchy of formal theories under their strength. Traditionally, logicians gauge the strength of theories in terms of the consistency strength, given by

$$S <_{\text{Con}} T \iff T \vdash \text{Con}(S).$$

In principle, there is no reason to believe $<_{\text{Con}}$ behaves like a well-order.¹ For example, the following ill-behavior of $<_{\text{Con}}$ was well-known by various people. (See [11] for their proof.)

- Theorem 1.1.** (1) *There are theories S, T extending PA such that neither $S <_{\text{Con}} T$ nor $T <_{\text{Con}} S$ hold.*
 (2) *For theories S, T extending PA satisfying $S <_{\text{Con}} T$, we can find an extension U of PA such that $S <_{\text{Con}} U <_{\text{Con}} T$.*
 (3) *There are theories T_0, T_1, \dots extending PA such that $T_0 >_{\text{Con}} T_1 >_{\text{Con}} \dots$. □*

However, various logicians claimed that $<_{\text{Con}}$ behaves like a well-order among ‘natural’ theories. For example, Simpson stated that

It is striking that a great many foundational theories are linearly ordered by $<_{\text{Con}}$. Of course, it is possible to construct pairs of artificial theories that are incomparable under $<_{\text{Con}}$. However, this is not the case for the “natural” or nonartificial theories which are usually regarded as significant in the foundations of mathematics. (Simpson [18, p11].)

Koellner also stated a similar claim:

Remarkably, it turns out that when one restricts to those theories that “arise in nature” the interpretability ordering is quite simple: There are no descending chains and there are no incomparable elements—the interpretability ordering on theories that “arise in nature” is a wellordering. (Koellner [13].)

Observations from logicians suggest there should be a way to well-order formal theories coherently with their strengths. Indeed, proof theorists have a way for it called the *proof-theoretic ordinal*, which appears in the *ordinal analysis* for a theory.

Ordinal analysis was initiated by Gentzen’s proof of the consistency of Peano arithmetic PA modulo the well-foundedness of ε_0 . After years, Takeuti provided an ordinal analysis for $\Pi_1^1\text{-CA}_0$, which is deemed to be impredicative so providing a proof-theoretic analysis was challenging. From this point, other proof theorists obtained an ordinal analysis for stronger theories, like, iterated inductive definitions, and Kripke-Platek set

The author would like to thank James Walsh for feedback on this paper, and Henry Towsner for valuable discussion on my work.

¹More precisely, a prewellorder.

theory with large ordinals. Recently, there were claims on the ordinal analysis for the full second-order arithmetic, from Arai [4] and Towsner [21].

The current project on ordinal analysis showed fruitful results in calibrating the strength of theories in terms of proof-theoretic ordinal

$$|T|_{\Pi_1^1} = \sup\{\alpha \mid \alpha \text{ is recursive and } T \vdash \alpha \text{ is well-ordered}\}.$$

However, the proof-theoretic ordinal of a theory does not precisely correspond to the consistency strength of a given theory: For example, both PA and PA + Con(PA) have the same proof-theoretic ordinal ε_0 , but the latter theory is stronger than the former. Then what does the proof-theoretic ordinal gauge? Walsh addressed an answer in [23], but let us look at another interesting phenomenon for natural theories before introducing Walsh's result.

Another interesting aspect of consistency strength is that it correlates with the consequences of theories. Again, Simpson described

Assuming that the language of T_1 is part of the language of T_2 , let us write $T_1 \subset T_2$ to mean that the sentences that are theorems of T_1 form a proper subset of the sentences in the language of T_1 which are theorems of T_2 . We may think of $T_2 \supset T_1$ as meaning that T_2 is "more powerful" or "stronger" than T_1 . In many cases, the $<_{\text{Con}}$ ordering and the \subset ordering coincide. (Simpson [18, p.111–112].)

Of course, what Simpson described breaks down for extensions of set theory, for example, it is well-known that ZFC and ZFC + CH have the same consistency strength, but ZFC \subset ZFC + CH. Still, $<_{\text{Con}}$ ordering goes with the *projective* consequences of a theory, which Steel describes:

Phenomenon 1.2 (Steel [20, p.159]). Let $S \subseteq_{\Pi_\infty^1} T$ mean every projective consequence of S is a theorem of T . For natural theories S, T whose consistency strength is at least that of ZFC with the Projective Determinacy. Then either

$$S \subseteq_{\Pi_\infty^1} T \text{ or } T \subseteq_{\Pi_\infty^1} S.$$

Also, the projective consequences of sufficiently strong natural theories monotonically increase along with their consistency strength.

A special case for this phenomenon at the level of Σ_2^1 is the following:

Phenomenon 1.3. Let $S \subseteq_{\Sigma_2^1} T$ mean every Σ_2^1 -consequence of S is a theorem of T . For natural theories S, T ,² we have

$$S \subseteq_{\Sigma_2^1} T \text{ or } T \subseteq_{\Sigma_2^1} S.$$

A part of the above phenomenon happens by Shoenfield absoluteness theorem: The main machinery to get the independence results in set theory is forcing and inner model, and Shoenfield absoluteness theorem says none of these change the validity of Σ_2^1 sentences. As an example, forcing and inner model arguments show ZFC, ZFC + CH, ZFC + \neg CH have the same consistency strength. Hence Shoenfield absoluteness theorem suggests all of ZFC, ZFC + CH, ZFC + \neg CH have the same Σ_2^1 -consequences. Since forcing and inner models are essentially the only practical tools to get another theory from one theory, we can speculate that theories with the same strength have the same Σ_2^1 -consequences. However, 'stronger' theories can have more Σ_2^1 -consequences than weaker theories: For example, ZFC with the existence of an inaccessible cardinal proves 'there is a transitive model of ZFC', which is equivalent to the Σ_2^1 -statement 'there is a countable well-founded model of ZFC' that is not a theorem of ZFC.

Going back to address the meaning of proof-theoretic ordinal, Walsh demystified the meaning of the proof-theoretic ordinal in his work [23]. Before introducing his result, let us introduce notions:

Definition 1.4. Let Γ be a complexity class (like Π_1^1 or Σ_2^1) and T be a theory. We say ϕ is T -provable with Γ -oracle if there is a true Γ -sentence θ such that $T + \theta \vdash \phi$. We denote it by $T \vdash^\Gamma \phi$.

For two theories S and T , we denote $S \subseteq_{\hat{\Gamma}} T$ if every Γ -sentence that is S -provable with $\hat{\Gamma}$ -oracle is also T -provable with $\hat{\Gamma}$ -oracle, where $\hat{\Gamma} = \{\neg\phi \mid \phi \in \Gamma\}$.

² S and T should be stronger than at least Π_1^1 -CA₀ since a version of Shoenfield absoluteness theorem is a theorem of Π_1^1 -CA₀. See [17, Chapter VII] for more details.

Definition 1.5. Let Γ be a complexity class and let T be a theory. Then $\Gamma\text{-RFN}(T)$ is the following statement:

$$\Gamma\text{-RFN}(T) \equiv \forall^0 \phi \in \Gamma [\text{Prv}_T(\phi) \rightarrow \text{True}_\Gamma(\phi)]$$

We say T is Γ -*sound* if every T -provable Γ -sentence is true. In other words, T is Γ -sound if $\Gamma\text{-RFN}(T)$ is true.

We may understand $\Gamma\text{-RFN}(T)$ as a generalization of $\text{Con}(T)$: In fact, we can prove that $\text{Con}(T)$ is equivalent to $\Pi_1^0\text{-RFN}(T)$. Now let us state Walsh’s result:

Theorem 1.6 (Walsh [23]). *Let S, T be Π_1^1 -sound extensions of ACA_0 .*

- (1) $|S|_{\Pi_1^1} \leq |T|_{\Pi_1^1}$ iff $S \subseteq_{\Pi_1^1}^{\Sigma_1^1} T$.³
- (2) Furthermore, if S and T are arithmetically definable, then $|S|_{\Pi_1^1} \leq |T|_{\Pi_1^1}$ iff

$$\text{ACA}_0 \vdash^{\Sigma_1^1} \Pi_1^1\text{-RFN}(T) \rightarrow \Pi_1^1\text{-RFN}(S). \quad \square$$

That is, Walsh’s result claims the following three notions on strength comparison are ‘equivalent’ for arithmetically definable Π_1^1 -sound extensions of ACA_0 :

- (1) Comparing the proof-theoretic ordinal $|T|_{\Pi_1^1}$.
- (2) Comparing the Π_1^1 -consequences of T (modulo true Σ_1^1 -sentences)
- (3) Comparing the Π_1^1 -reflection of T (modulo true Σ_1^1 -sentences), which is a Π_1^1 -analogue of $\text{Con}(T)$.

For an addendum for the Π_1^1 -reflection comparison, modifying Walsh’s proof yields the following, which looks more coherent with $<_{\text{Con}}$:

Theorem 1.7. *Let S, T be arithmetically definable Π_1^1 -sound extensions of ACA_0 . Then*

$$|S|_{\Pi_1^1} < |T|_{\Pi_1^1} \iff T \vdash^{\Sigma_1^1} \Pi_1^1\text{-RFN}(S). \quad \square$$

What is interesting about Walsh’s result is that it provides not only the meaning of the proof-theoretic ordinal but also evidence for Steel’s observation [Phenomenon 1.2](#) for Π_1^1 . However, Steel stated his observation about the connection between the projective consequences and the consistency strength for theories for the full projective hierarchy, and Walsh’s result does not justify the case Σ_2^1 stated in [Phenomenon 1.3](#). Thus it is natural to ask if we can push Walsh’s characterization for pointclass beyond Π_1^1 , which is the main topic of the sequel of this paper.

Then how to generalize Walsh’s result beyond Π_1^1 ? To see this, let us go back to the main motivation behind Walsh’s result. The underlying motivation behind Walsh’s results about the proof theory, which we will call Π_1^1 -*proof theory*, comes from Kleene normal form theorem, which says every true Π_1^1 -sentence has a recursive ordinal complexity:

Theorem 1.8 (Kleene normal form theorem). *The following is provable over ACA_0 : For every Π_1^1 -formula $\phi(x)$ we can effectively construct a primitive recursive linear order α_x , uniformly on x , such that*

$$\forall^1 x [\phi(x) \leftrightarrow \text{WO}(\alpha_x)]. \quad \square$$

To get an ordinal characteristic of a theory representing more complex consequences beyond Π_1^1 , we need a way to assign an ordinal complexity for a more complex formula. But is it possible? The answer is yes for a Σ_2^1 -formula, the case we will focus on throughout this paper. However, we need a different tool to calibrate the complexity of a Σ_2^1 -formula that we will call a *pseudodilator*. For each Σ_2^1 -sentence we can assign a recursive pseudodilator F , a function from ordinals to linear orders. F witnesses the ‘ordinal complexity’ α when α is the least ordinal making $F(\alpha)$ ill-founded, which we will call a *climax* $\text{Clim}(F)$ of F .

Now let us consider the Σ_2^1 -*proof-theoretic ordinal* $s_2^1(T)$ of T defined as follows:

$$s_2^1(T) = \sup\{\text{Clim}(F) \mid T \vdash F \text{ is a pseudodilator}\}.$$

(See [Definition 5.11](#) for a more precise definition.) We can ask whether $s_2^1(T)$ enjoys the properties that the Π_1^1 -proof-theoretic ordinal enjoys, and the following results in this paper answer the question:

Theorem.

³The equivalence holds without any definability constraint on S and T .

(1) (*Proposition 6.1*) For Σ_2^1 -sound extensions S, T of ACA_0 , we have

$$S \subseteq_{\Sigma_2^1}^{\Pi_2^1} T \iff s_2^1(S) \leq s_2^1(T).$$

(2) (*Proposition 6.4 and Proposition 6.6*) Furthermore, if S and T are arithmetically definable Σ_2^1 -sound extensions of $\Sigma_2^1\text{-AC}_0$, then we have

$$s_2^1(S) \leq s_2^1(T) \iff \Sigma_2^1\text{-AC}_0 \vdash^{\Pi_2^1} \Sigma_2^1\text{-RFN}(T) \rightarrow \Sigma_2^1\text{-RFN}(S).$$

See *Definition 1.5* for the meaning of $\Sigma_2^1\text{-RFN}(T)$. The requirement ‘ S and T being extensions of $\Sigma_2^1\text{-AC}_0$ ’ is optimal as presented in *Example 6.8*.

Pakhomov and Walsh [14] defined a different notion called *reflection rank* that also can be used to gauge the strength of theories, which can be thought as an attempt to rank theories under versions of $<_{\text{Con}}$. More precisely, they defined the relation

$$S \prec_{\Pi_1^1} T \iff T \vdash \Pi_1^1\text{-RFN}(S)$$

for Π_1^1 -sound r.e. extensions of ACA_0 , and showed that $\prec_{\Pi_1^1}$ is well-founded. Thus every Π_1^1 -sound r.e. extensions of ACA_0 admits a $\prec_{\Pi_1^1}$ -rank, which we will call the reflection rank. [15] proved that the reflection rank coincides with the proof-theoretic ordinal for Π_1^1 -sound r.e. extensions of ACA_0^+ , and [14, §5.4] proved that a variant of the reflection rank what they called *robust reflection rank* is ‘equivalent’ to the proof-theoretic ordinal: For $\Gamma = \Pi_1^1$, define

$$S \prec_{\Gamma}^{\check{\Gamma}} T \iff T \vdash^{\check{\Gamma}} \Gamma\text{-RFN}(S).$$

Then we have the following:

Theorem.

- (1) $\prec_{\Pi_1^1}^{\Sigma_1^1}$ is well-founded for Π_1^1 -sound r.e. extensions of ACA_0 .
(2) (*Theorem 4.10*) Let $\text{rank}_{\Pi_1^1}^{\Sigma_1^1}(T)$ be the $\prec_{\Pi_1^1}^{\Sigma_1^1}$ -rank of T . For Π_1^1 -sound r.e. extensions S, T of ACA_0 , we have

$$|S|_{\Pi_1^1} \leq |T|_{\Pi_1^1} \iff \text{rank}_{\Pi_1^1}^{\Sigma_1^1}(S) \leq \text{rank}_{\Pi_1^1}^{\Sigma_1^1}(T).$$

- (3) ([14, Theorem 5.20]) Let T be a Π_1^1 -sound extension of ACA_0 . If $\text{rank}_{\Pi_1^1}^{\Sigma_1^1}(T) = \alpha$ then $|T|_{\Pi_1^1} = \varepsilon_\alpha$.

It turns out that the Σ_2^1 -proof-theoretic ordinal also has an analogue of the previous result:

Theorem.

- (1) (*Proposition 7.1*) $\prec_{\Sigma_2^1}^{\Pi_2^1}$ is well-founded for Σ_2^1 -sound r.e. extensions of $\Sigma_2^1\text{-AC}_0$.
(2) (*Corollary 7.5*) Let $\text{rank}_{\Sigma_2^1}^{\Pi_2^1}(T)$ be the $\prec_{\Sigma_2^1}^{\Pi_2^1}$ -rank of T . For Σ_2^1 -sound r.e. extensions S, T of $\Sigma_2^1\text{-AC}_0$, we have

$$s_2^1(S) \leq s_2^1(T) \iff \text{rank}_{\Sigma_2^1}^{\Pi_2^1}(S) \leq \text{rank}_{\Sigma_2^1}^{\Pi_2^1}(T).$$

The structure of the paper. In *Section 2*, we review preliminaries, which include the reflection principle and set-theoretic facts. Preliminaries for dilators turned out to be too long to be a subsection of *Section 2*, so we separated it into *Section 3*. In *Section 4*, we review facts about Π_1^1 - and Π_2^1 -proof theory. We also prove the correspondence between $\prec_{\Pi_1^1}^{\Sigma_1^1}$ -rank and the proof-theoretic ordinal in *Section 4*, which was not known in previous literature. In *Section 5*, we define pseudodilators and s_2^1 -ordinal and briefly view their properties, which are the main protagonists of this paper. In *Section 6*, we prove the Σ_2^1 version of Walsh’s first and the second equivalence for the characterization of ordinal analysis [23], and in *Section 7*, we examine the connection between s_2^1 and the $\prec_{\Sigma_2^1}^{\Pi_2^1}$ -rank. In *Section 8*, we briefly explore the properties of $\prec_{\Pi_2^1}^{\Sigma_2^1}$ -rank. In *Section 9*, we discuss a philosophical meaning of s_2^1 and list some open problems.

The author does not encourage the reader to read every detail in *Section 2* and *Section 3* before reading the main sections. The reader who knows dilators may directly read sections after *Section 4* and go back to preliminary sections when necessary. Even if the reader does not know about dilators, it would be better to accept results in *Section 3* as facts in the first reading.

2. PRELIMINARIES

In this paper, we often work over the language of second-order arithmetic, in which there are two types of objects, natural numbers and real numbers. The standard way to distinguish these two is by using uppercase letters for real numbers and lowercase letters for natural numbers. We will not distinguish two types of variables systematically and impose their type by context, although we usually use i, j, k, l, m, n for natural numbers, and the other variables usually mean real numbers. However, we will use indexed quantifiers \forall^i and \exists^i to indicate the range of the quantification: Throughout this paper, \forall^0 and \exists^0 are quantifiers over natural numbers, and \forall^1 and \exists^1 are quantifiers over real numbers.

2.1. Complexity class and Γ -Reflection. A *complexity class* means a collection of formulas. Throughout this paper, the complexity class will always mean one of Σ_n^1 or Π_n^1 for a natural number n . If a formula or a sentence is a member of Γ , then we call it Γ -*formula* or Γ -*sentence* respectively. Also, for a complexity class Γ , we define $\hat{\Gamma}$ by

$$\hat{\Gamma} = \{\neg\phi \mid \phi \in \Gamma\}.$$

It is known that ACA_0 proves there is a universal Π_n^1 -formula for $n \geq 1$. This enables us to talk about the truth of Π_n^1 - or Σ_n^1 -formulas.

Proposition 2.1. *Let Γ be one of Π_n^1 or Σ_n^1 for $n \geq 1$. Then there is a Γ -formula $\phi(i, x)$ such that for every Γ -formula $\psi(x)$, we can find a natural number n such that*

$$\forall^1 x(\phi(n, x) \leftrightarrow \psi(x)). \quad \square$$

We denote a fixed universal Γ -formula by $\text{True}_\Gamma(\phi)$, where ϕ is a code for a Γ -formula.

The following lemma says adding a true $\hat{\Gamma}$ sentence does not change the Γ -reflection principle of a given theory:

Lemma 2.2. *Suppose that ϕ is in $\hat{\Gamma}$. If ϕ is true, then $\Gamma\text{-RFN}(T) \rightarrow \Gamma\text{-RFN}(T + \phi)$.*

Proof. Suppose that $T + \phi \vdash \psi$ holds for a Γ -sentence ψ . Then $T \vdash \phi \rightarrow \psi$, and $\phi \rightarrow \psi$ is equivalent to a Γ -sentence, whose equivalence is provable over the first-order logic. By $\Gamma\text{-RFN}(T)$, $\phi \rightarrow \psi$ is true. Since ϕ is true, ψ is also true. \square

The following lemma says being Γ -sound is transitive: That is, if T is Γ -sound and if $T \vdash S$ is Γ -sound, then S is also Γ -sound.

Lemma 2.3. *Let S, T be extensions of ACA_0 such that T is Γ -sound and S is r.e. If $T \vdash \Gamma\text{-RFN}(S)$, then $\Gamma\text{-RFN}(S)$ is true.*

Proof. If $\Gamma = \Pi_n^1$, then one can easily check that the statement $\Pi_n^1\text{-RFN}(S)$ is Π_n^1 . However, this line of argument does not work when $\Gamma = \Sigma_n^1$ since $\Sigma_n^1\text{-RFN}(S)$ takes of the form

$$\forall^0 \phi \in \Sigma_n^1[\text{Prv}_S(\phi) \rightarrow \text{True}_{\Sigma_n^1}(\phi)]$$

whose complexity takes of the form $\forall^0(\Sigma_1^0 \rightarrow \Sigma_n^1)$. However, we can still prove $\Sigma_n^1\text{-RFN}(S)$ from $T \vdash \Sigma_n^1\text{-RFN}(S)$ as follows:

Let $\phi \in \Sigma_n^1$ be a (natural number coding a) Σ_n^1 -formula. If $\text{Prv}_S(\phi)$, then we have $T \vdash \text{Prv}_S(\phi)$ since $\text{Prv}_S(\phi)$ is a true Σ_1^0 statement. Since $T \vdash \Sigma_n^1\text{-RFN}(S)$, we have $T \vdash \text{True}_{\Sigma_n^1}(\phi)$, which implies $\text{True}_{\Sigma_n^1}(\phi)$ by Σ_n^1 -soundness of T . \square

We will mainly focus on the Σ_2^1 -formulas in this paper. The class of Σ_2^1 -formulas are not closed under number quantifiers. That is, for a Σ_2^1 -formula $\phi(n)$, there is no guarantee to see $\forall^0 n\phi(n)$ is equivalent to a Σ_2^1 -formula in general. If we have $\Sigma_2^1\text{-AC}_0$, however, we can reduce $\forall^0 n\phi(n)$ to a Σ_2^1 -formula. Moreover, the reduction of $\forall^0 n\phi(n)$ implies $\forall^0 n\phi(n)$ without $\Sigma_2^1\text{-AC}_0$. We state this fact as follows:

Lemma 2.4. *Let $\phi(n)$ be a Σ_2^1 -formula. Then we can find a Σ_2^1 -formula ψ such that*

- (1) ACA_0 proves $\psi \rightarrow \forall^0 n\phi(n)$.
- (2) $\Sigma_2^1\text{-AC}_0$ proves $\forall^0 n\phi(n) \rightarrow \psi$.

We call ψ a reduction of $\forall n\phi(n)$.

Proof. Let $\phi(n) \equiv \exists x\theta(n, x)$ for a Π_1^1 -formula θ . Then consider the following statement:

$$\psi \equiv \exists^1 f \forall^0 n\theta(n, f(n)). \quad \square$$

2.2. Ordinals and well-orders. Throughout this paper, we conflate well-orders with ordinals. Thus, for example, we write $\alpha \leq \beta$ for well-orders α and β if there is an embedding $e: \alpha \rightarrow \beta$. But the choice of the words is not completely random: We prefer the word ‘well-order’ in a given argument if the argument is formalizable over second-order arithmetic. When we completely work over set theory or externally (i.e., over a metatheory), we prefer the word ‘ordinal.’ For a given linear order α , $\text{WO}(\alpha)$ means α is well-ordered.

The *lightface projective ordinals* δ_n^1 has a focal role in descriptive set theory. δ_n^1 is defined by the supremum of all Δ_n^1 -definable well-order of domain ω . In this paper, we will only see two of them, namely δ_1^1 and δ_2^1 . The following results are well-known folklore:

Proposition 2.5.

- (1) (Spector [19]) $\delta_1^1 = \omega_1^{\text{CK}}$.
- (2) ([5, Corollary V.8.3]) δ_2^1 is the least stable ordinal σ , that is, the least σ such that $L_\sigma \prec_{\Sigma_1} L$. \square

Proposition 2.6 ([5, Corollary V.7.9]). δ_2^1 is the set of all Σ_1 -definable ordinals over L without parameters. Similarly, $L_{\delta_2^1}$ is the set of all Σ_1 -definable sets over L without parameters. \square

Proposition 2.7. Every Π_1^1 -statement is equivalent to a Σ_1 -statement over $L_{\omega_1^{\text{CK}}}$. Every Σ_2^1 -statement is equivalent to a Σ_1 -statement over $L_{\delta_2^1}$. \square

3. PREDILATORS AND DILATORS

3.1. Denotation system. Girard introduced dilators to provide proof-theoretic analysis at the level of Π_1^1 . One way to understand a dilator is to understand them as a *denotation system* for a class ordinal. Let us give a simple example to illustrate what dilators are: Let us construct a class ordinal $\text{Ord} + \text{Ord}$. There is no way to express $\text{Ord} + \text{Ord}$ as a transitive class, but there is a way to express its ordertype: We can understand $\text{Ord} + \text{Ord}$ as a collection of pairs of the form $(\xi, 0)$ or $(\xi, 1)$ for $\xi \in \text{Ord}$, and compare them as follows:

- $(\xi, 0) < (\eta, 0)$ iff $\xi < \eta$. The same holds for $(\xi, 1)$ and $(\eta, 1)$.
- $(\xi, 0) < (\eta, 1)$ always hold.

Moreover, the denotation system is *uniform* in the sense that the same construction over α instead of Ord gives an ordertype of $\alpha + \alpha$. It turns out that handling the denotation system for class ordinals directly is more fruitful than considering their ordertypes only, which is named by *dilators*. In terms of dilators, the expression for $\text{Ord} + \text{Ord}$ corresponds to the dilator $\text{Id} + \text{Id}$, where Id is the identity dilator. (We will not delve into the details of the addition of dilators. The reader may consult with [9] or [10] about dilators.) However, the denotation system may result in an ill-founded order, so we define *predilators* first to embrace ill-founded cases, and we define dilators as predilators with certain conditions.

Informally, a denotation system D is a set of terms with a comparison rule between terms. Each term t comes with an *arity* $n = \text{arity}(t) \in \mathbb{N}$, and we understand t as a ‘function’ taking an increasing sequence of length n , or alternatively, a subset of size n . We will form a new linear order $D(\alpha)$ from a given linear order α , which takes the form

$$D(\alpha) = \{t(\vec{\xi}) \mid t \text{ is a } D\text{-term and } \vec{\xi} \in \alpha^{<\omega}\}.$$

We assume that $t(\vec{\xi}) \neq s(\vec{\eta})$ if $t \neq s$. Comparing $t(\vec{\xi})$ and $s(\vec{\eta})$ only depends on the relative order between $\vec{\xi}$ and $\vec{\eta}$.

So far there is no rigorous treatment of the denotation system, especially for the comparison rule. Various materials about dilators and ptynes left the meaning of the comparison rule ambiguous, and it often comes as an obstacle to treating dilators formally. Let us introduce some preliminary notions before defining predilators as denotation systems to overcome this issue.

Definition 3.1. An *arity diagram* Δ is a commutative diagram over the category $\text{LO}_{<\omega}$ of natural numbers with strictly increasing maps of the form

$$(1) \quad \Delta = \begin{array}{ccc} a_\cap & \longrightarrow & a_0 \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow g \\ a_1 & \xrightarrow{f} & a_\cup \end{array}$$

such that the above diagram is a pullback and $\text{ran } f \cup \text{ran } g = \text{field } a_{\cup}$. We say an arity diagram is *trivial* if $a_{\cap} = a_0 = a_1 = a_{\cup}$. For an arity diagram Δ of the form (1), the diagram $-\Delta$ is a diagram obtained by switching the order of a_0 and a_1 :

$$-\Delta = \begin{array}{ccc} a_{\cap} & \longrightarrow & a_1 \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow f \\ a_0 & \xrightarrow{g} & a_{\cup} \end{array}$$

An arity diagram is a way to describe a relative order between elements of a_0 and that of a_1 . A typical example of an arity diagram is induced from an inclusion diagram, for example,

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \{1, 3\} & \xrightarrow{\subseteq} & \{0, 1, 3\} \\ \subseteq \downarrow & & \downarrow \subseteq \\ \{1, 2, 3, 4\} & \xrightarrow{\subseteq} & \{0, 1, 2, 3, 4\} \end{array}$$

We can see that the above diagram is isomorphic to

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \{\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{1}\} & \xrightarrow{h} & \{\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{1}, \mathbf{2}\} \\ k \downarrow & & \downarrow g \\ \{\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{1}, \mathbf{2}, \mathbf{3}\} & \xrightarrow{f} & \{\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{1}, \mathbf{2}, \mathbf{3}, \mathbf{4}\} \end{array}$$

where h and k are maps sending boldface numbers to boldface numbers in an increasing manner, $f(n) = n+1$, and $g(0) = 0, g(1) = 1, g(2) = 3$. The following notion will be used to define the linearity condition of a denotation system:

Definition 3.2. Let a_0, \dots, a_{m-1} be natural numbers and let L_m be the free distributive lattice generated by $\{0, 1, \dots, m-1\}$. An *IU diagram* \mathbb{D} for a_0, \dots, a_{m-1} (abbreviation of *Intersection-Union diagram*) is a collection of objects $\{a_i \mid i \in L_m\}$ and strictly increasing functions $f_{ij}: a_i \rightarrow a_j$ for $i \leq j$ such that the following holds:

- (1) f_{ii} is the identity map.
- (2) For $i \leq j \leq k$, $f_{ik} = f_{jk} \circ f_{ij}$.
- (3) For each $i, j \in L_m$, the following diagram is an arity diagram:

$$\mathbb{D}(i, j) = \begin{array}{ccc} a_{i \wedge j} & \xrightarrow{f_{i \wedge j, i}} & a_i \\ f_{i \wedge j, j} \downarrow & & \downarrow f_{i, i \vee j} \\ a_j & \xrightarrow{f_{j, i \vee j}} & a_{i \vee j} \end{array}$$

Alternatively, we can think of an IU diagram as a functor from L_n as a category to the category of natural numbers with strictly increasing maps.

Definition 3.3. Let a_0, a_1, a_2 be natural numbers and suppose that we have two arity diagrams

$$\Delta_0 = \begin{array}{ccc} a_{0 \wedge 1} & \longrightarrow & a_0 \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ a_1 & \longrightarrow & a_{0 \vee 1} \end{array} \quad \text{and} \quad \Delta_1 = \begin{array}{ccc} a_{1 \wedge 2} & \longrightarrow & a_1 \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ a_2 & \longrightarrow & a_{1 \vee 2} \end{array} .$$

Furthermore, assume that \mathbb{D} is an IU diagram for a_0, a_1, a_2 such that $\mathbb{D}(0, 1) = \Delta_0, \mathbb{D}(1, 2) = \Delta_1$. Then the *merge* of Δ_0 and Δ_1 determined by \mathbb{D} , or a simply a *merge* of Δ_0 and Δ_1 is an arity diagram $\Delta_2 = \mathbb{D}(0, 2)$.

Note that a merge of Δ_0 and Δ_1 need not be unique since there might be more than one IU diagram \mathbb{D} having Δ_0 and Δ_1 as subdiagrams. Now let us define denotation systems, which we will call semidilators.

Definition 3.4. A *denotation system* or *semidilator* D is a set of D -terms usually denoted by t , and each term t comes with an *arity* $\text{arity}(t) \in \mathbb{N}$. Also, for each two D -terms t_0, t_1 and an arity diagram

$$\Delta = \begin{array}{ccc} a_{\cap} & \longrightarrow & a_0 \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ a_1 & \longrightarrow & a_{\cup} \end{array}$$

such that $a_i = \text{arity}(t_i)$, we have the relation $t_0 <_{\Delta} t_1$ between two terms. We call Δ an *arity diagram* for t_0 and t_1 . Then D satisfies the following:

- (1) (Irreflexivity) If $t_0 = t_1$ and Δ is trivial, then $t_0 <_{\Delta} t_0$ does not hold.
- (2) (Linearity) If $t_0 \neq t_1$ or Δ is not trivial, then one of $t_0 <_{\Delta} t_1$ or $t_1 <_{-\Delta} t_0$ must hold.
- (3) (Transitivity) For three D -terms t_0, t_1, t_2 such that $\text{arity}(t_i) = a_i$, and *every* merge Δ_2 of Δ_0 and Δ_1 , if $t_0 <_{\Delta_0} t_1$ and $t_1 <_{\Delta_1} t_2$, then $t_0 <_{\Delta_2} t_2$.

We say D is (*primitive*) *recursive* or *countable* if the set of D -terms and the set of comparison rules are (primitive) recursive or countable respectively.

The reader should be warned that materials call a semidilator in different ways: Aguilera-Pakhomov [1] call it *predilator*, but it overlaps with the standard definition of a predilator we will introduce later. Girard [10] call semidilator *paleodilator*, Freund [8] call it *prae-dilator*, and Catlow [6] call it *1-functor*.

The previous definition for semidilators looks a bit convoluted and may be less clear than stating ‘a comparison rule only depends on two terms a relative order between elements.’ It might be true for semidilators, but the above definition sheds light on the definition of n -ptykes in terms of a denotation system, which is less clear than for dilators. The definition of n -ptykes in terms of denotation system and arity diagram will appear in [12].

3.2. Category-theoretic aspects of semidilators. We want to understand semidilators as a functor over the category of linear orders \mathbf{LO} with strictly increasing functions as morphisms. Hence let us define the application of a semidilators:

Definition 3.5. From a given semidilator D and a linear order X , let us define a new structure $D(X)$ by

$$(2) \quad D(X) = \{(t, a) \mid t \text{ is a } D\text{-term, } a \subseteq X, \text{ and } |a| = \text{arity}(t)\}.$$

We write $t(a)$ instead of (t, a) , and we identify a with a finite increasing sequence over X . The order of $D(X)$ is given by

$$s(a) <_{D(X)} t(b) \iff s <_{\Delta} t$$

where $\Delta = \text{Diag}(a, b)$ is the *induced diagram* from a and b , that is the unique arity diagram isomorphic to the inclusion diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} a \cap b & \xrightarrow{\subseteq} & b \\ \subseteq \downarrow & & \downarrow \subseteq \\ a & \xrightarrow{\subseteq} & a \cup b \end{array}$$

More precisely, $\Delta = \text{Diag}(a, b)$ is the innermost diagram in the below commutative diagram, where $\text{en}_a: |a| \rightarrow a$ is the unique order isomorphism for finite linear order a .

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} a \cap b & \xrightarrow{\subseteq} & & & b \\ \downarrow \text{en}_{a \cap b} & \swarrow \mathbb{R} & & \searrow \mathbb{R} & \downarrow \text{en}_a \\ & |a \cap b| & \longrightarrow & |b| & \\ \downarrow \subseteq & \downarrow & & \downarrow e_1 & \downarrow \subseteq \\ & |a| & \xrightarrow{e_0} & |a \cup b| & \\ \downarrow \text{en}_b & \swarrow \mathbb{R} & & \searrow \mathbb{R} & \downarrow \text{en}_{a \cup b} \\ a & \xrightarrow{\subseteq} & & & a \cup b \end{array}$$

For a strictly increasing function $f: X \rightarrow Y$, consider the map $D(f): D(X) \rightarrow D(Y)$ given by

$$D(f)(t, a) = (t, f[a]),$$

where $f[a] = \{f(x) \mid x \in a\}$.

We can see the following facts without difficulty:

Proposition 3.6 (ACA₀). *Let D be a semidilator and X be a linear order. Then $D(X)$ is a linear order. Also, D induces a functor $\text{LO} \rightarrow \text{LO}$.*

Proof. Let us prove that $D(X)$ is a linear order. The irreflexivity and the linearity of a semidilator imply $<_{D(X)}$ satisfies the irreflexivity and the linearity respectively. To see $<_{D(X)}$ is transitive, suppose that we have $s_0(a_0) <_{D(X)} s_1(a_1) <_{D(X)} s_2(a_2)$. Now let \mathbb{D} be the IU diagram isomorphic to a diagram induced by intersections and unions of a_0, a_1, a_2 , and the insertion maps. Especially, $\mathbb{D}(i, j)$ is the induced diagram from a_i and a_j for $i \neq j < 2$. Then we have

$$s_0 <_{\mathbb{D}(0,1)} s_1 \wedge s_1 <_{\mathbb{D}(1,2)} s_2.$$

Thus we have $s_0 <_{\mathbb{D}(0,2)} s_2$ by the transitivity of a semidilator. To see D induces a functor, it suffices to show that the following holds:

- (1) $D(\text{Id}_X) = \text{Id}_{D(X)}$,
- (2) $D(f \circ g) = D(f) \circ D(g)$.

Both of them are easy to verify, so we leave their proof to the reader. \square

Like strictly increasing maps between linear orders, we can define a map between semidilators preserving their structures:

Definition 3.7. Let D, E be two semidilators. A map $\iota: D \rightarrow E$ is an *embedding* if it satisfies the following conditions:

- (1) ι is a function field D to field E .
- (2) ι preserves the arity: i.e., $\text{arity}(\iota(t)) = \text{arity}(t)$ for every $t \in \text{field } D$,
- (3) For each two terms $t_0, t_1 \in \text{field } D$ and an arity diagram Δ between them, we have $t_0 <_{\Delta} t_1$ iff $\iota(t_0) <_{\Delta} \iota(t_1)$.

An embedding ι is an *isomorphism* if $\iota: \text{field } D \rightarrow \text{field } E$ is a bijection and ι^{-1} is also an embedding. We denote $D \cong E$ if there is an isomorphism between D and E . We also write $D \leq E$ if there is an embedding from D to E .

We did not require an embedding between two semidilators to be one-to-one, but we can see that every embedding between two semidilators must be injective:

Lemma 3.8 (ACA₀). *If $\iota: D \rightarrow E$ is an embedding, then $\iota: \text{field } D \rightarrow \text{field } E$ is injective.*

Proof. Suppose the contrary that we have two different D -terms t_0 and t_1 such that $\iota(t_0) = \iota(t_1)$. Then $\text{arity } t_0 = \text{arity } \iota(t_0) = \text{arity } t_1$, and let Δ be a trivial diagram for t_0 . Then either $t_0 <_{\Delta} t_1$ or $t_1 <_{\Delta} t_0$ holds, so we get $\iota(t_0) <_{\Delta} \iota(t_1)$ or $\iota(t_1) <_{\Delta} \iota(t_0)$. It contradicts with the irreflexivity of E . \square

We can view an embedding between two semidilators as a natural transformation in the following manner:

Definition 3.9. For an embedding $\iota: D \rightarrow E$ and a linear order X , define $\iota_X: D(X) \rightarrow E(X)$ by

$$\iota_X(t, a) = (\iota(t), a).$$

Proposition 3.10 (ACA₀). *Let $\iota: D \rightarrow E$ be an embedding between two predilators D and E . Then $\iota_X: D(X) \rightarrow E(X)$ is a strictly increasing map. Furthermore, if $f: X \rightarrow Y$ is a strictly increasing map between two linear orders X and Y , then the following diagram commutes:*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} D(X) & \xrightarrow{D(f)} & D(Y) \\ \iota_X \downarrow & & \downarrow \iota_Y \\ E(X) & \xrightarrow{E(f)} & E(Y) \end{array}$$

Proof. For ι_X being strictly increasing, suppose that we have $s(a) <_{D(X)} t(b)$, and let Δ be the induced diagram from a and b . Then we have $s <_{\Delta} t$, so $\iota(s) <_{\Delta} \iota(t)$. Since $\text{arity } s = \text{arity } \iota(s)$ and $\text{arity } t = \text{arity } \iota(t)$, $(\iota(s), a), (\iota(t), b)$ are in $E(X)$ and moreover we have $\iota(s)(a) <_{E(X)} \iota(t)(b)$, which is $\iota_X(s(a)) <_{E(X)} \iota_X(t(b))$. The commutativity is easy to check. \square

3.3. Predilators and Dilators.

Definition 3.11. A semidilator D is a *predilator* if it satisfies the *monotonicity condition*: For every $t \in \text{field}(D)$ and a non-trivial arity diagram

$$(3) \quad \Delta = \begin{array}{ccc} n_{\cap} & \longrightarrow & n \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow e_1 \\ n & \xrightarrow{e_0} & n_{\cup} \end{array}$$

if $e_0(i) \leq e_1(i)$ for each $i < n$, then $t <_{\Delta} t$ holds.⁴

Why do we introduce predilators instead of using semidilators directly? One of the reasons is that every semidilator arising in our context is a predilator. Another reason is that finite predilators will turn out to be *dilators*, but not every finite semidilator is a dilator. We expect the role between predilators and dilators to be similar to that between linear orders and well-orders, so the current notion of predilators is a more natural choice than semidilators.

Girard's original formulation of a predilator is more category-theoretic. The next lemma says Girard's formulation is 'equivalent' to our formulation. For two strictly increasing maps $f, g: X \rightarrow Y$, let us say $f \leq g$ if $f(x) \leq g(x)$ for every $x \in X$.

Lemma 3.12 (ACA₀). *A semidilator D is a predilator iff for every linear order X, Y and strictly increasing maps $f, g: X \rightarrow Y$, if $f \leq g$ then $D(f) \leq D(g)$.*

Proof. For the left-to-right direction, suppose that $f, g: X \rightarrow Y$ be two strictly increasing maps such that $f \leq g$. We claim that for each $x \in D(X)$, $D(f)(x) \leq D(g)(x)$. Every element of $D(X)$ has the form $t(a)$ for some $t \in \text{field}(D)$ and $a \subseteq X$ such that $|a| = \text{arity } t$. Then

$$D(Y) \models D(f)(t(a)) \leq D(g)(t(a)) \iff D(Y) \models t(f[a]) \leq t(g[a]).$$

If $f[a] = g[a]$, then $D(Y) \models t(f[a]) \leq t(g[a])$ clearly holds. Now consider the case $f[a] \neq g[a]$: Let $n = \text{arity } t$ and Δ be the induced diagram from $f[a]$ and $g[a]$. Then Δ is not trivial. Moreover, if Δ has the form (3), then

$$e_0(i) \leq e_1(i) \iff f(a(i)) = \text{en}_{f[a]}(e_0(i)) \leq \text{en}_{g[a]}(e_1(i)) = g(a(i)),$$

where $a(i)$ is the i th element of a in the increasing order. Hence $e_0 \leq e_1$, so the monotonicity condition implies $D \models t <_{\Delta} t$. Therefore $D(Y) \models t(f[a]) < t(g[a])$.

For the right-to-left direction, let Δ be a non-trivial arity diagram of the form (3), and t be a D -term of arity n . Then $e_0 \leq e_1$ implies $D(e_0) \leq D(e_1)$, so

$$D(n_{\cup}) \models D(e_0)(t(\{0, 1, \dots, n-1\})) \leq D(e_1)(t(\{0, 1, \dots, n-1\})).$$

Observe that $D(e_i)(t(\{0, 1, \dots, n-1\})) = t(\text{ran } e_i)$, so we get $D(n_{\cup}) \models t(\text{ran } e_0) \leq t(\text{ran } e_1)$. By the non-triviality of Δ , we have $\text{ran } e_0 \neq \text{ran } e_1$, so $D(n_{\cup}) \models t(\text{ran } e_0) < t(\text{ran } e_1)$. Since the induced diagram from $\text{ran } e_0$ and $\text{ran } e_1$ is again Δ , we get $D \models t <_{\Delta} t$. \square

Now let us define dilators as semidilators preserving well-orderedness:

Definition 3.13. A semidilator D is a *dilator* if for every well-order α , $D(\alpha)$ is also well-ordered.

It turns out that checking D being a dilator only requires checking the well-orderedness of $D(\alpha)$ for countable α :

Lemma 3.14. *Let D be a predilator. Then D is dilator iff for every countable well-order α , $D(\alpha)$ is well-ordered.*

⁴By the non-triviality of Δ , there must be $i < n$ such that $e_0(i) < e_1(i)$.

Proof. Let us only prove the non-trivial direction. Suppose that D is a countable predilator, and there is an ordinal α such that $D(\alpha)$ is ill-founded. That is, we can find a sequence of D -terms $\langle t_n \mid n < \omega \rangle$ and ordinals $\langle \vec{\xi}_n \mid n < \omega \rangle$ such that $\vec{\xi}_n$ is a finite tuple of elements of α and

$$t_0(\vec{\xi}_0) >_{D(\alpha)} t_1(\vec{\xi}_1) >_{D(\alpha)} t_2(\vec{\xi}_2) >_{D(\alpha)} \cdots .$$

Now consider the well-order β given by the union of all $\vec{\xi}_n$ for $n < \omega$. Then β is countable, and we have

$$t_0(\vec{\xi}_0) >_{D(\beta)} t_1(\vec{\xi}_1) >_{D(\beta)} t_2(\vec{\xi}_2) >_{D(\beta)} \cdots .$$

Hence $D(\beta)$ is ill-founded. \square

Also, we can see that every dilator is a predilator:

Proposition 3.15 (ACA₀). *If D is a dilator, then D is a predilator.*

Proof. Let us rely on the following fact by Girard [9, Proposition 2.3.9]: For two well-orders α, β and strictly increasing maps $f, g: \alpha \rightarrow \beta$, $f \leq g$ iff there is a well-order γ and strictly increasing $h: \beta \rightarrow \gamma$, $k: \gamma \rightarrow \gamma$ such that $hg = khf$. Note that this fact is provable in ACA₀, and γ can be ω^{2^β} .

Now suppose that D is a dilator and Δ is a non-trivial arity diagram of the form (3) satisfying $e_0 \leq e_1$. We claim that $t <_{\Delta} t$ holds for $t \in \text{field}(D)$ of arity n . Since $e_0 \leq e_1$, we can find a well-order γ and strictly increasing $h: n_{\cup} \rightarrow \gamma$, $k: \gamma \rightarrow \gamma$ such that $he_1 = khe_0$. Then we have

$$D(\gamma) \models D(he_1)(t(n)) = D(khe_0)(t(n)) = D(k)(D(he_0)(t(n))) \geq D(he_0)(t(n)).$$

Here the last inequality holds since $D(\gamma)$ is a well-order and $D(k): D(\gamma) \rightarrow D(\gamma)$ is strictly increasing, so $D(k)(\xi) \geq \xi$ for every $\xi \in D(\gamma)$. Since $D(h): D(n_{\cup}) \rightarrow D(\gamma)$ is strictly increasing, we have

$$D(n_{\cup}) \models D(e_0)(t(n)) \leq D(e_1)(t(n)).$$

It happens only when either Δ is trivial or $t <_{\Delta} t$, as desired. \square

For finite semidilators, being a predilator is equivalent to being a dilator: Conversely, if D is a *finite* predilator, being monotone is sufficient for being a dilator:

Proposition 3.16 (ACA₀). *Every finite predilator is a dilator.*

Proof. Suppose that D is a finite semidilator that is not a dilator. We claim that D is not a predilator. Fix a countable well-order α such that $D(\alpha)$ is ill-founded, so we have a sequence of D -terms $\langle t_i \mid i \in \mathbb{N} \rangle$ and finite subsets $\langle a_i \mid i \in \mathbb{N} \rangle$ of α such that

$$t_0(a_0) >_{D(\alpha)} t_1(a_1) >_{D(\alpha)} t_2(a_2) >_{D(\alpha)} \cdots .$$

By the Pigeonhole principle, we may assume that all of t_i are equal to t whose arity is n . Now consider the coloring F of domain $[\mathbb{N}]^2$ defined by

$$F(i, j) = \text{The arity diagram induced from } a_i \text{ and } a_j.$$

Then the range of F is countable. Hence by Ramsey's theorem for pairs, we have an infinite homogeneous set $H \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ for F with value Δ .

For $i, j \in H$, $t(a_i) >_{D(\alpha)} t(a_j)$ implies $t \not<_{\Delta} t$. Δ is not trivial since otherwise we have $a_i = a_j$ for $i, j \in H$, so $t(a_i) = t(a_j)$. Now let us claim that Δ witnesses D is not a predilator: Suppose that Δ has the form (3). We claim that $e_0 \leq e_1$ holds. Suppose not, let $k < n$ be a natural number such that $e_0(k) > e_1(k)$. Recall that we have the unique isomorphism $\text{en}_{a_i}: n \rightarrow a_i$. Since Δ is the induced diagram from a_i and a_j , we have a commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
 a_i \cap a_j & \xrightarrow{\subseteq} & & \xrightarrow{\subseteq} & a_j \\
 \downarrow \text{en}_{a_i \cap a_j} & \swarrow \cong & n_{\cap} & \xrightarrow{\quad} & n & \searrow \cong & \text{en}_{a_j} \\
 & & \downarrow & & \downarrow e_1 & & \\
 \subseteq & & n & \xrightarrow{e_0} & n_{\cup} & & \\
 \downarrow \text{en}_{a_i} & \swarrow \cong & & & \searrow \cong & \text{en}_{a_i \cup a_j} & \downarrow \subseteq \\
 a_i & \xrightarrow{\subseteq} & & \xrightarrow{\subseteq} & a_i \cup a_j & &
 \end{array}$$

If we denote the k th element of a_i by $a_i(k)$, then $e_0(k) > e_1(k)$ implies $a_i(k) > a_j(k)$. It leads to a contradiction since H is infinite, so we get an infinite descending sequence over α .

Thus we have an arity diagram Δ of the form (3) such that $e_0 \leq e_1$, but also have $t \in \text{field}(D)$ of arity n such that $D \vDash t \not\prec_{\Delta} t$. Hence D is not a predilator. \square

The previous proposition gives the following ‘local’ characterization of a predilator:

Corollary 3.17. *For a semidilator D , D is a predilator iff for each $t \in \text{field}(D)$, the semidilator $D \upharpoonright \{t\}$ obtained from D by restricting the field to the singleton $\{t\}$ is a dilator.*

Proof. By the definition of a predilator, a semidilator D is a predilator iff $D \upharpoonright \{t\}$ is a predilator for each $t \in \text{field}(D)$. Hence Proposition 3.16 implies the desired result. \square

3.4. Alternative formulations for dilators. There are different ways to define predilators and dilators. Girard [9] defined dilators as autofunctors $F: \text{WO} \rightarrow \text{WO}$ over the category over well-orders preserving direct limits and pullbacks. Freund [7] defined dilators and predilators as functors $F: \text{LO} \rightarrow \text{LO}$ admitting the support transformation $\text{supp}: F \rightarrow [\cdot]^{<\omega}$, a transformation taking an element $t(a) \in F(X)$ and returning the element part a . Freund also proved that his definitions of a predilator and a dilator are equivalent to those of Girard.

It is natural to ask if our definitions of a predilator and a dilator are equivalent to those of Freund, and the answer is yes. We prove the equivalence of our definition and Freund’s definition in this subsection.

Freund defined two distinct but equivalent notions for predilators: One is a usual predilator, and the other is a coded predilator. Let us introduce the definition for both for the reader’s convenience. Let LO be the category of all linear orders with strictly increasing functions. We say a functor $F: \text{LO} \rightarrow \text{LO}$ is *monotone* if $f \leq g$ implies $D(f) \leq D(g)$. For a given set X , $[X]^{<\omega}$ is the set of all finite subsets of X . We can turn $[\cdot]^{<\omega}$ to a functor by defining $[f]^{<\omega}(a) = \{f(x) \mid x \in a\}$ for $f: X \rightarrow Y$.

Definition 3.18. An *F-semidilator* (F abbreviates ‘Freund’) is a pair (D, supp) , where $D: \text{LO} \rightarrow \text{LO}$ is a functor and $\text{supp}: D \rightarrow [\cdot]^{<\omega}$ is a natural transformation satisfying the *support condition*

$$(4) \quad \{\sigma \in D(Y) \mid \text{supp}_Y(\sigma) \subseteq \text{ran}(f)\} \subseteq \text{ran}(D(f))$$

for every morphism $f: X \rightarrow Y$. We often omit supp and simply write D to mean (D, supp) . If F is monotone, then we call D an *F-predilator*.

Again, let $\text{LO}_{<\omega}$ be the subcategory of LO induced by $\mathbb{N} = \{0, 1, 2, \dots\}$. That is, objects of $\text{LO}_{<\omega}$ are $n = \{0, 1, \dots, n-1\}$, and morphisms are strictly increasing functions.

Definition 3.19. An *F-coded semidilator* is a pair (D, supp) , where $D: \text{LO}_{<\omega} \rightarrow \text{LO}$ is a functor and supp is a natural transformation with the support condition (4). If D is monotone, we say D is *F-coded predilator*.

We can obtain an F-coded semidilator from an F-semidilator by taking its restriction to $\text{LO}_{<\omega}$. Conversely, we can recover an F-semidilator from an F-coded semidilator. To do this, let us extract the ‘denotation system’ from an F-coded semidilator:

Definition 3.20. The *trace* of an F-coded semidilator D is given by

$$\text{Tr}(D) = \{(n, \sigma) \mid \sigma \in D(n) \wedge \text{supp}_n(\sigma) = n\}.$$

Roughly, $\text{Tr}(D)$ will be the set of all elements of the form $t(0, 1, \dots, n-1)$ for an D -term t of arity n . This description will be the key for the later proof. Now let us define a way to recover an F-semidilator from an F-coded semidilator. Let $\text{en}_a: |a| \rightarrow a$ be the unique order isomorphism for a finite linear order a . For a given morphism $f: a \rightarrow b$, let $|f|: |a| \rightarrow |b|$ be the unique morphism in $\text{LO}_{<\omega}$ satisfying

$$\text{en}_b \circ |f| = f \circ \text{en}_a.$$

For two linear orders $X \subseteq Y$, $\iota_X^Y: X \rightarrow Y$ is the insertion map from X to Y .

Definition 3.21. Let (D, supp) be an F-coded semidilator. For a linear order X , define

$$\overline{D}(X) = \{(\sigma, a) \mid a \in [X]^{<\omega} \wedge (|a|, \sigma) \in \text{Tr}(D)\}.$$

and set

$$\overline{D}(X) \vDash (\sigma, a) < (\tau, b) \iff D(|a \cup b|) \vDash D(|\iota_a^{a \cup b}|)(\sigma) < D(|\iota_b^{a \cup b}|)(\tau).$$

Freund proved that \overline{D} is the correct way to recover an F-semidilator in the following manner:

Theorem 3.22 ([7, Proposition 2.6, Theorem 2.8]). *If D is an F-coded semidilator, then \overline{D} is an F-semidilator. Moreover, if D is an F-semidilator, then the map $\eta_X^D: \overline{D} \upharpoonright \text{LO}_{<\omega} \rightarrow D(X)$ given by*

$$\eta_X^D(\sigma, a) = D(t_a^X \circ \text{en}_a)(\sigma)$$

gives a natural isomorphism from $\overline{D} \upharpoonright \text{LO}_{<\omega}$ to D .

He proved his theorem for F-predilators, but examining his proof shows his argument works for F-semidilators.

We illustrate how to construct a predilator from an F-semidilator and vice versa in the remaining part of the section. First, let us introduce a way to construct a denotation system from an F-semidilator:

Definition 3.23. Let D be an F-semidilator. Define a semidilator \hat{D} as follows: \hat{D} -terms are σ such that $(n, \sigma) \in \text{Tr}(D)$, and $\text{arity}(\sigma) = n$. For an arity diagram

$$(5) \quad \Delta = \begin{array}{ccc} n_{\cap} & \longrightarrow & n_1 \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow e_1 \\ n_0 & \xrightarrow{e_0} & n_{\cup} \end{array}$$

such that $\text{arity}(\sigma_i) = n_i$, define

$$\sigma_0 <_{\Delta} \sigma_1 \iff D(n_{\cup}) \vDash D(e_0)(\sigma_0) < D(e_1)(\sigma_1).$$

Lemma 3.24. *If D is an F-semidilator, then \hat{D} is a semidilator.*

Proof. It is easy to check that the comparison rule of \hat{D} satisfies asymmetry and linearity. For transitivity, suppose that we have an IU diagram \mathbb{D} for three objects and $\sigma_0, \sigma_1, \sigma_2 \in \text{field}(\hat{D})$ such that $\text{arity} \sigma_i = n_i$ for $i = 0, 1, 2$ and

$$\hat{D} \vDash \sigma_0 <_{\mathbb{D}(0,1)} \sigma_1 <_{\mathbb{D}(1,2)} \sigma_2.$$

Let n_i ($i \in L_3$) be objects of \mathbb{D} , and $e_{ij}: n_i \rightarrow n_j$ for $i \leq j \in L_3$ be morphisms of \mathbb{D} . Then we have

$$D(n_{0\vee 1}) \vDash D(e_{0,0\vee 1})(\sigma_0) < D(e_{1,0\vee 1})(\sigma_1) \text{ and } D(n_{1\vee 2}) \vDash D(e_{1,1\vee 2})(\sigma_1) < D(e_{2,1\vee 2})(\sigma_2).$$

By applying $D(e_{0\vee 1,0\vee 1\vee 2})$ to the left side, we have

$$D(n_{0\vee 1\vee 2}) \vDash D(e_{0,0\vee 1\vee 2})(\sigma_0) < D(e_{1,0\vee 1\vee 2})(\sigma_1).$$

Similarly, we can see

$$D(n_{0\vee 1\vee 2}) \vDash D(e_{1,0\vee 1\vee 2})(\sigma_1) < D(e_{2,0\vee 1\vee 2})(\sigma_2).$$

Thus we have

$$D(n_{0\vee 1\vee 2}) \vDash D(e_{0,0\vee 1\vee 2})(\sigma_0) < D(e_{2,0\vee 1\vee 2})(\sigma_2).$$

Then by subtracting $D(e_{0\vee 2,0\vee 1\vee 2})$, we get

$$D(n_{0\vee 2}) \vDash D(e_{0,0\vee 2})(\sigma_0) < D(e_{2,0\vee 2})(\sigma_2),$$

which is equivalent to $D \vDash \sigma_0 <_{\mathbb{D}(0,2)} \sigma_2$. □

We may understand \hat{D} as a functor from LO to LO by Definition 3.5 and Proposition 3.6. The following proposition says D and \hat{D} are ‘isomorphic’:

Proposition 3.25. *Let D be an F-semidilator. Then there is a natural isomorphism η_D between D and \hat{D} if we understand \hat{D} as a functor $\text{LO} \rightarrow \text{LO}$.*

Proof. For each linear order X , consider the map $\eta_{D,X}: \hat{D}(X) \rightarrow D(X)$ defined by

$$\eta_{D,X}(\sigma, a) = D(\text{en}_a)(\sigma).$$

for $(n, \sigma) \in \text{Tr}(D)$ and $a \in [X]^n$. $\eta_{D,X}$ is well-defined, and for $f: X \rightarrow Y$, we have

$$(\eta_{D,Y} \circ \hat{D}(f))(\sigma, a) = D(\text{en}_{f[a]})(\sigma) = D(f \circ \text{en}_a)(\sigma) = (D(f) \circ \eta_{D,X})(\sigma, a).$$

Thus to see $\eta_{D,X}$ is the desired natural isomorphism, it suffices to see that $\eta_{D,X}: \hat{D}(X) \rightarrow D(X)$ is an isomorphism. For monotonicity of $\eta_{D,X}$, suppose that we have $(\sigma, a), (\tau, b) \in \hat{D}(X)$ such that $(\sigma, a) <_{\hat{D}(X)} (\tau, b)$. If Δ is the induced diagram from a and b , then we have

$$\Delta = \begin{array}{ccc} |a \cap b| & \longrightarrow & |b| \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow |t_b^{a \cup b}| \\ |a| & \xrightarrow{|t_a^{a \cup b}|} & |a \cup b| \end{array}$$

and $\sigma <_{\Delta} \tau$ when we view σ and τ as \hat{D} -terms. By the definition of comparison rules of \hat{D} ,

$$\sigma <_{\Delta} \tau \iff D(|t_a^{a \cup b}|)(\sigma) < D(|t_b^{a \cup b}|)(\tau).$$

By applying $D(\text{en}_{a \cup b})$ to the latter side, we get

$$D(t_a^{a \cup b} \circ \text{en}_a)(\sigma) < D(t_b^{a \cup b} \circ \text{en}_b)(\tau),$$

which implies $\eta_{D,X}(\sigma, a) < \eta_{D,X}(\tau, b)$, as desired. To see $\eta_{D,X}$ is onto, take $x \in D(X)$ and $a = \text{supp}_X(x)$. Then by the support condition, we have $x \in \text{ran}(D(\text{en}_a))$, so we can find $\sigma \in D(|a|)$ such that $x = D(\text{en}_a)(\sigma)$. To finish the proof, we need to check $(|a|, \sigma) \in \text{Tr}(D)$, which ensures $\sigma \in \hat{D}$. To see this, we need to check $\text{supp}_{|a|}(\sigma) = |a|$, which is equivalent to

$$[t_a^X \circ \text{en}_a]^{<\omega}(\text{supp}_{|a|}(\sigma)) = a.$$

Since $\text{supp}: D \rightarrow [\cdot]^{<\omega}$ is natural, the above is equivalent to

$$(\text{supp}_X \circ D(t_a^X \circ \text{en}_a))(\sigma) = a.$$

Then by the choice of σ , the above is equivalent to $\text{supp}_X(x) = a$, finishing the proof. \square

Lemma 3.26. *For a semidilator D , we can define the support transformation $\text{supp}: D \rightarrow [\cdot]^{<\omega}$ satisfying the support condition (4).*

Proof. For each linear order X , define $\text{supp}_X(t, a) = a$ for $(t, a) \in D(X)$. To see the support condition, let us fix linear orders X, Y and strictly increasing $f: X \rightarrow Y$. Now let $(t, a) \in D(Y)$ be such that $a = \text{supp}_Y(t, a) \subseteq \text{ran } f$. Since f is one-to-one, there must be $b \subseteq X$ such that $|a| = |b|$ and $a = f[b]$. So we have

$$(t, a) = (t, f[b]) = D(f)(t, b) \in \text{ran}(D(f)),$$

proving the support condition. \square

Proposition 3.27. *For every semidilator D , there is an isomorphism $\epsilon_D: D \rightarrow \hat{D}$.*

Proof. For each $t \in \text{field}(D)$ we have $(n, (t, n)) \in \text{Tr}(D)$, so $(t, n) \in \text{field}(\hat{D})$ and $\text{arity}_{\hat{D}}(t, n) = n$. Furthermore, every element of $\text{Tr}(D)$ has the form $(n, (t, n))$ for some $t \in \text{field}(D)$ with $\text{arity}_D(t) = n$. Hence the map $\epsilon_D: \text{field}(D) \rightarrow \text{field}(\hat{D})$ given by $\epsilon_D(t) = (t, n)$ is a bijection. To see ϵ_D is a semidilator isomorphism, it suffices to show that for every $t_0, t_1 \in \text{field}(D)$ with an arity diagram Δ for t_0 and t_1 , we have

$$D \vDash t_0 <_{\Delta} t_1 \iff \hat{D} \vDash (t_0, n_0) <_{\Delta} (t_1, n_1).$$

Let us assume that Δ has the form (5). Then

$$\hat{D} \vDash (t_0, n_0) <_{\Delta} (t_1, n_1) \iff D(e_0)(t_0, n_0) <_{D(n_{\cup})} D(e_1)(t_1, n_1)$$

and the latter is equivalent to $(t_0, \text{ran } e_0) <_{D(n_{\cup})} (t_1, \text{ran } e_1)$. Now observe that Δ is equal to the arity diagram induced from $\text{ran } e_0$ and $\text{ran } e_1$, so we have

$$(t_0, \text{ran } e_0) <_{D(n_{\cup})} (t_1, \text{ran } e_1) \iff D \vDash t_0 <_{\Delta} t_1.$$

Hence the equivalence follows. \square

The previous results show we can construct a semidilator from an F-semidilator, and vice versa. To see these constructions show the equivalence of two notions, let us prove that they form equivalence of the category of semidilators and that of F-semidilators. Recall that the category of F-semidilators is the category with F-semidilators as objects, and natural transformations as morphisms. For two F-semidilator D, E and a natural transformation $\iota: D \rightarrow E$, we can define the embedding $\hat{\iota}: \hat{D} \rightarrow \hat{E}$ by

$$\hat{\iota}(\sigma) = \iota_n(\sigma)$$

for $(n, \sigma) \in \text{Tr}(D)$, so $\sigma \in \hat{D}$ and of arity n . For a semidilator D , let us temporarily write D^{ftn} if we view D as a functor $\text{LO} \rightarrow \text{LO}$. Then we have the following:

Theorem 3.28. $D \mapsto \hat{D}$ is a category equivalence from the category of semidilators to the category of F-semidilators, with the inverse $D \mapsto D^{\text{ftn}}$.

Proof. We can see that $\eta_D: D \rightarrow \hat{D}^{\text{ftn}}$ in Proposition 3.25 and $\epsilon_D: D \rightarrow \widehat{D^{\text{ftn}}}$ in Proposition 3.27 are the natural isomorphisms witnessing the desired claim. \square

3.5. Logical aspects of dilators. Lemma 3.14 shows the sentence ‘ D is a dilator’ is Π_2^1 for a countable dilator D :

$$\text{Dil}(D) \equiv \forall^1 \alpha [\text{WO}(\alpha) \rightarrow \text{WO}(D(\alpha))].$$

Similar to Kleene normal form theorem, which says every Π_1^1 -formula is equivalent to a formula of the form $\text{WO}(\alpha)$, the Π_2^1 -completeness theorem of dilators we will introduce says every Π_2^1 -formula is equivalent to a formula of the form $\text{Dil}(D)$:

Theorem 3.29 (Girard [6], [10]). For every Π_2^1 formula $\phi(x)$ we can find a primitive recursive predilator D_x , which is uniform in x , such that

$$\text{ACA}_0 \vdash \text{Dil}(D_x) \leftrightarrow \phi(x). \quad \square$$

Thus we can identify every Π_2^1 sentence with $\text{Dil}(D)$ for some primitive recursive predilator D . Similarly, every Σ_2^1 -sentence can be identified with $\neg \text{Dil}(D)$ for some primitive recursive predilator D .

We will often quantify over the set of recursive predilators, and so checking the complexity of being a recursive predilator is important. The following proposition shows the collection of primitive recursive predilators has a low complexity:

Proposition 3.30. The set RecPreDil of all codes of recursive predilators is Π_2^0 .

Proof. A recursive object is a recursive predilator if there is a recursive set of terms with arity assignment and recursive comparison rules, all of which can be coded by a natural number. Also, we can see that there are countably many arity diagrams, and in fact, we can recursively enumerate all arity diagrams. Thus a statement ‘a natural number codes an arity diagram’ is Δ_1^0 . By inspecting a definition of a predilator, we can see that a real D predilator is $\Pi_2^0(D)$, so we get the desired result. \square

By Π_1^1 - and Π_2^1 -completeness of recursive well-orders and dilators, we can represent Π_1^1 and Π_2^1 sentences as of the form $\text{WO}(\alpha)$ or $\text{Dil}(D)$ for recursive α and D respectively. We may ask if there are ways to form new well-orders or dilators that correspond to logical connectives, which take formulas and form a new formula. The following constructions will illustrate operators for linear orders and predilators that correspond to logical connectives:

Lemma 3.31. Let D_0, D_1 be predilators of field subsets of \mathbb{N} . Then we can construct a predilator $D = D_0 \wedge D_1$ with the following properties:

- (1) ACA_0 proves $\text{Dil}(D) \leftrightarrow (\text{Dil}(D_0) \wedge \text{Dil}(D_1))$.
- (2) ACA_0 proves the following: If D_0 is a dilator, then for every well-order α , $\text{WO}(D_1(\alpha))$ iff $\text{WO}(D(\alpha))$.
- (3) If both of D_0 and D_1 are recursive, then so is D .

Proof. Take $D(x) = D_0(x) + D_1(x)$ as an ordered sum. More precisely, $D_0 + D_1$ is a dilator whose field is the disjoint sum

$$\text{field}(D_0 + D_1) = \{(0, t) \mid t \in \text{field}(D_0)\} \cup \{(1, t) \mid t \in \text{field}(D_1)\},$$

and $\text{arity}(i, t) = \text{arity } t$. The comparison between two terms is given as follows: For two terms $(k_0, t_0), (k_1, t_1) \in \text{field}(D_0 + D_1)$ and an arity diagram Δ between them, we have $(k_0, t_0) <_{\Delta} (k_1, t_1)$ iff either

- (1) $k_0 < k_1$, or
- (2) $k_0 = k_1$ and $t_0 <_{\Delta} t_1$.

We can see that $D_0 + D_1$ is a semidilator and is a predilator if both D_0 and D_1 are predilators. Proving the statements of the lemma is straightforward, so we leave it to the reader. \square

Lemma 3.32 (Aguilera-Pakhomov [1, Lemma 8], ACA₀). *For linear orders α and β of fields subsets of \mathbb{N} , we can effectively construct a predilator $D = (\alpha \rightarrow \beta)$ such that*

- (1) *There is an embedding $e: \beta \rightarrow D(\alpha)$.*
- (2) *D is a dilator iff $\text{WO}(\alpha) \rightarrow \text{WO}(\beta)$ holds.*
- (3) *If D is not a dilator, then $D(\gamma)$ is illfounded iff $\alpha \leq \gamma$ for any linear order γ .*

Furthermore, if both α and β are recursive, then so is D . \square

The following construction, which gives a ‘disjunction’ of two predilators, is a variant of [16, Lemma 5.2], which is also stated in [2, Proposition 23].

Lemma 3.33 (ACA₀). *Let D_0 and D_1 be two predilators of field subsets of \mathbb{N} . Then we can construct a new predilator $D = D_0 \vee D_1$ such that the following holds:*

- (1) *D is a dilator iff either D_0 or D_1 is a dilator.*
- (2) *If α is a well-order, D_0 is a dilator and $D_1(\alpha)$ is ill-founded with an infinite decreasing sequence b , then there is an embedding $e_{\alpha}^b: D_0(\alpha) \rightarrow D(\alpha)$.*
- (3) *If both of D_0 and D_1 are recursive, then so is D .*

Proof. For a fixed linear order α , let $T(\alpha)$ be the tree trying to construct decreasing sequences on $D_0(\alpha)$ and $D_1(\alpha)$ simultaneously. More precisely, $T(\alpha)$ is the set of all sequences of the form

$$\langle (x_0, y_0), \dots, (x_n, y_n) \rangle \in (D_0(\alpha) \times D_1(\alpha))^{<\omega}$$

such that $x_0 >_{D_0(\alpha)} \dots >_{D_0(\alpha)} x_n$ and $y_0 >_{D_1(\alpha)} \dots >_{D_1(\alpha)} y_n$. Then define $D(\alpha) = (T(\alpha), <_{\text{KB}})$, but we need to specify the meaning of $<_{\text{KB}}$ to make the point clear that the ordertype of $D(\alpha)$ only depends on D_0 , D_1 and the ordertype of α .

Let $c = \langle c_0, \dots, c_m \rangle$, $c' = \langle c'_0, \dots, c'_n \rangle$ be members of $T(\alpha)$. Then we say $c <_{\text{KB}} c'$ holds if one of the following holds:

- (1) If c' is a proper initial segment of c .
- (2) If it is not the first case, and suppose that $i \leq \min(m, n)$ is the least natural number such that $c_i \neq c'_i$. Furthermore, assume that c_i and c'_i take the following form:
 - $c_i = (s(\vec{\xi}), t(\vec{\eta}))$.
 - $c'_i = (s'(\vec{\xi}'), t'(\vec{\eta}'))$.

Here s, s' are D_0 -terms, t, t' are D_1 -terms, and $\vec{\xi}, \vec{\xi}', \vec{\eta}, \vec{\eta}'$ are finite increasing sequences over α . Since D_0 and D_1 are countable, we may view s, s', t, t' as natural numbers. Then we say $c <_{\text{KB}} c'$ when we have

$$c_i \triangleleft c'_i \equiv (s, t, \vec{\xi}, \vec{\eta}) < (s', t', \vec{\xi}', \vec{\eta}') \text{ under the lexicographic order over } \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N} \times [\alpha]^{<\omega} \times [\alpha]^{<\omega},$$

where $[\alpha]^{<\omega}$ is the set of finite subsets over α , identified with their increasing enumeration, with the lexicographic order. Here we view D_i -terms as natural numbers.

We can see that $<_{\text{KB}}$ is a strict linear order over $T(\alpha)$. Hence D is a semidilator since the comparison only depends on the terms and the relative order of elements of α .⁵ Furthermore, D is recursive if both D_0 and D_1 are recursive.

To see D is a predilator, let us apply Lemma 3.12: Let $f, g: \alpha \rightarrow \beta$ to be strictly increasing functions between two linear orders α and β such that $f \leq g$. We can see that for $c = \langle (s_i(\vec{\xi}_i), t_i(\vec{\eta}_i)) \mid i < m \rangle$,

$$D(f)(c) = \langle (s_i(f[\vec{\xi}_i]), t_i(f[\vec{\eta}_i])) \mid i < m \rangle.$$

So by the definition of $<_{\text{KB}}$ over $D(\beta)$, we can see that $D(f)(c) \leq D(g)(c)$ holds.

Now let us claim that for each well-order α ,

$$\text{WO}(D(\alpha)) \leftrightarrow \text{WO}(D_0(\alpha)) \vee \text{WO}(D_1(\alpha)).$$

⁵Alternatively, we can define a support function $\text{supp}_{\alpha}: D(\alpha) \rightarrow [\alpha]^{<\omega}$ by $\text{supp}_{\alpha}(c) = \bigcup_{i < m} \vec{\xi}_i \cup \vec{\eta}_i$, where $c = \langle (s_i(\vec{\xi}_i), t_i(\vec{\eta}_i)) \mid i < m \rangle$.

Clearly $D(\alpha)$ is ill-founded if both of $D_0(\alpha)$ and $D_1(\alpha)$ are ill-founded. Conversely, suppose that $D(\alpha)$ is ill-founded, so we have an infinite decreasing sequence

$$c(0) >_{\text{KB}} c(1) >_{\text{KB}} c(2) >_{\text{KB}} \cdots$$

We claim that the length of $c(i)$ is unbounded, so we can find a decreasing sequence over $D_0(\alpha)$ and $D_1(\alpha)$.

Suppose not, assume that the length of $c(i)$ is stabilized by, say, n . For notational convenience, we may assume that the length of all of $c(i)$ are n , so $c(i) = (c_0(i), \dots, c_{n-1}(i))$. If there are infinitely many i such that $c_0(i)$ are different, then there must be an infinite sequence $\langle i_k \mid k < \omega \rangle$ such that $c_0(i_0) \triangleright c_0(i_1) \triangleright \cdots$, which is impossible. Hence $c_0(i)$ is eventually constant. By the same argument, we can see that all of $c_1(i)$, $c_2(i)$, \dots , $c_{n-1}(i)$ are eventually constant, so we get a contradiction.

Hence if one of D_0 or D_1 is a dilator, then so is D . It remains to construct e_α^b we promised. It follows from modifying the construction in the proof of [16, Lemma 5.2] Suppose that we are given an infinite decreasing sequence $b = \langle b_n \mid n < \omega \rangle$ over $D_1(\alpha)$.

Now let us enumerate elements of $D_0(\alpha)$ using the lexicographic order $<_{\mathbb{N} \times [\alpha]^{<\omega}}$, which is possible since

$$D_0(\alpha) = \{ \langle t, \vec{\xi} \rangle \in \text{field}(D_0) \times [\alpha]^{<\omega} \mid \text{arity}(t) = |\vec{\xi}| \}.$$

Since α is a well-order, $<_{\mathbb{N} \times [\alpha]^{<\omega}}$ is also a well-order. For a notational convenience, we assume that we enumerate elements of $D_0(\alpha)$ by $\{ \langle t_\nu, \vec{\xi}_\nu \rangle \mid \nu \in \kappa \}$, where κ is a well-order isomorphic to a subset of $\text{field}(D_0) \times [\alpha]^{<\omega}$ with the lexicographic order.

Define $e_\alpha^b(\langle t_0, \vec{\xi}_0 \rangle) = \langle (t_0(\vec{\xi}), b_0) \rangle$. Now for a given $\nu \in \kappa$, consider the two cases:

- (1) $t_\nu(\vec{\xi}_\nu) >_{D_0(\alpha)} t_\mu(\vec{\xi}_\mu)$ for all $\mu < \nu$.
- (2) $t_\nu(\vec{\xi}_\nu) <_{D_0(\alpha)} t_\mu(\vec{\xi}_\mu)$ for some $\mu < \nu$.

In the first case, set $e_\alpha^b(t_\nu(\vec{\xi}_\nu)) = \langle (t_\nu(\vec{\xi}_\nu), b_0) \rangle$. In the second case, let us pick $\mu' < \nu$ satisfying

$$(\spadesuit) \quad t_{\mu'}(\vec{\xi}_{\mu'}) = \min_{D_0(\alpha)} \{ t_\mu(\vec{\xi}_\mu) \mid \mu < \nu \wedge t_\nu(\vec{\xi}_\nu) <_{D_0(\alpha)} t_\mu(\vec{\xi}_\mu) \},$$

where the minimum is computed under the order over $D_0(\alpha)$ induced by a dilator D_0 . It is possible since D_0 is a dilator, so $D_0(\alpha)$ is a well-order. Then define

$$e_\alpha^b(t_\nu(\vec{\xi}_\nu)) = e_\alpha^b(t_{\mu'}(\vec{\xi}_{\mu'})) \frown \langle (t_\nu(\vec{\xi}_\nu), b_l) \rangle$$

where l is the length of $e_\alpha^b(t_{\mu'}(\vec{\xi}_{\mu'}))$. Then we can inductively show the following holds:

- (1) If $e_\alpha^b(t_\nu(\vec{\xi}_\nu))$ has length l , then it takes the form

$$\langle (t_{\nu_0}(\vec{\xi}_{\nu_0}), b_0), (t_{\nu_1}(\vec{\xi}_{\nu_1}), b_1), \dots, (t_{\nu_{l-1}}(\vec{\xi}_{\nu_{l-1}}), b_{l-1}) \rangle$$

with $\nu_0 < \nu_1 < \dots < \nu_{l-1} = \nu$.

- (2) $e_\alpha^b : D_0(\alpha) \rightarrow D(\alpha)$ is order-preserving.

The first item follows almost immediately from the definition of e_α^b . Let us claim the second by induction on $\nu \in \kappa$: Suppose inductively that $e_\alpha^b : \{ t_\mu(\vec{\xi}_\mu) \mid \mu < \nu \} \rightarrow D(\alpha)$ is order-preserving. Fix $\mu < \nu$, and divide the cases:

- (1) Suppose that $t_\mu(\vec{\xi}_\mu) > t_\nu(\vec{\xi}_\nu)$. Let $\mu' < \nu$ be the index satisfying (\spadesuit) , that is, $t_{\mu'}(\vec{\xi}_{\mu'})$ is the $D_0(\alpha)$ -least value among $t_\zeta(\vec{\xi}_\zeta)$ greater than $t_\nu(\vec{\xi}_\nu)$ such that $\zeta < \nu$. Then we have

$$e_\alpha^b(t_\nu(\vec{\xi}_\nu)) = e_\alpha^b(t_{\mu'}(\vec{\xi}_{\mu'})) \frown \langle (t_\nu(\vec{\xi}_\nu), b_l) \rangle <_{D(\alpha)} e_\alpha^b(t_{\mu'}(\vec{\xi}_{\mu'})) \leq_{D(\alpha)} e_\alpha^b(t_\mu(\vec{\xi}_\mu)),$$

where the last inequality is held by the inductive assumption on e_α^b .

- (2) Now suppose that $t_\mu(\vec{\xi}_\mu) < t_\nu(\vec{\xi}_\nu)$. If $t_\zeta(\vec{\xi}_\zeta) < t_\nu(\vec{\xi}_\nu)$ holds for all $\zeta < \mu$, then

$$e_\alpha^b(t_\nu(\vec{\xi}_\nu)) = \langle (t_\nu(\vec{\xi}_\nu), b_0) \rangle <_{D(\alpha)} \langle (t_\zeta(\vec{\xi}_\zeta), b_0), \dots \rangle = e_\alpha^b(t_\mu(\vec{\xi}_\mu)),$$

for some $\zeta \leq \mu < \nu$. We can see that the above inequality holds since $(t_\zeta(\vec{\xi}_\zeta), b_0) \triangleleft (t_\nu(\vec{\xi}_\nu), b_0)$, which follows from $\zeta < \nu$ and the definition of the enumeration $\{ t_\nu(\vec{\xi}_\nu) \mid \nu \in \kappa \}$.

Now consider the case when $t_\zeta(\vec{\xi}_\zeta) > t_\nu(\vec{\xi}_\nu)$ holds for some $\zeta < \mu$. Choose again $\mu' < \nu$ satisfying (\spadesuit) . Then we have $e_\alpha^b(t_\mu(\vec{\xi}_\mu)) < e_\alpha^b(t_{\mu'}(\vec{\xi}_{\mu'}))$, so we have the following two possible cases:

- (a) $e_\alpha^b(t_\mu(\vec{\xi}_\mu)) \supsetneq e_\alpha^b(t_{\mu'}(\vec{\xi}_{\mu'}))$, or

(b) There is the least i such that the i th component of $e_\alpha^b(t_\mu(\vec{\xi}_\mu))$ is different from that of $e_\alpha^b(t_{\mu'}(\vec{\xi}_{\mu'}))$, and the former is \triangleleft -less than the latter.

In the latter case, we have $e_\alpha^b(t_\mu(\vec{\xi}_\mu)) < e_\alpha^b(t_\nu(\vec{\xi}_\nu))$ since $e_\alpha^b(t_\nu(\vec{\xi}_\nu)) \supseteq e_\alpha^b(t_{\mu'}(\vec{\xi}_{\mu'}))$. In the former case, we have

$$e_\alpha^b(t_\mu(\vec{\xi}_\mu)) = e_\alpha^b(t_{\mu'}(\vec{\xi}_{\mu'})) \frown \langle (t_{\mu''}(\vec{\xi}_{\mu''}), b_l), \dots, (t_\mu(\vec{\xi}_\mu), b_l) \rangle$$

for some $\mu' < \mu'' \leq \mu$ and $l \leq l' < \omega$, and we have

$$e_\alpha^b(t_\nu(\vec{\xi}_\nu)) = e_\alpha^b(t_{\mu'}(\vec{\xi}_{\mu'})) \frown \langle (t_\nu(\vec{\xi}_\nu), b_l) \rangle.$$

Since $\mu'' < \nu$, we have $(t_{\mu''}(\vec{\xi}_{\mu''}), b_l) \triangleleft (t_\nu(\vec{\xi}_\nu), b_l)$, so $e_\alpha^b(t_\mu(\vec{\xi}_\mu)) < e_\alpha^b(t_\nu(\vec{\xi}_\nu))$.

Thus e_α^b is an order-preserving map, as desired. \square

The following construction is a countably infinite variant of [Lemma 3.33](#):

Lemma 3.34 (ACA₀). *Let $\langle D_n \mid n < \omega \rangle$ be an enumeration of countable predilators. Then we can find a disjunctive join $D = \bigvee_{n < \omega} D_n$ of $\langle D_n \mid n < \omega \rangle$ such that for every well-order α ,*

$$\text{WO}(D(\alpha)) \iff \exists n < \omega \text{WO}(D_n(\alpha)).$$

Furthermore, if each of D_n and the enumeration $\{D_n \mid n < \omega\}$ are recursive, then so is D .

Proof. First, for each α , define a partial order $P(\alpha)$ as follows: Its domain consists of the following two-dimensional sequence

$$c = \begin{pmatrix} c_0^0 & c_1^0 & \cdots & c_n^0 \\ & c_1^1 & \cdots & c_n^1 \\ & & \ddots & \vdots \\ & & & c_n^n \end{pmatrix}$$

and each i th row of the sequence is $<_{D_n(\alpha)}$ -decreasing. The order over $P(\alpha)$ is given by an extension. Then consider $D(\alpha) = (P(\alpha), <_{\text{KB}})$. Then D is a predilator by a similar argument in the proof of [Lemma 3.33](#). More formally, we compare $c, d \in P(\alpha)$ as follows. $c <_{\text{KB}} d'$ if and only if either

- (1) d is a proper initial segment of c , or
- (2) Suppose that i is the least natural number such that the i th column of c and that of d are different. Then

$$\langle c_i^0, \dots, c_i^i \rangle \triangleleft \langle d_i^0, \dots, d_i^i \rangle$$

holds, which is given as follows: If $c_i^j = s_i^j(\vec{\xi}_i^j)$ and $d_i^j = t_i^j(\vec{\eta}_i^j)$, then (2) is equivalent to

$$\langle \langle s_i^0, \dots, s_i^i \rangle, \vec{\xi}_i^0 \cup \dots \cup \vec{\xi}_i^i \rangle < \langle \langle t_i^0, \dots, t_i^i \rangle, \vec{\eta}_i^0 \cup \dots \cup \vec{\eta}_i^i \rangle$$

over $\mathbb{N} \times \alpha^{<\omega}$ under the lexicographic order, where $\langle n_0, \dots, n_{k-1} \rangle$ is a bijective primitive recursive function coding a finite tuple into a natural number.

Then $<_{\text{KB}}$ is a strict linear order over $P(\alpha)$, and we can see that D is a predilator. Clearly, D is recursive if $\langle D_n \mid n < \omega \rangle$ is recursive.

It is clear that $D(\alpha)$ is ill-founded if all of $D_i(\alpha)$ is ill-founded. Conversely, suppose that $D(\alpha)$ is ill-founded, so we have an infinite decreasing sequence

$$c(0) >_{\text{KB}} c(1) >_{\text{KB}} c(2) >_{\text{KB}} \cdots$$

By the same argument we provided in the proof of [Lemma 3.33](#), we have that the number of columns of $c(i)$ is unbounded. From this, we can extract an infinite decreasing sequence over $D_i(\alpha)$ for every i , so $D_i(\alpha)$ is ill-founded for every i . \square

4. Π_1^1 - AND Π_2^1 -PROOF THEORY, AND REFLECTION RANK

4.1. Π_1^1 -proof theory. In this subsection, we will briefly review a more technical aspect of Π_1^1 -proof theory that we have not explained in the introduction. Proof theorists gauged the strength of a given theory by examining how far the given theory can be capable of recursive well-orders.

Definition 4.1. Let T be a Π_1^1 -sound extension of ACA_0 . We define its *proof-theoretic ordinal* by

$$|T|_{\Pi_1^1} = \sup\{\alpha \in \text{PRWO} \mid T \vdash \text{WO}(\alpha)\},$$

where PRWO is the set of all primitive recursive well-orders, and $\text{WO}(\alpha)$ is the assertion that a linear order α is well-ordered.

The subscript Π_1^1 of $|T|_{\Pi_1^1}$ means the proof-theoretic ordinal of T gauges its robustness via gauging its Π_1^1 -consequences. The Kleene normal form theorem justifies the reason for using primitive recursive well-orders.

The following theorem characterizes the well-orderedness of the proof-theoretic ordinal of a theory:

Theorem 4.2 (ACA_0). *Let T be a Π_1^1 -sound extension of ACA_0 . If T is arithmetically definable, then $|T|_{\Pi_1^1}$ is recursive. Furthermore, the assertion $\text{WO}(|T|_{\Pi_1^1})$ is equivalent to $\Pi_1^1\text{-RFN}(T)$. \square*

4.2. Reflection rank. [14] defined a different way to gauge the strength of a given theory using Π_1^1 -reflection. More precisely, they defined the following relation:

Definition 4.3. Let Γ be a complexity class, and define

$$S \prec_{\Gamma} T \iff T \vdash \Gamma\text{-RFN}(S)$$

for Γ -sound r.e. extensions of ACA_0 .

It turns out that \prec_{Γ} is well-founded if $\Gamma = \Pi_n^1$ or $\Gamma = \Sigma_{n+1}^1$ for $n \geq 1$:

Theorem 4.4 (Pakhomov-Walsh [14, Theorem 3.2]). *Let $\Gamma = \Pi_n^1$ or $\Gamma = \Sigma_{n+1}^1$ for $n \geq 1$. Then \prec_{Γ} is well-founded.*

[14] actually proved the above result for $\Gamma = \Pi_1^1$, but the same proof works for any Σ_n^1 or Π_n^1 for $n \geq 2$. It allows us to define the Γ -reflection rank $\text{rank}_{\Gamma}(T)$ for Γ -sound r.e. theories T extending ACA_0 .

It is natural to ask the value and the behavior of the Γ -reflection rank for natural theories. The following lemma says the rank is always less than ω_1^{CK} :

Lemma 4.5. *Let T be a Γ -sound r.e. extension of ACA_0 . Then $\text{rank}_{\Gamma}(T) < \omega_1^{\text{CK}}$.*

Proof. Fix a Γ -sound r.e. extension T of ACA_0 , and consider the following set:

$$\mathbb{P} = \{S \mid T \vdash \Gamma\text{-RFN}(S)\},$$

where S is ranged over all r.e. extension of ACA_0 . That is, we do not assume Γ -soundness of S in \mathbb{P} , but the Γ -soundness of S follows from the Γ -soundness of T by Lemma 2.3.

We can see that \mathbb{P} is a recursive set, and the relation \prec_{Γ} over Γ is a recursive well-founded relation. Hence we can define a \prec_{Γ} -rank function ρ over \mathbb{P} . Moreover, the supremum of all $\rho(S)$ for $S \in \mathbb{P}$ must be less than ω_1^{CK} . However, we can see that $\rho(S) = \text{rank}_{\Gamma}(S)$ for all $S \in \mathbb{P}$ by \prec_{Γ} -induction, and the supremum of all $\rho(S)$ for $S \in \mathbb{P}$ coincides with $\text{rank}_{\Gamma}(T)$. Hence $\text{rank}_{\Gamma}(T) < \omega_1^{\text{CK}}$ \square

We will see that \prec_{Γ} does not cohere well with other proof-theoretic characteristics like the Σ_2^1 -proof-theoretic ordinal $s_2^1(T)$. Hence let us define the following variant of \prec_{Γ} :

Definition 4.6. Let Γ be a complexity class. Define

$$S \prec_{\hat{\Gamma}} T \iff T \vdash^{\hat{\Gamma}} \Gamma\text{-RFN}(S).$$

The argument provided in [14] shows $\prec_{\hat{\Gamma}}$ is well-founded for $\Gamma = \Pi_n^1$ for extensions of $\Sigma_n^1\text{-AC}_0$. This allows us to define the $\prec_{\hat{\Gamma}}$ -rank for theories extending $\Sigma_n^1\text{-AC}_0$ for $\Gamma = \Pi_n^1$. Let us provide its proof for $n = 2$:

Proposition 4.7 ($\Sigma_2^1\text{-AC}_0$). *$\prec_{\hat{\Pi}_2^1}$ for r.e. Π_2^1 -sound extensions of $\Sigma_2^1\text{-AC}_0$ is well-founded.*

Proof. To prove the above statement from $\Sigma_2^1\text{-AC}_0$, we instead prove the inconsistency $\Sigma_2^1\text{-AC}_0$ with the following statement:

$$\theta \equiv \exists^1 \langle T_n \mid n \in \mathbb{N} \rangle [\Pi_2^1\text{-RFN}(T_0) \wedge \forall n \text{Prv}_{T_n}^{\Sigma_2^1}(\Pi_2^1\text{-RFN}(T_{n+1})) \wedge \forall^0 n (T_n \supseteq \Sigma_2^1\text{-AC}_0)].$$

To prove this, we claim that $\Sigma_2^1\text{-AC}_0 + \theta$ proves its own consistency. Reasoning over $\Sigma_2^1\text{-AC}_0 + \theta$, let $\langle T_n \mid n \in \mathbb{N} \rangle$ be a sequence witnessing θ . Then consider the following statement:

$$\tau_0 \equiv \exists^1 \langle S_n \mid n \in \mathbb{N} \rangle [S_0 = T_1 \wedge \forall n \text{Prv}_{S_n}^{\Sigma_2^1}(\Pi_2^1\text{-RFN}(S_{n+1})) \wedge \forall n (S_n \supseteq \Sigma_1^1\text{-AC}_0)].$$

By $\Sigma_2^1\text{-AC}_0$, τ_0 is equivalent to a Σ_2^1 -statement τ . Furthermore, τ is true since $\langle T_{n+1} \mid n \in \mathbb{N} \rangle$ witnesses τ_0 . From $\Sigma_2^1\text{-RFN}(T_0)$ and that τ is true Σ_2^1 , we get

$$\text{Con}(T_0 + \tau).$$

By $T_0 \supseteq \Sigma_2^1\text{-AC}_0$ and $\text{Pr}_{T_0}(\Sigma_2^1\text{-RFN}(T_1))$, we have

$$\text{Con}(\Sigma_2^1\text{-AC}_0 + \Sigma_2^1\text{-RFN}(T_1) + \tau).$$

However, we can see that $\Sigma_2^1\text{-RFN}(T_1) + \tau$ implies θ over $\Sigma_1^1\text{-AC}_0$, so we have $\text{Con}(\Sigma_2^1\text{-AC}_0 + \theta)$. \square

We will prove in [Section 8](#) that $\prec_{\Pi_2^1}^{\Sigma_2^1}$ is well-founded for Π_2^1 -sound r.e. extensions of ACA_0 . Although the above proof gives a weaker result, it has the benefit that a similar argument works for the well-foundedness of $\prec_{\Pi_n^1}^{\Sigma_n^1}$ for extensions of $\Sigma_n^1\text{-AC}_0$. However, the well-foundedness of $\prec_{\Sigma_2^1}^{\Pi_2^1}$ does not follow from the proof similar to that of [Proposition 4.7](#) even for theories extending $\Sigma_2^1\text{-AC}_0$: The main trouble is that θ in [Proposition 4.7](#) becomes Σ_3^1 instead of Π_2^1 . We will go back to this issue in [Section 7](#).

We can ask whether there is any connection between the $\prec_{\Pi_1^1}$ -rank and the proof-theoretic ordinal. [\[15\]](#) proved that they coincide for theories extending ACA_0^+ :

Theorem 4.8 (Pakhomov-Walsh [\[15\]](#)). *Let T be a Π_1^1 -sound r.e. extension of ACA_0^+ . Then $\text{rank}_{\Pi_1^1}(T) = |T|_{\Pi_1^1}$.*

Then what can we say about $\prec_{\Pi_1^1}^{\Sigma_1^1}$ -rank? It turns out that $\prec_{\Pi_1^1}^{\Sigma_1^1}$ -rank gauges the size of the proof-theoretic ordinal in the following manner:

Theorem 4.9 (Pakhomov-Walsh [\[14, Theorem 5.20\]](#)). *Let T be a Π_1^1 -sound extension of ACA_0 . If $\text{rank}_{\Pi_1^1}^{\Sigma_1^1}(T) = \alpha$ then $|T|_{\Pi_1^1} = \varepsilon_\alpha$.*

Hence we immediately get the following:

Theorem 4.10. *Let S, T be Π_1^1 -sound r.e. extensions of ACA_0 . Then we have*

$$|S|_{\Pi_1^1} \leq |T|_{\Pi_1^1} \iff \text{rank}_{\Pi_1^1}^{\Sigma_1^1}(S) \leq \text{rank}_{\Pi_1^1}^{\Sigma_1^1}(T). \quad \square$$

4.3. Π_2^1 -proof theory. Proof-theoretic ordinal gauges the Π_1^1 -consequences of a theory. We need a more complicated object than ordinals to describe an appropriate characteristic for the Π_2^1 -consequences of a theory. It turns out that dilators are the right object to describe Π_2^1 -consequences. The following definition is due to [\[1\]](#):

Definition 4.11. Let T be a Π_2^1 -sound extension of ACA_0 . Then $|T|_{\Pi_2^1}$ is the dilator unique up to bi-embeddability satisfying the following conditions:

- (1) For a recursive predilator D , if $T \vdash \text{Dil}(D)$ then D embeds to $|T|_{\Pi_2^1}$.
- (2) (Universality) If a dilator \hat{D} satisfies (1), then \hat{D} embeds $|T|_{\Pi_2^1}$ and the following diagram commutes:

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 D_0 & & \hat{D} \\
 \searrow & & \nearrow \\
 & |T|_{\Pi_2^1} & \\
 \nearrow & & \searrow \\
 D_i & & \hat{D}
 \end{array}$$

Here $\{D_i \mid i < \omega\}$ is an enumeration of all T -provably recursive dilators.

[1] showed that every Π_2^1 -sound extension of ACA_0 has a proof-theoretic dilator, and is recursive if T is. In fact, $|T|_{\Pi_2^1}$ can be defined by taking the sum of all T -provably recursive dilators. Furthermore, if T is r.e. then we can make $|T|_{\Pi_2^1}$ to be recursive. We may try to define $|T|_{\Pi_2^1}$ for Π_2^1 -unsound theories. In this case, however, $|T|_{\Pi_2^1}$ will not be a dilator and there is no guarantee that $|T|_{\Pi_2^1}$ satisfies the universality condition.

Also, like proof-theoretic ordinals is associated with the Π_1^1 -reflection, proof-theoretic dilators are related to Π_2^1 -reflection:

Theorem 4.12 (Aguilera-Pakhomov [1, Theorem 7]). *ACA_0 proves the following: If T is a Π_2^1 -sound r.e. extension of ACA_0 , then $\text{Dil}(|T|_{\Pi_2^1})$ is equivalent to $\Pi_2^1\text{-RFN}(T)$.* \square

$|T|_{\Pi_2^1}$ has the following extensional description for ordinals less than ω_1^{CK} :

Theorem 4.13 (Aguilera-Pakhomov [1, Theorem 9]). *Let T be a Π_2^1 -sound extension of ACA_0 . If α is a recursive well-order, then*

$$|T|_{\Pi_2^1}(\alpha) = |T + \text{WO}(\alpha)|_{\Pi_1^1}. \quad \square$$

The following theorem shows an extensional description of some proof-theoretic dilators. Some of the results are available in [16], and some others are unpublished results by Aguilera and Pakhomov:

Theorem 4.14.

- (1) *Let ε^+ be a dilator such that $\varepsilon^+(\alpha)$ is the least epsilon number greater than α . Then $|\text{ACA}_0|_{\Pi_2^1} = \varepsilon^+$.*
- (2) *Let φ_2^+ be a dilator such that $\varphi_2^+(\alpha)$ is the least Veblen number of the form $\varphi_2(\xi)$ greater than α . Then $|\text{ACA}_0^+|_{\Pi_2^1} = \varphi_2^+$.*
- (3) *Let Γ^+ be a dilator such that $\Gamma^+(\alpha)$ is the least fixpoint for Veblen function greater than α . Then $|\text{ATR}_0|_{\Pi_2^1} = \Gamma^+$.* \square

5. PSEUDODILATORS: A TRANSITION TO GROWTH AND CLIMAX

Recursive predilators that are not dilators appear frequently when we handle Σ_2^1 -formulas. Thus let us name this concept separately.

Definition 5.1. A predilator D is an *pseudodilator* if it is not a dilator. For a pseudodilator D , the *climax* of D is the least ordinal α such that $D(\alpha)$ is not well-founded. We denote the climax of D by $\text{Clim}(D)$.

Pseudodilators can be used to represent ordinals via their climax. For example, we can find a recursive pseudodilator whose climax is ω_1^{CK} , which is impossible to represent via a recursive well-ordering:

Example 5.2. Let $\phi(i)$ be a universal Π_1^1 -formula; That is, for each Π_1^1 -sentence σ we can find a natural number n such that $\phi(n)$ and σ are equivalent. By the Kleene normal form theorem, we can find a recursive well-order α_i such that $\phi(i) \leftrightarrow \text{WO}(\alpha_i)$ for every natural number i . Then we can see that the family $\langle (\alpha_i \rightarrow \omega^*) \mid i < \omega \rangle$ of dilators is also recursive, where ω^* is ω with the reversed order. Notice that if α_i is well-founded, then $(\alpha_i \rightarrow \omega^*)$ is a pseudodilator of climax α_i .

Now define $D_i = (\alpha_i \rightarrow \omega^*) \wedge C_{\alpha_i}$, where C_x is a constant predilator with value x , i.e., $C_x(\alpha) = x$ for all α . Then take D as the disjunctive sum of all D_i s. Since the enumeration $\langle D_i \mid i < \omega \rangle$ is a recursive enumeration of recursive predilators, D is a recursive predilator. Observe that

- (1) If α_i is ill-founded, then $D_i(\gamma)$ is ill-founded regardless of γ . Thus D_i is a pseudodilator of climax 0.
- (2) If α_i is well-founded, then $D_i(\gamma)$ is ill-founded iff $(\alpha_i \rightarrow \omega^*)(\gamma)$ is ill-founded, which is equivalent to $\alpha_i \leq \gamma$. Hence D_i is a pseudodilator of climax α_i .

Hence by Lemma 3.33 again, $D(\gamma)$ is ill-founded iff $\gamma \geq \alpha_i$ for all i when α_i is well-founded. Hence D is a recursive predilator whose climax is ω_1^{CK} !

However, there is a limit to express ordinals in terms of the climax of a recursive pseudodilator: In fact, if D is Σ_2^1 -definable, then its climax must be less than δ_2^1 :

Proposition 5.3. *Let D be a Σ_2^1 -definable pseudodilator. Then $\text{Clim}(D) < \delta_2^1$. In addition, the supremum of all $\text{Clim}(D)$ for recursive pseudodilators D is δ_2^1 .*

Proof. The statement ‘ D is a pseudodilator’ is stated as follows:

$$(6) \quad \exists^1 \alpha [\text{WO}(\alpha) \wedge \neg \text{WO}(D(\alpha))].$$

Since D is Σ_2^1 -definable, $\neg \text{WO}(D(\alpha))$ is also Σ_2^1 because it is equivalent to

$$\exists^1 f \forall^0 n [f(n) \in D(\alpha) \wedge f(n) >_{D(\alpha)} f(n+1)].$$

Here the statement $f(n) \in D(\alpha)$ and $f(n) >_{D(\alpha)} f(n+1)$ are Σ_2^1 with parameters α and f , and $\forall n$ is a universal quantifier over the natural numbers. Hence we can reduce the above formula to a Σ_2^1 -formula (using $\Sigma_2^1\text{-AC}_0$ that holds over the metatheory.) Thus (6) also holds over $L_{\delta_2^1}$ by Shoenfield absoluteness theorem, Proposition 2.5, and Proposition 2.7. This shows $\text{Clim}(D) < \delta_2^1$.

To show δ_2^1 is the supremum of all $\text{Clim}(D)$ for a recursive D , fix an ordinal $\alpha < \delta_2^1$ and its Σ_1 -definition $\phi(x)$ over L . We follow an argument through β -preproof presented in [1, Theorem 28]: Consider the β -preproof $P = \{P(\xi) \mid \xi \in \text{Ord}\}$ trying to show the conjunction of the axioms of KP_i, a theory KP plus a proper class of admissible ordinals with the following:

- (1) $V = L$ holds.
- (2) $\neg \exists x \phi(x)$.

Then P gives a recursive predilator. Since $T = \text{KP}_i + (V = L) + \exists x \phi(x)$ has a transitive model (namely $L_{\delta_2^1}$), so P is a pseudodilator. Furthermore, $P(\xi)$ is well-founded for $\xi < \alpha$ since no model of T of height less than α . Hence $\text{Clim}(P) \geq \alpha$. \square

It is well-known that every ordinal below ω_1^{CK} has an isomorphic recursive well-order. Similarly, we can ask if every ordinal below δ_2^1 is a climax of a recursive pseudodilator. However, the proof of [1, Theorem 24] implies there is no recursive pseudodilator D such that $\alpha = \text{Clim}(D)$ if α is *parameter-free* Σ_1^1 -*reflecting* and is either admissible or a limit of admissibles. The case when α is *neither* an admissible nor a limit admissible is open:

Question 5.4. Can we characterize ordinals $\alpha < \delta_2^1$ such that $\alpha = \text{Clim}(D)$ for some recursive pseudodilator D ?

One may ask why we do not use semidilators instead of predilators when we define pseudodilators. The reason is that non-pre-semidilators have trivial climaxes, which make them less interesting:

Proposition 5.5. *Suppose that D is a semidilator that is not a predilator. Then $\text{Clim}(D) < \omega^\omega$.*

Proof. Assume the conditions for D in the statement. Then we have a non-trivial arity diagram

$$\Delta = \begin{array}{ccc} n_\cap & \longrightarrow & n \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow e_1 \\ n & \xrightarrow{e_0} & n_\cup \end{array}$$

with $e_0 \leq e_1$, and a D -term t of arity n such that $D \models t \not\prec_\Delta t$. Now let $\gamma = \omega^{2 \cdot n_\cup}$ and $h: n_\cup \rightarrow \gamma$, $k: \gamma \rightarrow \gamma$ be increasing maps such that $he_1 = khe_0$, which exist by [9, Proposition 2.3.9]. By analyzing the proof of Proposition 3.15, we have

$$D(\gamma) \text{ is well-founded} \implies \Delta \text{ is trivial or } t <_\Delta t.$$

By its contrapositive, $D(\gamma)$ is ill-founded, so $\text{Clim}(D) \leq \gamma < \omega^\omega$. \square

The following notion describes how to compare the climaxes of two pseudodilators:

Definition 5.6. Let D_0 and D_1 be two pseudodilators. We say D_0 *grows over* D_1 if $\text{Clim}(D_0) \leq \text{Clim}(D_1)$. Equivalently, D_0 grows over D_1 if the following holds:

$$\text{Grow}(D_0, D_1) \equiv \forall^1 \alpha [[\text{WO}(\alpha) \wedge \text{WO}(D_0(\alpha))] \rightarrow \text{WO}(D_1(\alpha))].$$

Note that if D_0 and D_1 are recursive, then $\text{Grow}(D_0, D_1)$ is Π_1^1 .

The choice of the terminology ‘ D_0 grows over D_1 ’ may be awkward because it states $\text{Clim}(D_0) \leq \text{Clim}(D_1)$ and not the reversed one. The reason of the current choice is that if $\text{Clim}(D_0) \leq \text{Clim}(D_1)$, then $D_0(\alpha)$ ‘diverges’ to the ill-founded state earlier than $D_1(\alpha)$. This means we may regard D_0 ‘grows’ faster than D_1 so it diverges sooner.

In the case of a well-order, we can effectively construct its successor. We can ask the same for pseudodilators: That is, for a given pseudodilator D , can we effectively construct a new pseudodilator D' such that $\text{Clim}(D') = \text{Clim}(D) + 1$? One way to do this is to consider the following predilator:

$$\int D(\alpha) = \sum_{i \in \text{field } \alpha} D(\alpha \upharpoonright i),$$

where $\alpha \upharpoonright i$ is the well-order given from α by restricting its field to $\{j \in \text{field}(\alpha) \mid j <_\alpha i\}$. Let us formulate the construction of D' from D more formally, in a way that the construction works over ACA_0 .

Lemma 5.7 (ACA_0). *Let D be a predilator. Then we can construct a predilator $\int D$ such that the following holds: For a well-order α ,*

- (1) *If $D(\alpha)$ is ill-founded, then so is $\int D(\alpha + 1)$.*
- (2) *If $D(\alpha \upharpoonright i)$ is well-founded for all $i \in \text{field}(\alpha)$, then so is $\int D(\alpha)$.*
- (3) *If D is recursive, then so is $\int D$.*

Proof. Let D be a predilator. From the terms of D , let us construct terms of $\int D$ as follows: For each n -ary D -term t , add a new $(n + 1)$ -ary term t' . Fix a linear order α , and define the order $<_{\int D(\alpha)}$ over $\int D(\alpha)$ as follows: For given D -terms s, t , and elements $\vec{\xi}, \vec{\eta}, \xi', \eta'$ of α ,

$$s'(\vec{\xi}, \xi') <_{\int D(\alpha)} t'(\vec{\eta}, \eta') \iff \text{either } \xi' < \eta' \text{ or } [\xi' = \eta' \text{ and } s(\vec{\xi}) <_{D(\alpha)} t(\vec{\eta})].$$

Since $s(\vec{\xi}) <_{D(\alpha)} t(\vec{\eta})$ only depends on s, t , and the type of $\vec{\xi}, \vec{\eta}$, so D' and $<_{\int D(\alpha)}$ defines a denotation system. Clearly, if D is recursive, then so is D' .

On the one hand, we can see that there is an embedding from $D(\alpha)$ to $(\int D)(\alpha + 1)$ given by

$$t(\vec{\xi}) \mapsto t'(\vec{\xi}, \alpha).$$

Therefore if $D(\alpha)$ is ill-founded, then so is $\int D(\alpha + 1)$. On the other hand, if $D(\alpha \upharpoonright i)$ is well-founded for every $i \in \text{field}(\alpha)$, then we can find D -terms s_0, s_1, \dots and ordinals $\vec{\xi}_0, \vec{\xi}_1, \dots \in \alpha, \eta_0, \eta_1, \dots \in \alpha$ such that

$$s'_0(\vec{\xi}_0, \eta_0) >_{\int D(\alpha)} s'_1(\vec{\xi}_1, \eta_1) >_{\int D(\alpha)} s'_2(\vec{\xi}_2, \eta_2) >_{\int D(\alpha)} \dots$$

Since we do not have $\eta_0 >_\alpha \eta_1 >_\alpha \dots$, there must be n such that $\eta_n = \eta_{n+1} = \eta_{n+2} = \dots$. For such n , we get

$$s_0(\vec{\xi}_n) >_{D(\alpha \upharpoonright \eta_n)} s_1(\vec{\xi}_{n+1}) >_{D(\alpha \upharpoonright \eta_n)} s_2(\vec{\xi}_{n+2}) >_{D(\alpha \upharpoonright \eta_n)} \dots,$$

contradicting with that $D(\alpha \upharpoonright \eta_n)$ is well-founded. \square

5.1. Proof-theoretic pseudodilator. We will define the *proof-theoretic pseudodilator* $|T|_{\Sigma_2^1}$ for a given theory T , which is characterized by the following property: For every well-order α ,

$$(7) \quad \langle \forall^0 D \in \text{RecPreDil}(S \vdash \neg \text{Dil}(D)) \rightarrow \neg \text{WO}(D(\alpha)) \rangle \iff \neg \text{WO}(|T|_{\Sigma_2^1}(\alpha))$$

where RecPreDil is the set of all recursive predilators. One may naively define $|T|_{\Sigma_2^1}$ by

$$|T|_{\Sigma_2^1} = \bigvee \langle D \mid D \text{ is a recursive predilator such that } T \vdash \neg \text{Dil}(D) \rangle.$$

However, this definition has a faulty: $|T|_{\Sigma_2^1}$ is not necessarily recursive even if T is. We will resolve this issue by modifying our naive definition in the following way:

Definition 5.8. Let T be a Σ_2^1 -sound extension of ACA_0 . A *proof-theoretic pseudodilator* $|T|_{\Sigma_2^1}$ is defined as follows: Consider the enumeration of all pairs $\langle D, \pi \rangle$, where D is a recursive predilator and π is a T -proof for $\neg \text{Dil}(D)$. For a given pair $\langle D, \pi \rangle$, let D_π be a recursive predilator obtained from D by replacing all D -terms t with $\langle \pi, t \rangle$. Then define

$$|T|_{\Sigma_2^1} = \bigvee \langle D_\pi \mid D \in \text{RecPreDil} \wedge \pi \text{ is a proof for } \neg \text{Dil}(D) \text{ from } T \rangle.$$

If T is recursive, then the statements ' π is a T -proof of a given statement' and the map $\langle D, \pi \rangle \mapsto D_\pi$ are also recursive. Hence $|T|_{\Sigma_2^1}$ is also recursive. Like proof-theoretic dilators, we can still define $|T|_{\Sigma_2^1}$ for Σ_2^1 -unsound theories; We just do not know if $|T|_{\Sigma_2^1}$ is a pseudodilator or not in this case.

We need to check our proof-theoretic pseudodilator meets (7):

Lemma 5.9 (ACA_0). *Let D be a predilator and T be a Σ_2^1 -sound extension of ACA_0 . Then for a well-order α , the following two are equivalent:*

- (1) For every recursive predilator D such that $T \vdash \neg \text{Dil}(D)$, $D(\alpha)$ is ill-founded, and
- (2) $|T|_{\Sigma_2^1}(\alpha)$ is ill-founded.

Proof. Fix a well-order α . Suppose that for every T -provably recursive pseudodilator D , $D(\alpha)$ is ill-founded, and let π be a T -proof for D being a pseudodilator. Then D and D_π are isomorphic predilators, so $D_\pi(\alpha)$ is also ill-founded. Since D and π are arbitrarily, we have that $|T|_{\Sigma_2^1}(\alpha)$ is also ill-founded. The remaining direction can be shown similarly. \square

Proof-theoretic pseudodilator of T is associated with the Σ_2^1 -reflection of T :

Proposition 5.10 ($\Sigma_2^1\text{-ACA}_0$). *Let T be a Σ_2^1 -sound extension of ACA_0 . Then $\Sigma_2^1\text{-RFN}(T)$ iff $\neg \text{Dil}(|T|_{\Sigma_2^1})$.*

Proof. For one direction, suppose that $\Sigma_2^1\text{-RFN}(T)$ holds. Then if D is a recursive predilator such that $T \vdash \neg \text{Dil}(D)$, then D is a pseudodilator. That is, if $T \vdash \neg \text{Dil}(D)$, then we can find a well-order α such that $D(\alpha)$ is ill-founded. Then by $\Sigma_2^1\text{-AC}_0$ applied to the sentence

$$\forall^1 D \in \mathcal{X} \exists \alpha [\text{WO}(\alpha) \wedge \neg \text{WO}(D(\alpha))]$$

for the set $\mathcal{X} = \{D \in \text{RecPreDil} \mid T \vdash \neg \text{Dil}(D)\}$, which can be viewed as a subset of \mathbb{N} , we have a set a such that

$$\forall^1 D \in \mathcal{X} [\text{WO}((a)_D) \wedge \neg \text{WO}(D((a)_D))].$$

Now take $\gamma = \sum_{D \in \mathcal{X}} (a)_D$. Then γ is a well-order embedding all $(a)_D$ for $D \in \mathcal{X}$, so $D(\gamma)$ is ill-founded for every recursive D such that $T \vdash \neg \text{Dil}(D)$. Hence by Lemma 5.9, $|T|_{\Sigma_2^1}$ is also a pseudodilator.

For the remaining direction, suppose that $|T|_{\Sigma_2^1}$ is a pseudodilator. By the completeness of dilators, every Σ_2^1 -sentence is equivalent to $\neg \text{Dil}(D)$ for some recursive predilator D , and this is a theorem of ACA_0 . Thus we can identify a Σ_2^1 -sentence with $\neg \text{Dil}(D)$ for some recursive predilator D .

Now assume that $T \vdash \neg \text{Dil}(D)$. Since $|T|_{\Sigma_2^1}$ is a pseudodilator, we can find a well-order α such that $\neg \text{WO}(|T|_{\Sigma_2^1}(\alpha))$ holds. But by Lemma 5.9, we have $\neg \text{WO}(D(\alpha))$. Hence D is not a dilator. \square

5.2. Σ_2^1 -proof-theoretic ordinal. [1] defined a Σ_2^1 -proof-theoretic ordinal for Σ_2^1 -sound theories. We will see in the next section that it has the role of proof-theoretic ordinal for Σ_2^1 -sentences.

Definition 5.11. Let T be a Σ_2^1 -sound extension of ACA_0 . We define $s_2^1(T)$ as follows:

$$s_2^1(T) = \sup\{\text{Clim}(D) \mid D \text{ is a recursive predilator and } T \vdash \neg \text{Dil}(D)\}.$$

Then the following is immediate by Lemma 5.9:

Lemma 5.12. *Let T be a Σ_2^1 -sound extension of ACA_0 . Then $\text{Clim}(|T|_{\Sigma_2^1}) = s_2^1(T)$.* \square

Lemma 5.13. *Let T be a Σ_2^1 -sound extension of ACA_0 . Then $s_2^1(T)$ is the strict supremum of all $\text{Clim}(D)$ for T -provably recursive pseudodilators D . That is, if $T \vdash \neg \text{Dil}(D)$, then $\text{Clim}(D) < s_2^1(T)$.*

Proof. Let D be a recursive pseudodilator such that $T \vdash \neg \text{Dil}(D)$. Then by Lemma 5.7, we can construct a new recursive predilator $\int D$.

First, we need to show $T \vdash \neg \text{Dil}(\int D)$. Reasoning over T , let α be a well-order such that $\neg \text{WO}(D(\alpha))$. Then by Lemma 5.7, $\neg \text{WO}(\int D(\alpha+1))$. Hence $\int D$ is also a pseudodilator. Furthermore, Lemma 5.7 ensures $\text{Clim}(\int D) = \text{Clim}D + 1$. Hence we get $\text{Clim}(D) < \text{Clim}(\int D) < s_2^1(T)$. \square

It is known that the supremum of all $|T|_{\Pi_1^1}$ for Π_1^1 -sound r.e. extension of ACA_0 is ω_1^{CK} . What about the supremum of $s_2^1(T)$? The following theorem gives the answer:

Theorem 5.14 (Aguilera-Pakhomov [1, Theorem 33]). δ_2^1 is the supremum of all $s_2^1(T)$ for Σ_2^1 -sound r.e. extension of ACA_0 . \square

The following result shows the $s_2^1(T)$ for some theories T :

Theorem 5.15 (Aguilera-Pakhomov [1, Theorem 36]).

- (1) $s_2^1(\text{ACA}_0) = s_2^1(\text{KP}) = \omega_1^{\text{CK}}$.
- (2) $s_2^1(\Pi_1^1\text{-CA}_0) = \omega_\omega^{\text{CK}}$.

- (3) $s_2^1(\Pi_2^1\text{-CA}_0) = \sup_{n < \omega} \sigma_n$, where σ_n is the least ordinal α such that there are $\alpha_0 < \dots < \alpha_{n-1} = \alpha$ satisfying $L_{\alpha_0} \prec_{\Sigma_1} \dots \prec_{\Sigma_1} L_{\alpha_{n-1}}$.⁶ \square

Proposition 5.16. *Let BI stand for Bar Induction schema (or Transfinite Induction for all second-order formulas.) Then we have the following:*

- (1) $s_2^1(\text{ATR}_0 + \text{BI}) = \omega_1^{\text{CK}}$.
(2) $s_2^1(\Pi_1^1\text{-CA}_0 + \text{BI}) = \omega_\omega^{\text{CK}}$.

Proof. The right-to-left inequality follows from [Theorem 5.15](#). To show $s_2^1(\text{ATR}_0 + \text{BI}) \leq \omega_1^{\text{CK}}$, let us consider a β -model M of height ω_1^{CK} (For example, one constructed from the hyperjump of \emptyset .) By [Theorem VII.2.7](#) and [Lemma VII.2.15](#) of [17], M satisfies $\text{ATR}_0 + \text{BI}$. If D is a recursive pseudodilator such that $\text{ATR}_0 + \text{BI} \vdash \neg \text{Dil}(D)$, then we get

$$M \models \neg \text{Dil}(D).$$

Hence the climax of D must be less than ω_1^{CK} . To prove $s_2^1(\Pi_1^1\text{-CA}_0 + \text{BI}) \leq \omega_\omega^{\text{CK}}$, repeat the same argument with the minimal β -model of $\Pi_1^1\text{-CA}_0$ instead. \square

It is open whether $s_2^1(T)$ must be either an admissible ordinal or a limit of admissible ordinals if T is a sound r.e. extension of ACA_0 .

6. s_2^1 , Σ_2^1 -CONSEQUENCES, AND Σ_2^1 -REFLECTION

6.1. The first equivalence. The main goal of this section is to provide the Σ_2^1 -version of the characterization of Π_1^1 -proof theory. Let us state the Σ_2^1 version of the first equivalence stated in [23]:

Proposition 6.1. *For Σ_2^1 -sound extensions S, T of ACA_0 , we have*

$$S \subseteq_{\Sigma_2^1} T \iff s_2^1(S) \leq s_2^1(T).$$

Instead of proving the above claim directly, let us prove the following lemma that will immediately imply [Proposition 6.1](#). We separate this lemma from the proof of [Proposition 6.1](#) for later purposes.

Lemma 6.2. *Let T be a Σ_2^1 -sound extension of ACA_0 , and let D be a recursive predilator. Then*

$$T \vdash^{\Pi_2^1} \neg \text{Dil}(D) \iff \text{Clim}(D) < s_2^1(T).$$

Proof. For one direction, assume that $T \vdash^{\Pi_2^1} \neg \text{Dil}(D)$. By Π_2^1 -completeness of dilators, we have a recursive dilator E such that $T + \text{Dil}(E) \vdash \neg \text{Dil}(D)$. Hence we get

$$T \vdash \neg(\text{Dil}(E) \wedge \text{Dil}(D)).$$

Now let $\hat{D} = D \wedge E$ given by [Lemma 3.31](#). Then \hat{D} is a recursive predilator and $T \vdash \neg \text{Dil}(\hat{D})$, so $\text{Clim}(\hat{D}) < s_2^1(T)$. Since E is a dilator, we have for each ordinal α ,

$$\text{WO}(\hat{D}(\alpha)) \iff \text{WO}(D(\alpha)).$$

This implies $\text{Clim}(\hat{D}) = \text{Clim}(D)$, which gives the desired inequality.

Let us show the remaining direction. Suppose that $\text{Clim}(D) < s_2^1(T)$. Then we can find a recursive pseudodilator E such that $T \vdash \neg \text{Dil}(E)$ and $\text{Clim}(D) \leq \text{Clim}(E) < s_2^1(T)$. Since $\text{Clim}(D) \leq \text{Clim}(E)$, a Π_2^1 -statement

$$\text{Grow}(D, E) \equiv \forall^1 \alpha [[\text{WO}(\alpha) \wedge \text{WO}(D(\alpha))] \rightarrow \text{WO}(E(\alpha))]$$

is true. Since T proves $\neg \text{Dil}(E)$,

$$T \vdash \exists^1 \alpha (\text{WO}(\alpha) \wedge \neg \text{WO}(E(\alpha))).$$

Now let us reason in $T + \text{Grow}(D, E)$: Suppose that α is a well-order such that $\text{WO}(E(\alpha))$. Then by the contrapositive of $\text{Grow}(D, E)$, $D(\alpha)$ is also ill-founded. Hence D is also not a dilator. That is, we get

$$T + \text{Grow}(D, E) \vdash \neg \text{Dil}(D).$$

Since $\text{Grow}(D, E)$ is a true Π_2^1 -statement, we have $T \vdash^{\Pi_2^1} \neg \text{Dil}(D)$. \square

⁶The Σ_2^1 -proof-theoretic ordinal for $\Pi_2^1\text{-CA}_0$ presented in [1] is incorrect, and the value presented in this paper is due to Aguilera (Private communication).

Proof of Proposition 6.1. For one direction, assume that $S \subseteq_{\Sigma_2^1}^{\Pi_2^1} T$. If D is a recursive predilator such that $S \vdash \neg \text{Dil}(D)$, then $T \vdash^{\Pi_2^1} \neg \text{Dil}(D)$ by the assumption. Thus by Lemma 6.2, we have $\text{Clim}(D) < s_2^1(T)$. Hence $s_2^1(S) \leq s_2^1(T)$.

For the other direction, assume that $s_2^1(S) \leq s_2^1(T)$ and $S \vdash^{\Pi_2^1} \phi$ for a Σ_2^1 -statement ϕ . By Π_2^1 -completeness of dilators, we may assume that ϕ takes the form $\neg \text{Dil}(D)$ for some recursive dilator D . Then by Lemma 6.2, we have $\text{Clim}(D) < s_2^1(S) \leq s_2^1(T)$. Hence by Lemma 6.2 again, we get $T \vdash^{\Pi_2^1} \neg \text{Dil}(D)$. \square

Then the following is immediate, which is a Σ_2^1 -version of Kreisel's theorem:

Corollary 6.3. *Let T be an Σ_2^1 -sound extension of ACA_0 . If σ is any true Π_2^1 sentence, then $s_2^1(T) = s_2^1(T + \sigma)$. \square*

6.2. The second equivalence. [23] also provided a connection between proof-theoretic ordinal and Π_2^1 -reflection. The following shows the connection between s_2^1 and Σ_2^1 -reflection:

Proposition 6.4. *Let S and T be Σ_2^1 -sound extensions of ACA_0 such that S is Π_2^1 -definable and T is Σ_2^1 -definable. Then we have*

$$(8) \quad s_2^1(S) \leq s_2^1(T) \implies \Sigma_2^1\text{-AC}_0 \vdash^{\Pi_2^1} \Sigma_2^1\text{-RFN}(T) \rightarrow \Sigma_2^1\text{-RFN}(S).$$

Proof. Suppose that $s_2^1(S) \leq s_2^1(T)$, which implies $S \subseteq_{\Sigma_2^1}^{\Pi_2^1} T$. That is, the following sentence becomes true:

$$\theta := \forall^0 \phi \in \Sigma_2^1 [\text{Prv}_S(\phi) \rightarrow \text{Prv}_T^{\Pi_2^1}(\phi)].$$

Let us prove the following first:

Lemma 6.5. $\text{ACA}_0 + \theta \vdash \Sigma_2^1\text{-RFN}(T) \rightarrow \Sigma_2^1\text{-RFN}(S)$.

Proof. Let us reason over $\text{ACA}_0 + \theta$, and suppose that we have $\Sigma_2^1\text{-RFN}(T)$. If $\text{Prv}_S(\phi)$ holds for a Σ_2^1 -sentence ϕ , then by θ , we have $\text{Prv}_T^{\Pi_2^1}(\phi)$. That is, we can find a true Π_2^1 -sentence ψ such that $\text{Prv}_T(\psi \rightarrow \phi)$. Hence by $\Sigma_2^1\text{-RFN}(T)$ and since $\psi \rightarrow \phi$ is Σ_2^1 , $\psi \rightarrow \phi$ is true. Since ψ is true, so is ϕ . In sum we have

$$\forall^0 \phi \in \Sigma_2^1 [\text{Prv}_S(\phi) \rightarrow \text{True}_{\Sigma_2^1}(\phi)]. \quad \square$$

Now let us compute the complexity of θ . One can see the following holds:

- (1) If a theory T is Γ -definable and $\Gamma \supseteq \Sigma_1^0$, then $\text{Prv}_T(\phi)$ has the complexity of the form $\exists^0 \forall^0 \Gamma$.
- (2) Under the same assumption, $\text{Prv}_T^{\Pi_2^1}$ has the complexity of the form $\exists^0 \forall^0 (\Pi_2^1 \wedge \Gamma)$.

Hence θ has the following complexity:

$$\forall^0 [(\exists^0 \forall^0 \Pi_2^1) \vee (\exists^0 \forall^0 \Pi_2^1)],$$

which reduces to $\forall^0 \exists^0 \Pi_2^1$. Furthermore, by Lemma 2.4, for every Π_2^1 -formula $\phi(m)$ we can find a Π_2^1 -sentence τ such that

- $\text{ACA}_0 \vdash \exists^0 m \phi(m) \rightarrow \tau$, and
- $\Sigma_2^1\text{-AC}_0 \vdash \tau \rightarrow \exists^0 m \phi(m)$.

Hence by using $\Sigma_2^1\text{-AC}_0$, we can replace θ to an equivalent formula θ' of the form $\forall^0 \Pi_2^1$. Then we have

$$\Sigma_2^1\text{-AC}_0 + \theta' \vdash \Sigma_2^1\text{-RFN}(T) \rightarrow \Sigma_2^1\text{-RFN}(S). \quad \square$$

Now let us prove the remaining direction:

Proposition 6.6. *Suppose that S, T be Σ_2^1 -sound extensions of ACA_0 such that S is definable and T is arithmetically definable. If*

$$(9) \quad \text{ACA}_0 \vdash^{\Pi_2^1} \Sigma_2^1\text{-RFN}(T) \rightarrow \Sigma_2^1\text{-RFN}(S),$$

then we have $s_2^1(S) \leq s_2^1(T)$. The same holds if we replace all occurrences of ACA_0 to $\Sigma_2^1\text{-AC}_0$.

Proof. Suppose the contrary that (9) holds but $s_2^1(T) < s_2^1(S)$ holds. Then we have a true Π_2^1 -sentence τ such that the following holds:

$$(10) \quad \text{ACA}_0 + \tau \vdash \Sigma_2^1\text{-RFN}(T) \rightarrow \Sigma_2^1\text{-RFN}(S),$$

We can find a recursive pseudodilator \hat{D} such that $S \vdash \neg \text{Dil}(\hat{D})$ and $s_2^1(T) \leq \text{Clim}(\hat{D}) < s_2^1(S)$. Especially, the following Π_2^1 sentence is true:

$$\theta \equiv \forall^0 D \in \text{RecPreDil}[\text{Prv}_T(\neg \text{Dil}(D)) \rightarrow \text{Grow}(D, \hat{D})].$$

Here RecPreDil is the set of all (codes for) recursive predilators. Since S extends ACA_0 , we have

$$S + \theta \vdash \forall^0 D \in \text{RecPreDil}[\text{Prv}_T(\neg \text{Dil}(D)) \rightarrow \neg \text{Dil}(D)].$$

Thus by the Π_2^1 -completeness of recursive dilators, we have

$$S + \theta \vdash \Sigma_2^1\text{-RFN}(T).$$

By applying (10), we can derive $S + \theta + \tau \vdash \Sigma_2^1\text{-RFN}(S)$. Hence by Lemma 2.2, we have

$$S + \theta + \tau \vdash \Sigma_2^1\text{-RFN}(S + \theta + \tau).$$

However, no theory can prove its own Σ_2^1 -reflection, a contradiction. \square

Hence we get the following:

Corollary 6.7. *Let S and T be Σ_2^1 -sound arithmetically definable extensions of $\Sigma_2^1\text{-AC}_0$. Then we have*

$$s_2^1(S) \leq s_2^1(T) \iff \Sigma_2^1\text{-AC}_0 \vdash^{\Pi_2^1} \Sigma_2^1\text{-RFN}(T) \rightarrow \Sigma_2^1\text{-RFN}(S). \quad \square$$

6.3. The restriction in the second equivalence. The restriction for theories being extensions of $\Sigma_2^1\text{-AC}_0$ might be annoying at first glance, which is inherited from Proposition 6.4. The reader may want to fortify the conclusion (8) of Proposition 6.4 by

$$(11) \quad s_2^1(S) \leq s_2^1(T) \implies \text{ACA}_0 \vdash^{\Pi_2^1} \Sigma_2^1\text{-RFN}(T) \rightarrow \Sigma_2^1\text{-RFN}(S).$$

However, the following example shows (11) cannot be achieved even if we replace ACA_0 -provability with $\Pi_1^1\text{-CA}_0$ -provability for sound recursive extensions of ACA_0 :

Example 6.8. By Theorem 5.15 and Proposition 5.16, we have $s_2^1(\Pi_1^1\text{-CA}_0) = s_2^1(\Pi_1^1\text{-CA}_0 + \text{BI})$. Now suppose that we have

$$\Pi_1^1\text{-CA}_0 \vdash^{\Pi_2^1} \Sigma_2^1\text{-RFN}(\Pi_1^1\text{-CA}_0) \rightarrow \Sigma_2^1\text{-RFN}(\Pi_1^1\text{-CA}_0 + \text{BI}).$$

Let θ be a true Π_2^1 -sentence satisfying

$$\Pi_1^1\text{-CA}_0 + \theta + \Sigma_2^1\text{-RFN}(\Pi_1^1\text{-CA}_0) \vdash \Sigma_2^1\text{-RFN}(\Pi_1^1\text{-CA}_0 + \text{BI}).$$

Then by Lemma 2.2, we have

$$(12) \quad \Pi_1^1\text{-CA}_0 + \Sigma_2^1\text{-RFN}(\Pi_1^1\text{-CA}_0) + \theta \vdash \Sigma_2^1\text{-RFN}(\Pi_1^1\text{-CA}_0 + \text{BI} + \theta).$$

[17, Theorem IX.4.10] says $\Pi_1^1\text{-CA}_0$ with Σ_2^1 -Induction implies $\Pi_3^1\text{-RFN}(\Sigma_2^1\text{-AC}_0)$. Hence by Lemma 2.2 and the implication $\Sigma_2^1\text{-AC}_0 \rightarrow \Pi_1^1\text{-CA}_0$, we get

$$(13) \quad \Pi_1^1\text{-CA}_0 + \text{BI} \vdash \Sigma_2^1\text{-RFN}(\Pi_1^1\text{-CA}_0).$$

Combining (12) with (13), we have

$$\Pi_1^1\text{-CA}_0 + \Sigma_2^1\text{-RFN}(\Pi_1^1\text{-CA}_0) + \theta \vdash \Sigma_2^1\text{-RFN}(\Pi_1^1\text{-CA}_0 + \Sigma_2^1\text{-RFN}(\Pi_1^1\text{-CA}_0) + \theta).$$

However, no theory can prove its own Σ_2^1 -reflection, a contradiction. In sum, if we let $S = \Pi_1^1\text{-CA}_0 + \text{BI}$ and $T = \Pi_1^1\text{-CA}_0$, then

$$s_2^1(S) \leq s_2^1(T) \quad \text{but} \quad \Pi_1^1\text{-CA}_0 \not\vdash^{\Pi_2^1} \Sigma_2^1\text{-RFN}(T) \rightarrow \Sigma_2^1\text{-RFN}(S).$$

7. Σ_2^1 -REFLECTION RANK

The well-foundedness of $\prec_{\Sigma_2^1}^{\Pi_2^1}$ does not follow from the proof similar to that of [Proposition 4.7](#) even for theories extending $\Sigma_2^1\text{-AC}_0$. The main trouble is that θ in [Proposition 4.7](#) becomes Σ_3^1 instead of Π_2^1 . To establish the well-foundedness of $\prec_{\Sigma_2^1}^{\Pi_2^1}$, we follow an argument in [22]:

Proposition 7.1. $\prec_{\Sigma_2^1}^{\Pi_2^1}$ is well-founded for Σ_2^1 -sound r.e. extensions of $\Sigma_2^1\text{-AC}_0$.

Proof. To attack [Proposition 7.1](#), it is natural to observe the connection between $\prec_{\Sigma_2^1}^{\Pi_2^1}$ and s_2^1 .

Suppose not, and let $\langle T_n \mid n < \omega \rangle$ be a $\prec_{\Sigma_2^1}^{\Pi_2^1}$ -decreasing sequence of Σ_2^1 -sound r.e. extensions of $\Sigma_2^1\text{-AC}_0$. Then we have, for each n ,

$$T_n \vdash^{\Pi_2^1} \Sigma_2^1\text{-RFN}(T_{n+1}).$$

Since $T_n \supseteq \Sigma_2^1\text{-AC}_0$, we have $T_n \vdash \neg \text{Dil}(|T_{n+1}|_{\Sigma_2^1})$ for each n by [Proposition 5.10](#). Hence by [Lemma 6.2](#), we have

$$s_2^1(T_{n+1}) = \text{Clim}(|T_{n+1}|_{\Sigma_2^1}) < s_2^1(T_n)$$

for each n , a contradiction. \square

It is natural to ask whether $\prec_{\Sigma_2^1}^{\Pi_2^1}$ -rank is related to the Σ_2^1 -proof-theoretic ordinal. The subsequent results say it is:

Proposition 7.2. Let S, T be Σ_2^1 -sound r.e. extensions of $\Sigma_2^1\text{-AC}_0$. If $s_2^1(S) \leq s_2^1(T)$, then $\text{rank}_{\Sigma_2^1}^{\Pi_2^1}(S) \leq \text{rank}_{\Sigma_2^1}^{\Pi_2^1}(T)$.

Proof. Suppose that $\alpha < \text{rank}_{\Sigma_2^1}^{\Pi_2^1}(S)$. We claim the following lemma:

Lemma 7.3. There is a Σ_2^1 -sound r.e. extension U of $\Sigma_2^1\text{-AC}_0$ such that $\text{rank}_{\Sigma_2^1}^{\Pi_2^1}(U) = \alpha$ and $S \vdash^{\Pi_2^1} \Sigma_2^1\text{-RFN}(U)$.

Proof. Let \mathbb{P} be the set of all Σ_2^1 -sound r.e. extension of $\Sigma_2^1\text{-AC}_0$ such that $S \vdash \Sigma_2^1\text{-RFN}(U)$, and consider the structure $(\mathbb{P}, \prec_{\Sigma_2^1}^{\Pi_2^1})$. By [Proposition 7.1](#), $\prec_{\Sigma_2^1}^{\Pi_2^1}$ over \mathbb{P} is well-founded, so it defines a rank function ρ over \mathbb{P} .

We claim that $\rho(U) = \text{rank}_{\Sigma_2^1}^{\Pi_2^1}(U)$ for all $U \in \mathbb{P}$ by $\prec_{\Sigma_2^1}^{\Pi_2^1}$ -induction on \mathbb{P} : Suppose that $\rho(V) = \text{rank}_{\Sigma_2^1}^{\Pi_2^1}(V)$ holds for all $V \in \mathbb{P}$ such that $V \prec_{\Sigma_2^1}^{\Pi_2^1} U$. Then

$$\rho(U) = \sup\{\rho(V) + 1 \mid V \prec_{\Sigma_2^1}^{\Pi_2^1} U\} = \sup\{\text{rank}_{\Sigma_2^1}^{\Pi_2^1}(V) + 1 \mid V \prec_{\Sigma_2^1}^{\Pi_2^1} U\} = \text{rank}_{\Sigma_2^1}^{\Pi_2^1}(U),$$

proving the claim. By a similar argument, we can see that the supremum of all $\rho(U)$ for $U \in \mathbb{P}$ is $\text{rank}_{\Sigma_2^1}^{\Pi_2^1}(S)$, which proves the desired claim. \square

Going back to the proof of the main proposition, let U be a theory such that $\text{rank}_{\Sigma_2^1}^{\Pi_2^1}(U) = \alpha$ and $S \vdash \Sigma_2^1\text{-RFN}(U)$. Since $s_2^1(S) \leq s_2^1(T)$, which implies $S \subseteq_{\Sigma_2^1}^{\Pi_2^1} T$, we get $T \vdash^{\Pi_2^1} \Sigma_2^1\text{-RFN}(U)$. That is, $U \prec_{\Sigma_2^1}^{\Pi_2^1} T$, which implies $\alpha = \text{rank}_{\Sigma_2^1}^{\Pi_2^1}(U) < \text{rank}_{\Sigma_2^1}^{\Pi_2^1}(T)$. \square

Proposition 7.4. Let S, T be Σ_2^1 -sound r.e. extensions of $\Sigma_2^1\text{-AC}_0$. If $s_2^1(S) < s_2^1(T)$, then $\text{rank}_{\Sigma_2^1}^{\Pi_2^1}(S) < \text{rank}_{\Sigma_2^1}^{\Pi_2^1}(T)$.

Proof. Let \hat{D} be a recursive pseudodilator such that $s_2^1(S) \leq \text{Clim}(\hat{D}) < s_2^1(T)$. Then by [Lemma 6.2](#), we have $T \vdash^{\Pi_2^1} \neg \text{Dil}(\hat{D})$.

Now let D be a recursive pseudodilator such that $S \vdash \neg \text{Dil}(D)$. Then we have $\text{Clim}(D) \leq \text{Clim}(\hat{D})$, so the following sentence is true:

$$\theta \equiv \forall^0 D \in \text{RecPreDil}[\text{Prv}_S(\neg \text{Dil}(D)) \rightarrow \text{Grow}(D, \hat{D})].$$

Clearly θ is Π_2^1 . Furthermore, we get

$$T + \theta \vdash \forall^0 D \in \text{RecPreDil}[\text{Prv}_S(\neg \text{Dil}(D)) \rightarrow \neg \text{Dil}(D)].$$

Hence by the Π_2^1 -completeness of dilators, we get

$$T + \theta \vdash \Sigma_2^1\text{-RFN}(S).$$

Since θ is true, $T \vdash^{\Pi_2^1} \Sigma_2^1\text{-RFN}(S)$, which is the definition of $S \prec_{\Sigma_2^1}^{\Pi_2^1} T$. Hence $\text{rank}_{\Sigma_2^1}^{\Pi_2^1}(S) < \text{rank}_{\Sigma_2^1}^{\Pi_2^1}(T)$. \square

Combining [Proposition 7.2](#) and [Proposition 7.4](#), we get the following:

Corollary 7.5. *Let S, T be Σ_2^1 -sound r.e. extensions of $\Sigma_2^1\text{-AC}_0$. Then we have*

$$s_2^1(S) \leq s_2^1(T) \iff \text{rank}_{\Sigma_2^1}^{\Pi_2^1}(S) \leq \text{rank}_{\Sigma_2^1}^{\Pi_2^1}(T). \quad \square$$

Note that the only reason we assumed S and T be extensions of $\Sigma_2^1\text{-AC}_0$ is to impose them $\prec_{\Sigma_2^1}^{\Pi_2^1}$ -rank. From the proof of [Proposition 7.4](#), we can extract the following result:

Corollary 7.6. *Let S, T be Σ_2^1 -sound r.e. extensions of ACA_0 . If $s_2^1(S) < s_2^1(T)$, then $T \vdash^{\Pi_2^1} \Sigma_2^1\text{-RFN}(S)$. \square*

8. A GLIMPSE TO CASE Π_2^1

[Corollary 6.3](#) shows $s_2^1(T)$ is stable under true Π_2^1 -statements, and we may ask the similar property holds at Π_2^1 -level. The following proposition, which shows adding a true Σ_2^1 -true sentence does not change the eventual behavior of the proof-theoretic dilator, gives some hint:

Proposition 8.1. *Let T be a Π_2^1 -sound theory and let F be a recursive pseudodilator. If α is a well-order such that $F(\alpha)$ is ill-founded, then for every $\beta \geq \alpha$ we have*

$$|T|_{\Pi_2^1}(\beta) = |T + \neg \text{Dil}(F)|_{\Pi_2^1}(\beta).$$

Proof. Clearly, $T \subseteq T + \neg \text{Dil}(F)$, so $|T|_{\Pi_2^1}$ is embeddable into $|T + \neg \text{Dil}(F)|_{\Pi_2^1}$. This shows $|T|_{\Pi_2^1}(\beta) \leq |T + \neg \text{Dil}(F)|_{\Pi_2^1}(\beta)$ for every β .

To show the reverse direction, let E be a recursive dilator such that $T + \neg \text{Dil}(F) \vdash \text{Dil}(E)$. Then we have

$$T \vdash \text{Dil}(F) \vee \text{Dil}(E).$$

Hence $T \vdash \text{Dil}(F \vee E)$. By [Lemma 3.33](#), $F \vee E$ is a recursive dilator. Thus $F \vee E$ is embedded into $|T|_{\Pi_2^1}$. Also, $\beta \geq \alpha$ implies $F(\beta)$ is ill-founded, so there is an embedding $E(\beta) \leq (F \vee E)(\beta)$. Therefore

$$E(\beta) \leq (F \vee E)(\beta) \leq |T|_{\Pi_2^1}(\beta). \quad \square$$

Especially, if F is a recursive pseudodilator, then there is $\alpha < \delta_2^1$ such that $F(\alpha)$ is ill-founded. Thus we get the following:

Corollary 8.2. *Let T be a Π_2^1 -sound extension of ACA_0 and let F be a recursive pseudodilator. Then*

$$|T|_{\Pi_2^1}(\delta_2^1) = |T + \neg \text{Dil}(F)|_{\Pi_2^1}(\delta_2^1). \quad \square$$

By using the eventual value of the proof-theoretic dilator $|T|_{\Pi_2^1}(\delta_2^1)$, we can show that $\prec_{\Pi_2^1}^{\Sigma_2^1}$ is well-founded:

Lemma 8.3. *Suppose that S, T be Π_2^1 -sound r.e. extensions of ACA_0 . If $T \vdash^{\Sigma_2^1} \Pi_2^1\text{-RFN}(S)$, then we can find $\alpha < \delta_2^1$ such that*

$$\forall \beta \geq \alpha [|S|_{\Pi_2^1}(\beta) < |T|_{\Pi_2^1}(\beta)].$$

Especially, we have $|S|_{\Pi_2^1}(\delta_2^1) < |T|_{\Pi_2^1}(\delta_2^1)$.

Proof. Let us prove the following claim first: If $T \vdash \Pi_2^1\text{-RFN}(S)$, then we have

$$|S|_{\Pi_2^1} \cdot 2 \leq |T|_{\Pi_2^1}.$$

Since ACA_0 proves $\Pi_2^1\text{-RFN}(S)$ is equivalent to $\text{Dil}(|S|_{\Pi_2^1})$, $|S|_{\Pi_2^1}$ appears in the enumeration of all T -provable recursive dilators. Furthermore, $T \vdash \Pi_2^1\text{-RFN}(S)$ implies every Π_2^1 -consequence of S is a theorem of T . This means every S -provable recursive dilator is also a T -recursive dilator. However, no S -provable recursive

dilator is equal to $|S|_{\Pi_2^1}$, or S proves its own Π_2^1 -reflection that is impossible. Since we defined $|T|_{\Pi_2^1}$ by the sum of all T -provable recursive dilators, we have the desired inequality.

Now let us prove the lemma we stated. If F is a recursive pseudodilator and if $T + \neg \text{Dil}(F)$ proves $\Pi_2^1\text{-RFN}(S)$, then we have

$$|S|_{\Pi_2^1} \cdot 2 \leq |T + \neg \text{Dil}(F)|_{\Pi_2^1}.$$

If α is a well-order such that $F(\alpha)$ is ill-founded, then by [Proposition 8.1](#), we have

$$|S|_{\Pi_2^1}(\beta) \cdot 2 \leq |T + \neg \text{Dil}(F)|_{\Pi_2^1}(\beta) = |T|_{\Pi_2^1}(\beta)$$

for all $\beta \geq \alpha$. Furthermore, since non-zero constant dilators of a natural number value are S -provable dilators, we have $|S|_{\Pi_2^1}(\beta) \geq \omega$ for all β . This shows

$$|S|_{\Pi_2^1}(\beta) < |S|_{\Pi_2^1}(\beta) \cdot 2,$$

proving the desired inequality. \square

Now the following is immediate by the definition of $\prec_{\Pi_2^1}^{\Sigma_2^1}$ and the previous lemma:

Corollary 8.4. $\prec_{\Pi_2^1}^{\Sigma_2^1}$ is well-founded for Π_2^1 -sound r.e. theories extending ACA_0 . \square

We proved in previous sections that $s_2^1(T)$ ranks Σ_2^1 -consequences of Σ_2^1 -sound theories (modulo Π_2^1 -oracle) in a linear way, and it gauges the strength of Σ_2^1 -reflection of T if T is an extension of $\Sigma_2^1\text{-AC}_0$. We may ask whether we can get an ordinal characteristic of T that captures its Π_2^1 -consequences modulo Σ_2^1 -oracle. However, the following result by Aguilera and Pakhomov says obtaining such an ordinal characteristic for Π_2^1 -consequences is impossible:

Theorem 8.5 ([3]). We can find a recursive $T \supseteq \text{ACA}_0$ and Π_2^1 -sentences ϕ_0, ϕ_1 such that

- (1) Both of $T + \phi_0$ and $T + \phi_1$ are Π_2^1 -sound.
- (2) Neither $T \vdash^{\Sigma_2^1} \phi_0 \rightarrow \phi_1$ nor $T \vdash^{\Sigma_2^1} \phi_1 \rightarrow \phi_0$ holds. \square

Corollary 8.6. There is no ordinal assignment $o(T)$ for Π_2^1 -sound r.e. extensions T of ACA_0 such that

$$o(S) \leq o(T) \iff S \subseteq_{\Pi_2^1}^{\Sigma_2^1} T.$$

Proof. Let T, ϕ_0, ϕ_1 be a theory and Π_2^1 -sentences provided by [Theorem 8.5](#). Then neither $T + \phi_0 \vdash^{\Sigma_2^1} \phi_1$ nor $T + \phi_1 \vdash^{\Sigma_2^1} \phi_0$ hold, so $\subseteq_{\Pi_2^1}^{\Sigma_2^1}$ cannot be linear. \square

However, the above result does not rule out an ordinal characteristic capturing the $\prec_{\Pi_2^1}^{\Sigma_2^1}$ -rank of a theory. We conjecture the eventual value of a proof-theoretic dilator $|T|_{\Pi_2^1}(\delta_2^1)$ should have this role:

Question 8.7. Let $\text{rank}_{\Pi_2^1}^{\Sigma_2^1}(T)$ be the $\prec_{\Pi_2^1}^{\Sigma_2^1}$ -rank of T for Π_2^1 -sound r.e. extension T of ACA_0 . Then does the following hold? For two Π_2^1 -sound r.e. extensions S, T of ACA_0 ,

$$\text{rank}_{\Pi_2^1}^{\Sigma_2^1}(S) \leq \text{rank}_{\Pi_2^1}^{\Sigma_2^1}(T) \iff |S|_{\Pi_2^1}(\delta_2^1) \leq |T|_{\Pi_2^1}(\delta_2^1).$$

9. CONCLUDING REMARKS

Throughout this paper, we generalized the main properties of Π_1^1 -proof theory to Σ_2^1 -proof theory. Let us provide some remarks and questions based on the results we produced.

[1] stated that ‘‘Although the approach via Σ_2^1 -consequences might initially seem more natural, it appears that this type of analysis is not as informative as the approach via Π_2^1 consequences...’’ The results in this paper bolster this claim in the following sense:

- (1) The usual ordinal analysis for the Π_1^1 -proof-theoretic ordinal allows further improvement in the sense that taking a close look at Π_1^1 -ordinal analysis allows extracting information about Π_0^0 -consequences of a theory. One may hope that a proper method for Σ_2^1 -ordinal analysis should allow extracting information about Π_1^1 - or Σ_1^1 -consequences of a theory, whose way is unclear at least for the author. The current method to obtain an upper bound for $s_2^1(T)$ relies on model-theoretic arguments with β -models, which does not allow extracting useful information about Π_1^1 - or Σ_1^1 -consequences of T since

β -models are absolute for Π_1^1 -statements. It contrasts with the Π_2^1 -ordinal analysis, which results in the proof-theoretic dilator $|T|_{\Pi_2^1}$: We can easily extract the Π_1^1 -proof-theoretic ordinal from $|T|_{\Pi_2^1}$ by [Theorem 4.13](#).

- (2) The Σ_2^1 -proof-theoretic ordinal does not distinguish the strength of theories which are discernible by Π_1^1 -proof-theoretic ordinal: For example, [Theorem 5.15](#) and [Proposition 5.16](#) says s_2^1 does not distinguish ACA_0 , ATR_0 , and their strengthening by Bar Induction. In general, it looks like that $s_2^1(T) = s_2^1(T + \text{BI})$ for every T with $s_2^1(T)$ is known.
- (3) Unlike the Π_1^1 -case, the connection between Σ_2^1 -proof-theoretic ordinal and Σ_2^1 -reflection works only for theories extending $\Sigma_2^1\text{-AC}_0$. For example, the second equivalence [Proposition 6.4](#) holds only for theories extending $\Sigma_2^1\text{-AC}_0$, and [Example 6.8](#) shows the equivalence may fail for theories extending $\Pi_1^1\text{-CA}_0$. Furthermore, we proved [Proposition 5.10](#), the equivalence between $\Sigma_2^1\text{-RFN}(T)$ and $\neg\text{Dil}(|T|_{\Sigma_2^1})$, over $\Sigma_2^1\text{-AC}_0$ and not over ACA_0 . It is different from what happens for proof-theoretic dilators: For example, the equivalence between $\Pi_2^1\text{-RFN}(T)$ and $\text{Dil}(|T|_{\Pi_2^1})$ is a theorem of ACA_0 as stated in [Theorem 4.12](#).
- (4) For Π_2^1 -unsound theories, we can still distill the Π_2^1 -*soundness ordinal* $o_2^1(T)$ (cf. [1, §4]) that gives a useful information about the degree of soundness. We can extract $o_2^1(T)$ from a given theory T by tracking the least ordinal α such that $|T|_{\Pi_2^1}(\alpha)$ is ill-founded. However, in Σ_2^1 -case, there is no obvious way to extract a similar characteristic: If T is Σ_2^1 -unsound, then $|T|_{\Sigma_2^1}(\alpha)$ will always be well-founded for α , and the author does not know how to extract useful information from $|T|_{\Sigma_2^1}$ that happens to be a dilator.

Despite faults on Σ_2^1 -proof-theoretic ordinal, it has the following positive sides:

- (1) Computing the Σ_2^1 -proof-theoretic ordinal can rely on a softer model-theoretic argument and gives an ordinal scale for gauging the strength of theories.
- (2) The currently known value for $s_2^1(T)$ seems somehow tied with $|T|_{\Pi_1^1}$: For example, for theories at the level of iterated inductive definition, $|T|_{\Pi_1^1}$ takes the form of the collapse of $D(s_2^1(T))$ for some dilator D . Also, Towsner pointed out that the current ordinal analysis for $\Pi_2^1\text{-CA}_0$ relies on stable ordinals, which also have a critical role in computing $s_2^1(\Pi_2^1\text{-CA}_0)$. It might be possible that $s_2^1(T)$ gives some hint on computing $|T|_{\Pi_1^1}$ for a complicated T .
- (3) The Σ_2^1 -proof-theoretic ordinal for a set theory looks closely tied with the transitive models of the theory. For example, both $s_2^1(\text{KP})$ and $s_2^1(\text{KP}\ell)$ ⁷ are the least height of a transitive model of the theory. Thus the Σ_2^1 -proof-theoretic ordinal may show a better mental picture of how set theorists compare the strength of theories since set theorists use transitive models instead of arbitrary models.

Computing $s_2^1(T)$ for specific theories, like, the theory of $(< \alpha)$ -fold iterated inductive definition $\text{ID}_{<\alpha}$ would be an interesting problem:

Question 9.1. What is the value of $s_2^1(T)$ for a natural Σ_2^1 -sound T ? For example, what is $s_2^1(\Pi_n^1\text{-CA}_0)$? Also, do we have $s_2^1(\text{ID}_{<\alpha}) = \omega_{1+\alpha}^{\text{CK}}$ for reasonably small α ?

As pointed out before, the currently known value of $s_2^1(T)$ for specific T is closely related to the least height of a transitive model of T . The author has the following guess, whose proof should appear in a forthcoming paper:

Conjecture 9.2. Let T be a Σ_2^1 -sound extension of $\Pi_1^1\text{-CA}_0$, and $\Sigma_2^1(T)$ be the set of all Σ_2^1 -consequences of T . Then $\text{ATR}_0^{\text{set}} + \Sigma_2^1(T)$ has a transitive model, and moreover

$$s_2^1(T) = \min\{N \cap \text{Ord} \mid N \text{ is a transitive model of } \text{ATR}_0^{\text{set}} + \Sigma_2^1(T)\}.$$

The proof for [Proposition 7.1](#) is based on a connection between Σ_2^1 -proof-theoretic ordinal $s_2^1(T)$ and Σ_2^1 -reflection principle for extensions of $\Sigma_2^1\text{-AC}_0$. The argument breaks down even at the level of $\Pi_1^1\text{-CA}_0$ as we examined in [Example 6.8](#). However, it does not rule out the possibility of well-foundedness of $\prec_{\Sigma_2^1}^{\Pi_2^1}$ for extensions of ACA_0 :

Question 9.3. Can we prove $\prec_{\Sigma_2^1}^{\Pi_2^1}$ is well-founded for Σ_2^1 -sound r.e. extensions of ACA_0 ?

⁷ $\text{KP}\ell$ is the theory comprising Primitive Recursive set theory with ‘every set is contained in an admissible set.’ $L_{\omega_{\text{CK}}}$ is a model of $\text{KP}\ell$.

Although we ‘justified’ [Phenomenon 1.3](#) throughout this paper, it still does not address Steel’s full observation [Phenomenon 1.2](#). In the next sequel [12], we discuss evidence for Steel’s observation for Π_3^1 and Σ_4^1 for theories extending ACA_0 plus Δ_2^1 -Determinacy.

REFERENCES

- [1] J. P. Aguilera and F. Pakhomov. “The Π_2^1 consequences of a theory”. In: *J. Lond. Math. Soc. (2)* 107.3 (2023), pp. 1045–1073.
- [2] J. P. Aguilera and F. Pakhomov. “The spectrum of Π_3^1 -soundness”. In: *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society A: Mathematical, Physical and Engineering Sciences* 381.2248 (2023), p. 20220013. DOI: [10.1098/rsta.2022.0013](https://doi.org/10.1098/rsta.2022.0013).
- [3] J. P. Aguilera and F. Pakhomov. “Non-linearities in the analytical hierarchy”. In preparation.
- [4] Toshiyasu Arai. *An ordinal analysis of Π_N -Collection*. 2023. arXiv: [2311.12459](https://arxiv.org/abs/2311.12459).
- [5] Jon Barwise. *Admissible sets and structures*. Perspectives in Mathematical Logic. An approach to definability theory. Springer-Verlag, Berlin-New York, 1975.
- [6] J. R. G. Catlow. “A proof-theoretical analysis of ptykes ”. In: *Arch. Math. Logic* 33.1 (1994), pp. 57–79.
- [7] Anton Freund. “Well ordering principles and Π_4^1 -statements: a pilot study”. In: *J. Symb. Log.* 86.2 (2021), pp. 709–745.
- [8] Anton Jonathan Freund. “Type-Two Well-Ordering Principles, Admissible Sets, and Π_1^1 -Comprehension”. PhD thesis. University of Leeds, 2018.
- [9] Jean-Yves Girard. “ Π_2^1 -logic. I. Dilators”. In: *Ann. Math. Logic* 21.2-3 (1981), pp. 75–219.
- [10] Jean-Yves Girard. “Proof theory and logical complexity II”. Unpublished manuscript. URL: <https://girard.perso.math.cnrs.fr/ptlc2.pdf>.
- [11] Joel David Hamkins. *Nonlinearity and illfoundedness in the hierarchy of large cardinal consistency strength*. 2022. arXiv: [2208.07445](https://arxiv.org/abs/2208.07445) [[math.LO](https://arxiv.org/abs/2208.07445)].
- [12] Hanul Jeon. “The behavior of Higher proof theory II”. In preparation.
- [13] Peter Koellner. “Independence and Large Cardinals”. In: *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. Ed. by Edward N. Zalta. Summer 2011. Metaphysics Research Lab, Stanford University, 2011.
- [14] Fedor Pakhomov and James Walsh. “Reflection ranks and Ordinal analysis”. In: *The Journal of Symbolic Logic* 86.4 (2021), pp. 1350–1384.
- [15] Fedor Pakhomov and James Walsh. *Reflection ranks via infinitary derivations*. 2021. arXiv: [2107.03521](https://arxiv.org/abs/2107.03521).
- [16] Fedor Pakhomov and James Walsh. “Reducing ω -model reflection to iterated syntactic reflection”. In: *Journal of Mathematical Logic* 23.02 (2023), p. 2250001. DOI: [10.1142/S0219061322500015](https://doi.org/10.1142/S0219061322500015).
- [17] Stephen G. Simpson. *Subsystems of second order arithmetic*. Vol. 1. Cambridge University Press, 2009.
- [18] Stephen G. Simpson. “The Gödel hierarchy and reverse mathematics”. In: *Kurt Gödel: essays for his centennial*. Vol. 33. Lect. Notes Log. Assoc. Symbol. Logic, La Jolla, CA, 2010, pp. 109–127.
- [19] Clifford Spector. “Recursive well-orderings”. In: *J. Symbolic Logic* 20 (1955), pp. 151–163. ISSN: 0022-4812,1943-5886. DOI: [10.2307/2266902](https://doi.org/10.2307/2266902). URL: <https://doi.org/10.2307/2266902>.
- [20] John R. Steel. “Gödel’s program”. In: *Interpreting Gödel*. Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 2014, pp. 153–179.
- [21] Henry Towsner. *Proofs that Modify Proofs*. 2024. arXiv: [2403.17922](https://arxiv.org/abs/2403.17922) [[math.LO](https://arxiv.org/abs/2403.17922)].
- [22] James Walsh. “An incompleteness theorem via ordinal analysis”. In: *The Journal of Symbolic Logic* (2022), pp. 1–17.
- [23] James Walsh. “Characterizations of ordinal analysis”. In: *Annals of Pure and Applied Logic* 174.4 (2023), p. 103230.

Email address: hj344@cornell.edu
 URL: <https://hanuljeon95.github.io>

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, CORNELL UNIVERSITY, ITHACA, NY 14853