

Ladder mice

Farmer Schlutzenberg*
 farmer.schlutzenberg@tuwien.ac.at
 TU Wien

June 11, 2024

Abstract

Assume $\text{ZF} + \text{AD} + V = L(\mathbb{R})$. We prove some “mouse set” theorems, for definability over $\mathcal{J}_\alpha(\mathbb{R})$ where $[\alpha, \alpha]$ is a projective-like gap (of $L(\mathbb{R})$) and α is either a successor ordinal or has countable cofinality, but $\alpha \neq \beta + 1$ where β ends a strong gap. For such ordinals α and integers $n \geq 1$, we show that there is a mouse M with $\mathbb{R} \cap M = \text{OD}_{\alpha n}$.

The proof involves an analysis of ladder mice and their generalizations to $\mathcal{J}_\alpha(\mathbb{R})$. This analysis is related to earlier work of Rudominer, Woodin and Steel on ladder mice. However, it also yields a new proof of the mouse set theorem even at the least point where ladder mice arise – one which avoids the stationary tower. The analysis also yields a corresponding “anti-correctness” result on a cone, generalizing facts familiar in the projective hierarchy; for example, that $(\Pi_3^1)^V \upharpoonright M_1$ truth is $(\Sigma_3^1)^{M_1}$ -definable and $(\Sigma_3^1)^{M_1}$ truth is $(\Pi_3^1)^V \upharpoonright M_1$ -definable.

We also define and study versions of ladder mice on a cone at the end of weak gap, and at the successor of the end of a strong gap, and an anti-correctness result on a cone there.

Contents

1	Introduction	1
2	Projective-like gaps of countable cofinality	4
2.1	The mouse set theorem on an explicit cone	4
2.2	Antichains of the extender algebra	10
2.3	Q-local local K^c -constructions	10
2.4	The mouse set theorem for $\text{OD}_{\alpha 2}$	11
2.5	The mouse set theorem for $\text{OD}_{\alpha, n+3}$	16
3	Admissible gaps	19

1 Introduction

Assume $\text{ZF} + \text{AD}^{L(\mathbb{R})}$, so by [2], DC holds. By a result of Woodin [1, Theorem 1.5], if α is a limit ordinal¹ which starts an \mathcal{S} -gap $[\alpha, \beta]$ and α is not of form $\gamma + \omega$ where γ ends a strong \mathcal{S} -gap, then $\text{OD}^{<\alpha}$ is a mouse set. Here $\text{OD}^{<\alpha} = \text{OD}^{<\alpha}(\emptyset)$, where $\text{OD}^{<\alpha}(x)$ is the set of reals y such that for some ordinal $\beta < \alpha$ which is either a limit or 0, y is definable over $\mathcal{S}_\beta(\mathbb{R})$ from countable ordinals in the codes; that is, there is some $\xi < \omega_1$ and some formula φ such that for all $w \in \text{WO}_\xi$ (that is, w is a wellorder of ω in ordertype ξ) and all reals z , we have

$$z = y \iff \mathcal{S}_\beta(\mathbb{R}) \models \varphi(x, z, w). \tag{1}$$

And a *mouse set* is the set of reals of some $(0, \omega_1 + 1)$ -iterable premouse M .

*This research was funded by the Austrian Science Fund (FWF) [10.55776/Y1498].
¹We use Jensen’s \mathcal{S} -hierarchy, not his \mathcal{J} -hierarchy, throughout; $\mathcal{J}_\alpha(\mathbb{R}) = \mathcal{S}_{\alpha\omega}(\mathbb{R})$ for all ordinals α . This diverges from [1]. An \mathcal{S} -gap is just an interval $[\gamma\omega, \delta\omega]$ such that $[\gamma, \delta]$ is a gap. In [1, Theorem 1.3], it appears that α is assumed to be a limit ordinal in order to avoid the possibility that $\mathcal{J}_\alpha(\mathbb{R})$ ends a strong gap. Note that because of this assumption, even in the case of [1, Theorem 1.5] that $\mathfrak{P}_\alpha(\mathbb{R}) \subseteq L(\mathbb{R})$, [1, Theorem 1.5] is more general than [1, Theorem 1.3]. And note that $\mathfrak{P}_\alpha(\mathbb{R})$ is closed under complement.

Rudominer conjectured in [4, Conjecture 2.24] that a sharper fact holds, proved certain instances of this conjecture, and posed related questions [4, p. 18]. Steel also refers to such a conjecture in [1, prior to Theorem 1.3]; see also the introduction of [5]. Given an ordinal β which is either a limit or 0, $n \in [1, \omega)$ and $x \in \mathbb{R}$, let $\text{OD}_{\beta n}(x)$ denote the set of reals y such that for some Σ_n formula (of the $L(\mathbb{R})$ language) and some $\xi < \omega_1$, for all $w \in \text{WO}_\xi$ and all reals z , line (1) holds. Write $\text{OD}_{\beta, n} = \text{OD}_{\beta, n}(\emptyset)$.

Define the pointclasses $\Sigma_n^{\mathbb{R}}$ by setting $\Sigma_1^{\mathbb{R}} = \Sigma_1$ (in the $L(\mathbb{R})$ language), $\Pi_n^{\mathbb{R}} = \neg \Sigma_n^{\mathbb{R}}$, and $\Sigma_{n+1}^{\mathbb{R}} = \exists^{\mathbb{R}} \Pi_n^{\mathbb{R}}$. Let $\text{OD}_{\beta n}^{\mathbb{R}}(x)$ denote the set of reals y such that for some $\Sigma_n^{\mathbb{R}}$ formula and some $\xi < \omega_1$, for all $w \in \text{WO}_\xi$ and all reals z , line (1) holds.² Rudominer conjectured that if $[\beta, \beta]$ is a projective-like \mathcal{S} -gap which is not the successor of a strong \mathcal{S} -gap then $\text{OD}_{\beta, n+1}^{\mathbb{R}}$ is a mouse set, for each $n \geq 0$. He also asked [4, p. 18], for $[\beta, \beta]$ a projective-like \mathcal{S} -gap and $n \geq 1$, whether $\text{OD}_{\beta, n+1} = \text{OD}_{\beta, n+1}^{\mathbb{R}}$ (the equality holds when $n = 0$ directly by definition).

In this paper we consider these questions in the case that β is an ordinal such that $\text{cof}^{L(\mathbb{R})}(\beta) = \omega$ and $[\beta, \beta]$ is a projective-like \mathcal{S} -gap which is not the successor of a strong \mathcal{S} -gap.³ Rudominer established only partial results on this case in [4] (along with further such results in other cases). Results of Rudominer from [4], combined with more recent work of Woodin [3], established that $\text{OD}_{\omega 2} = \text{OD}_{\omega 2}^{\mathbb{R}}$ is a mouse set. Adapting the methods of these papers, combined with some from [1] and [7], we will show the following:

Theorem 1.1. *Assume $\text{ZF} + \text{AD}^{L(\mathbb{R})}$. Let $[\beta, \beta]$ be an \mathcal{S} -gap of $L(\mathbb{R})$ such that $\text{cof}^{L(\mathbb{R})} = \omega$ and β is not of the form $\gamma + \omega$ where γ ends a strong \mathcal{S} -gap. Let $n \in [1, \omega)$. Then:*

- $\text{OD}_{\beta n} = \text{OD}_{\beta n}^{\mathbb{R}}$, and
- there is an ω -small $(0, \omega_1 + 1)$ -iterable premouse M with $\text{OD}_{\beta n} = \mathbb{R} \cap M$.

(This “mouse set” result was already known for $n = 1$, and in fact then $\text{OD}_{\beta 1} = \text{OD}_{\beta 1}^{\mathbb{R}} = \text{OD}_{<\beta}$. In [3], the result $\beta = \omega$ and $n = 2$. His proof easily extends to certain other such values of β and $n = 2$, but doesn’t appear to work for all of them.)

Note that the first conclusion stated in the theorem – that $\text{OD}_{\beta n} = \text{OD}_{\beta n}^{\mathbb{R}}$ – is a purely descriptive fact, with no mention of mice in the hypothesis or conclusion. But this equality will be established by finding a mouse M with $\text{OD}_{\beta n} \subseteq \mathbb{R} \cap M \subseteq \text{OD}_{\beta n}^{\mathbb{R}}$.

Central to our analysis is a well known phenomenon, which we call *anti-correctness*. Recall that given any Π_1^1 formula φ , there is a Σ_1 formula $\psi_{\Sigma_1, \varphi}$ (of the language of set theory) and also a Σ_1^1 formula $\psi_{\Sigma_1^1, \varphi}$ such that for all reals $x \in L_{\omega_1^{\text{ck}}}$, we have

$$\varphi(x) \iff L_{\omega_1^{\text{ck}}} \models \psi_{\Sigma_1, \varphi}(x) \iff L_{\omega_1^{\text{ck}}} \models \psi_{\Sigma_1^1, \varphi}(x),$$

and the natural maps $\varphi \mapsto \psi_\varphi$ and $\varphi \mapsto \varrho_\varphi$ are recursive. (Given $\psi_{\Sigma_1, \varphi}$, take $\psi_{\Sigma_1^1, \varphi}(x)$ to assert that there is a real which codes a model M for the language of set theory such that M is ω -wellfounded and $M \models “V = L \wedge \psi_{\Sigma_1, \varphi}(x)”$. This works by Ville’s Lemma.) Secondly, given any Π_1^1 formula φ , there is a Σ_1^1 formula $\varrho_{\Sigma_1^1, \varphi}$ such that for all reals $x \in L_{\omega_1^{\text{ck}}}$, we have

$$L_{\omega_1^{\text{ck}}} \models \varphi(x) \iff \varrho_{\Sigma_1^1, \varphi}(x).$$

(Take $\varrho_{\Sigma_1^1, \varphi}(x)$ to assert that there is an ω -wellfounded model M for the language of set theory which models $\text{KP} + “\varphi(x) + V = L + \text{there is no ordinal } \alpha \text{ such that } L_\alpha \models \text{KP}”$. Again, this works by Ville’s Lemma.) This is “anti-correctness”, since not only is $L_{\omega_1^{\text{ck}}}$ not Σ_1^1 -correct⁴, but $(\Pi_1^1)^V \upharpoonright (\mathbb{R} \cap L_{\omega_1^{\text{ck}}})$ is $(\Sigma_1^1)^{L_{\omega_1^{\text{ck}}}}$, and $(\Pi_1^1)^{L_{\omega_1^{\text{ck}}}}$ is $(\Sigma_1^1)^V$.

The analogue holds two real quantifiers higher. Given any Π_3^1 formula φ , there is a Σ_1 formula $\psi_{\Sigma_1, \varphi}$ in the language of passive premisses, and also a Σ_3^1 formula $\psi_{\Sigma_3^1, \varphi}$, such that for all reals $x \in M_1$, we have

$$\varphi(x) \iff M_1 \models \psi_{\Sigma_1, \varphi}(x) \iff M_1 \models \psi_{\Sigma_3^1, \varphi}(x).$$

²Ignoring the difference in indexing, in Rudominer’s notation, $A_{(\beta n)} = \text{OD}_{\beta, n+1}^{\mathbb{R}}$, at least assuming $\text{AD}^{L(\mathbb{R})}$, as we are. Note that we have defined $\text{OD}_{\beta, n+1}^{\mathbb{R}}$ slightly differently to Rudominer’s definition of $A_{(\beta, n)}$, because we have required directly by definition that y is defined from each $w \in \text{WO}_\xi$, uniformly in w , whereas this uniformity is not part of Rudominer’s definition; but cf. [4, p. 18], where it is shown that this makes no difference.

³Recall that since β is a limit ordinal, $\mathcal{S}_\beta(\mathbb{R}) = \mathcal{I}_\gamma(\mathbb{R})$ where $\gamma\omega = \beta$, and γ could be a successor ordinal here.

⁴For a pointclass Γ , a model M is Γ -correct iff $M \models \varphi(x) \iff V \models \varphi(x)$ for all formulas φ in Γ and reals $x \in M$.

(The formula $\psi_{\Sigma_1, \varphi}(x)$ asserts that there is some proper segment of M_1 which is a $\varphi(x)$ -prewitness, where a $\varphi(x)$ -prewitness is a premouse N with $x \in N$ and such that there is $\delta \in \text{OR}^N$ such that $N \models \text{ZF}^- + \text{“}\delta \text{ is Woodin and the extender algebra } \mathbb{B}_\delta \text{ at } \delta \text{ forces } \varphi(x)\text{”}$. And the formula $\psi_{\Sigma_3^1, \varphi}(x)$ asserts “there is a countable 1-small Π_2^1 -iterable $\varphi(x)$ -prewitness”. This works by the analogue of Ville’s Lemma, by which if N is Π_2^1 -iterable but N is not iterable, then $M_1 \upharpoonright \omega_1^{M_1} \leq N$.) Secondly, given any Π_3^1 formula φ , there is a Σ_3^1 formula $\varrho_{\Sigma_3^1, \varphi}$ such that for all reals $x \in M_1$, we have

$$M_1 \models \varphi(x) \iff \varrho_{\Sigma_3^1, \varphi}(x).$$

(Take $\varrho_{\Sigma_3^1, \varphi}(x)$ to assert that there is a countable, Π_2^1 -iterable premouse N which is a putative $M_1^\#$ and $N \models \varphi(x)$. Again, this works by the analogue of Ville’s Lemma.)

This generalizes in a direct manner to $\Pi_{2n+1}^1, \Sigma_{2n+1}^1$ and the mouse M_{2n-1} , for all integers $n > 1$.

Now the first pointclass beyond projective which is analogous to Π_{2n+1}^1 , is $\Pi_2^{\mathcal{S}_\omega(\mathbb{R})}$ (here $\mathcal{S}_\omega(\mathbb{R}) = \mathcal{J}(\mathbb{R})$ is the rud-closure of $\mathbb{R} \cup \{\mathbb{R}\}$). Our understanding of this pointclass (and its dual, $\Sigma_2^{\mathcal{S}_\omega(\mathbb{R})}$) was advanced significantly with Woodin’s proof of the mouse set theorem at this level, via his analysis of ladder mice in [3, §§1–5]. Woodin’s analysis was extended by Steel in his unpublished notes [10] (part of which forms [3, §7], but involves also more not included in [3]). It seems to the author that anti-correctness at this level was intended to be conjectured in [3, §7], but what is written there is actually something else.⁵ We establish anti-correctness at this level of $L(\mathbb{R})$, and also other levels. Recall that M_{Id} is the minimal ladder mouse (see [3]), and M_{Id} is to $\Pi_2^{\mathcal{S}_\omega(\mathbb{R})}$ as $L_{\omega_1^{\text{ck}}}$ is to Π_1^1 and M_1 is to Π_3^1 :

Theorem 1.2. *There are recursive maps $\varphi \mapsto \psi_{\Sigma_2, \varphi}$ and $\varphi \mapsto \varrho_{\Sigma_2, \varphi}$ such that for all Π_2 formulas φ , $\psi_{\Sigma_2, \varphi}$ and $\varrho_{\Sigma_2, \varphi}$ are Σ_2 formulas (where the formulas are in the $L(\mathbb{R})$ language⁶ and the complexity is in this sense) and for all reals $x \in M_{\text{Id}}$, we have:*

1. $\mathcal{S}_\omega(\mathbb{R}) \models \varphi(x) \iff (\mathcal{S}_\omega(\mathbb{R}))^{M_{\text{Id}}} \models \psi_{\Sigma_2, \varphi}(x)$, and
2. $(\mathcal{S}_\omega(\mathbb{R}))^{M_{\text{Id}}} \models \varphi(x) \iff \mathcal{S}_\omega(\mathbb{R}) \models \varrho_{\Sigma_2, \varphi}(x)$.

The formula $\psi_{\Sigma_2, \varphi}(x)$ will assert “there is a Π_1 -iterable $\varphi(x)$ -prewitness”, where we will formulate the appropriate notion of $\varphi(x)$ -prewitness in Definition 2.17 below, and “ Π_1 -iterability” is recalled in Definition 2.4. The definition of Π_1 -iterability is standard, but the notion of $\varphi(x)$ -prewitness seems to be new.

The instance of the mouse set theorem for OD_{ω_2} , which was established by Woodin’s result, is also a corollary of the theorem above. The proof does not depend on Woodin’s result, and our proof – although related to Woodin’s – does not make any mention of stationary tower forcing, whereas this seemed to be an important component of Woodin’s proof.

The proof actually goes through more generally, and is hardly different in the more general context, so we give it there.

Definition 1.3. We say that $\beta \in \text{OR}$ is ω -standard iff $[\beta, \beta]$ is a projective-like \mathcal{S} -gap of $L(\mathbb{R})$ (so β is a limit ordinal), $\text{cof}^{L(\mathbb{R})}(\beta) = \omega$, and β is not of form $\gamma + \omega$ where γ ends a strong \mathcal{S} -gap of $L(\mathbb{R})$.

Let β be ω -standard. A pair $(x_{\text{cof}}, \varphi_{\text{cof}})$ is called β -ascending iff $x_{\text{cof}} \in \mathbb{R}$, φ_{cof} is a Σ_1 formula of the $L(\mathbb{R})$ language,

$$\mathcal{S}_\beta(\mathbb{R}) \models \forall^\omega n \varphi_{\text{cof}}(n, x_{\text{cof}}),$$

and letting α_n be the least α such that

$$\mathcal{S}_\alpha(\mathbb{R}) \models \varphi_{\text{cof}}(n, x_{\text{cof}}),$$

then $\alpha_n < \alpha_{n+1} < \beta$ for all $n < \omega$, and $\sup_{n < \omega} \alpha_n = \beta$, and finally, if $\beta = \gamma + \omega$ where γ is a limit or $\gamma = 0$, then $\gamma < \alpha_0$. –1

Note that the ordinals α_n are allowed to be successors, and β might be of form $\beta = \gamma + \omega$ for some γ . We have:

⁵The version for Σ_3^1, Π_3^1 stated in [3] is also different to anti-correctness. This all refers to the arXiv v2 preprint version of the paper.

⁶Recall that this is the language of set theory augmented with a constant symbol \mathbb{R} , which is interpreted as the set of reals of the structure.

Fact 1.4. Assume $\text{DC}_{\mathbb{R}}$ and let $[\beta, \beta]$ be a projective-like \mathcal{S} -gap with $\text{cof}^{L(\mathbb{R})}(\beta) = \omega$. Then there is a β -ascending pair $(x_{\text{cof}}, \varphi_{\text{cof}})$.

Since $\text{AD}^{L(\mathbb{R})}$ implies DC , we are free to apply this fact. The following result describes the direct analogue of ladder mice just beyond $[\beta, \beta]$:

Theorem 1.5. Assume $\text{ZF} + \text{AD}^{L(\mathbb{R})}$. Let β be ω -standard. Let $(x_{\text{cof}}, \varphi_{\text{cof}})$ be β -ascending, and let $\langle \alpha_n \rangle_{n < \omega}$ be as in Definition 1.3.

Write $\Gamma = \Sigma_1^{\mathcal{S}_\beta(\mathbb{R})}$. Let $y \in \mathbb{R}$. Then there is a minimal sound (y, x_{cof}) -mouse $M = M_{\text{id}}^\Gamma(y, x_{\text{cof}})$ such that:

1. M has no largest cardinal (so $\rho_1^M = \text{OR}^M$),
2. $\rho_2^M = \omega$ and $p_2^M = \emptyset$,
3. For each $n < \omega$ there is an M -cardinal $\theta_n^M < \text{OR}^M$ such that $M \models \text{“}\theta_n^M \text{ is not Woodin”}$, and letting $Q_n \triangleleft M$ be the Q -structure for $M \upharpoonright \theta_n^M$, there is no above- θ_n^M iteration strategy Σ for Q_n with $\Sigma \in \mathcal{S}_{\alpha_n}(\mathbb{R})$.⁷

By [7, ***Lemma 3.1], we have:

Fact 1.6. Assume $\text{ZF} + \text{AD}^{L(\mathbb{R})}$. Let β be ω -standard and $(x_{\text{cof}}, \varphi_{\text{cof}})$ be β -ascending. Let $\Gamma = \Sigma_1^{\mathcal{S}_\beta(\mathbb{R})}$, $y \in \mathbb{R}$ and $M = M_{\text{id}}^\Gamma(y, x_{\text{cof}})$. Then there is a unique pair $(\bar{\beta}, \pi)$ such that $\bar{\beta} \in \text{OR}$ and

$$\pi : \mathcal{S}_{\bar{\beta}}(\mathbb{R}^M) \rightarrow \mathcal{S}_\beta(\mathbb{R})$$

is Σ_1 -elementary. Moreover, $\mathbb{R}^M = \mathbb{R} \cap \mathcal{S}_{\bar{\beta}}(\mathbb{R}^M)$ and $\pi \upharpoonright \mathbb{R}^M = \text{id}$.

Write $\bar{\beta}_{y, x_{\text{cof}}} = \bar{\beta}$, where $\bar{\beta}$ is as above.

Theorem 1.7. Assume $\text{ZF} + \text{AD}^{L(\mathbb{R})}$. Let β be ω -standard and $(x_{\text{cof}}, \varphi_{\text{cof}})$ be β -ascending. Write $\Gamma = \Sigma_1^{\mathcal{S}_\beta(\mathbb{R})}$. Then there are recursive maps $\varphi \mapsto \psi_{\Sigma_2, \varphi}$ and $\varphi \mapsto \varrho_{\Sigma_2, \varphi}$ such that for all Π_2 formulas φ , $\psi_{\Sigma_2, \varphi}$ and $\varrho_{\Sigma_2, \varphi}$ are Σ_2 formulas (all with respect to the $L(\mathbb{R})$ language) and for all $y \in \mathbb{R}$, letting $\bar{\beta} = \bar{\beta}_{y, x_{\text{cof}}}$, for all $x \in \mathbb{R} \cap M_{\text{id}}^\Gamma(x_{\text{cof}}, y)$, we have:

- (a) $\mathcal{S}_\beta(\mathbb{R}) \models \varphi(x) \iff \mathcal{S}_{\bar{\beta}}(\mathbb{R}^M) \models \psi_{\Sigma_2, \varphi}(x, x_{\text{cof}})$, and
- (b) $\mathcal{S}_{\bar{\beta}}(\mathbb{R}^M) \models \varphi(x) \iff \mathcal{S}_\beta(\mathbb{R}) \models \varrho_{\Sigma_2, \varphi}(x, x_{\text{cof}})$.

Finally, in §3, we will identify, on a cone, ladder mice at the ends of weak gaps and at successors of the ends of strong gaps, prove an associated anti-correctness result.⁸

2 Projective-like gaps of countable cofinality

2.1 The mouse set theorem on an explicit cone

Fix an ω -standard ordinal α_g (see Definition 1.3). In particular, $\mathcal{S}_{\alpha_g}(\mathbb{R}) = \text{Hull}_1^{\mathcal{S}_{\alpha_g}(\mathbb{R})}(\mathbb{R})$ and for each Σ_1 formula ψ and each real x , $\mathcal{S}_{\alpha_g} \models \psi(x)$ iff there is a $\psi(x)$ -witness which is iterable via a strategy in $\mathcal{S}_{\alpha_g}(\mathbb{R})$ (cf. [7]). Let $(x_{\text{cof}}, \varphi_{\text{cof}})$ be α_g -ascending.

Lemma 2.1. Suppose that $\alpha_g = \beta + \omega$ where β ends a weak gap $[\alpha, \beta]$. Then there is a real x_{sc} from which the standard scale $\vec{\leq}$ at the end of the weak gap $[\alpha, \beta]$ (cf. [8]) is definable over $\mathcal{S}_\beta(\mathbb{R})$ from x_{sc} , and x_{sc} is $\Delta_1^{\mathcal{S}_{\alpha_g}(\mathbb{R})}(\{x_{\text{cof}}\})$.

Proof. Fix $n < \omega$. Then there is an x_{cof} -premouse N and $\delta < \text{OR}^N$ such that N is pointwise definable, $N \models \text{ZF}^- + \text{“}\delta \text{ is Woodin”}$, N is an above- δ , $\varphi_{\text{cof}}(n, x_{\text{cof}})$ -prewitness, and N is (ω, ω_1) -iterable via a strategy $\Sigma \in \mathcal{S}_{\alpha_g}(\mathbb{R})$. The least such $\{N\}$ is $\Delta_1^{\mathcal{S}_{\alpha_g}(\mathbb{R})}(\{x_{\text{cof}}\})$. By taking n large enough, note that $\text{Col}(\omega, \delta)$ forces over N that the standard scale $\vec{\leq}$ at the end of the weak gap $[\alpha, \beta]$ is definable over $\mathcal{S}_\beta(\mathbb{R})$ from the generic real \dot{x} as parameter, meaning more precisely that

⁷But Q_n will be above- θ_n^M -iterable via a strategy in $\mathcal{S}_\beta(\mathbb{R})$.

⁸§3 in particular needs some more explanation added.

this fact is expressed by a statement in the (partial) theory of a level of $L(\mathbb{R})$ for which $N^{\text{Col}(\omega, \delta')}$ has a universally Baire representation, where δ' is the least Woodin of N such that $\delta' > \delta$. But there is also an (N, \mathbb{B}_δ^N) -generic filter g such that $p \in g$ and $\{g\}$ is $\Delta_1^{\mathcal{S}_{\alpha_g}(\mathbb{R})}(\{N\})$, and hence $\{g\}$ is $\Delta_1^{\mathcal{S}_{\alpha_g}(\mathbb{R})}(\{x_{\text{cof}}\})$. So we get a real $x_{\text{sc}} \in N[g]$ as desired. \square

Definition 2.2. As in Definition 1.3, let α_n be the least α such that $\mathcal{S}_\alpha(\mathbb{R}) \models \varphi_{\text{cof}}(n, x_{\text{cof}})$. Let

$$A_n = \{(\varphi, x, y) \mid \varphi \text{ is a } \Pi_1 \text{ formula } \wedge x, y \in \mathbb{R} \wedge \mathcal{S}_{\alpha_n}(\mathbb{R}) \models \varphi(x, y, z)\}.$$

Let $\vec{\Phi}_n$ be the natural very good scale on A_n .⁹ In particular, $\vec{\Phi}_n \in \mathcal{S}_{\alpha_g}(\mathbb{R})$ and $\langle \vec{\Phi}_n \rangle_{n < \omega}$ is $\Sigma_1^{\mathcal{S}_{\alpha_g}(\mathbb{R})}(\{x_{\text{cof}}\})$. Let $\vec{\leq}_n$ be the sequence of prewellorders associated to $\vec{\Phi}_n$. Write $\vec{\Phi}_n = \langle \Phi_{ni} \rangle_{i < \omega}$ and $\vec{\leq}_n = \langle \leq_{ni} \rangle_{i < \omega}$. Take Φ_{ni} regular (its range is an ordinal), let $\kappa_{ni} = \text{rg}(\Phi_{ni})$, and $\kappa_n = \sup_{i < \omega} \kappa_{ni}$. Let T_n be the tree of $\vec{\Phi}_n$. \dashv

Definition 2.3. Given an ordinal $\alpha \leq \alpha_g$, we say that a putative iteration tree \mathcal{T} on a countable tame premouse N is $\mathcal{S}_\alpha(\mathbb{R})$ -guided iff for every limit ordinal $\lambda < \text{lh}(\mathcal{T})$, there is $Q \leq M_\lambda^{\mathcal{T}}$ such that Q is a $\delta(\mathcal{T} \upharpoonright \lambda)$ -sound Q-structure for $M(\mathcal{T} \upharpoonright \lambda)$ and Q is above- $\delta(\mathcal{T})$, (k, ω_1) -iterable via a strategy $\Sigma \in \mathcal{S}_\alpha(\mathbb{R})$ (in the codes, if $\alpha < \omega_1$), where k is least such that $\rho_{k+1}^Q \leq \delta(\mathcal{T})$. \dashv

Definition 2.4. Let N be a tame n -sound premouse, where $n < \omega$. We say that N is $\Pi_1^{\alpha_g}-(n, \omega_1)$ -iterable iff for every putative n -maximal tree \mathcal{T} on N with $\mathcal{T} \in \text{HC}$, and every ordinal $\alpha < \alpha_g$, if \mathcal{T} is $\mathcal{S}_\alpha(\mathbb{R})$ -guided then:

- \mathcal{T} has wellfounded models, and
- if \mathcal{T} has limit length and there is $Q \in \text{HC}$ such that Q is a $\delta(\mathcal{T})$ -sound Q-structure for $M(\mathcal{T})$ and Q is (k, ω_1) -iterable via a strategy $\Sigma \in \mathcal{S}_\alpha(\mathbb{R})$, where k is least such that $\rho_{k+1}^Q \leq \delta(\mathcal{T})$, then there is a \mathcal{T} -cofinal branch b such that $Q \leq M_b^{\mathcal{T}}$.¹⁰

If N is tame and ω -sound, we say that N is $\Pi_1^{\alpha_g}$ -iterable iff N is $\Pi_1^{\alpha_g}-(\omega, \omega_1)$ -iterable. \dashv

Definition 2.5. Let $\Gamma = \Sigma_1^{\mathcal{S}_{\alpha_g}(\mathbb{R})}$. For $\alpha \leq \alpha_g$, let $\Gamma_\alpha = \Sigma_1^{\mathcal{S}_\alpha(\mathbb{R})}$. Given a transitive swo'd¹¹ $X \in \text{HC}$, $\text{Lp}_{\Gamma_\alpha}(X)$ denotes the stack of all X -premise N such that N is sound, projects to X , and there is an (ω, ω_1) -iteration strategy Σ for N with $\Sigma \in \mathcal{S}_\alpha(\mathbb{R})$. We write $\text{Lp}_\Gamma = \text{Lp}_{\Gamma_{\alpha_g}}$.

Given a transitive swo'd $X \in \text{HC}$ with $x_{\text{cof}} \in X$, and given $n < \omega$, $P_n(X)$ denotes the least $P \triangleleft \text{Lp}(X)$ which is a $\varphi_{\text{cof}}(n, x_{\text{cof}})$ -prewitness (as an X -premise, so the relevant Woodin cardinals δ have $\delta > \text{rank}(X)$, etc). \dashv

As usual, $\text{Lp}_\Gamma(X)$ is a sound, passive premouse with no largest proper segment. But because α_g has countable cofinality, it can be that $\text{Lp}_\Gamma(X) \not\models \text{ZF}^-$ (so $\text{Lp}_\Gamma(X)$ could project to X), since the strategies Σ witnessing that the projecting $N \triangleleft \text{Lp}_\Gamma(X)$ are in fact valid, could appear cofinally in $\mathcal{S}_{\alpha_g}(\mathbb{R})$, and so the join of these strategies (which is essentially a strategy for $\text{Lp}_\Gamma(X)$) would then not be in $\mathcal{S}_{\alpha_g}(\mathbb{R})$. The simplest example is of course $\text{stack}_{n < \omega} M_n^\#$. This also occurs given $x_{\text{cof}} \in X$:

Lemma 2.6. *Let $X \in \text{HC}$ be transitive swo'd with $x_{\text{cof}} \in X$. Then $\text{Lp}_\Gamma(X) = \text{stack}_{n < \omega} P_n(X)$.*

Proof. Certainly $P = \text{stack}_{n < \omega} P_n(X) \leq \text{Lp}_\Gamma(X)$, so suppose $P \triangleleft \text{Lp}_\Gamma(X)$. Then there is an iteration strategy $\Sigma \in \mathcal{S}_{\alpha_g}(\mathbb{R})$ for P . But $t = \text{Th}_{\Gamma, \Sigma_1^{\mathcal{S}_{\alpha_g}(\mathbb{R})}}(\mathbb{R})$ can be computed from Σ , so $t \in \mathcal{S}_{\alpha_g}(\mathbb{R})$, which is impossible. \square

⁹See [8] and Lemma 2.1.

¹⁰We will only apply this in case N is a projecting sound premouse, in which case it is reasonable to hope for such a branch b .

¹¹Recall that *swo'd* abbreviates *self-wellordered*, which says that X has form (X', W) where X' is transitive and W is a wellorder of X' . This induces a canonical wellorder on any X -premouse, which extends W . We could probably make do with there simply being a wellorder of X in $\mathcal{J}(X)$, in which case there might not be a *canonical* wellorder of X -premise, but there would be some $\vec{x} \in X^{<\omega}$ and some wellorder determined by \vec{x} . Actually we could just work with arbitrary transitive X ; we have only avoided this to slightly simplify some statements to do with cardinalities in X -premise, and since it suffices for our purposes.

Remark 2.7. The premisses of form $P_n(X)$ are preserved under the relevant hulls and iteration maps, since being a $\varphi_{\text{cof}}(n, x_{\text{cof}})$ -prewitness is suitably definable. We will use this fact wherever needed, without explicit mention.

Definition 2.8. Let $X \in \text{HC}$ be transitive swo'd. A Γ -ladder over X is an X -premouse N such that for each $\xi \in [\text{rank}(X), \text{OR}^N)$, we have $\text{Lp}_\Gamma(N|\xi) \triangleleft N$, and for each $\alpha < \alpha_g$ there is $\theta < \text{OR}^N$ such that θ is an N -cardinal and θ is Woodin in $\text{Lp}_{\Gamma_\alpha}(N|\theta)$.

Suppose also that $x_{\text{cof}} \in X$. Note that an X -premouse N is a Γ -ladder over X iff for each $\xi < \text{OR}^N$, we have $\text{Lp}_\Gamma(N|\xi) \triangleleft N$, and for each $n < \omega$, there is $\theta < \text{OR}^N$ such that θ is an N -cardinal, $P_n(N|\theta) \models \text{“}\theta \text{ is Woodin”}$. Suppose N is such. Let θ_n^N denote the least such θ (with respect to $n < \omega$), and $P_n^N = P_n(N|\theta_n^N)$. Then the θ_n^N are called the *rungs* of the ladder. A Γ -ladder N over X is called *minimal* if no $N' \triangleleft N$ is a Γ -ladder (in particular, $\sup_{n < \omega} \theta_n^N = \text{OR}^N$). We write $M_{\text{id}}^\Gamma(X)$ for the unique iterable sound minimal Γ -ladder over X . We say that a premouse N is Γ -ladder-small if no $N' \trianglelefteq N$ is a Γ -ladder. \dashv

Definition 2.9. Let $A \subseteq \mathbb{R}$. We say that A is $\Sigma_1^{\alpha_g}$ -correct iff there is an ordinal $\bar{\alpha}$ and π such that $A = \mathbb{R} \cap \mathcal{S}_{\bar{\alpha}}(A)$ and $\pi : \mathcal{S}_{\bar{\alpha}}(A) \rightarrow \mathcal{S}_{\alpha_g}(\mathbb{R})$ is Σ_1 -elementary. \dashv

Remark 2.10. Suppose A is $\Sigma_1^{\alpha_g}$ -correct. Note that since $\mathcal{S}_{\alpha_g}(\mathbb{R}) = \text{Hull}_1^{\mathcal{S}_{\alpha_g}}(\mathbb{R})$, the witnessing pair $(\bar{\alpha}, \pi)$ is uniquely determined, and moreover, $\mathcal{S}_{\bar{\alpha}}(A) = \text{Hull}_1^{\mathcal{S}_{\bar{\alpha}}(A)}(A)$.

By [7, ***Lemma 3.1], we have:

Lemma 2.11. Let $X \in \text{HC}$ be transitive swo'd with $x_{\text{cof}} \in X$. Let N be an X -premouse such that for all $\xi < \text{OR}^N$, we have $\text{Lp}_\Gamma(N|\xi) \trianglelefteq N$. Then:

1. $\mathbb{R} \cap N$ is $\Sigma_1^{\alpha_g}$ -correct.
2. $\mathbb{R} \cap N[g]$ is $\Sigma_1^{\alpha_g}$ -correct whenever g is (N, \mathbb{P}) -generic for a forcing $\mathbb{P} \in N$.

The following lemma is established by the obvious adaptation of the proof of the analogous fact for the original ladder mice, as in [4] or [3].

Lemma 2.12. Let $X \in \text{HC}$ be transitive swo'd with $x_{\text{cof}} \in X$. Let $M = M_{\text{id}}^\Gamma(X)$. Let N be a $\Pi_1^{\alpha_g}$ -iterable X -premouse which is sound, with $\rho_\omega^N = X$. Then either $N \triangleleft M|_{\omega_1^M}$ or $M|_{\omega_1^M} \trianglelefteq N$.

We now want to move toward defining $\varphi(y)$ -prewitness for a Π_2 formula φ (of the $L(\mathbb{R})$ language), and show that for $x \geq_T x_{\text{cof}}$, and $y \in \mathbb{R}^{M_{\text{id}}^\Gamma(x)}$, we have $\mathcal{S}_\alpha(\mathbb{R}) \models \varphi(y)$ iff there is a $\varphi(y)$ -prewitness N such that $N \triangleleft M_{\text{id}}^\Gamma(x)$. The intention is that if N is an iterable $\varphi(y)$ -prewitness over x which is Γ -ladder-small, but $\neg\varphi(y)$ holds, as witnessed by $w \in \mathbb{R}$,¹² then we can run a version of the stationary tower argument in [3], iterating out N to make w generic over various segments of the iterate, using this to produce nodes in trees $T_x^{N'[g]}$ for various collapse generics g , where T_x is the tree for producing a witness to $\neg\varphi(x)$. However, we will also arrange that the full iteration in fact drops infinitely often along its unique branch, and N' is the common part model, and is a ladder mouse; so since N is iterable and is a proper segment of $M|_{\omega_1^M}$, we will have reached two contradictions. At each step of the process of iterating to make w generic at the next “rung” of the ladder N' we are producing, there will be a drop in model, at a cutpoint of the iteration.

Definition 2.13. Given $X \in \text{HC}$ with $x_{\text{cof}} \in X$, an X -premouse N and $n < \omega$, we say that N is an n -partial- Γ -ladder iff:

- $\text{Lp}_\Gamma(N|\xi) \trianglelefteq N$ for each $\xi < \text{OR}^N$,
- there are $\theta_0 < \dots < \theta_n < \text{OR}^N$ such that for each $i \leq n$, θ_i is the least ordinal θ such that θ is an N -cardinal and $P_n(N|\theta) \models \text{“}\theta \text{ is Woodin”}$,
- $\theta_n^{+N} < \text{OR}^N$ and θ_n^{+N} is the largest cardinal of N .

Let N be an n -partial- Γ -ladder. For $i \leq n$, we write θ_i^N for the least N -cardinal θ such that θ is Woodin in $P_i(N|\theta)$. \dashv

¹²Note that $\neg\varphi$ is Π_2 , as opposed to $\forall^{\mathbb{R}}\Sigma_1$. But because we can refer to x , and hence to x_{cof} , it suffices to deal with $\forall^{\mathbb{R}}\Sigma_1$ formulas.

Definition 2.14. Let $\varphi(u, v)$ be a Π_1 formula of the $L(\mathbb{R})$ language, of two free variables u, v , and $\psi(u)$ be $\exists^{\mathbb{R}}v \varphi(u, v)$.

Then T_ψ denotes the tree projecting to

$$A_\psi = \{x \in \mathbb{R} \mid \mathcal{S}_{\alpha_g}(\mathbb{R}) \models \psi(x)\},$$

derived in the standard manner from the sequence $\langle T_n \rangle_{n < \omega}$ (see Definition 2.2). The details are like for the analogous tree introduced in [3]. That is, fix a recursive bijection $f : \omega^2 \rightarrow \omega$ such that $f^{-1}(n) \subseteq n \times n$ for all $n < \omega$, and write $\ulcorner i, j \urcorner = f(i, j)$. Also write $\ulcorner i_m, j_m \urcorner = m$. Now let $(s, t, u) \in T_\psi$ iff for some $n < \omega$, we have $s, t : n \rightarrow \omega$, $u : n \rightarrow \text{OR}$, and for each $m < n$, letting $(i, j) = (i_m, j_m)$,

$$a_m = \{\ell \leq m \mid \ulcorner i, k \urcorner = \ell \text{ for some } k\},$$

$c_m = \text{card}(a_m)$ and $\tau_m : c_m \rightarrow a_m$ be the order-preserving bijection, we have

$$(\varphi, s \upharpoonright c_m, t \upharpoonright c_m, u'_m) \in T_i$$

where $u'_m : c_m \rightarrow \text{OR}$ and $u'_m(b) = u(\tau_m(b))$.

Let $T_{\psi, x}$ for the section of T_ψ at $x \in \mathbb{R}$; so $x \in A_\psi$ iff $T_{\psi, x}$ is illfounded. \dashv

Definition 2.15. Let ψ be an $\exists^{\mathbb{R}}\Pi_1$ formula of the $L(\mathbb{R})$ language.

Let N be an n -partial- Γ -ladder. Let g be $\text{Col}(\omega, \theta_n^N)$ -generic. Then $T_\psi^{N[g]}$ denotes the version of T_ψ computed in $N[g]$. That is, we use the $\pi^{-1}(\vec{\zeta}_n)$ in place of $\vec{\zeta}_n$ (for each $n < \omega$), where

$$\pi : \mathcal{S}_{\bar{\alpha}}(\mathbb{R} \cap N[g]) \rightarrow \mathcal{S}_{\alpha_g}(\mathbb{R})$$

is as in Definition 2.9. By Lemma 2.16 below, $T_\psi^{N[g]}$ is independent of the choice of g , and hence in N . We write $\tilde{T}_\psi^N = T_\psi^{N[g]}$. We write $\tilde{T}_{\psi, x}^N$ for the section of \tilde{T}_ψ^N at $x \in \mathbb{R} \cap N$. If ψ is clear from context we may just write \tilde{T}^N and \tilde{T}_x^N instead.

Let N' be an $(n+1)$ -partial- Γ -ladder with $N|\theta_n^{+N} = N'|\theta_n^{+N'}$; note that $\theta_i^N = \theta_i^{N'}$ for all $i \leq n$. Then $\tilde{\pi}_\psi^{NN'} : \tilde{T}_\psi^N \rightarrow \tilde{T}_\psi^{N'}$ denotes the map $\tilde{\pi}$ given by setting

$$\tilde{\pi}((s, t, (\alpha_0, \dots, \alpha_{k-1}))) = (s, t, (\beta_0, \dots, \beta_{k-1}))$$

where if g is $(N, \text{Col}(\omega, \theta_n^N))$ -generic and g' is $(N', \text{Col}(\omega, \theta_{n+1}^{N'}))$ -generic with $g \in N'[g']$, and $m < k$ and $x \in A_{i_m}^{N[g]} = A_{i_m} \cap N[g]$ and $\alpha_m = \Phi_{i_m, j_m}^{N[g]}(x)$, then $\beta_m = \Phi_{i_m, j_m}^{N'[g']}(x)$. Also by Lemma 2.16, $\tilde{\pi}$ is independent of g, g' , and hence $\pi \in N'$. We write $\tilde{\pi}_{\psi, x}^{NN'} : T_{\psi, x}^N \rightarrow T_{\psi, x}^{N'}$ for the corresponding section of $\tilde{\pi}_\psi^{NN'}$ (where $s = x \upharpoonright \text{lh}(s)$). In practice, ψ will be clear from context, and we will just write $\tilde{\pi}_x^{NN'}$. \dashv

Lemma 2.16. The tree $T_\psi^{N[g]}$ introduced in Definition 2.15 is independent of the N -generic $g \subseteq \text{Col}(\omega, \theta_n^N)$, and hence $\tilde{T}_\psi^N = T_\psi^{N[g]} \in N$.

The embedding $\tilde{\pi}_\psi^{NN'}$ is independent of g, g' , and hence $\tilde{\pi}_\psi^{NN'} \in N'$.

Proof. This is the fact, due to Hjorth, and explained in [3], about collapse generic extensions hitting the same equivalence classes of thin equivalence relations. \square

Definition 2.17. Let $X \in \text{HC}$ be transitive swo'd with $x_{\text{cof}} \in X$. Let N be an X -premouse, $x \in \mathbb{R}^N$, and $\Delta, t, u \in N$ with $(t, u) \in (\omega \times \text{OR})^{<\omega}$. Let φ be a $\forall^{\mathbb{R}}\Sigma_1$ formula of the $L(\mathbb{R})$ language. We say that (N, Δ) is a $(\varphi(x), t, u)$ -prewitness iff, letting $n = \text{lh}(t, u)$ and $(N_n, t_n, u_n, \Delta_n) = (N, t, u, \Delta)$, then N is an n -partial- Γ -ladder, and writing $\tilde{T}_x = \tilde{T}_{\neg\varphi, x}$, then $(t, u) \in \tilde{T}_x^N$, $\Delta \in N$ is a non-empty tree (set of finite sequences closed under initial segment) whose elements σ have form

$$\sigma = (\sigma_{n+1}, \dots, \sigma_{n+k})$$

where $k < \omega$ and for $0 \leq i \leq k$, σ_{n+i} has form

$$\sigma_{n+i} = (N_{n+i}, t_{n+i}, u_{n+i}, \Delta_{n+i})$$

(so $\sigma_n = (N, t, u, \Delta)$, but σ_n is not actually an element of σ), and moreover, for each $\sigma \in \Delta$, with σ, k, σ_{n+i} as above, the following conditions hold:

1. If $\sigma \neq \emptyset$ then for every $i < k$, we have the following:

- (a) $N_{n+i+1} \triangleleft N_{n+i}$,
- (b) N_{n+i+1} is an $(n+i+1)$ -partial ladder,
- (c) $\rho_1^{N_{n+i+1}} = \rho_\omega^{N_{n+i+1}} = \theta_{n+i}^{+N_{n+i}}$ (so note $\theta_j^{N_{n+i+1}} = \theta_j^{N_{n+i}}$ for $j \leq n+i$),
- (d) $(t_{n+i+1}, u_{n+i+1}) \in \tilde{T}_x^{N_{n+i+1}}$,
- (e) $\text{lh}((t_{n+i+1}, u_{n+i+1})) = n+i+1$,
- (f) $\pi_x^{N_{n+i}, N_{n+i+1}}((t_{n+i}, u_{n+i})) \leq (t_{n+i+1}, u_{n+i+1})$,
- (g) $\Delta_{n+i+1} \in N_{n+i+1}$ is a tree (set of finite sequences closed under initial segment),
- (h) $(\sigma_{n+i+2}, \dots, \sigma_{n+k}) \in \Delta_{n+i+1}$.

2. $\Delta_{n+k} = \{\tau \mid \sigma \hat{\ } \tau \in \Delta\}$.

3. For every $(t', u') \in \tilde{T}_x^{N_{n+k}}$ with $(t_{n+k}, u_{n+k}) \triangleleft (t', u')$ and $\text{lh}(t', u') = n+k+1$, there is $\sigma' \in \Delta$ with $\sigma' = \sigma \hat{\ } ((N', \tilde{\pi}_x^{N_{n+k}N'}(t', u'), \Delta'))$ for some N', Δ' .

A $\varphi(x)$ -prewitness is a $(\varphi(x), \emptyset, \emptyset)$ -prewitness. +

Definition 2.18. Let $X \in \text{HC}$ be transitive swo'd with $x_{\text{cof}} \in X$. Let $M = M_{\text{Id}}^\Gamma(X)$. Let ψ be an $\exists^{\mathbb{R}}\Pi_1$ formula. Then \tilde{T}_ψ^M denotes the direct limit of the trees $\tilde{T}_\psi^{N_n}$, under the maps $\tilde{\pi}_\psi^{N_n N_{n+1}}$, where $N_n = M|\theta_n^{+M}$. And $\tilde{\pi}^{N_n M} : \tilde{T}_\psi^{N_n} \rightarrow \tilde{T}_\psi^M$ denotes the direct limit map. Likewise for $\tilde{T}_{\psi(x)}^M$ and $\tilde{\pi}_{\psi(x)}^M$ for $x \in \mathbb{R}^M$. +

Lemma 2.19. Let $X \in \text{HC}$ be transitive swo'd with $x_{\text{cof}} \in X$. Let $M = M_{\text{Id}}^\Gamma(X)$. Let $x \in \mathbb{R}^M$ and ψ be $\exists^{\mathbb{R}}\Pi_1$. Then the following are equivalent:

(i) $\mathbb{S}_{\alpha_g} \models \neg\psi(x)$

(ii) $\tilde{T}_{\psi, x}^M$ is wellfounded.

(iii) There is a $\neg\psi(x)$ -prewitness (N, Δ) such that $N \triangleleft M$ and $\rho_\omega^N = \omega$.

Proof. (i) \Rightarrow (ii): This follows easily from Lemma 2.11.

(ii) \Rightarrow (iii): We will actually prove something stronger. For $n < \omega$, let $N_n = M|\theta_n^{++}$. We say that (n, t, u) is *relevant* iff $n < \omega$ and $(t, u) \in \tilde{T}_x^{N_n}$ and $\text{lh}((t, u)) = n$. We will show that for each relevant (n, t, u) ,

$$\exists \Delta \in N_n \ [(N_n, \Delta) \text{ is a } (\neg\psi(x), t, u)\text{-prewitness}]. \quad (2)$$

Applying this with $n = 0$ and $(t, u) = (\emptyset, \emptyset)$, we will get some $\Delta \in N_0$ such that (N_0, Δ) is a $\neg\psi(x)$ -prewitness, and then by taking an appropriate hull of N_0 , we can get such an $N \triangleleft M|\omega_1^M$ with $\rho_\omega^N = \omega$.

For relevant (n, t, u) , let $\text{rank}(n, t, u) = \text{rank}_{\tilde{T}_x^M}(\tilde{\pi}_x^{N_n M}(t, u))$. We will establish line (2) by induction on $\text{rank}(n, t, u)$, simultaneously for all n .

First suppose (n, t, u) is relevant and $\text{rank}(n, t, u) = 0$. So (t, u) is an end-node of $\tilde{T}_x^{N_n}$. Let $\Delta = \{\emptyset\}$. Then (N_n, Δ) is a $(\neg\psi(x), t, u)$ -prewitness.

Now suppose that we have established line (2) for all relevant (n, t, u) with $\text{rank}(n, t, u) < \alpha$, and fix a relevant (n, t, u) with $\text{rank}(n, t, u) = \alpha$. We must show there is a system $\Delta \in N_n$ such that (N_n, Δ) is a $(\neg\psi(x), t, u)$ -prewitness. Given $(t', u') \in \tilde{T}_x^{N_n}$ with $\text{lh}((t', u')) = n+1$ and $(t, u) \triangleleft (t', u')$, let $(t^*, u^*) = \tilde{\pi}_x^{N_n N_{n+1}}((t', u'))$. Then $(t^*, u^*) \in \tilde{T}_x^{N_{n+1}}$, $(n+1, t^*, u^*)$ is relevant and $\text{rank}(n+1, t^*, u^*) < \alpha$. So by induction, we can fix (the least) $\Delta_{t^*, u^*} \in N_{n+1}$ such that $(N_{n+1}, \Delta_{t^*, u^*})$ is a $(\neg\varphi(x), t^*, u^*)$ -prewitness.

Let

$$\bar{N} = \text{cHull}_1^{N_{n+1}}(\theta_n^{+N_n} \cup \{\theta_{n+1}^{N_{n+1}}\})$$

and let $\varrho : \bar{N} \rightarrow N_{n+1}$ be the uncollapse. Then \bar{N} is 1-sound with $\rho_1^{\bar{N}} = \theta_n^{+N_n}$ and $\pi(p_1^{\bar{N}}) = \{\theta_{n+1}^{+N_{n+1}}\}$, and ϱ is $\text{r}\Sigma_1$ -elementary, and so $\bar{N} \triangleleft N_n$ by condensation; also $\varrho \in M$. (The identification of $p_1^{\bar{N}}$ works because $N_{n+1}|\theta_{n+1}^{+N_{n+1}} \preceq_1 N_{n+1}$ and $\theta_{n+1}^{+N_{n+1}} \in \text{rg}(\varrho)$; this gives the corresponding 1-solidity witness in $\text{rg}(\varrho)$.) Note that since $\theta_n^{+N_n} < \text{cr}(\varrho)$, we have $\tilde{T}_x^{N_n} \in \bar{N}$ and $\varrho(\tilde{T}_x^{N_n}) = \tilde{T}_x^{N_n}$,

and further, $\tilde{T}_x^{N_{n+1}}, \tilde{\pi}_x^{N_n N_{n+1}} \in \text{rg}(\varrho)$, and $\Delta_{t^*, u^*} \in \text{rg}(\varrho)$ for each (t', u') and (t^*, u^*) as in the previous paragraph.

We now specify an appropriate Δ : let Δ be the set of finite sequences σ of form

$$\sigma = (\sigma_{n+1}, \dots, \sigma_{n+k})$$

where $k < \omega$ and for each $i \in [1, k]$, σ_{n+i} has form

$$\sigma_i = (N_{n+i}, t_{n+i}, u_{n+i}, \Delta_{n+i}),$$

and where either $k = 0$ (so $\sigma = \emptyset$) or $N_{n+1} = \bar{N}$ and for some $(t', u') \in \tilde{T}_x^{N_n}$ with $\text{lh}((t', u')) = n+1$ and $(t, u) \triangleleft (t', u')$, we have $\varrho(t_{n+1}, u_{n+1}, \Delta_{n+1}) = (t^*, u^*, \Delta_{t^*, u^*})$ where t^*, u^* are as before, and

$$(\sigma_{n+2}, \dots, \sigma_{n+k}) \in \Delta_{n+1}.$$

Then it is straightforward to see that (N_n, Δ) is a $(\neg\varphi(x), t, u)$ -prewitness, which completes the induction.

(iii) \Rightarrow (i): Fix a $(\neg\psi(x))$ -prewitness $N \triangleleft M | \omega_1^M$. Suppose $\mathcal{S}_{\alpha_g}(\mathbb{R}) \models \psi(x)$, as witnessed by $w \in \mathbb{R}$. Since $\text{lh}((\emptyset, \emptyset)) = 0$, N is a 0-partial- Γ -ladder. Iterate N at θ_0^N , making w generic over the image of $P_0(N | \theta_0)$ for the extender algebra at the image of θ_0 ; let \mathcal{T}_0 be the tree. Then letting g_0 be $\text{Col}(\omega, \theta_0^{M \mathcal{T}_0})$ -generic, there is $(t'_0, u'_0) \in \tilde{T}_x^{M \mathcal{T}_0}[g_0]$ such that $\text{lh}((t'_0, u'_0)) = 1$ and $t'_0 = w \upharpoonright 1$ and $u'_0(0)$ matches the first norm value for (x, w) . Therefore, noting that $(M_\infty^{\mathcal{T}_0}, i_\infty^{\mathcal{T}_0}(\Delta))$ is a $(\neg\psi(x), \emptyset, \emptyset)$ -prewitness, we can find $\sigma' \in i_{0\infty}^{\mathcal{T}_0}(\Delta)$ with $\text{lh}(\sigma') = 1$ and $\sigma' = ((N', t_0^*, u_0^*, S'))$ for some N', S' , with $(t_0^*, u_0^*) = \tilde{\pi}_x^{M \mathcal{T}_0 N'}((t'_0, u'_0))$. Now drop to N' , and iterate N' above $\theta_0^{+N'} = \theta_0^{+M \mathcal{T}_0}$, making w generic over the image of $P_1(N' | \theta_1^{N'})$. Then we get some (t'_1, u'_1) extending $i_{0\infty}^{\mathcal{T}_1}(t_0^*, u_0^*)$ with $(t'_1, u'_1) \in \tilde{T}_x^{M \mathcal{T}_1 [g_1]}$ and $\text{lh}(t'_1, u'_1) = 2$, and $t'_1 \triangleleft w$, and u'_1 giving the first two norm values for (x, w) . We can continue in this way for ω steps, and note that this produces a tree with a unique cofinal branch which drops infinitely often (contradiction 1), and the common part model of the tree is a Γ -ladder (contradiction 2). \square

Proof of Theorem 1.7. Let $\bar{\alpha}$ and $\pi : \mathcal{S}_{\bar{\alpha}}(\mathbb{R}^M) \rightarrow \mathcal{S}_{\alpha_g}(\mathbb{R})$ be the map given by Fact 1.6.

Let φ be Π_2 . First, we need to specify a Σ_2 formula $\psi_{\Sigma_2, \varphi}$ (recursively in φ) such that for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^M$,

$$\mathcal{S}_{\alpha_g}(\mathbb{R}) \models \varphi(x) \iff \mathcal{S}_{\bar{\alpha}}(\mathbb{R}^M) \models \psi_{\Sigma_2, \varphi}(x, x_{\text{cof}}).$$

But by Lemma 2.19, we can just set $\psi_{\Sigma_2, \varphi}$ to be the formula asserting “there is a Π_1 -iterable ω -premouse R over x_{cof} which is a $\varphi(x)$ -prewitness”. By the Σ_1 -elementarity of π and since all Π_1 -iterable ω -premise R over x_{cof} with $R \in \text{HC}^M$ are segments of M , this works.

Secondly, we need to specify a Σ_2 formula $\varrho_{\Sigma_2, \varphi}$ such that for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^M$,

$$\mathcal{S}_{\bar{\alpha}}(\mathbb{R}^M) \models \varphi(x) \iff \mathcal{S}_{\alpha_g}(\mathbb{R}) \models \varrho_{\Sigma_2, \varphi}(x, x_{\text{cof}}).$$

For this, first let $\varphi^{\mathbb{R}}(x, x_{\text{cof}})$ be the standard $\Pi_2^{\mathbb{R}}$ formula such that

$$\mathcal{S}_{\alpha_g}(\mathbb{R}) \models \forall^{\mathbb{R}} x [\varphi^{\mathbb{R}}(x, x_{\text{cof}}) \Leftrightarrow \varphi(x)].$$

Now let $\varrho_{\Sigma_2, \varphi}(x, x_{\text{cof}})$ be the formula asserting the existence of a countable Π_1 -iterable premouse N over x_{cof} such that:

- $\text{Lp}_\Gamma(N | \eta) \trianglelefteq N$ for every $\eta < \text{OR}^N$,
- N is a putative Γ -ladder, and
- $N \models$ “There is $\gamma \in \text{OR}$ such that $\mathcal{S}_\gamma(\mathbb{R}^N) \models \forall^{\omega n} \varphi_{\text{cof}}(n, x_{\text{cof}})$, and letting γ be least such, $\mathcal{S}_\gamma(\mathbb{R}^N) \models \varphi^{\mathbb{R}}(x)$ ”.

Because every N as above has $\mathbb{R}^M \subseteq N$, it is straightforward to see that this works. \square

2.2 Antichains of the extender algebra

Work in a premouse N and let $\delta < \text{OR}^N$ be such that $N \models \text{“}\delta \text{ is Woodin”}$ and $\delta^{+N} < \text{OR}^N$. Let \mathcal{L} be the collection of formulas φ of infinitary propositional logic in ω -many Boolean variables $\{X_n\}_{n < \omega}$, with $\varphi \in V_\delta$. For $\Gamma \subseteq \mathcal{L}$ and $\varphi \in \mathcal{L}$, a *proof of φ from Γ* is a transitive $P \models \text{ZFC}^-$ such that for some transitive swo'd $X \in P$, we have $\varphi \in X$ and some $\Gamma' \in X$ such that $\Gamma' \subseteq \Gamma$ and $P \models \text{“Col}(\omega, X) \text{ forces that for every real } x, \text{ if } x \models \Gamma' \text{ then } x \models \varphi\text{”}$. We say that Γ is *consistent* iff for all $\varphi \in \mathcal{L}$, there is no proof P of $\varphi \wedge \neg\varphi$ from Γ , and a formula $\varphi \in \mathcal{L}$ is *consistent with Γ* if $\Gamma \cup \{\varphi\}$ is consistent.

Let Γ_0 be the set of all extender algebra axioms for the extender algebra \mathbb{B}_δ at δ (induced by extenders $E \in \mathbb{E}^{N|\delta}$ with $\nu(E)$ an N -cardinal, in the usual way). Clearly Γ_0 is consistent, since the constantly 0 real gives models. As in the proof of the δ -cc for the extender algebra (using the Woodinness of δ), for any $\varphi \in \mathcal{L}$, there is a proof P of φ from Γ_0 iff there is $\Gamma' \in V_\delta$ such that $\Gamma' \subseteq \Gamma_0$, and a proof $P' \in V_\delta$ of φ from Γ' . Recall that the extender algebra \mathbb{B}_δ consists of all equivalence classes $[\varphi]$ of formulas $\varphi \in \mathcal{L}$ which are consistent with Γ_0 , modulo the equivalence relation \approx , where $\varphi \approx \psi$ iff there is a proof of $\varphi \Leftrightarrow \psi$ from Γ_0 . As δ is Woodin, \mathbb{B}_δ has the δ -cc.

Let $\varphi \in \mathcal{L}$. Then the following are equivalent:

- $[\varphi] \in \mathbb{B}_\delta$
- there is no limit cardinal $\eta < \delta$ such that $\varphi \in N|\eta$ and $N|\eta \models \text{“there is a proof of } \neg\varphi \text{ from } \Gamma' \cup \{\varphi\} \text{ from some set } \Gamma', \text{ with } \Gamma' \subseteq \Gamma_0^{P|\eta}\text{”}$, where $\Gamma_0^{P|\eta}$ is the set of extender algebra axioms induced by extenders $E \in \mathbb{E}^{N|\eta}$,
- there is $\eta < \delta$ such that $N|\eta \preceq N|\delta$ and $\varphi \in N|\eta$, and $N|\eta \models \text{“there is no such proof”}$.

So we can uniformly determine whether a given $\varphi \in \mathcal{L}$ yields an element $[\varphi]$ of \mathbb{B}_δ in any $\eta < \delta$ with $\varphi \in N|\eta \preceq N|\delta$. It follows that the ordering $[\varphi] \leq [\psi]$ is likewise definable, since if $[\varphi], [\psi] \in \mathbb{B}_\delta$, then $[\varphi] \leq [\psi]$ iff $[\varphi \wedge \neg\psi] \notin \mathbb{B}_\delta$. The compatibility of $[\varphi]$ with $[\psi]$ is likewise so definable.

Now for $A \subseteq \mathcal{L}$, let $[A] = \{[\varphi] \mid \varphi \in A\}$. Say that A is *representing* iff for all $\varphi, \psi \in A$, if $\varphi \neq \psi$ then $[\varphi] \neq [\psi]$. By the previous paragraph, the questions of whether A is representing and whether $[A]$ is an antichain can be similarly determined, over any $N|\eta \preceq N|\delta$ with $A \in N|\eta$; moreover, if A is representing and $[A]$ is an antichain, then $A \in N|\delta$, by the δ -cc. The question of whether (A is representing and) $[A]$ is a maximal antichain is likewise, since if A is representing then $[A]$ is maximal iff $[\neg(\bigvee A)] \notin \mathbb{B}_\delta$.

2.3 Q-local local K^c -constructions

Let P be an x -premouse which has no largest cardinal, where $x \in \mathbb{R}$. Let $y \leq_T x$. Working in P , we define the *maximal Q-local-plus-1 certified ms-array over y* , by combining features of the local K^c -construction of [9] with the Q-local $L[\mathbb{E}]$ -construction of [6]. The main features are as follows. For simplicity assume $y = 0$; the general case is just a relativization (since $y \leq_T x$).

The structure of the construction is basically that of the maximal +1 certified ms-array of P (see [9, p. 5***]), except as follows. We define a *Q-local-plus-1 certificate* as in the definition of *plus-1 certificate* ([9, Definition 1.3***]) except for the following modifications:

1. A Q-local-plus-1 certificate for an ms-array $\langle N_\gamma \rangle_{\gamma \leq \eta_0}$ (the ms-array is the sequence of uncored models of the construction) is a triple

$$(\langle H_\gamma \rangle_{\gamma < \eta_0}, \langle F_\gamma^* \rangle_{\gamma \leq \eta_0}, \langle t_\gamma \rangle_{\gamma \leq \eta_0}).$$

2. For each $\gamma \leq \eta_0$, we have $t_\gamma \in \{0, 1, 3\}$.
3. If $t_\gamma \neq 3$, then N_γ is active iff $F_\gamma^* \neq \emptyset$ iff $t_\gamma = 1$.
4. We demand that $\nu(F_\gamma^*) = \aleph_\gamma^{H_\gamma}$, for all $\gamma < \eta_0$ with $t_\gamma = 1$.
5. We demand that if $t_{\eta_0} = 1$ then $\nu(F_{\eta_0}^*) = \aleph_{\eta_0}^P$.
6. We demand that $\text{OR}^{H_{\gamma_0}} < \text{OR}^{H_{\gamma_1}}$ for $\gamma_0 < \gamma_1 < \eta_0$.
7. We demand that $\text{OR}^{H_\gamma} < \text{OR}^P$ for $\gamma < \eta_0$.

8. We set $t_\gamma = 3$ iff $N_\gamma \models$ “There is a Woodin cardinal”.
9. Suppose $t_{\gamma_0} = 3$, and let δ be the least Woodin cardinal of N_{γ_0} . Then $\text{OR}(N_\delta) = \delta$ and $N_\delta \trianglelefteq N_{\gamma_0}$. Thus, $t_{\delta+1} = 3$. Moreover, $P \upharpoonright \delta \models \text{ZFC}$ and $P \upharpoonright (\delta + \omega) \models$ “ δ is the least Woodin”. Let Q be the largest segment of P which models “ δ is Woodin”. Then for $\delta + (\gamma\omega) \in (\delta, \text{OR}^Q]$, $t_{\delta+\gamma} = 3$ and $N_{\delta+\gamma}$ is the output of the P-construction of $Q \upharpoonright (\delta + \gamma\omega)$ over N_δ . This makes sense, and if $P \models$ “ δ is Woodin”, we get $N_{\delta+\gamma} \models$ “ δ is Woodin” where $\delta + \gamma\omega = \text{OR}^P$, whereas if $P \models$ “ δ is not Woodin”, we get that $N_{\delta+\gamma}$ is a δ -sound Q-structure for δ where $\delta + \gamma\omega = \text{OR}^Q$ (assuming iterability and sufficient soundness of P).

Other than these changes, things are as in [9, Definition 1.3]. We then define the *maximal Q-local-plus-1 certified ms-array* as in [9, p. 5], but using the above certificates in place of plus-1 certificates. Note that this implies that for limit ordinals η such that κ_α is not eventually constant as $\alpha \rightarrow \eta$, if the resulting model N_η eventually produced by this construction (so $\text{OR}(N_\eta) = \kappa_\eta$ and N_η has no largest cardinal) is such that $N_\eta \models \text{ZFC}$ and $\mathcal{J}(N_\eta) \models$ “ $\delta = \kappa_\eta$ is Woodin”, then the next stage of the construction (producing segments projecting to δ) has to begin with P-construction, through to either P itself (if δ is (the least) Woodin of P) or the Q-structure $Q \triangleleft P$ for δ (otherwise). One should refer to [6] for more details regarding this aspect of the construction.

2.4 The mouse set theorem for OD_{α_2}

The analysis in §2.1 for the \mathcal{S} -gap $[\alpha_g, \alpha_g]$ was relative to the real x_{cof} . We next adapt the methods to establish the (lightface) mouse set theorem with respect to $\text{OD}_{\alpha_g, 2}$ and $\text{OD}_{\alpha_g, 2}^{\mathbb{R}}$ (for the same kinds of \mathcal{S} -gaps as in §2.1).

Definition 2.20. Recall that for $\alpha \in \text{OR}$, $n \in [1, \omega)$ and $x \in \mathbb{R}$, $\text{OD}_{\alpha n}(x)$ is the set of reals y such that for some ordinal $\xi < \omega_1$ and some Σ_n formula φ of the $L(\mathbb{R})$ language, for all $w \in \text{WO}_\xi$ and all $z \in \mathbb{R}$, we have

$$z = y \iff \mathcal{S}_\alpha(\mathbb{R}) \models \varphi(x, \xi, z).$$

And $\text{OD}_{\alpha n} = \text{OD}_{\alpha n}(\emptyset)$. ⊣

Definition 2.21. Recall that $\Sigma_1^{\mathbb{R}} = \Sigma_1$, $\Pi_1^{\mathbb{R}} = \Pi_1$, and given $n \geq 1$, $\Sigma_{n+1}^{\mathbb{R}} = \exists^{\mathbb{R}} \Pi_n^{\mathbb{R}}$ and $\Pi_{n+1}^{\mathbb{R}} = \forall^{\mathbb{R}} \Sigma_n^{\mathbb{R}}$.

For $\alpha \in \text{OR}$, $n \in [1, \omega)$ and $x \in \mathbb{R}$, $\text{OD}_{\alpha n}^{\mathbb{R}}(x)$ is the set of reals y such that for some ordinal $\xi < \omega_1$ and some $\Sigma_n^{\mathbb{R}}$ formula φ of the $L(\mathbb{R})$ language, for all $w \in \text{WO}_\xi$ and all $z \in \mathbb{R}$, we have

$$z = y \iff \mathcal{S}_\alpha(\mathbb{R}) \models \varphi(x, \xi, z).$$

And $\text{OD}_{\alpha n}^{\mathbb{R}} = \text{OD}_{\alpha n}^{\mathbb{R}}(\emptyset)$. ⊣

One should be aware of the potential contrast of the preceding definitions with the next one:

Definition 2.22. Given $x, y \in \mathbb{R}$, we say y is $\Sigma_n^{\mathcal{S}_\alpha(\mathbb{R})}(\omega_1 \cup \{x\})$ iff there is $\xi < \omega_1$ and a Σ_n formula φ such that for all $w \in \text{WO}_\xi$ and all $n < \omega$, we have

$$n \in y \iff \mathcal{S}_\alpha(\mathbb{R}) \models \varphi(x, \xi, n).$$

Likewise define y is $\Pi_n^{\mathcal{S}_\alpha(\mathbb{R})}(\omega_1)$. And y is $\Delta_n^{\mathcal{S}_\alpha(\mathbb{R})}(\omega_1)$ iff y is both $\Sigma_n^{\mathcal{S}_\alpha(\mathbb{R})}(\omega_1)$ and $\Pi_n^{\mathcal{S}_\alpha(\mathbb{R})}(\omega_1)$. ⊣

Remark 2.23. Clearly, if $y \in \text{OD}_{\alpha n}$, then y is $\Delta_n^{\mathcal{S}_\alpha(\mathbb{R})}(\omega_1)$. If α has uncountable cofinality in $L(\mathbb{R})$, then the converse also holds, but it doesn’t seem that the converse should hold in general.

Definition 2.24. Say that a real y is (α_g, \mathbb{R}) -*cofinal* if there is a Σ_1 formula φ of the $L(\mathbb{R})$ language and such that α_g is the least ordinal α such that $\mathcal{S}_\alpha(\mathbb{R}) \models \forall^{\mathbb{R}} x \varphi(x, y)$. ⊣

Proof of Theorem 1.1 for $n = 2$. Fix an α_g -ascending pair $(x_{\text{cof}}, \varphi_{\text{cof}})$, let $\Gamma = \Sigma_1^{\mathcal{S}_{\alpha_g}(\mathbb{R})}$ and $N = M_{\text{id}}^\Gamma(x_{\text{cof}})$ (see §2.1). Let M be the output of the Q-local local K^c -construction of N (over \emptyset) (see §2.3). We will see that M witnesses the theorem.

Let us first establish some general facts about M . By §2.3 (and adapting further material from [9] and [6]), for each $n < \omega$, since θ_n^N is a limit cardinal of N , $M \upharpoonright \theta_n^N = N_{\theta_n^N}$, and since $Q_n^N \models$ “ θ_n^N is Woodin”, $M \upharpoonright \text{OR}^{Q_n^N}$ is the P-construction of Q_n^N over $M \upharpoonright \theta_n^N$. Write $Q_n^M = Q_n^N$ (though Q_n^M need

not be defined internally to M in the manner it is defined in N). Let Σ_n^N be the above- θ_n^N , (ω, ω_1) -strategy for Q_n^N , and let β_n^N be the least β such that $\Sigma_n^N \in \mathcal{S}_\beta(\mathbb{R})$. So $\sup_{n < \omega} \beta_n^N = \alpha_g$. Let Σ_n^M be the translation of Σ_n^N to an above- θ_n^N , (ω, ω_1) -strategy for Q_n^M (so Σ_n^M and Σ_n^N are essentially equivalent). Note M has no largest cardinal, and $M \models$ “there is no Woodin cardinal” (since N has no Woodin, and by the properties of the construction; for example, Q_n^M is the Q-structure for $M|\theta_n^N$).

Now each rung θ_n^N is a strong cutpoint of N , by the Σ_1^N -definability of the Lp_Γ -operator. It follows that θ_n^N is a cutpoint of M , and that θ_n^N is not measurable in M (though it seems that there might be partial measures $E \in \mathbb{E}^M$ with $\text{cr}(E) = \theta_n^N$). It follows that for each $m < \omega$, $\theta_n^{(+m+1)M}$ is a strong cutpoint of M .

Since M, N each have no largest cardinal, $\rho_1^M = \rho_1^N = \text{OR}^M = \text{OR}^N$. Note that this also implies that 0-maximal trees on these models are equivalent to 1-maximal trees (all $\text{r}\Sigma_1^M$ functions f with domain in M , are such that $f \in M$; likewise for N). So N is $(1, \omega_1 + 1)$ -iterable. All iteration trees on M, N we consider will be 1-maximal.+ Let Ψ_M be $(1, \omega_1 + 1)$ -strategy for M given by lifting/resurrection to 1-maximal trees on N via Σ_N . Given \mathcal{T} on M via Ψ_M , let $\mathcal{U}_\mathcal{T}$ be the corresponding tree on N , and given $\alpha < \text{lh}(\mathcal{T})$ and $d = \text{deg}_\alpha^\mathcal{T}$, let $\xi_\alpha^\mathcal{T} \leq \text{OR}(M_\alpha^{\mathcal{U}_\mathcal{T}})$ and $\pi_\alpha^\mathcal{T} : M_\alpha^\mathcal{T} \rightarrow \mathfrak{C}_d(N_{\xi_\alpha^\mathcal{T}}^{M_\alpha^{\mathcal{U}_\mathcal{T}}})$ be the standard lifting map. (In particular, $\xi_0^\mathcal{T} = \text{OR}^N$, $\text{deg}_0^\mathcal{T} = 1$ and $\pi_0^\mathcal{T} : M \rightarrow \mathfrak{C}_1(M) = M$ is the identity.)

Claim 1. *Let \mathcal{T} be a tree on M via Ψ_M , of successor length. Let $P \trianglelefteq M_\infty^\mathcal{T}$. Then:*

1. *There is no $\delta \leq \text{OR}^P$ such that $\text{Lp}_\Gamma(P|\delta)$ is a premouse and $\text{Lp}_\Gamma(P) \models$ “ δ is Woodin”.*
2. *The following are equivalent:*
 - (i) *For all $\alpha < \alpha_g$ there is a P -cardinal $\delta < \text{OR}^P$ such that $\text{Lp}_{\Gamma_\alpha}(P|\delta)$ is a premouse and $\text{Lp}_{\Gamma_\alpha}(P|\delta) \models$ “ δ is Woodin”,*
 - (ii) *$b^\mathcal{T}$ is non-dropping, and $P = M_\infty^\mathcal{T}$.*

Proof. Part 1: Suppose otherwise. In particular, $P|\delta \models \text{ZFC}$. So if $\delta = \text{OR}^P$ then $P \models \text{ZFC}$ and $b^\mathcal{T}$ does not drop, but then $\mathbb{S}(P) \models$ “ δ is not Woodin”, since OR^M is a limit of strong cutpoints of M , and hence likewise for OR^P and P . So $\delta < \text{OR}^P$. Since $M \models$ “there is no Woodin”, there is $Q \trianglelefteq P$ which is a Q-structure for $P|\delta$. We have $\pi_\infty^\mathcal{T} : M_\infty^\mathcal{T} \rightarrow N_{\xi_\infty^\mathcal{T}}^{M_\infty^{\mathcal{U}_\mathcal{T}}}$. Let $(\delta', Q') = \pi_\infty^\mathcal{T}(\delta, Q)$, where $Q' = N_{\xi_\infty^\mathcal{T}}^{M_\infty^{\mathcal{U}_\mathcal{T}}}$ if $Q = P$. Then $Q' \triangleleft \text{Lp}_\Gamma(Q'|\delta')$, since Q' is just the output of the P-construction of $M_\infty^{\mathcal{U}_\mathcal{T}}|\text{OR}^{Q'}$ over $Q'|\delta'$, and $M_\infty^{\mathcal{U}_\mathcal{T}}|\text{OR}^{Q'} \triangleleft \text{Lp}_\Gamma(M_\infty^{\mathcal{U}_\mathcal{T}}|\delta')$. But then using $\pi_\infty^\mathcal{T}$, we can pull back the above- δ' strategy for Q' , giving an above- δ strategy for Q which is in $\mathcal{S}_{\alpha_g}(\mathbb{R})$, so $Q \triangleleft \text{Lp}_\Gamma(Q|\delta)$, as desired.

Part 2: This follows from similar considerations as the previous part. \square

Claim 2. $\mathbb{R} \cap M \subseteq \text{OD}_{\alpha_g 2}^{\mathbb{R}}$.

Proof. Using Claim 1, this is just the direct analogue of Rudominer’s result that $\mathbb{R}^{M_{\text{id}}} \subseteq \text{OD}_{\omega 2}^{\mathbb{R}}$. That is, let $R \triangleleft M|\omega_1^M$ with $\rho_\omega^R = \omega$. Certainly R is $\Pi_1^{\alpha_g}$ -iterable, so it is enough to see that R is the unique ω -premouse R' such that $\text{OR}^{R'} = \text{OR}^R$ and R is $\Pi_1^{\alpha_g}$ -iterable. But if not, then comparison of R with R' via the correct (partial) strategies produces a tree on R which violates Claim 1. \square

So it just remains to see that $\text{OD}_{\alpha_g 2} \subseteq M$. For this, we consider two cases.

Case 1. There is no $(\mathcal{T}, R, \lambda, g, y)$ such that \mathcal{T} is a successor length tree on M via Ψ_M , $b^\mathcal{T}$ is non-dropping, $R = M_\infty^\mathcal{T}$, $\lambda < \text{OR}^R$, g is $(R, \text{Col}(\omega, \lambda))$ -generic, and $y \in R[g]$ is an (α_g, \mathbb{R}) -cofinal real.

In this case, we will show $\text{OD}_{\alpha_g 2} = \text{OD}_{\alpha_g 1} = \text{OD}^{<\alpha_g} = \mathbb{R} \cap M$.

Claim 3. *Let \mathcal{T} be a successor length tree on M via Ψ_M such that $b^\mathcal{T}$ does not drop. Let $R = M_\infty^\mathcal{T}$. Then $R|\theta^{+R} = \text{Lp}_\Gamma(R|\theta)$ for each strong cutpoint θ of R .*

Proof. We have $\text{Lp}_\Gamma(R|\theta) \trianglelefteq R$, since otherwise letting $P \triangleleft \text{Lp}_\Gamma(R|\theta)$ be such that $\rho_\omega^P \leq \theta$ and $P \not\triangleleft R$, we can compare R with P , producing trees $\mathcal{T}', \mathcal{U}'$ respectively, with \mathcal{T}' being 1-maximal, $M_\infty^{\mathcal{T}'} \trianglelefteq M_\infty^{\mathcal{U}'}$ and $b^{\mathcal{T}'}$ does not drop in model or degree. Now there is $\alpha < \alpha_g$ such that P is above- θ iterable in $\mathcal{S}_\alpha(\mathbb{R})$. And there is $n < \omega$ such that $\theta < i_{0\infty}^\mathcal{T}(\theta_n^N)$ and Q_n^M is not above

θ_n^N -iterable in $\mathcal{S}_\alpha(\mathbb{R})$. But $i_{0_\infty}^{\mathcal{T}'}(i_{0_\infty}^{\mathcal{T}}(Q_n^M))$ is above $i_{0_\infty}^{\mathcal{T}'}(i_{0_\infty}^{\mathcal{T}}(\theta_n^M))$ -iterable in $\mathcal{S}_\alpha(\mathbb{R})$, and pulling back this iteration strategy with $i_{0_\infty}^{\mathcal{T}'} \circ i_{0_\infty}^{\mathcal{T}}$ gives a contradiction.

Now suppose for a contradiction that $\text{Lp}_\Gamma(R|\theta) \triangleleft R|\theta^{+R}$; and suppose for the moment that \mathcal{T} is trivial, so $R = M$. Let $P \triangleleft M$ be such that $\text{Lp}_\Gamma(M|\theta) = M|\theta^{+M}$ and $\rho_\omega^M \leq \theta$. Let g be $(M, \text{Col}(\omega, \theta))$ -generic and $y \in M[g]$ be a real coding P . Now for all sound premice P' such that θ is a strong cutpoint of P' , $P'|\theta^{+P'} = P|\theta^{+P}$, and $\rho_\omega^{P'} \leq \theta$ but $P' \neq P$, we have that P' is not above- θ , $\Pi_1^{S_{\alpha_g}}(\mathbb{R})$ -iterable. (Otherwise comparing P with P' gives an above- θ tree \mathcal{T} on P which generates a Γ -ladder, contradicting Claim 1.) Note that this statement is $\forall^{\mathbb{R}}\Sigma_1(\{P, \theta\})$, and is true in $\mathcal{S}_{\alpha_g}(\mathbb{R})$. So, since there is no (α_g, \mathbb{R}) -cofinal real in $M[g]$, there is $\alpha < \alpha_g$ which already satisfies the statement. But P is above- θ , Π_1 -iterable in \mathcal{S}_{α_g} , and hence also in \mathcal{S}_α . So P is the unique sound premouse P' such that θ is a strong cutpoint of P' , $P'|\theta^{+P'} = P|\theta^{+P}$, $\rho_\omega^{P'} \leq \theta$, and P is Π_1 -iterable in $\mathcal{S}_\alpha(\mathbb{R})$. Therefore $P \in \text{OD}^\alpha(P|\theta)$, so $P \in \text{OD}^{<\alpha_g}(P|\theta) \subseteq \text{Lp}_\Gamma(P|\theta) = P|\theta^{+P}$, a contradiction.

Now suppose \mathcal{T} is non-trivial. First consider the case that $\theta = i_{0_\infty}^{\mathcal{T}}(\bar{\theta})$ for some strong cutpoint $\bar{\theta}$ of M . Note that $i_{0_\infty}^{\mathcal{T}}$ is continuous at $\bar{\theta}^{+M}$. So fix $\bar{P} \triangleleft M$ such that $\rho_\omega^{\bar{P}} \leq \bar{\theta} \leq \text{OR}^{\bar{P}}$; it suffices to see that $P = i_{0_\infty}^{\mathcal{T}}(\bar{P}) \triangleleft \text{Lp}_\Gamma(R|\theta)$. We can fix $n < \omega$ and some $W \leq Q_n^N$ with $\text{OR}^{\bar{P}} < \theta_n^N < \text{OR}^W$ and such that W is an above- θ_n^N , $\varphi(\bar{P}, \bar{\theta})$ -prewitness where $\varphi(P', \theta')$ asserts “there is an above- θ' iteration strategy for P' ”. Since $b^{\mathcal{T}}$ is non-dropping, $b^{\mathcal{U}\tau}$ is also non-dropping, and $\pi_\infty^{\mathcal{T}} : M_\infty^{\mathcal{T}} \rightarrow N_{\xi_\infty}^{M_\infty^{\mathcal{U}\tau}}$ and $\pi_\infty^{\mathcal{T}} \circ i_{0_\infty}^{\mathcal{T}} = i_{0_\infty}^{\mathcal{U}\tau} \upharpoonright M$. So $i_{0_\infty}^{\mathcal{U}\tau}(W) \leq Q_n^{M_\infty^{\mathcal{U}\tau}}$ and $i_{0_\infty}^{\mathcal{U}\tau}$ is an above- $\theta_n^{M_\infty^{\mathcal{U}\tau}}$, $\varphi(\pi_\infty^{\mathcal{T}}(P), \pi_\infty^{\mathcal{T}}(\theta))$ -prewitness. But $Q_n^{M_\infty^{\mathcal{U}\tau}}$ is above- $\theta_n^{M_\infty^{\mathcal{U}\tau}}$ iterable in $\mathcal{S}_{\alpha_g}(\mathbb{R})$, so $\pi_\infty^{\mathcal{T}}(P)$ is above- $\pi_\infty^{\mathcal{T}}(\theta)$ iterable in $\mathcal{S}_{\alpha_g}(\mathbb{R})$, so P is above- θ iterable in $\mathcal{S}_{\alpha_g}(\mathbb{R})$, which suffices.

Now fix a strong cutpoint θ_0 of M . Note that for every strong cutpoint θ of M with $\theta < \theta_0$, and for every $P \triangleleft M$ with $\theta \leq \text{OR}^P$ and $\rho_\omega^P \leq \theta$, there is an above- θ_0 , $\varphi(P, \theta)$ -prewitness W such that $W \triangleleft M|\theta_0^{+M}$. This statement is preserved by $i_{0_\infty}^{\mathcal{T}}$, so for every strong cutpoint θ of R with $\theta < i_{0_\infty}^{\mathcal{T}}(\theta_0)$, and for every $P \triangleleft R$ with $\theta \leq \text{OR}^P$ and $\rho_\omega^P \leq \theta$, there is an above- $i_{0_\infty}^{\mathcal{T}}(\theta_0)$, $\varphi(P, \theta)$ -prewitness W such that $W \triangleleft R|i_{0_\infty}^{\mathcal{T}}(\theta_0)^{+R}$. But we have already seen that $R|i_{0_\infty}^{\mathcal{T}}(\theta_0)^{+R} = \text{Lp}_\Gamma(R|\theta_0)$, and it follows that P is above- θ iterable in $\mathcal{S}_{\alpha_g}(\mathbb{R})$, as desired. \square

By Claim 3, $M|\omega_1^M = \text{Lp}_\Gamma(\emptyset)$, so $\mathbb{R}^M = \text{OD}_{\alpha_g 1} = \text{OD}_{<\alpha_g}$.

Now let $y \in \text{OD}_{\alpha_g 2}$. It suffices to see that $y \in M$. Let φ be a Π_1 formula and $\eta < \omega_1$ be such that for all $w \in \text{WO}_\eta$ and for all $z \in \mathbb{R}$, we have

$$z = y \iff \mathcal{S}_{\alpha_g}(\mathbb{R}) \models \exists X \varphi(X, w, z).$$

Let \mathcal{T} be the length $\eta + 1$ linear iteration of M at its least measurable. Let $R = M_\infty^{\mathcal{T}}$. Let α_0 be least such that there is $X \in \mathcal{S}_{\alpha_0}(\mathbb{R})$ and $w \in \text{WO}_\eta$ such that $\mathcal{S}_{\alpha_g}(\mathbb{R}) \models \varphi(X, w, z)$. Let $n < \omega$ be such that Q_n^M is not above- θ_n^N iterable in $\mathcal{S}_{\alpha_0}(\mathbb{R})$. Clearly $\eta < \text{OR}(i_{0_\infty}^{\mathcal{T}}(Q_n^M))$. Let θ be a strong cutpoint of M with $\text{OR}(Q_n^M) < \theta$. Let $W \triangleleft M|\theta^{+M}$ be an above- θ , $\psi(Q_n^M, \theta_n^N)$ -prewitness, where $\psi(Q', \theta')$ asserts “there is an above θ' iteration strategy for Q' ”.

We claim that for $k < \omega$, we have $k \notin y$ iff $R|i_{0_\infty}^{\mathcal{T}}(\theta)^{+R} \models$ “there is $U \triangleleft L[\mathbb{E}]$ which is an above- $i_{0_\infty}^{\mathcal{T}}(\theta)$, $\tau(k, \eta, i_{0_\infty}^{\mathcal{T}}(Q), i_{0_\infty}^{\mathcal{T}}(\theta_n^N))$ -prewitness, where $\tau(k', \eta', Q', \theta')$ asserts “ $\exists \alpha, \beta$ such that $\alpha \leq \beta$ and $\mathcal{S}_\alpha(\mathbb{R}) \models$ “ Q' is above- θ' iterable, and I am the least level of $L(\mathbb{R})$ with such an iteration strategy”, and $\mathcal{S}_\beta(\mathbb{R}) \models$ “letting $\pi : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathcal{S}_\alpha(\mathbb{R})$ be the resulting canonical surjection, we have

$$\forall^{\mathbb{R}} x, w, z [k \in z \wedge w \in \text{WO}_\eta \implies \neg \varphi(\pi(x), w, z)]”.$$

This is straightforward to verify, using (i) the fact that $R|i_{0_\infty}^{\mathcal{T}}(\theta)^{+R} = \text{Lp}_\Gamma(R|i_{0_\infty}^{\mathcal{T}}(\theta))$ and $\text{Lp}_\Gamma(R|i_{0_\infty}^{\mathcal{T}}(\theta))$ has segments which yield ϱ -witnesses for all the relevant $\Sigma_1^{L(\mathbb{R})}$ assertions, and (ii) letting α'_0 be the least α' such that $i_{0_\infty}^{\mathcal{T}}(Q)$ is above- $i_{0_\infty}^{\mathcal{T}}(\theta_n^N)$ iterable in $\mathcal{S}_{\alpha'}(\mathbb{R})$, and $\pi : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathcal{S}_{\alpha'_0}(\mathbb{R})$ the resulting canonical surjection, then if $k \in \omega \setminus y$, we have

$$\mathcal{S}_{\alpha_g}(\mathbb{R}) \models \forall^{\mathbb{R}} x, w, z [k \in z \wedge w \in \text{WO}_\eta \implies \neg \varphi(\pi(x), w, z)],$$

and so by case hypothesis, there is $\beta \in [\alpha'_0, \alpha_g)$ such that $\mathcal{S}_\beta(\mathbb{R})$ satisfies the same statement.

This shows that y is definable over $R|i_{0_\infty}^{\mathcal{T}}(\theta)^{+R}$, so $y \in R$, so $y \in M$, as desired.

Case 2. Otherwise; that is, there is $(\mathcal{T}, R, \lambda, g, y)$ as described in Case 1.

In this case, we will just show $\text{OD}_{\alpha_g 2} = \mathbb{R} \cap M$.

Subcase 1. There is an (α_g, \mathbb{R}) -cofinal real $y_0 \in M$.

Easily, $\Sigma_2^{\mathcal{S}_{\alpha_g}(\mathbb{R})}$ reduces recursively to $\exists^{\mathbb{R}} \Pi_1^{\mathcal{S}_{\alpha_g}(\mathbb{R})}(\{y_0\})$. We will show that $\exists^{\mathbb{R}} \Pi_1^{\mathcal{S}_{\alpha_g}(\mathbb{R})}$ can be appropriately defined over M , by doing a version of what we did in §2.1.

Fix a Π_1 formula $\psi(u, v, w)$. Fix $x \in \mathbb{R}^M$. Consider the game $\mathcal{G} = \mathcal{G}_{\exists^{\mathbb{R}} \psi(x, y_0)}$ in which player 2 attempts to build $(X, \langle g_n \rangle_{n < \omega}, w)$ such that $X \preceq_1 M$, $\{\theta_n^N\}_{n < \omega} \subseteq X$, g_n is $(P_n^N, \mathbb{B}_{\theta_n^N}^{Q_n^N})$ -generic, w is the corresponding generic real (independent of n), $g_n = g_{n+1} \cap \mathbb{B}_{\theta_n^N}^{Q_n^N}$, and there is no $n < \omega$ and $W \triangleleft Q_n^N$ such that $W[w]$ is an above- θ_n^N , $\neg\psi(x, y_0, w)$ -prewitness.

In more detail, this is as follows. Fix a recursive enumeration $\langle \psi_i \rangle_{i < \omega}$ of all formulas in the passive premouse language. Write $\mathbb{B}_i = \mathbb{B}_{\theta_i^M}^{Q_i^M}$ (the extender algebra of Q_i^M at θ_i^M). The game \mathcal{G} has length ω . In round $n < \omega$, player 1 first plays some $\vec{a}_n \in (M|\theta_n^N)^{<\omega}$, and then player 2 plays $\vec{b}_n, \vec{x}_n \in (M|\theta_n^N)^{<\omega}$ such that:

1. (Cofinality of X) $\vec{a}_n \cup \vec{b}_n \subseteq \vec{x}_n$, and if $n > 0$ then $\theta_{n-1}^N \in \vec{x}_n$.
2. (Σ_1 -elementarity of X): If $n > 0$ then for all $i, j, k < n$, letting $\vec{x}'_\ell = \vec{x}_\ell \cap M|\theta_i^N$, if

$$M|\theta_i^N \models \exists z \psi_j(\vec{x}'_0, \dots, \vec{x}'_{k-1}, z)$$

then there is some $x \in \vec{x}_n$ such that $M|\theta_i^N \models \psi_j(\vec{x}'_0, \dots, \vec{x}'_{k-1}, x)$.

3. $\vec{b}_n = \langle b_{ni} \rangle_{i \leq n}$ where $b_{ni} \in \mathbb{B}_i$ for each $i \leq n$.
4. If $n > 0$ then $b_{ni} \leq^{\mathbb{B}_i} b_{n-1, i}$ for each $i < n$.
5. For all $i \leq j \leq n$, (noting that $b_{ni} \in \mathbb{B}_j$) we have $b_{nj} \leq^{\mathbb{B}_j} b_{ni}$.
6. If $n > 0$ then for each $A \in \vec{x}_{n-1}$ and each $i < n$, if A is a maximal antichain of \mathbb{B}_i then there is $a \in A$ such that $b_{ni} \leq^{\mathbb{B}_i} a$.
7. For each $i \leq n$, there is no $W \triangleleft Q_i^M$ with $\theta_i^N < \text{OR}^W$ such that

$$Q_i^M \Vdash_{\mathbb{B}_i} \text{“} W \text{ is an above-}\theta_i^N, \neg\psi(x, y_0, \dot{w})\text{-prewitness”},$$

where \dot{w} denotes the \mathbb{B}_i -generic real.

Now \mathcal{G} is closed for player 2, so one of the players has a winning strategy. We claim that player 2 has a winning strategy iff $\mathcal{S}_{\alpha_g}(\mathbb{R}) \models \exists^{\mathbb{R}, w} \psi(x, y, w)$.

First suppose player 2 wins \mathcal{G} , and let σ be a winning strategy. Then we can clearly play against σ , ensuring that $X = \bigcup_{n < \omega} \vec{x}_n = M$. This yields $\langle g_n \rangle_{n < \omega}$ such that for each $n < \omega$, g_n is (Q_n^M, \mathbb{B}_n) -generic, and $g_n \subseteq g_{n+1}$. So letting w_n be the generic real given by g_n , in fact w_n is independent of n , so write $w = w_n$. Then $\mathcal{S}_{\alpha_g}(\mathbb{R}) \models \psi(x, y, w)$, since the cofinality of the Q_n^M 's in $\mathcal{S}_{\alpha_g}(\mathbb{R})$ ensure that all potential counterexamples to ψ have been ruled out (using condition 7 in the rules of \mathcal{G}).

Now suppose instead that player 1 wins \mathcal{G} . Then the game tree associated to \mathcal{G} is ranked in the usual manner. That is, define sets W_α of positions in \mathcal{G} , which will be winning positions for player 1, by recursion on α . We will have $W_\alpha \subseteq W_\beta$ for $\alpha < \beta$, and $\emptyset \in W_\infty$. Start with $W_0 =$ the set of finite partial plays

$$\sigma = \left\langle \vec{a}_i, \vec{b}_i, \vec{x}_i \right\rangle_{i < n}, \quad (3)$$

with player 1 next to move, in which player 1 has already won. Then given $\langle W_\alpha \rangle_{\alpha < \beta}$, let W_β be the set of all finite partial plays σ as in (3) such that there is $\vec{a}_n \in (M|\theta_n^N)^{<\omega}$ such that for all $\vec{b}_n, \vec{x}_n \in (M|\theta_n^N)^{<\omega}$, we have $\sigma \hat{\ } \langle \vec{a}_n, \vec{b}_n, \vec{x}_n \rangle \in \bigcup_{\alpha < \beta} W_\alpha$. Then $W_\alpha \subseteq W_\beta$ for all $\alpha < \beta$. Let α_∞ be least such that $W_{\alpha_\infty+1} = W_{\alpha_\infty}$. Then for any finite partial play σ as above, player 1 has a winning strategy from σ iff $\sigma \in W_{\alpha_\infty}$. In particular, $\emptyset \in W_{\alpha_\infty}$.

We now define a Π_2 -witness by analogy with the corresponding notion in §2.1.

Definition 2.25. Given a transitive swo'd $X \in \text{HC}$, an X -premouse N and $n < \omega$, we say that $(N, \theta_0, \dots, \theta_n)$ is n -partial-potential-ladder iff:

$$- \theta_0 < \theta_1 < \dots < \theta_n,$$

- θ_i is a cutpoint of N , for each $i \leq n$,
- $N \models \text{“}\theta_i \text{ is a limit cardinal which is not Woodin and not measurable”}$ for each $i \leq n$, and
- $\theta_n^+ < \text{OR}^N$ and θ_n^+ is the largest cardinal of N .

Suppose $(N, \vec{\theta})$ is an n -partial-potential-ladder. Then let $Q_i^{(N, \vec{\theta})} \trianglelefteq N$ denote the \mathbb{Q} -structure for $N \upharpoonright \theta_i$, for $i \leq n$. Given $x, y_0 \in \mathbb{R}^N$ and a Π_1 formula $\psi(u, v, w)$ of the $L(\mathbb{R})$ language, let $\mathcal{G}^{(N, \vec{\theta})} = \mathcal{G}_{\exists^{\mathbb{R}} \psi(x, y_0)}^{(N, \vec{\theta})}$ denote the set of partial plays $\sigma = \langle (\vec{a}_i, \vec{b}_i, \vec{x}_i) \rangle_{i < n}$ (of length exactly n) according to the rules for $\mathcal{G}_{\exists^{\mathbb{R}} \psi(x, y_0)}$ described earlier, relative to $\langle (\theta_i, Q_i) \rangle_{i < n}$ where $Q_i = Q_i^{(N, \vec{\theta})}$. \dashv

Definition 2.26. Let $X \in \text{HC}$ be transitive swo'd, N be an X -premouse, $\vec{\theta}, \varrho \in N^{<\omega}$, $x, y_0 \in \mathbb{R}^N$, and $\Delta \in N$. Let $\psi(u, v, w)$ be a Π_1 formula of the $L(\mathbb{R})$ language. We say that $(N, \vec{\theta}, \Delta)$ is a $(\forall^{\mathbb{R}} \neg \psi(x, y_0), \varrho)$ -prewitness iff, letting $n = \text{lh}(\varrho)$, then $(N, \vec{\theta})$ is an n -partial-potential-ladder (so $\text{lh}(\vec{\theta}) = n + 1$), and letting $(N_n, \vec{\theta}_n, \varrho_n, \Delta_n) = (N, \vec{\theta}, \varrho, \Delta)$, then $\varrho \in \mathcal{G}_{\exists^{\mathbb{R}} \psi(x, y_0)}^{(N, \vec{\theta})}$ and Δ is a non-empty tree (set of finite sequences closed under initial segment) whose elements σ have form

$$\sigma = (\sigma_{n+1}, \dots, \sigma_{n+k})$$

where $k < \omega$ and for $0 \leq i \leq k$, σ_{n+i} has form

$$\sigma_{n+i} = (N_{n+i}, \vec{\theta}_{n+i}, \varrho_{n+i}, \Delta_{n+i})$$

(so $\sigma_n = (N, \vec{\theta}, \varrho, \Delta)$, but σ_n is not actually an element of σ), and moreover, for each $\sigma \in \Delta$, with σ, k, σ_{n+i} as above, the following conditions hold:

1. If $\sigma \neq \emptyset$ then for every $i < k$, we have the following:

- (a) $N_{n+i+1} \triangleleft N_{n+i}$,
- (b) $(N_{n+i+1}, \vec{\theta}_{n+i+1})$ is an $(n + i + 1)$ -potential-partial-ladder,
- (c) $\rho_1^{N_{n+i+1}} = \rho_\omega^{N_{n+i+1}} = \theta_{n+i}^{+N_{n+i}}$,
- (d) $\vec{\theta}_{n+i+1} \upharpoonright (n + i + 1) = \vec{\theta}_{n+i}$,
- (e) $\varrho_{n+i+1} \in \mathcal{G}_{\exists^{\mathbb{R}} \psi(x, y_0)}^{(N_{n+i+1}, \vec{\theta}_{n+i+1})}$ (so $\text{lh}(\varrho_{n+i+1}) = n + i + 1$),
- (f) $\varrho_{n+i} = \varrho_{n+i+1} \upharpoonright (n + i)$,
- (g) $\Delta_{n+i+1} \in N_{n+i+1}$ is a tree,
- (h) $(\sigma_{n+i+2}, \dots, \sigma_{n+k}) \in \Delta_{n+i+1}$.

2. $\Delta_{n+k} = \{\tau \mid \sigma \hat{\ } \tau \in \Delta\}$.

3. Letting $\theta_{n+k} = \max(\vec{\theta}_{n+k})$, there is $\vec{a} \in (N_{n+k} \upharpoonright \theta_{n+k})^{<\omega}$ such that for all $\vec{b}, \vec{x} \in (N_{n+k} \upharpoonright \theta_{n+k})^{<\omega}$ such that

$$\varrho' = \varrho_{n+k} \hat{\ } \langle (\vec{a}, \vec{b}, \vec{x}) \rangle \in \mathcal{G}_{\exists^{\mathbb{R}} \psi(x, y_0)}^{(N_{n+k}, \vec{\theta}_{n+k})},$$

there is $\sigma' \in \Delta$ such that $\sigma' = \sigma \hat{\ } \langle (N', \vec{\theta}', \varrho', \Delta') \rangle$ for some $N', \vec{\theta}', \Delta'$.

A $(\forall^{\mathbb{R}} \neg \psi(x, y_0))$ -prewitness is a $(\forall^{\mathbb{R}} \neg \psi(x, y_0), \emptyset)$ -prewitness. \dashv

Lemma 2.27. *There is a $(\forall^{\mathbb{R}} \neg \psi(x, y_0))$ -prewitness $(N, \vec{\theta}, \Delta)$ with $N \triangleleft M \upharpoonright \omega_1^M$.*

Proof. This follows from the following more general fact: For each $n < \omega$ and finite partial play ϱ of $\mathcal{G}_{\exists^{\mathbb{R}} \psi(x, y_0)}$ with $\varrho \in W_{\alpha_\infty}$, there is a $(\forall^{\mathbb{R}} \neg \psi(x, y_0), \varrho)$ -prewitness $(N, \vec{\theta}, \Delta)$ such that $N \triangleleft M \upharpoonright \theta_n^{++M}$. (Applying this to $n = 0$ and $\varrho = \emptyset$, we get some $(N', \vec{\theta}', \Delta')$ with $N' \triangleleft M \upharpoonright \theta_0^{++M}$ (and $\text{lh}(\vec{\theta}') = 1$). But then by condensation, we get some such $(N, \vec{\theta}, \Delta)$ with $N' \triangleleft M \upharpoonright \omega_1^M$.) The proof of this is by induction on ranks of nodes in W_{α_∞} , much like in the proof of Lemma 2.19, so we omit further detail.¹³ \square

¹³Recall that θ_n^N is a strong cutpoint of N . It follows that θ_n^N is a non-measurable cutpoint in M . It seems it might be that θ_n^N fails to be a strong cutpoint of M , however, since coring might lead to partial measures $E \in \mathbb{E}^M$ with $\text{cr}(E) = \theta_n^N$. Hence the formulation of Definition 2.25 in this regard.

Lemma 2.28. *Suppose there is a $(\forall^{\mathbb{R}}\neg\psi(x, y_0))$ -prewitness $(N, \vec{\theta}, \Delta)$ with $N \triangleleft M|\omega_1^M$. Then $\mathcal{S}_{\alpha_g}(\mathbb{R}) \models \forall^{\mathbb{R}} w \neg\psi(x, y_0, w)$.*

Proof. Suppose otherwise and let $w \in \mathbb{R}$ be a counterexample. Iterate N to N' , making w generic for the image of the extender algebra at θ_0 where $\vec{\theta} = \langle \theta_0 \rangle$. Let \mathcal{T}_0 be the iteration tree doing this. Let g_0 be the $(Q'_0, \mathbb{B}_{\theta'_0}^{Q'_0})$ -generic determined by w , where $Q'_0 \triangleleft N'$ is the Q-structure for $\theta'_0 = i_{0\infty}^{\mathcal{T}_0}(\theta)$. Let $a_0 \in (N'|\theta'_0)^{<\omega}$ witness the choice of $(N, \vec{\theta}, \Delta)$ (which is preserved by $i_{0\infty}^{\mathcal{T}_0}$). Choose \vec{b}_0, \vec{x}_0 such that $(\vec{a}_0, \vec{b}_0, \vec{x}_0) \in \mathcal{G}_{\exists^{\mathbb{R}}\psi(x, y_0)}^{(N', \theta'_0)}$ with \vec{b}_0 consistent with g_0 . This is possible since there is no conflict with condition 7 of the rules of \mathcal{G}_x , since $\mathcal{S}_{\alpha_g}(\mathbb{R}) \models \psi(x, y_0, w)$, and $Q'_0 = i_{0\infty}^{\mathcal{T}_0}(Q_0)$ is above- θ'_0 iterable in $\mathcal{S}_{\alpha_g}(\mathbb{R})$ (so any W as in condition 7 would also have to be above- θ'_0 iterable in $\mathcal{S}_{\alpha_g}(\mathbb{R})$, but this would imply that $\mathcal{S}_{\alpha_g}(\mathbb{R}) \models \neg\psi(x, y_0, w)$). Then we can find $\sigma \in \Delta' = i_{0\infty}^{\mathcal{T}_0}(\Delta)$ with $\text{lh}(\sigma) = 1$, and σ consistent with $(\vec{a}_0, \vec{b}_0, \vec{x}_0)$. Let $\sigma = (N_1, \vec{\theta}_1, \varrho_1, \Delta_1)$. Now iterate N_1 to make w generic for the image of the extender algebra of $Q_1 \triangleleft N_1$ at θ_1 (where Q_1 is the Q-structure for $N_1|\theta_1$, and where $\vec{\theta}_1 = (\theta', \theta_1)$). Since we already made w generic over N'_0 , and θ'_0 is a cutpoint of N_1 , this iteration is above θ'_0 . We can carry on in this manner throughout all finite stages n . But this produces a correct tree which drops in model infinitely often along its unique branch, a contradiction. \square

Subcase 2. There is no (α_g, \mathbb{R}) -cofinal real $y \in M$.

Fix $(\mathcal{T}, R, \lambda, g, y)$ witnessing Case 2 hypothesis; this tuple is as described in Case 1. Note we may assume that λ is a strong cutpoint of R . The argument of Subcase 1 relativizes above $(R|\lambda, g)$, so letting $x \in \mathbb{R}$ be the natural real coding $(R|\lambda, g)$, we have $\text{OD}_{\alpha_g 2}(x) \subseteq R[g]$. Therefore $\text{OD}_{\alpha_g 2} \subseteq R[g]$. But this is independent of g , and so $\text{OD}_{\alpha_g 2} \subseteq R$, so $\text{OD}_{\alpha_g 2} \subseteq M$, as desired. \square

2.5 The mouse set theorem for $\text{OD}_{\alpha, n+3}$

Recall that we have already defined $\Pi_1^{\alpha_g}$ -iterability.

Definition 2.29. For $n \geq 1$ and $k \leq \omega$, we define $\Pi_{n+1}^{\alpha_g}(k, \omega_1)$ -iterability for X -premise $P \in \text{HC}$, where $X \in \text{HC}$ is transitive swo'd. The definition is by recursion on n , simultaneously for all k and X . Say that a k -sound X -premise $P \in \text{HC}$ is $\Pi_{n+1}^{\alpha_g}(k, \omega_1)$ -iterable iff for every putative k -maximal tree \mathcal{T} on P of length $\eta < \omega_1$, for every ordinal $\lambda \in \text{Lim} \cup \{0\}$ with $\lambda \leq \eta$, and every sequence $\langle Q_\xi \rangle_{\xi \in \text{Lim} \cap (0, \lambda]}$ such that for every limit ordinal $\xi \leq \lambda$, we have:

- Q_ξ is an above- $\delta(\mathcal{T} \upharpoonright \xi)$, $\Pi_n^{\alpha_g}(\omega, \omega_1)$ -iterable $\delta(\mathcal{T} \upharpoonright \xi)$ -sound Q-structure for $M(\mathcal{T} \upharpoonright \xi)$, and
- if $\xi < \lambda$ then $Q_\xi \trianglelefteq M_\xi^{\mathcal{T}}$,

then:

- if $\lambda < \text{lh}(\mathcal{T})$ and either $\lambda = 0$ or $Q_\lambda \trianglelefteq M_\lambda^{\mathcal{T}}$ then $\mathcal{T} \upharpoonright (\min(\eta, \lambda + \omega))$ has wellfounded models, and
- there is a $\mathcal{T} \upharpoonright \lambda$ -cofinal branch b such that $Q_\lambda \trianglelefteq M_b^{\mathcal{T} \upharpoonright \lambda}$. +

Note that $\Pi_{n+1}^{\alpha_g}$ -iterability is $(\Pi_{n+1}^{\mathbb{R}})^{\mathcal{S}_{\alpha_g}(\mathbb{R})}$.

Definition 2.30. Let α_g be ω -standard, $(x_{\text{cof}}, \varphi_{\text{cof}})$ be α_g -ascending, $\Gamma = \Sigma_1^{\mathcal{S}_{\alpha_g}(\mathbb{R})}$. Let $X \in \text{HC}$ be transitive swo'd with $x_{\text{cof}} \in X$. Let N be an X -premise. For $n < \omega$, we say that N is n - Γ -ladder-large iff there is $N' \trianglelefteq N$ and $\delta_0, \dots, \delta_{n-1} \in (\text{rank}(X), \text{OR}^{N'})$ such that:

- $\delta_0 < \dots < \delta_{n-1}$,
- for each $i < n$, $N' \models \text{“}\delta_i \text{ is Woodin”}$, and
- N' is a putative Γ -ladder as an $N|\delta$ -premise, where $\delta = \delta_{n-1}$ if $n > 0$, and $\delta = 0$ otherwise.

We say that N is n - Γ -ladder-small iff it is not n - Γ -ladder-large.

For $y \in \mathbb{R}$, let $M_{n, \text{id}}^\Gamma(x_{\text{cof}}, y)$ denote the minimal sound 1- Γ -large (x_{cof}, y) -mouse. (So $M_{0, \text{id}}^\Gamma(x_{\text{cof}}, y) = M_{\text{id}}^\Gamma(x_{\text{cof}}, y)$.) +

Proof of Theorem 1.1 for $n > 2$. Let $m < \omega$ and $N = M_{m+1, \text{id}}^\Gamma(x_{\text{cof}})$. Let M be the output of the Q-local $L[\mathbb{E}]$ -construction of N (as in [6]).¹⁴ We will show that $\text{OD}_{\alpha_g, m+3} = \text{OD}_{\alpha_g, m+3}^{\mathbb{R}} = \mathbb{R} \cap M$.

Let Ψ_M be the $(1, \omega_1 + 1)$ -strategy for M given by lifting/resurrection to Σ_N . Given \mathcal{T} on M via Ψ_M , let $\mathcal{U} = \mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{T}}$ be the corresponding tree on N , and for $\alpha < \text{lh}(\mathcal{T})$, let $\xi_\alpha \leq \text{OR}^{M_\alpha^{\mathcal{U}}}$ and $\pi_\alpha : M_\alpha^{\mathcal{T}} \rightarrow \mathfrak{C}_d(N_{\xi_\alpha}^{M_\alpha^{\mathcal{U}}})$ be the standard lifting map, where $d = \text{deg}_\alpha^{\mathcal{T}}$.

Claim 4. *Let \mathcal{T} on M be a tree via Ψ_M of countable successor length $\eta + 1$, and let $R \trianglelefteq M_\eta^{\mathcal{T}}$. Then the following are equivalent:*

- (i) $(0, \eta]^\mathcal{T} \cap \mathcal{D}^\mathcal{T} = \emptyset$ and $R = M_\eta^{\mathcal{T}}$,
- (ii) $(0, \eta]^\mathcal{T} \cap \mathcal{D}_{\text{deg}}^\mathcal{T} = \emptyset$ and $R = M_\eta^{\mathcal{T}}$,
- (iii) *there are $\delta_0 < \dots < \delta_m < \text{OR}^R$ such that:*
 - $R \models \text{“}\delta_i \text{ is Woodin”}$ for all $i \leq m$, and
 - for all $\alpha < \alpha_g$, there is $\theta \in (\delta_m, \text{OR}^R)$ such that θ is a R -cardinal and there is $Q \triangleleft R$ such that $\theta < \text{OR}^Q$ and $Q \models \text{“}\theta \text{ is Woodin”}$ and there is no above- θ iteration strategy for Q in $\mathcal{S}_\alpha(\mathbb{R})$.

Proof. Since trees \mathcal{U} via Σ_N have the corresponding properties (since they are appropriately first-order relative to x_{cof}), this follows in a straightforward manner from the existence of the lifting maps π_α and properties of the Q-local $L[\mathbb{E}]$ -construction. \square

Claim 5. $\mathbb{R} \cap M \subseteq \text{OD}_{\alpha_g, m+3}^{\mathbb{R}}$.

Proof. It is enough to see that for each $P \triangleleft M$ with $\rho_\omega^P = \omega$, letting $\xi = \text{OR}^P$, P is the unique $\Pi_{n+2}^{\alpha_g}$ -iterable ω -premouse such that $\text{OR}^{P'} = \xi$. But this follows from Claim 4 via a quite routine comparison argument. (Compare P with another candidate P' . Since $P \triangleleft M | \omega_1^M$, the tree \mathcal{T} on P drops, for no $\eta < \text{lh}(\mathcal{T})$ is there $R \trianglelefteq M_\eta^{\mathcal{T}}$ and $\delta_0 < \dots < \delta_m < \text{OR}^R$ as in clause (iii) of Claim 4. Because of this, the $\Pi_{n+2}^{\alpha_g}$ -iterability of P' is enough to complete the comparison.) \square

Claim 6. $\text{OD}_{\alpha_g, m+3} \subseteq M$.

Proof. Suppose first that $m = 0$, so $N = M_{1, \text{id}}^\Gamma(x_{\text{cof}})$. Let $y \in \text{OD}_{\alpha_g, 3}$. Let $\xi < \omega_1$ and φ be a Σ_3 formula such that for all $w \in \text{WO}_\xi$ and all $z \in \mathbb{R}$, we have

$$z = y \iff \mathcal{S}_{\alpha_g}(\mathbb{R}) \models \varphi(z, w).$$

Let φ' be the natural $\Sigma_3^{\mathbb{R}}$ formula such that for all $x \in \mathbb{R}$, if $(x, \varphi_{\text{cof}})$ is α_g -ascending then

$$\mathcal{S}_{\alpha_g} \models \forall^{\mathbb{R}} z, w [\varphi(z, w) \iff \varphi'(z, w, x)].$$

Let ψ' be $\Pi_2^{\mathbb{R}}$, such that

$$\varphi'(z, w, x) \iff \exists^{\mathbb{R}} t \psi'(t, z, w, x). \quad (4)$$

Now δ_0^N is the least Woodin cardinal of M (so write $\delta_0^M = \delta_0^N$), $M | \delta_0^M$ is definable over $N | \delta_0^N$, $N | \delta_0^N$ is extender algebra generic over M , and M is the P-construction of N above $M | \delta_0^M$. Since $\text{Lp}_\Gamma(N | \delta_0^N) \triangleleft \text{Lp}_\Gamma(N | \delta_0^{+N})$ and $(\delta_0^M)^+M = (\delta_0^N)^+N$, $\text{Lp}_\Gamma(M | \delta_0^M)$ is just the P-construction of $\text{Lp}_\Gamma(N | \delta_0^N)$ over $M | \delta_0^M$, and $\text{Lp}_\Gamma(M | \delta_0^M) \triangleleft M | (\delta_0^M)^+M$. Let $\zeta = \text{OR}(\text{Lp}_\Gamma(M | \delta_0^M)) = \text{OR}(\text{Lp}_\Gamma(N | \delta_0^N))$. Note $\text{cof}^N(\zeta) = \omega$ (since $x_{\text{cof}} \in N$). Let $\mu = \text{cof}^M(\zeta)$. Then μ is not measurable in M , since every measurable cardinal of M is also measurable in N . So letting \mathcal{T} be any countable length tree on M via Ψ_M of length $\eta + 1$, if $(0, \eta]^\mathcal{T} \cap \mathcal{D}^\mathcal{T} = \emptyset$ (so $(0, \eta]^\mathcal{T} \cap \mathcal{D}_{\text{deg}}^\mathcal{T} = \emptyset$), and $\mathcal{U} = \mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{T}}$, then $i_{0\eta}^{\mathcal{T}}$ and $i_{0\eta}^{\mathcal{U}}$ are both continuous at ζ , and since $\pi_\eta \circ i_{0\eta}^{\mathcal{T}} = i_{0\eta}^{\mathcal{U}} \upharpoonright M$, it easily follows that

$$i_{0\eta}^{\mathcal{T}}(\text{Lp}_\Gamma(M | \delta_0^M)) = \text{Lp}_\Gamma(M_\eta^{\mathcal{T}} | i_{0\eta}^{\mathcal{T}}(\delta_0^M)).$$

Let \mathcal{T} be the length $(\xi + 1)$ linear iteration on M at its least measurable, and $M' = M_\xi^{\mathcal{T}}$. Let $\delta' = i_{0\xi}^{\mathcal{T}}(\delta)$. So δ' is the least Woodin of $M_\xi^{\mathcal{T}}$ and $i_{0\xi}^{\mathcal{T}}(\text{Lp}_\Gamma(M | \delta_0^M)) = \text{Lp}_\Gamma(M_\xi^{\mathcal{T}} | \delta')$. Let $\eta' = \text{OR}(\text{Lp}_\Gamma(M_\xi^{\mathcal{T}} | \delta'))$.

Let $n < \omega$. It is enough to see that for each $\ell < \omega$, we have:

¹⁴We don't use the Q-local local K^c -construction here, just because it's not necessary. It would also work fine though.

Subclaim 2.31. $\ell \in y$ iff $M' | (\delta')^{+M'} \models$ “there is $p \in \mathbb{B}_{\delta', > \xi}$ which forces that, letting \dot{g} be the standard name for the generic filter and $(\dot{t}, \dot{z}, \dot{w}, \dot{x})$ the standard name for the generic real, we have:

1. $\dot{w} \in \text{WO}_\xi$,
2. For every $k < \omega$ there is an above- δ' , $\varphi_{\text{cof}}(k, \dot{x})$ -prewitness J such that $J \triangleleft (M' | \eta')[\dot{g}]$.
3. For every $k < \omega$ there is an above- δ' , $\varphi_{\text{cof}}^*(k, \dot{x})$ -prewitness J such that $J \triangleleft (M' | \eta')[\dot{g}]$, where $\varphi_{\text{cof}}^*(u, v)$ asserts “there is an ordinal γ such that $\mathcal{S}_\gamma(\mathbb{R}) \models \varphi_{\text{cof}}(a, b) \wedge \neg \varphi_{\text{cof}}(u + 1, v)$ ”.
4. There is no above- δ' , $\psi(\dot{x})$ -prewitness J such that $J \triangleleft (M' | \eta')[\dot{g}]$, where $\psi(u)$ asserts “there is an ordinal γ such that $\mathcal{S}_\gamma(\mathbb{R}) \models \forall^\omega k \varphi_{\text{cof}}(k, u)$ ”.
5. There is an above- δ' , $\psi'(\dot{t}, \dot{z}, \dot{w}, \dot{x})$ -prewitness J , as defined in 2.17, but relative to the putatively α_g -cofinal pair $(\dot{x}, \varphi_{\text{cof}})$, such that $J \triangleleft L[\mathbb{E}, \dot{g}]$.¹⁵
6. $\ell \in \dot{z}$.”

Proof. Suppose first that $M' | (\delta')^{+M'}$ satisfies the indicated statement. Let g be $(M', \mathbb{B}_{\delta', > \xi})$ -generic with $p \in g$. Let (t, z, w, x) be the generic real. It is enough to see that $z = y$, and for this, it is enough to see that $w \in \text{WO}_\xi$, $(x, \varphi_{\text{cof}})$ is α_g -ascending and $\mathcal{S}_{\alpha_g}(\mathbb{R}) \models \psi'(t, z, w, x)$. But considering what p forces, certainly $w \in \text{WO}_\xi$, and because $M' | \eta' = \text{Lp}_\Gamma(M' | \delta')$, also $(x, \varphi_{\text{cof}})$ is α_g -ascending. Finally, we have $J \triangleleft M' | (\delta')^{+M'}[g]$ which is an above- δ' , $\psi'(t, z, w, x)$ -prewitness (in the sense of 2.17) relative to $(x, \varphi_{\text{cof}})$. Since $(x, \varphi_{\text{cof}})$ is indeed α_g -ascending, and therefore Lemma 2.19 holds with respect to $(x, \varphi_{\text{cof}})$ (replacing $(x_{\text{cof}}, \varphi_{\text{cof}})$), it is enough to see that

$$M'[g] = M_{\text{id}}^\Gamma((M' | \delta')[g]),$$

with the M_{id}^Γ -operator also defined relative to $(x, \varphi_{\text{cof}})$. But this follows easily enough from the facts that:

- $\text{Lp}_\Gamma(M' | \delta')[g] = \text{Lp}_\Gamma((M' | \delta')[g])$,
- α_g is the least ordinal α such that every proper segment of $\text{Lp}_\Gamma((M' | \delta')[g])$ is above- δ' iterable in $\mathcal{S}_\alpha(\mathbb{R})$, and
- $\eta' = \text{OR}(\text{Lp}_\Gamma((M' | \delta')[g]))$ is the least ordinal η'' such that for each $k < \omega$, there is an above- δ' , $\varphi_{\text{cof}}(k, x)$ -prewitness J with $(J \triangleleft M' | \eta'')[g]$,
- $M'[g]$ is sound as an $(M' | \delta', g)$ -premouse.

Now suppose that $\ell \in y$. Then because we can iterate M' , above $\xi + 1$, to make $(t, y, w, x_{\text{cof}})$ generic for the image of $\mathbb{B}_{\delta', > \xi}$, and $(\delta')^{+M'} < \text{OR}^{M'}$, and by the calculations used in the previous direction, it is easy to see that $M' | (\delta')^{+M'}$ satisfies the desired statement, completing the proof of the subclaim, and hence that of Claim 6 in case $m = 0$. \square

Now suppose $m = 1$, so $N = M_{2, \text{id}}^\Gamma(x_{\text{cof}})$. We proceed as before, but “3” is replaced by “4”, and in particular, φ is Σ_4 , φ' is $\Sigma_4^{\mathbb{R}}$ and ψ' is $\Pi_3^{\mathbb{R}}$. Let τ' be $\Sigma_2^{\mathbb{R}}$, such that

$$\psi'(t, z, w, x) \iff \forall^{\mathbb{R}} s \tau'(s, t, z, w, x). \quad (5)$$

Again $\delta_0^M = \delta_0^N$ is the least Woodin of M , etc, and M is the P-construction of N above $M | \delta_0^M$ (not just above δ_1^N). We have ξ as before, and iterate M to M' at the least measurable of M as before, with tree \mathcal{T} . Let $\delta'_i = i_{0\xi}^{\mathbb{R}}(\delta_i^M)$, for $i = 0, 1$. Let $\eta'_i = \text{OR}(\text{Lp}_\Gamma(M_\xi^{\mathbb{R}} | \delta'_i))$.

Subclaim 2.32. $\ell \in y$ iff $M' | (\delta'_1)^{+M'} \models$ “there is $p \in \mathbb{B}_{\delta'_0, > \xi}$ which forces that, letting \dot{g}_0 be the standard name for the generic filter and $(\dot{t}, \dot{z}, \dot{w}, \dot{x})$ the standard name for the generic real, we have:

1. $\dot{w} \in \text{WO}_\xi$,

¹⁵Here ψ' was the $\Pi_2^{\mathbb{R}}$ formula from line (4). Recall that we are presently working in $M' | (\delta')^{+M'}$, so $L[\mathbb{E}]$ denotes this model. And the phrase “relative to the putatively α_g -cofinal pair” means that we use $(\dot{x}, \varphi_{\text{cof}})$ in exactly the manner in which we earlier used $(x_{\text{cof}}, \varphi_{\text{cof}})$ in Definition 2.17.

2. For every $k < \omega$ there is an above- δ'_0 , $\varphi_{\text{cof}}(k, \dot{x})$ -prewitness J such that $J \triangleleft (M'|\eta'_0)[\dot{g}_0]$.
3. For every $k < \omega$ there is an above- δ'_0 , $\varphi_{\text{cof}}^*(k, \dot{x})$ -prewitness J such that $J \triangleleft (M'|\eta'_0)[\dot{g}_0]$, where $\varphi_{\text{cof}}^*(u, v)$ asserts “there is an ordinal γ such that $\mathcal{S}_\gamma(\mathbb{R}) \models \varphi_{\text{cof}}(a, b) \wedge \neg \varphi_{\text{cof}}(u+1, v)$ ”.
4. There is no above- δ'_0 , $\psi(\dot{x})$ -prewitness J such that $J \triangleleft (M'|\eta'_0)[\dot{g}_0]$, where $\psi(u)$ asserts “there is an ordinal γ such that $\mathcal{S}_\gamma(\mathbb{R}) \models \forall^\omega k \varphi_{\text{cof}}(k, u)$ ”.

and $\mathbb{B}_{\delta'_1, > \delta'_0}$ forces that, letting \dot{g}_1 be the standard name for the generic filter and \dot{s} that for the generic real, we have:

- (a) There is no above- δ'_1 , $\neg \tau'(\dot{s}, \dot{t}, \dot{z}, \dot{w}, \dot{x})$ -prewitness J , as defined in 2.17, but relative to $(\dot{x}, \varphi_{\text{cof}})$, such that $J \triangleleft L[\mathbb{E}, \dot{g}_0, \dot{g}_1]$.¹⁶
- (b) $\ell \in \dot{z}$.

The subclaim is proved much like Subclaim 2.31, and completes the proof of Claim 6 in case $m = 1$. (Note that aside from the extra Woodin, a key difference between the cases of $m = 0$ and $m = 1$ arises between clause 5 of Subclaim 2.31 and clause (a) of Subclaim 2.32.)

The cases $m > 1$ are likewise, alternating in details with parity. This completes the proof of Claim 6. \square

This completes the proof of Theorem 1.1 for $n > 2$. \square

3 Admissible gaps

In this section, we will adapt arguments of previous sections to admissible gaps $[\alpha_g, \beta_g]$. That is, $\mathcal{S}_{\alpha_g}(\mathbb{R})$ is admissible. So $[\alpha_g, \beta_g]$ is either a weak or strong gap. If it is weak, let $\widehat{\beta}_g = \beta_g$, and if strong, let $\widehat{\beta}_g = \beta_g + \omega$. We write $\mathcal{S} = \mathcal{S}_{\widehat{\beta}_g}(\mathbb{R})$.

We make use of the P_g -operator associated to \mathcal{S} , defined in [7]. Let $a \in \mathbb{R}$ be such that the P_g -operator $X \mapsto P_g(X)$ is defined for transitive swo'd $X \in \text{HC}$ with $a \in X$, with $P = P_g(X)$ a sound ω -small X -mouse projecting to X with $\text{Lp}_{\Gamma_g}(X) = P|\Theta_{X^{<\omega}}^P$ ¹⁷ and P has ω -many Woodin cardinals $> \text{rank}(X)$ in ordertype (so $P = L_\xi[P|\lambda^P]$ where λ^P is the sup of those Woodins and $\xi \in \text{OR}$). Let $x_c \in \mathbb{R}$ be such that $P_g(a) \leq_T x_c$. Let \mathcal{C} be the transitive swo'd HC-cone above x_c ; that is, the set of all transitive swo'd $X \in \text{HC}$ with $x_c \in X$. Also as in [7], let β^* be the end of the gap in the \mathcal{M}^{α_g} -hierarchy.

Let's suppose for simplicity that $\rho_1^{P_g(x_c)} = \omega < \lambda < \text{OR}^{P_g(x_c)}$ and $\lambda^{P_g(x_c)} \notin p_1^{P_g(x_c)}$, and letting β^* be as in [7], $\text{m}\Sigma_1^{\mathcal{M}^{\beta^*}}$ is μ -reflecting and β^* is closed enough that $\beta^* = \widehat{\beta}_g$. So for all $X \in \mathcal{C}$, we have $\text{lh}(p_1^{P_g(X)}) = \text{lh}(p_1^{\mathcal{S}})$. And by [7], we can fix a Σ_1 formula ψ_{Sat} such that for all $X \in \mathcal{C}$, all $\text{r}\Sigma_1$ formulas φ and all $\vec{x} \in X^{<\omega}$, we have

$$P_g(X) \models \varphi(\vec{x}, p_1^{P_g(X)}) \iff \mathcal{S} \models \psi_{\text{Sat}}(\varphi, \vec{x}, X, p_1^{\mathcal{S}}). \quad (6)$$

Let t_a be the theory $\text{Th}_{\text{r}\Sigma_1}^{P_g(a)}(\{a, p_1^{P_g(a)}\})$.

Lemma 3.1. *There is an $\text{r}\Sigma_1$ formula φ_0 such that for all $X \in \mathcal{C}$, letting $P = P_g(X)$, we have:*

1. P is the least $P' \trianglelefteq P$ with $p_1^P \in P'$ and $P' \models \forall^\omega n \varphi_0(n, t_a, p_1^{P_g(X)})$, and
2. letting α_n^P be the least α such that $\max(p_1^P) < \alpha$ and $P|\alpha \models \varphi_0(n, t_a, p_1^P)$, then $\alpha_n^P < \alpha_{n+1}^P$ for all $n < \omega$.¹⁸

Proof. Part 1: Recall that $P_g(a) \leq_T x_c$, so $P_g(a), t_a \in \mathcal{J}(X)$. Let N be the output of the Q-local $L[\mathbb{E}, a]$ -construction of $P_g(X)$ (see [6]). Then N is a correct non-dropping iterate of $P_g(a)$,

¹⁶Recall τ' is the $\Sigma_2^{\mathbb{R}}$ formula in line (5), so $\neg \tau'$ is $\Pi_2^{\mathbb{R}}$.

¹⁷Here $\Theta_{X^{<\omega}}^P$ is the supremum of all ordinals which are the surjective image of $X^{<\omega}$ in P . Actually we could restrict our attention to self-wellordered X , in which case $\Theta_{X^{<\omega}}^P = \text{rank}(X)^+P$.

¹⁸Here if $P = \mathcal{J}(P|\beta)$ for some β , then we allow α_n^P to be a successor ordinal, with $P|\alpha_n^P$ being defined via Jensen's \mathcal{S} -hierarchy.

$\delta_0^N = \delta_0^{P_g(X)}$, N is the P-construction of P over $N|\delta_0^N$, N is δ_0^N -sound, and $p_1^N = p_1^P$. So for all $r\Sigma_1$ formulas φ , we have

$$P_g(a) \models \varphi(a, p_1^{P_g(a)}) \iff N \models \varphi(a, p_1^P).$$

But these Σ_1 truths are verified cofinally in $\text{OR}^N = \text{OR}^P$, so by taking $\varphi_0(n, t, p_1^P)$ to assert that N satisfies the n th statement in $t[p_1^{P_g(a)}/p_1^P]$ (this denotes the theory resulting from t by replacing $p_1^{P_g(a)}$ with p_1^P), φ_0 is as desired.

Part 2: This is obtained via a simple modification of the formula just constructed. \square

We fix a formula φ_0 witnessing the lemma.

Definition 3.2. Let $X \in \mathcal{C}$. An X -premouse N is called *relevant* if there is $\delta < \text{OR}^N$ such that $N \models \text{“}\delta \text{ is the least Woodin } > \text{rank}(X)\text{”}$ (and write $\delta^N = \delta$), $N = P_g(N|\delta)$, and $P_g(N|\beta) \triangleleft N$ for each $\beta < \delta$.

Let N be relevant. Then α_n^N denotes the least α such that $\max(p_1^N) < \alpha < \text{OR}^N$ and $N|\alpha \models \varphi_0(n, t, p_1^N)$. Define

$$\gamma_n^N = \sup(\delta^N \cap \text{Hull}_1^{N|\alpha_n^N}(\{p_1^N\})),$$

and

$$T_n^N = \text{Th}_1^{N|\alpha_n^N}(\gamma_n^N \cup \{p_1^N\}).$$

Note γ_n^N is a limit cardinal of N and $\gamma_n^N < \delta^N$. \dashv

Now also by [7], we can fix a Σ_1 formula ψ_{Th} such that for all $X \in \mathcal{C}$, all $t \in \text{Lp}_{\Gamma_g}(X)$, and all $n < \omega$, letting $P = P_g(X)$, we have:

$$t = \text{Th}_{\Sigma_1}^{P|\alpha_n^P}(\{p_1^P\} \cup X) \iff \mathcal{S} \models \psi_{\text{Th}}(x_c, n, t, X, p_1^{\mathcal{S}}). \quad (7)$$

Definition 3.3. Let $X \in \mathcal{C}$ and N be an X -premouse. We say that N is a P_g -ladder iff N is relevant and for each $n < \omega$, there is a relevant $P \triangleleft N$ such that $\gamma_n^N < \text{OR}^P$ and $T_n^P = T_n^N$ (after identifying p_1^P with p_1^N ; it follows that $\gamma_n^P = \gamma_n^N$). Write $P_n^N = P$ for the least such P . We write $M_{\text{id}}^{P_g}(X)$ for the least X -mouse which is a P_g -ladder. \dashv

For each $X \in \mathcal{C}$, $M_{\text{id}}^{P_g}(X)$ exists (assuming $\text{AD}^{L(\mathbb{R})}$): for example, the least relevant X -mouse N such that $p_1^N = \delta^N$ is a P_g -ladder.

Lemma 3.4. Let $M = M_{\text{id}}^{P_g}(X)$. Then $\delta^M = \sup_{n < \omega} \gamma_n^M$.

Proof. Suppose not and let $\bar{\delta} = \sup_{n < \omega} \gamma_n^M$ and $\bar{M} = \text{Hull}_1^M(\bar{\delta} \cup \{p_1^M\} \cup X)$, and $\pi : \bar{M} \rightarrow M$ the uncollapse. Then $\text{cr}(\pi) = \bar{\delta}$ and $\pi(\bar{\delta}) = \delta$, and by calculations in [7], \bar{M} is also a P_g -ladder, and since $\bar{\delta} < \delta^M$ and M is P_g -closed, we have $\bar{M} \triangleleft M$, contradicting the minimality of M . \square

Definition 3.5. Let $X \in \mathcal{C}$ and N be an X -premouse.

We say N is P_g -correct iff for each $\xi < \text{OR}^N$ with $\text{rank}(X) \leq \xi$, either $P_g(N|\xi) \trianglelefteq N$ or $N \triangleleft \text{Lp}_{\Gamma_g}(N|\xi)$ and N is ξ -sound and projects $\leq \xi$. And N is called P_g -closed iff for all $\xi < \text{OR}^N$ with $\text{rank}(X) \leq \xi$, we have $P_g(N|\xi) \triangleleft N$.

Suppose N is P_g -correct and n -sound. Let \mathcal{T} be an n -maximal tree on N . We say that \mathcal{T} is P_g -transcendent iff for each $\alpha + 1 < \text{lh}(\mathcal{T})$, if $M_\beta^{\mathcal{T}}$ is P_g -correct for all $\beta \leq \alpha$ then $M_\alpha^{\mathcal{T}} \parallel \text{lh}(E_\alpha^{\mathcal{T}})$ is P_g -closed.

Let \mathcal{T} be an n -maximal tree on an n -sound X -premouse Q . We say that \mathcal{T} is Γ_g -guided iff for every limit $\eta < \text{lh}(\mathcal{T})$, there is $Q \trianglelefteq M_\eta^{\mathcal{T}}$ which is a Q -structure for $M(\mathcal{T} \upharpoonright \eta)$, and $Q \triangleleft \text{Lp}_{\Gamma_g}(M(\mathcal{T} \upharpoonright \eta))$. If \mathcal{T} has limit length, we say that \mathcal{T} is Γ_g -short iff \mathcal{T} is Γ_g -guided and there is $Q \triangleleft \text{Lp}_{\Gamma_g}(M(\mathcal{T}))$ which is a Q -structure for $M(\mathcal{T})$, and we say that \mathcal{T} is Γ_g -maximal otherwise (that is, if $\text{Lp}_{\Gamma_g}(M(\mathcal{T}))$ is a premouse and satisfies “ $\delta(\mathcal{T})$ is Woodin”). \dashv

Definition 3.6. Let $X \in \mathcal{C}$ and N be an n -sound X -premouse.

Say that an N is $\Pi_1^S(\{p_1^S, x_c\})$ - n -iterable (abbreviated Π_1 - n -iterable) iff N is P_g -correct and for every putative n -maximal iteration tree \mathcal{T} on N which is Γ_g -guided and P_g -transcendent, we have:

1. \mathcal{T} has wellfounded P_g -correct models,

2. if \mathcal{T} has limit length and is Γ_g -short and $Q \triangleleft \text{Lp}_{\Gamma_g}(M(\mathcal{T}))$ is the Q -structure for $M(\mathcal{T})$, then there is a \mathcal{T} -cofinal branch b with $Q \trianglelefteq M_b^{\mathcal{T}}$, and
3. if \mathcal{T} has limit length and is Γ_g -maximal and $M(\mathcal{T}) \models$ “there is no Woodin cardinal $> \text{rank}(X)$ ” then for every $n < \omega$ there is a \mathcal{T} -cofinal branch b and some $Q \trianglelefteq M_b^{\mathcal{T}}$ such that:
 - $\text{Lp}_{\Gamma_g}(M(\mathcal{T})) = Q|\delta(\mathcal{T})^{+Q}$,
 - Q has ω Woodins $> \delta(\mathcal{T})$,
 - $\rho_1^Q \leq \delta(\mathcal{T}) < \lambda^Q < \text{OR}^Q$ and $p_1^Q \setminus (\lambda^Q + 1) = \emptyset$,
 - defining α_k^Q , γ_k^Q and T_k^Q as in 3.2 (we do not assume that $Q = P_g(M(\mathcal{T}))$, but can still define these objects), we have $\sup_{k < \omega} \alpha_k^Q = \text{OR}^Q$ and $\sup_{k < \omega} \gamma_k^Q = \delta(\mathcal{T})$, and moreover, $T_n^Q = T_n^{P_g(M(\mathcal{T}))}$ (for the particular n under consideration). \dashv

Lemma 3.7. *Let $X \in \mathcal{C}$ and $n \leq \omega$. The set of $\Pi_1^S(\{p_1^S, x_c\})$ - n -iterable X -premise is $\Pi_1^S(\{p_1^S, x_c\})$, uniformly in X, n .*

Proof. First note that HC and wellfoundedness for elements of HC are $\Delta_1^S(\{p_1^S, x_c\})$, as is $\{\alpha_g\}$, and using these we can express everything other than P_g -correctness and the equation $T_n^Q = T_n^{P_g(M(\mathcal{T}))}$ in part 3. (For P_g -transcendence, given P_g -correctness, we can just say that for each $\alpha + 1 < \text{lh}(\mathcal{T})$ and each $\xi < \text{lh}(E_\alpha^{\mathcal{T}})$, we have $\text{Lp}_{\Gamma_g}(M_\alpha^{\mathcal{T}}|\xi) \triangleleft M_\alpha^{\mathcal{T}}|\text{lh}(E_\alpha^{\mathcal{T}})$. And note that the quantifier “there is a \mathcal{T} -cofinal branch” is not a problem.)

Now N is P_g -correct iff for every $\xi < \text{OR}^N$, either:

- (i) $N \triangleleft \text{Lp}_{\Gamma_g}(N|\xi)$ and N is ξ -sound and projects $\leq \xi$, or
- (ii) $P_g(N|\xi) \trianglelefteq N$.

Clause (i) is easily expressible, as already discussed. To assert clause (ii), we use the definability of Lp_{Γ_g} and standard calculations like those used in connection the proof that solidity of the standard parameter ensures its preservation under iteration maps. That is, we assert that, letting $\eta \leq \text{OR}^N$ be such that $\text{Lp}_{\Gamma_g}(N|\xi) = N|\eta$, then in fact $\text{Lp}_{\Gamma_g}(N|\xi) \triangleleft N$, and there is (a uniquely specified) $Q \trianglelefteq N$ such that $\eta = \xi^{+Q} < \text{OR}^Q$ and $\rho_1^Q \leq \xi$ and ξ is a strong cutpoint of Q , and for each $r \Sigma_1$ formula φ and each $\vec{x} \in (N|\xi)^{<\omega}$,

$$S \models \psi(x_c, \varphi, \vec{x}, N|\xi, p_1^S) \implies Q' \models \varphi(\vec{x}, p_1^{Q'})$$

where Q' is the reorganization of Q as a $N|\xi$ -premise (and recall that the language for $N|\xi$ -premise has a constant symbol interpreted as $N|\xi$, so φ can refer to $N|\xi$). The key is now that these properties ensure that $Q' = P_g(N|\xi)$, since letting $P = P_g(N|\xi)$, certainly

$$\text{Th}_{r\Sigma_1}^P(\{p_1^P\} \cup (N|\xi)^{<\omega}) \trianglelefteq^* \text{Th}_{r\Sigma_1}^Q(\{p_1^Q\} \cup (N|\xi)^{<\omega}),$$

where \trianglelefteq^* means both \subseteq and that the theory on the left is an initial segment of that on the right with respect to the usual prewellorder on $r\Sigma_1$ truth. But then if the theories were not equal, we would get $P \triangleleft Q$, but $\eta = \xi^{+P}$ and $\rho_1^P \leq \xi < \eta$, contradicting that $\eta = \xi^{+Q}$.

We can similarly assert that later models $M_\alpha^{\mathcal{T}}$ of \mathcal{T} are P_g -correct (and so our earlier expression of P_g -transcendence will be valid).

Finally, to assert the equation “ $T_n^Q = T_n^{P_g(M(\mathcal{T}))}$ ” in the context of condition 3, we just have to be able to identify $T_n^{P_g(M(\mathcal{T}))}$ in a simple enough manner. But this is achieved via the formula Ψ_{Th} and line (7). \square

Π_1 -iterability is enough to determine the proper segments of $M_{\text{Id}}^{P_g}(X)$, but not enough for $M_{\text{Id}}^{P_g}(X)$ itself.

Lemma 3.8. *Let $X \in \mathcal{C}$. Let N be a $\Pi_1^S(\{p_1^S, x_c\})$ -iterable X -premise which is sound and projects to X . Let $M = M_{\text{Id}}^{P_g}(X)$. Then either $N \triangleleft M|\omega_1^M$ or $M|\omega_1^M \triangleleft N$.*

Proof. Suppose not. We attempt to compare $M|\omega_1^M$ with N , with trees \mathcal{T}, \mathcal{U} respectively (padded in the usual way for comparison). Note that by the contradictory hypothesis, the comparison is non-trivial, but cannot terminate successfully. Since both trees produce P_g -correct models as far as the tree is Γ_g -short and P_g -transcendent, both trees are in fact P_g -transcendent as far as they are Γ_g -short. So the comparison must reach a limit stage λ (and let us say that $(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{U})$ has length λ such that if \mathcal{T} is cofinally (in λ) non-padding, then \mathcal{T} is Γ_g -maximal, and likewise for \mathcal{U} . Let $b = \Sigma_M(\mathcal{T})$.

Claim 7. $E_\alpha^\mathcal{U} \neq \emptyset$ for cofinally many $\alpha < \lambda$.

Proof. Suppose not. So we can fix $\alpha < \lambda$ such that $M_{\alpha'}^\mathcal{U} = M_\alpha^\mathcal{U}$ for all $\alpha' \in [\alpha, \lambda)$. Then note that $P_g(M(\mathcal{T})) \trianglelefteq M_b^\mathcal{T}$ and $P_g(M(\mathcal{T})) \trianglelefteq M_\alpha^\mathcal{U}$. We can't have $P_g(M(\mathcal{T})) \triangleleft M_b^\mathcal{T}$, by smallness (since $\delta(\mathcal{T})$ is a cardinal in $M_b^\mathcal{T}$, by taking appropriate hulls and using condensation, we get a P_g -ladder $N \triangleleft M_b^\mathcal{T}$). So $M_b^\mathcal{T} = P_g(M(\mathcal{T}))$. Similarly, $M_\alpha^\mathcal{U} = P_g(M(\mathcal{T}))$, but then the comparison succeeded, contradiction. \square

So we can apply clause 3 of Π_1 -iterability to \mathcal{U} . Let b_n be a branch and $Q_n \trianglelefteq M_{b_n}^\mathcal{U}$ witness the requirement for $n < \omega$. Note that by smallness, $Q_n = M_{b_n}^\mathcal{U}$ and $\rho_1(M_{b_n}^\mathcal{U}) < \delta(\mathcal{U})$. Let ξ_n be least such that $\xi_n + 1 \in b_n$ and $\rho_1(M_{b_n}^\mathcal{U}) \leq \text{cr}(E_{\xi_n}^\mathcal{U})$. Let $\kappa_n = \text{cr}(E_{\xi_n}^\mathcal{U})$.

Claim 8. *We have:*

1. $\rho = \sup_{n < \omega} \rho_1(M_{b_n}^\mathcal{U}) < \delta(\mathcal{U})$.
2. For each $n < \omega$, we have $(\xi_n + 1, b_n) \cap \mathcal{D}^\mathcal{U} = \emptyset$ and $\text{deg}_{\xi_n + 1}^\mathcal{U} = \text{deg}_{b_n}^\mathcal{U} = 0$, so $i_{\xi_n + 1, b_n}^{*\mathcal{U}} : M_{\xi_n + 1}^{*\mathcal{U}} \rightarrow M_{b_n}^\mathcal{U}$ exists and is a 0-embedding.
3. $\sup_{n < \omega} \kappa_n < \delta(\mathcal{U})$.

Proof. Part 1: Otherwise, condensation easily gives that $P_g(M(\mathcal{U}))$ is a P_g -ladder, but since $P_g(M(\mathcal{U})) \trianglelefteq M_b^\mathcal{T}$, this contradicts smallness.

Part 2: This is a routine consequence of the fact that $\rho_1(M_{b_n}^\mathcal{U}) \leq \kappa_n$.

Part 3: Suppose not. With ρ as in part 1, let β be least such that $\rho < \nu(E_\beta^\mathcal{U})$ and let n be such that $\nu(E_\beta^\mathcal{U}) \leq \kappa_n$ (n exists as $\sup_{n < \omega} \kappa_n = \delta(\mathcal{U})$). So $\beta < \text{pred}^\mathcal{U}(\xi_n + 1)$. Let η be least such that $\eta \geq \beta$ and $\eta + 1 \in b_n$. So $\text{pred}^\mathcal{U}(\eta + 1) \leq \beta$, so $\eta < \xi_n$, so

$$\text{cr}(E_\eta^\mathcal{U}) < \rho_1(M_{b_n}^\mathcal{U}) \leq \rho < \nu(E_\beta^\mathcal{U}) \leq \nu(E_\eta^\mathcal{U}).$$

This contradicts the preservation of fine structure along b_n (irrespective of drops along b_n). \square

Claim 9. $c = \liminf_{n < \omega} b_n$ is a \mathcal{U} -cofinal branch, $c \cap \mathcal{D}^\mathcal{U}$ is finite, and $M_c^\mathcal{U} = P_g(M(\mathcal{U}))$.

Proof. Let $m < \omega$ with $\gamma_m^{P_g(M(\mathcal{U}))} > \sup_{n < \omega} \kappa_n$, and let $m \leq m_0 < m_1 < \omega$. Since $T_{m_0}^{M_{b_{m_0}}^\mathcal{U}} = T_{m_0}^{P_g(M(\mathcal{U}))} = T_{m_0}^{M_{b_{m_1}}^\mathcal{U}}$, we have that $\text{rg}(i_{\xi_{m_i} + 1, b_{m_i}}^{*\mathcal{U}}) \cap \gamma_{m_0}^{P_g(M(\mathcal{U}))}$ is cofinal in $\gamma_{m_0}^{P_g(M(\mathcal{U}))}$, for $i \in \{0, 1\}$. So letting $\eta_i + 1 \in b_{m_i}$ be least with $\gamma_{m_0}^{P_g(M(\mathcal{U}))} \leq \text{cr}(E_{\eta_i}^\mathcal{U})$, for $i \in \{0, 1\}$, then $\text{pred}^\mathcal{U}(\eta_0 + 1) = \text{pred}^\mathcal{U}(\eta_1 + 1) \in b_{m_0} \cap b_{m_1}$, by the Zipper Lemma. This shows that $c = \liminf_{n < \omega} b_n$ is a \mathcal{U} -cofinal branch. The agreement between the branches b_n (for sufficiently large n) also gives that $c \cap \mathcal{D}^\mathcal{U}$ is bounded in λ and hence finite, since $\rho_1(M_{b_{m_0}}^\mathcal{U}) \leq \rho$ for each $m_0 < \omega$.

Now note that for sufficiently large $\xi \in c$, letting δ_ξ be the least Woodin of $M_\xi^\mathcal{U}$ with $\delta_\xi > \text{rank}(X)$, we have:

- $(\xi, c)^\mathcal{U} \cap \mathcal{D}^\mathcal{U} = \emptyset$ and $\text{deg}_\xi^\mathcal{U} = 0$,
- $M_\xi^\mathcal{U}$ is δ_ξ -sound with $\rho_1(M_\xi^\mathcal{U}) < \delta_\xi$,
- $\sup_{n < \omega} \alpha_n^{M_\xi^\mathcal{U}} = \text{OR}(M_\xi^\mathcal{U})$ and $\sup_{n < \omega} \gamma_n^{M_\xi^\mathcal{U}} = \delta_\xi$,
- $i_{\xi c}^\mathcal{U} \text{ "OR}(M_\xi^\mathcal{U})$ is cofinal in $\text{OR}(M_c^\mathcal{U})$ and $i_{\xi c}^\mathcal{U}(\alpha_n^{M_\xi^\mathcal{U}}) = \alpha_n^{M_c^\mathcal{U}}$ for all $n < \omega$,

– $i_{\xi c}^{\mathcal{U}}$ is continuous at δ_ξ and $i_{\xi c}^{\mathcal{U}}(\gamma_n^{M_\xi^{\mathcal{U}}}) = \gamma_n^{P_g(M(\mathcal{U}))}$ for all $n < \omega$, and so $i_{\xi c}^{\mathcal{U}}(\delta_\xi) = \delta(\mathcal{U}) \in \text{wfp}(M_c^{\mathcal{U}})$.

Note that for each $n < \omega$, for sufficiently large $\xi \in c$, we have $\gamma_n^{M_\xi^{\mathcal{U}}} < \text{cr}(i_{\xi c}^{\mathcal{U}})$ and $T_n^{M_c^{\mathcal{U}}} = T_n^{M_\xi^{\mathcal{U}}} = T_n^{P_g(M(\mathcal{U}))}$. Also $M_c^{\mathcal{U}}$ is $\delta(\mathcal{U})$ -sound, and it follows that $M_c^{\mathcal{U}} = P_g(M(\mathcal{U}))$, completing the proof of the claim. \square

Since $P_g(M(\mathcal{U})) \sqsubseteq M_{\Sigma_M(\mathcal{T})}^{\mathcal{T}}$ (or $M_\alpha^{\mathcal{T}}$ for sufficiently large $\alpha < \lambda$, if \mathcal{T} is eventually only padding), we have found a successful comparison, a contradiction, completing the proof of the lemma. \square

Now let $X \in \mathcal{C}$ and $M = M_{\text{Id}}^{P_g}(X)$. Let $\bar{\beta}$ and $\pi : \mathcal{S}_{\bar{\beta}}(\mathbb{R}^M) \rightarrow \mathcal{S}$ be the Σ_1 -elementary embedding described in [7]. So $\mathbb{R}^M = \mathcal{S}_{\bar{\beta}}(\mathbb{R}^M) \cap \mathbb{R}$. We now want to show that $\Sigma_2^S(\{x_c, X\}) \upharpoonright \mathbb{R}^M$ is $\Pi_2^{\mathcal{S}_{\bar{\beta}}(\mathbb{R}^M)}(\{x_c, X\})$; this is analogous to what we showed for projective-like gaps of countable cofinality.

Let φ be $\exists^{\mathbb{R}}\Pi_1$, of form $\varphi(u) \iff \exists^{\mathbb{R}}w \psi(w, u)$, where ψ is Π_1 . Let $x \in \mathbb{R}^M$. For $n < \omega$, let $b_n^M \in \mathbb{B}_{\delta^M}^M$ be the Boolean value of the statement¹⁹ “ $M \upharpoonright \alpha_n^M$ verifies that the generic $L(\mathbb{R})$ models $\neg\psi(\dot{w}, x)$, where \dot{w} is the generic real”. Let S be the natural tree of attempts to build (H, g) such that $H \preceq_1 M$ and $\delta^M, p_1^M, x_c \in H$ and $g \subseteq H$, and letting \bar{M} be the transitive collapse of H and $\tau : \bar{M} \rightarrow H$ the isomorphism and $\bar{g} = \tau^{-1}g$, then \bar{g} is a $(\bar{M}, \mathbb{B}_{\delta^{\bar{M}}})$ -generic filter such that for no $n < \omega$ is $b_n^{\bar{M}} = \tau^{-1}(b_n^M) \in \bar{g}$. More precisely, S is the set of finite sequences $((\vec{x}_0, q_0), (\vec{x}_1, q_1), \dots, (\vec{x}_{n-1}, q_{n-1}))$ such that:

1. $\vec{x}_i \in \text{Hull}_1^{M \upharpoonright \alpha_i^M}(\gamma_i^M \cup X^M \cup \{p_1^M\})^{<\omega}$ for $i < n$,
2. if $n > 0$ then \vec{x}_0 includes p_1^M, x_0^{20} and δ^M ,
3. $q_i \in \vec{x}_i$ for all $i < n$,
4. $\alpha_i^M \in \vec{x}_{i+1}$ for all $i + 1 < n$,
5. (Σ_1 -elementarity closure) for all $i < n$, for the first i 3-tuples (in some reasonable recursive ordering) of form (ϱ, \vec{b}, k) such that:

- $\varrho = \varrho(\vec{v}, u)$ is a Σ_1 formula in the language of passive premeice with free variables exactly \vec{v}, u ,
- \vec{b} is a finite tuple with $\vec{b} \subseteq \vec{x}_0 \hat{\ } \dots \hat{\ } \vec{x}_{i-1}$,
- $\text{lh}(\vec{v}) = \text{lh}(\vec{b})$,
- $k < i$,
- $\vec{b} \subseteq M \upharpoonright \alpha_k^M$, and
- $M \upharpoonright \alpha_k^M \models \exists u \varrho(\vec{b}, u)$,

there is some $y \in (M \upharpoonright \alpha_k^M) \cap \vec{x}_i$ such that $M \upharpoonright \alpha_k^M \models \varrho(\vec{b}, y)$,

6. $q_i \in \mathbb{B}_{\delta^M}^M$ for $i < n$,
7. if $0 < i < n$ and there is a maximal antichain A of $\mathbb{B}_{\delta^M}^M$ with $A \in \vec{x}_0 \hat{\ } \dots \hat{\ } \vec{x}_{i-1}$ and $A \in M \upharpoonright \gamma_{i-1}^M$ such that for no $j < i$ is $q_j \in A$, then letting A_i be the first such one appearing in the list $\vec{x}_0 \hat{\ } \dots \hat{\ } \vec{x}_{i-1}$, we have $q_i \leq q_{i-1}$ and $q_i \in A$; otherwise $q_i = q_{i-1}$,
8. for no $j + 1 < n$ is $q_j \leq b_j^M$.²¹

¹⁹***This needs explaining what the generic $L(\mathbb{R})$ means. It’s not just the naive derived model, but the model encoded as in [7].

²⁰Of course, we had assumed that $x_0 = \emptyset$, but in general this should be included.

²¹Note that $b_j^M \leq b_{j+1}^M$ for all j , and on the other hand, we have $q_{j+1} \leq q_j$.

Note that in condition 7, since $A \in M|\gamma_{i-1}^M$, and by §2.2, the fact that A is a maximal antichain is a simple condition on the parameters $A, M|\delta^M$, and moreover, there are cofinally many $\eta < \gamma_{i-1}^M$ such that $M|\eta \preceq M|\delta^M$, so it is just a simple fact about $\text{Th}_{\Sigma_1}^{M|\alpha_{i-1}^M}(\vec{x}_0 \wedge \dots \wedge \vec{x}_{i-1})$.

It is straightforward to see that if $\langle (\vec{x}_i, q_i) \rangle_{i < \omega}$ is an infinite branch through S and $X = \bigcup_{i < \omega} \vec{x}_i$ and \bar{g} is the filter generated by $\{q_i \mid i < \omega\}$, then letting \bar{M} be the transitive collapse of X and $\pi : \bar{M} \rightarrow M$ the uncollapse and $\bar{g} = \pi^{-1}g$, then $\bar{M} = P_g(\bar{M}|\bar{\delta})$ and $\bar{\delta}$ is Woodin in \bar{M} and \bar{g} is $(\bar{M}, \mathbb{B}_{\bar{\delta}^{\bar{M}}})$ -generic and letting w be the generic real, $\bar{M}[\bar{g}] \models \psi(w, x)$ holds in the generic $L(\mathbb{R})$, which proves that $\mathbb{S}_\beta(\mathbb{R}) \models \psi(x, w)$ (since we can iterate just at the Woodins strictly above δ^M to produce $\mathbb{S}_\beta(\mathbb{R})$ as a derived model).

Now suppose that S is instead wellfounded. We claim that $\mathbb{S}_\beta(\mathbb{R}) \models \forall^{\mathbb{R}} w \neg \psi(w, x)$. The proof will also show that there is a “ $\forall^{\mathbb{R}} w \neg \psi(w, x)$ -witness” which is a proper segment of $M|\omega_1^M$ which projects to ω .

For $n < \omega$, an n -partial- P_g -ladder is a pair (N, P) such that N is a premouse and $P \triangleleft N$ and there are $\eta_0 < \dots < \eta_n < \text{OR}^N$ which are limit cardinals of N , $\eta_n^{++} < \text{OR}^N$ and η_n^{++} is the largest cardinal of N , N is P_g -closed, and there are $P_0 \triangleleft P_1 \triangleleft \dots \triangleleft P_n = P$ such that $\eta_i < \text{OR}^{P_i}$ and $\rho_1^{P_i} = \rho_\omega^{P_i} = \eta_i$ and P_i is a relevant premouse with $\eta_j = \gamma_j^{P_i}$ for $j \leq i$, and (η_j, P_j) is the j th P_g -rung of P_i for $j \leq i$. (Let’s change the definition of a rung to require that the Σ_1 -theories of $P|\alpha_n^P$ in parameters $< \gamma_n^P$ and in X^P and p_1^P are identical.) Note that η_0, \dots, η_n and P_0, \dots, P_n are all determined by P .

Note that given an n -partial- Γ_g -ladder (N, P) , and $\eta_0, \dots, \eta_n, P_0, \dots, P_n$ the corresponding objects, for each $i \leq n+1$ and $j \leq i+1$, we can define $S_j^{P_i}$ just as above, except that this includes only sequences $\sigma = ((\vec{x}_0, q_0), \dots, (\vec{x}_{k-1}, q_{k-1}))$ of length $k \leq j$. For $k \leq j$, let $S_j^{P_i} \upharpoonright k = S_k^{P_i}$ (its restriction to sequences σ of length $\leq k$).

For $i < n$, note that $S_{i+1}^{P_i}$ is isomorphic to $S_{i+1}^{P_n}$, and letting $\pi_{in} : S_{i+1}^{P_i} \rightarrow S_{i+1}^{P_n}$ be the natural isomorphism, π_{in} does not move any ordinals $< \gamma_i^{P_i} = \gamma_i^{P_n}$. (For $j+1 < i+1$, so $j < i$, we have $b_j^{P_i} = b_j^{P_n}$, so P_i will agree with P_n about whether $q_j \leq b_j$, ensuring agreement regarding condition 8).

Let N be a premouse with $x \in \mathbb{R}^N$ and let $S, \sigma \in N$ and $n < \omega$. We say that (N, P, Δ) is a $(\forall^{\mathbb{R}} \neg \psi(x), \sigma)$ -prewitness iff (N, P) is an n -partial- Γ_g -ladder, as witnessed by $\eta_0, \dots, \eta_n, P_0, \dots, P_n = P$, $\sigma = \langle (\vec{x}_i, q_i) \rangle_{i < n} \in S_n^{P_n}$ and $\Delta \in N|\eta_n^{++}$ is a non-empty tree (set of finite sequences closed under initial segment, so $\emptyset \in \Delta$), whose elements take the form

$$\tau = ((N_{n+1}, P_{n+1}, \sigma_{n+1}, \Delta_{n+1}), \dots, (N_{n+k}, P_{n+k}, \sigma_{n+k}, \Delta_{n+k})),$$

and moreover (writing $N_n = N, P_n = P, \sigma_n = \sigma, \Delta_n = \Delta$), for all $\tau \in \Delta$ as above,

1. (N_{n+i+1}, P_{n+i+1}) is an $(n+i+1)$ -partial- P_g -ladder with $P_{n+i} = P_{n+i}^{P_{n+i+1}}$,
2. $P_{n+i} \triangleleft P_{n+i+1} \triangleleft N_{n+i+1} \triangleleft N_{n+i}$,
3. $\rho_1^{N_{n+i+1}} = \rho_\omega^{N_{n+i+1}} = (\eta_{n+i}^{(N_{n+i}, P_{n+i})} + N_{n+i})$,
4. $\sigma_{n+i+1} \in S_{n+i+1}^{P_{n+i+1}}$ and $\pi_{n+i}^{P_{n+i}, P_{n+i+1}}(\sigma_{n+i}) = \sigma_{n+i+1} \upharpoonright (n+i)$,
5. $\Delta_{n+i+1} \in N_{n+i+1} | (\eta_{n+i+1}^{(N_{n+i+1}, P_{n+i+1})} + N_{n+i+1})$ (recall this is the largest cardinal proper segment of N_{n+i+1}),
6. $\Delta_{n+i+1} = (\Delta_{n+i})_{\pi(i+1)}$,
7. for every $\sigma' \in S_{n+i+1}^{P_{n+i+1}}$ such that $\sigma_{n+i} \triangleleft \sigma'$ (so $\text{lh}(\sigma') = n+i+1$) there is $\tau' \in \Delta$ such that $\tau' \upharpoonright i = \tau \upharpoonright i$ and $\text{lh}(\tau') = i+1$ and letting $\tau'(i) = (N'', P'', \sigma'', \Delta'')$, then $\pi_{n+i+1}^{P_{n+i}, P''}(\sigma') = \sigma''$.

Suppose that (N, P, Δ) is a $(\forall^{\mathbb{R}} \neg \psi(x), \emptyset)$ -prewitness and N is iterable. Then we claim that $\mathcal{J}_\beta(\mathbb{R}) \models \forall^{\mathbb{R}} u \neg \psi(x, u)$. Suppose not and let $w \in \mathbb{R}$ be such that $\mathcal{J}_\beta(\mathbb{R}) \models \psi(x, w)$. Fix a surjection $f : \omega \rightarrow X^M$. We begin to iterate N to make w generic for the image of the extender algebra of P at δ^P , producing iteration tree \mathcal{T} , except that at the first stage $\beta < \text{lh}(\mathcal{T})$ such that there are no w -bad extender algebra axioms indexed below $i_{0\beta}^{\mathcal{T}}(\gamma_0^P)$, we proceed as follows. We will specify some $\sigma \in S_1^{i_{0\beta}^{\mathcal{T}}}(P)$. Recall that elements of S_1 have length 1, taking the form $\sigma = ((\vec{x}_0, q_0))$.

Note that conditions 4, 5, 7 and 8 are trivial for elements of length 1. So just set q_0 to be the “1” of the extender algebra of $i_{0\beta}^T(P)$ at $\delta^{i_{0\beta}^T(P)}$ and $\vec{x}_0 = (p_1^M, x_0, \delta^M, q_0, f(0), A)$ where $f : \omega \rightarrow X$ is the surjection fixed earlier, and A is some maximal antichain of $\mathbb{B}_{\delta^{P_\beta}}^{P_\beta}$ with $A \in P_\beta \parallel \gamma_0^{P_\beta}$;²² it is easy to see that $(\vec{x}_0, q_0) \in S_1^{i_{0\beta}^T(P)}$.

Now since (N, P, Δ) is a $(\forall^{\mathbb{R}} \neg \psi(x), \emptyset)$ -prewitness, so is $(M_\beta, P_\beta, \Delta_\beta) = (M_\beta^T, i_{0\beta}^T(P), i_{0\beta}^T(\Delta))$. So we can apply property 7 to $\sigma' = ((\vec{x}_0, q_0)) \in S_1^{P_\beta} = S_{n+i+1}^{P_\beta, n+i}$ where $n = i = 0$ and $P_{\beta,0} = P_\beta$, and $\sigma_{n+i} = \sigma_0 = \emptyset$. So fix some $\tau' \in \Delta_\beta$ with $\text{lh}(\tau') = 1$ and letting $\tau'(0) = (N'', P'', \sigma'', \Delta'')$, we have $\pi_1^{P_\beta, P''}((\vec{x}_0, q_0)) = \sigma''$.

We choose E_β^T as for the w -genericity iteration of P'' at $\delta^{P''}$, as long as this yields $\text{lh}(E_\beta^T) < \gamma_1^{P''}$. Suppose that this does indeed occur. Note that $P_\beta \parallel \gamma_0^{P_\beta} = P'' \parallel \gamma_0^{P''}$ and $\gamma_0^{P_\beta}$ is a limit cardinal of $N_\beta = M_\beta^T, P_\beta, N''$ and P'' . And recall that there is no w -bad extender algebra axiom induced by an extender indexed in $\mathbb{E}^{P_\beta} \parallel \gamma_0^{P_\beta}$, so if E_β^T exists then $\gamma_0^{P_\beta} = \gamma_0^{P''} < \text{lh}(E_\beta^T) < \delta^{P''}$. Recall that also $\rho_\omega^{P_\beta} = \gamma_0^{P_\beta} = \eta_0^{(N_\beta, P_\beta)}$, and $\rho_\omega^{N''} = (\eta_0^{(N_\beta, P_\beta)})^{+N_\beta} = (\gamma_0^{P_\beta})^{+N_\beta}$ and $\eta_1^{(N'', P'')} = \gamma_1^{P''}$ is a limit cardinal of both N'' and P'' and $N'' \parallel \eta_1^{(N'', P'')} = P'' \parallel \gamma_1^{P''}$, and $\rho_\omega^{P''} = \gamma_1^{P''}$, and since $\nu(E_\beta^T)$ is a P'' -cardinal and $\gamma_0^{P''} < \text{lh}(E_\beta^T) < \gamma_1^{P''}$, if $\gamma \geq \beta$ and $\text{pred}^T(\gamma + 1) = \beta$ then we will have:

- if $\text{cr}(E_\gamma^T) < \gamma_0^{P_\beta}$ then $M_{\gamma+1}^{*T} = N_\beta$ (so $\gamma + 1 \in \mathcal{D}^T$), and
- if $\text{cr}(E_\gamma^T) \geq \gamma_0^{P_\beta}$ then $M_{\gamma+1}^{*T} = N''$ (so $\gamma + 1 \notin \mathcal{D}^T$).

Let $\gamma + 1$ be such, and let $\gamma + 1 \leq^T \varepsilon$ with $(\gamma + 1, \varepsilon]^T \cap \mathcal{D}^T = \emptyset$. If $\text{cr}(E_\gamma^T) < \gamma_0^{P_\beta}$, then we proceed making w generic for the extender algebra of the image P_ε of P at δ^{P_ε} , unless there are no w -bad axioms induced by extenders in $\mathbb{E}(P_\varepsilon \parallel \gamma_0^{P_\varepsilon})$, in which case we will proceed like at stage β . If instead $\gamma_0^{P_\beta} \leq \text{cr}(E_\gamma^T)$, then we proceed by making w generic for the extender algebra of $P_\varepsilon = i_{\gamma+1, \varepsilon}^{*T}(P'')$ at δ^{P_ε} , unless there are no w -bad extenders in $\mathbb{E}(P_\varepsilon \parallel \gamma_1^{P_\varepsilon})$.

Now suppose that $\gamma + 1, \varepsilon$ are as above, with $\gamma_0^{P_\beta} \leq \text{cr}(E_\gamma^T)$, and there are indeed no w -bad axioms induced by extenders in $\mathbb{E}^{P_\varepsilon} \parallel \gamma_1^{P_\varepsilon}$. We proceed at stage ε in a fashion much like at stage β earlier, but this time there is more to consider, most importantly regarding condition 7 and (sort of) condition 8. Consider condition 7. If possible, we want to find an element $\sigma'_\varepsilon \in S_2^{P_\varepsilon}$ which is consistent with making w generic and such that $\sigma_\varepsilon \triangleleft \sigma'_\varepsilon$, where $\sigma_\varepsilon = i_{\gamma+1, \varepsilon}^{*T}(\sigma'')$. For this, we must consider conditions 7 and 8. Since we are interested in $\text{lh}(\sigma_\varepsilon) = 2$, condition 7 is non-trivial. Let $\sigma_\varepsilon = ((\vec{x}_0, q_0))$. Suppose there is a maximal antichain A of $\mathbb{B}_{\delta^{P_\varepsilon}}^{P_\varepsilon}$ with $A \in \vec{x}_0$ and $A \in P_\varepsilon \parallel \gamma_0^{P_\varepsilon}$ such that $q_0 \notin A$, and let A_0 be the first one appearing in \vec{x}_0 .²³ Because w satisfies all extender algebra axioms induced by extenders indexed in $P_\varepsilon \parallel \gamma_0^{P_\varepsilon} = P_\beta \parallel \gamma_0^{P_\beta}$ (in fact satisfies all those induced by extenders indexed in $P_\varepsilon \parallel \gamma_1^{P_\varepsilon}$), there is exactly one $q \in A$ such that, if $\varphi \in P_\varepsilon \parallel \gamma_0^{P_\varepsilon}$ is any formula such that $q = [\varphi]$, then $w \models \varphi$. Set $q_1 = q$. We have $q_1 \leq q_0$ since $q_0 = 1$, so we have satisfied the requirements for condition 7. (In more generality, when selecting q_i , we will have “ $w \models q_{i-1}$ ” in the appropriate sense, and we will set $q_i = q \wedge q_{i-1}$, which will be a non-zero condition since “ $w \models q$ ” and “ $w \models q_{i-1}$ ”.)

Now consider condition 8.²⁴ Suppose first that $q_0 \leq b_0^{P_\varepsilon}$. (Then clearly there is no way to find an appropriate σ'_ε .) In this case we will continue with w -genericity iteration over the image of P_ε ; note that then if E_ε^T exists, we will have $\gamma_1^{P_\varepsilon} \leq \nu(E_\varepsilon^T)$. Since $P_\varepsilon \triangleleft N_\varepsilon$ and $\rho_\omega^{P_\varepsilon} = \gamma_1^{P_\varepsilon} = \eta_1^{(N_\varepsilon, P_\varepsilon)}$, if $\xi \geq \varepsilon$ and $\text{pred}^T(\xi + 1) = \varepsilon$ then:

1. if $\text{cr}(E_\xi^T) < \gamma_1^{P_\varepsilon}$ then $M_{\xi+1}^{*T} = N_\varepsilon$ (so $\xi + 1 \notin \mathcal{D}^T$), and
2. if $\text{cr}(E_\xi^T) \geq \gamma_1^{P_\varepsilon}$ then $M_{\xi+1}^{*T} = P_\varepsilon$ (so $\xi + 1 \in \mathcal{D}^T$).

²²There is actually no need to put A in \vec{x}_0 , but it does no harm. We only put it in for expository reasons; it forces us to deal with some maximal antichains earlier in the overall process than we would otherwise have to. There is also no need to put $f(0)$ in, but we will do something similar in general to arrange that we include all elements of X along any infinite branch, mostly for convenience.

²³There could be some such antichain, since we put A explicitly in \vec{x}_0 earlier.

²⁴Since $q_0 = 1$, this condition is actually rather trivial in the case of interest. But let's ignore this, for expository purposes.

For $\xi + 1$ as above and θ such that $\xi + 1 \leq^T \theta$ and $(\xi + 1, \theta]^T \cap \mathcal{D}^T = \emptyset$, if $\text{cr}(E_\xi^T) < \gamma_1^{P_\varepsilon}$ then we proceed at stage θ like at stages ε as before; if instead $\gamma_1^{P_\varepsilon} \leq \text{cr}(E_\xi^T)$ then we simply continue with w -genericity iteration, without further restrictions.²⁵

Now suppose instead that $q_0 \not\leq b_0^{P_\varepsilon}$. Then we have satisfied condition 8, and it is now easy to find an appropriate $\sigma'_\varepsilon \in S_2^{P_\varepsilon}$; it just remains to specify \vec{x}_1 appropriately. Put $\vec{x}_1 = (q_1, \alpha_0^{P_\varepsilon}, f(1), y)$ where y is the least object satisfying the requirements of condition 5, with respect to the natural wellorder of P_ε given by combining the enumeration f of X with P_ε -(prewell)order of constructibility. It is easy to see that $((\vec{x}_0, q_0), (\vec{x}_1, q_1)) \in S_2^{P_\varepsilon}$, and note that also $w \models \varphi$, whenever $\varphi \in P_\varepsilon \upharpoonright \gamma_1^{P_\varepsilon}$ and $P_\varepsilon \models "q_1 = [\varphi]"$.

Since $(N_\varepsilon, P_\varepsilon, \Delta_\varepsilon)$ is a $(\forall^{\mathbb{R}} \neg \psi(x), \sigma_\varepsilon)$ -prewitness, applying property 7 to $\sigma'_\varepsilon \in S_2^{P_\varepsilon}$, we can fix $\tau' \in \Delta_\varepsilon$ such that $\text{lh}(\tau') = 1$ and letting $\tau(0) = (N'', P'', \sigma'', \Delta'')$, we have $\pi_2^{P_\varepsilon, P''}(\sigma'_\varepsilon) = \sigma''$.

The process described so far generalizes in the obvious manner to all stages θ of \mathcal{T} . We have two kinds of stages $\theta < \text{lh}(\mathcal{T})$: θ can be w -consistent, or w -inconsistent. Given $\theta < \text{lh}(\mathcal{T})$, the set $\{\varepsilon \leq^T \theta \mid \varepsilon \text{ is } w\text{-consistent}\}$ will be a closed initial segment of $[0, \theta]^T$, including $\varepsilon = 0$. At each stage w -consistent stage $\theta < \text{lh}(\mathcal{T})$, we will have $N_\theta = M_\theta^T$, $P_\theta \triangleleft N_\theta$, $n_\theta < \omega$, such that (N_θ, P_θ) is an n_θ -partial- P_ε -ladder, and have $\sigma_\theta \in S_{n_\theta}^{P_\theta}$ and $\Delta_\theta \in N_\theta$ such that $(N_\theta, P_\theta, \Delta_\theta)$ is a $(\forall^{\mathbb{R}} \neg \psi(x), \sigma_\theta)$ -prewitness. We will have relationships and drops along $[0, \theta]^T$ essentially like in the cases described above. This is maintained by induction using crucially the fact that for any θ , $(0, \theta]^T$ drops only finitely often, and if $\theta_0 <^T \theta_1$ then $n_{\theta_0} \leq n_{\theta_1}$, with $n_{\theta_0} < n_{\theta_1}$ iff $(\theta_0, \theta_1]^T \cap \mathcal{D}^T \neq \emptyset$. The w -inconsistent stages ε are just those such that for some $\theta <^T \varepsilon$, θ is w -consistent, and at stage θ , we want to extend σ_θ to some σ'_θ with $\text{lh}(\sigma'_\theta) = n_\theta + 1$, but cannot, because we violate condition 8 and $\text{cr}(E_\xi^T) \geq \gamma_{n_\theta}^{P_\theta}$, where $\xi + 1 = \min((\theta, \varepsilon]^T)$. That is, regarding the violation of condition 8, there is some $j + 1 < n_\theta + 1$ (so $j < n_\theta$, so $0 < n_\theta$) such that $q_{\theta j} \leq b_j^{P_\theta}$, where $\sigma_\theta = ((\vec{x}_{\theta 0}, q_{\theta 0}), \dots, (\vec{x}_{\theta(n_\theta-1)}, q_{\theta(n_\theta-1)}))$. We will have here that $w \models \varphi$, whenever $\varphi \in P_\theta \upharpoonright \gamma_{n_\theta}^{P_\theta}$ and $P_\theta \models "q_{\theta j} = [\varphi]"$. In this case we will also have that $(\xi + 1, \varepsilon]^T \cap \mathcal{D}^T = \emptyset$, and we will be iterating to make w generic for the extender algebra of M_ε^T at $\delta^{M_\varepsilon^T}$ (and likewise at stage θ , for the extender algebra of P_ε at δ^{P_ε}).

Now the construction of \mathcal{T} must terminate in countably many steps. For suppose we reach a construction of length $\omega_1 + 1$. Then there are only finitely many drops along $[0, \omega_1]^T$. But then the usual argument for termination of genericity iteration yields a contradiction.

Let $\varepsilon + 1 = \text{lh}(\mathcal{T})$. Suppose ε is w -inconsistent, and adopt the notation with θ, ξ , etc, as above. Since the process terminates, w is generic over M_ε^T for $\mathbb{B}_{\delta^{M_\varepsilon^T}}^{M_\varepsilon^T}$. But $w \models \varphi$ where $\varphi \in P_\theta \upharpoonright \gamma_{n_\theta}^{P_\theta}$ and $P_\theta \models "q_{\theta j} = [\varphi]"$. Since $i_{\xi+1, \varepsilon}^* : P_\theta \rightarrow M_\varepsilon^T$ is sufficiently elementary and $\gamma_{n_\theta}^{P_\theta} \leq \text{cr}(i_{\xi+1, \varepsilon}^*)$, we also have $M_\varepsilon^T \models "q_{\theta j} = [\varphi]"$. So $q_{\theta j} \in g_w$, where g_w is the M_ε^T -generic filter determined by w . But $q_{\theta j} \leq b_j^{P_\theta}$, and so $q_{\theta j} \leq b_j^{M_\varepsilon^T}$, so $b_j^{M_\varepsilon^T} \in g_w$, which gives that $\mathcal{J}_\beta(\mathbb{R}) \models \neg \psi(x, w)$, a contradiction.

So ε is w -consistent. So $(N_\varepsilon, P_\varepsilon, \sigma_\varepsilon, \Delta_\varepsilon)$ are defined, etc. Because the process terminates at this stage, there are no w -bad extender algebra axioms induced by extenders indexed in $\mathbb{E}^{P_\varepsilon \upharpoonright \gamma_{n_\varepsilon}^{P_\varepsilon}}$. So we try to define σ'_ε . If this attempt violates condition 8, then we proceed at this stage with looking for E_ε^T within P_ε . But since the process terminates at this stage, it is just that w is already generic over P_ε . But this now yields the same contradiction as in the preceding paragraph. So we must successfully define σ'_ε . But there is no w -bad extender found in $P_{\varepsilon, 1}$ indexed below $\gamma_{n_\varepsilon+1}^{P_{\varepsilon, 1}}$, so we immediately attempt to extend σ'_ε one step further to σ''_ε . This must satisfy condition 8, since otherwise we get a contradiction like before. So we get σ''_ε . Etc. But this produces $N_{\varepsilon, n}$ for all $n > 0$, with $N_{\varepsilon, n+1} \triangleleft N_{\varepsilon, n}$, a contradiction.

References

- [1] John R. Steel. A theorem of Woodin on mouse sets. In Alexander S. Kechris, Benedikt Löwe, and John R. Steel, editors, *Ordinal Definability and Recursion Theory: The Cabal Seminar*,

²⁵Note here that we must continue to consider extender algebra axioms induced by extenders overlapping $\gamma_1^{P_\varepsilon}$. This is because the assumption is that $q_0 \leq b_0^{P_\varepsilon}$, but this refers to the standardly defined extender algebra, without restrictions on critical points of extenders used to induce axioms. If we switch at this point to only inducing axioms with extenders E with $\gamma_1^{P_\varepsilon} \leq \text{cr}(E)$, then we will be changing the forcing under consideration, so that the fact that $q_0 \leq b_0^{P_\varepsilon}$ will become irrelevant.

Volume III, pages 243–256. Cambridge University Press, 2016. Cambridge Books Online. Preprint available at author’s website.

- [2] Alexander S. Kechris. The Axiom of Determinacy Implies Dependent Choices in $L(\mathbb{R})$. *The Journal of Symbolic Logic*, 49(1):161–173, 1984.
- [3] Mitch Rudominer. The mouse set theorem just past projective. *Journal of Mathematical Logic*. Published Online Ready, <https://doi.org/10.1142/S0219061324500144>.
- [4] Mitch Rudominer. Mouse sets. *Annals of Pure and Applied Logic*, 87(1):1–100, 1997.
- [5] Mitch Rudominer and John Steel. Inner models with wellorders in $L(\mathbb{R})$. Unpublished, available at <http://math.berkeley.edu/~steel>, 1999.
- [6] Farmer Schlutzenberg. Mouse scales. arXiv:2310.19764v2.
- [7] Farmer Schlutzenberg and John Steel. Σ_1 gaps as derived models and correctness of mice. arXiv:2307.08856, 2023.
- [8] John R. Steel. Scales in $L(\mathbb{R})$. In *Cabal seminar 79–81*, volume 1019 of *Lecture Notes in Math.*, pages 107–156. Springer, Berlin, 1983.
- [9] John R. Steel. Local K^c constructions. *The Journal of Symbolic Logic*, 72(3):721–737, 2007.
- [10] John R. Steel. Mouse pairs and Suslin cardinals in a type 1 hierarchy. Privately circulated notes, December 2018.