

Cardinal Characteristics and Computability

Logan McDonald

Abstract

Cardinal characteristics of the continuum represent the boundaries in size between the countable and the continuum with respect to certain properties of sets. They are often defined as the minimum sizes of families of reals that meet some criteria. Taking these families and considering their analogues in the setting of computability theory provides a rich hierarchy of properties of oracles, which can be studied in terms of the Muchnik/Medvedev lattices of mass problems. We provide more detail to the proof of the Medvedev equivalence between dominating functions and maximal independent families given by Lempp et al. (2023) and adapt their construction of maximal almost disjoint families to the setting of ω -computably approximable sets. We then extend the theory to include correspondents of maximal ideal independent families and show they behave similarly to the maximal independent families.

Contents

1	Introduction	2
1.1	Notation	3
1.2	Cardinal characteristics of the continuum	4
1.3	Preliminaries on families in Boolean algebras	5
1.4	Recursive analogues of characteristics	7
1.4.1	Highness classes and Weihrauch problems	7
1.4.2	Mass problems in the Medvedev lattice	8
1.4.3	Other work on cardinal characteristics in computability	9
1.4.4	The Gamma question and mass problems	10
2	Combinatorial Mass Problems	11
2.1	Independent families and dominating functions	12
2.2	The Boolean algebra of ω -c.a. sets	16

This text was submitted in November, 2024 in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Bachelor of Science (Honours) in Mathematics at the University of Auckland. The project was supervised by Professor André Nies and Associate Professor Sina Greenwood.

3	Ideal Independent Families	19
3.1	Ideal independent families and dominating functions	20
3.2	The Boolean algebra of K -trivial sets	22
4	Conclusions	23
	References	24

1 Introduction

The continuum is an essential concept in many areas of mathematics. Among the most famous results in mathematical logic are the two statements that comprise the undecidability of the cardinality of the continuum. The continuum hypothesis (CH), as posed by Cantor in 1878, states: “There is no set whose cardinality is strictly between that of the integers and that of the reals.” Work by Gödel [15] in 1940 and Cohen [9] in 1963 shows that this is undecidable in the framework of Zermelo-Frankael set theory (ZFC), a sufficient foundation for much of mathematics. If we assume ZFC is consistent, then there are models of ZFC in which CH holds and models where it does not hold.

Despite CH being independent of ZFC, there is a good amount of thought to be given to the size of the continuum. ZFC is very far from being an absolute characterisation of mathematics, so the undecidability of the size of the continuum does not ensure that there is no evidence for or against CH. When working with mathematics, one can accept some rigorous yet incomplete view of the universe of sets, such as ZFC, or hold a Platonistic view and assert that there is some underlying structure to mathematics that we can only approximate with our formal theories. In the latter case, one may believe that the size of the continuum will have an evidenced and intuitive answer, but we have not found it. If this were the case, it may seem strange we still use an axiomatic system that has not changed for over a century, as that would suggest no progress has been made in this direction.

However, there are axioms we could add, the axiom of projective determinacy (PD) is one such case. Projective determinacy is believed to be true by Woodin [41], and like CH it is independent from ZFC. Regarding axioms such as PD, Woodin [41, p. 569] says:

The truth of these axioms became evident only after a great deal of work. For me, a remarkable aspect of this is that it demonstrates that the discovery of mathematical truth is not a purely formal endeavor.

Several attempts have been made to resolve the continuum problem in the way some think of projective determinacy. Woodin [40] developed his notion of Ω -logic as one approach to finding evidence against CH. His work in this direction eventually all depended on a very strong conjecture. Perhaps because of this, in 2010, a shift occurred in Woodin’s thoughts, with him beginning work in a new direction. We take a slight detour to discuss this.

Gödel’s proof that CH is consistent used his constructible universe L , which satisfies the axioms of ZFC and CH. The assumption that the set theoretic universe V is equal to L could be taken, and indeed, it resolves many undecidable statements in ZFC. Unfortunately, $ZFC + “V = L”$ is very restrictive. Not only does it satisfy CH, it also contradicts many large cardinal axioms that speak about the size of the set theoretic universe. Woodin [39] believes that there is no reason to rule out these large cardinal axioms, and so now works on developing an alternative to $V = L$ which accommodates these large cardinal axioms while preserving CH. He looks for an ultimate version of L , which should be compatible with many large cardinals, suggesting that it is always close to V ; then arguably the analogue of $V = L$ may be true.

Cardinal characteristics of the continuum are sizes of families of reals that preserve some properties of the reals. They act as a sort of boundary between the countable sets and the reals with respect to some property. The range of possibilities for cardinal characteristics depends on CH. If CH holds, the only uncountable possibility is \mathfrak{c} , the cardinality of the continuum. If we do not assume CH, perhaps we can find a richer structure below the continuum; these cardinal characteristics provide an interesting direction to study.

As CH trivialises the theory of cardinal characteristics of the continuum, the rich structure of cardinal characteristics could be taken as evidence against CH. There is no apparent reason that all of these values should coincide, as CH suggests.

The main topic of interest in this dissertation is the analogues of these cardinal characteristics in the setting of computability theory, mass problems in particular. We can study these in terms of lattices of degrees under the Muchnik and Medvedev reductions. Much the same as Turing reduction, which gives a degree structure and notion of computational complexity on sets of natural numbers, the Muchnik and Medvedev reductions give a similar structure on collections of functions or sets on the natural numbers.

The lattices of Muchnik and Medvedev degrees have notably been studied at length by Simpson [10, 34, 35]. It is a popular opinion that the structure of Π_1^0 -classes with the Muchnik and Medvedev reducibilities is natural to study, relative to the c.e. degrees of sets, as noted by Binns [3]. We can see an example of this with how easily computability theoretic correspondents arise from the cardinal characteristics studied in set theory.

1.1 Notation

We elaborate on some of the set theoretic notation that will be used throughout this dissertation. ${}^\omega\omega$ is the set of functions from naturals to naturals (to avoid being confused with the ordinal ω^ω). Following suit, ${}^\omega X$ is used for countably infinite sequences of elements from X . The set of infinite subsets of the naturals is written $[\omega]^\omega$. The quantifiers \forall^∞ and \exists^∞ are used to mean ‘for all but finitely many’ and ‘there exist infinitely many’ respectively. Note that ‘for all but finitely many’ is equivalent to excluding some finite initial segment. These follow the same duality relation as the usual quantifiers \forall and \exists via negation. An asterisk is often used to represent mod finite

relations. For example, $A \subseteq^* B$ means that A is a subset of B if you ignore finitely many exceptions. The word ‘almost’ is also often used to mean with finitely many exceptions. Given a set A , its characteristic function χ_A is defined to be 1 on inputs within A and 0 everywhere else.

1.2 Cardinal characteristics of the continuum

Among the simplest cardinal characteristics are the bounding number \mathfrak{b} and the dominating number \mathfrak{d} . We look at the mod finite relation between functions on the natural numbers. For $f, g \in {}^\omega\omega$ we have $f \leq^* g$ iff $\forall^\infty x : f(x) \leq g(x)$, there is some fixed x_0 such that f is at least as much as g past that point. One can define the reverse and non-strict relations in much the same way.

The *bounding number* \mathfrak{b} is the least size of an unbounded family in ${}^\omega\omega$ ordered by \leq^* . Specifically a family $\mathcal{B} \subseteq {}^\omega\omega$ is *unbounded* if there is no choice of a single $f \in {}^\omega\omega$ such that $g \leq^* f$ for all $g \in \mathcal{B}$. The *dominating number* \mathfrak{d} is similarly the least size of a dominating family. A family $\mathcal{D} \subseteq {}^\omega\omega$ is *dominating* if for each $f \in {}^\omega\omega$ there is a $g \in \mathcal{D}$ such that $f \leq^* g$. Clearly $\mathfrak{b} \leq \mathfrak{d}$ (a family cannot be dominating if it is not unbounded). An unbounded family must be uncountable, this can be observed via a diagonalisation argument. Suppose we have a countable family $\{g_n : n \in \omega\}$, then define $f(n) := \max_{i \leq n} g_i(n)$ which ensures the family is not unbounded.

The bounding number was first considered by Rothberger [31], who studied its relation to the continuum hypothesis. The dominating number was introduced by Katětov [18]. Some more classical results in cardinal characteristics are described and referenced in van Douwen [11]. These cardinals have had various notations. The first notation for \mathfrak{b} was \aleph_η , and the symbols K_8 , λ_3 , and ξ have also been used according to van Douwen [11].

Several further characteristics are defined in terms of families of sets of naturals, rather than functions on the natural numbers. A family $\mathcal{A} \subseteq [\omega]^\omega$ is called *almost disjoint* if the intersection of any pair of elements is finite. An almost disjoint family is maximal if no more sets can be added while preserving almost disjointness. In general a set is maximal with respect to a property if it can not be extended while preserving the property. The *almost disjointness number* \mathfrak{a} is the least size of a maximal almost disjoint (MAD) family.

A family $\mathcal{T} \subseteq [\omega]^\omega$ is called a *tower* if it is linearly ordered by \subseteq^* . The *tower number* \mathfrak{t} is the least size of a maximal tower. In a weakening of this, a family has the *strong finite intersection property* if any finite subset has infinite intersection. Such a family is said to have a *pseudointersection* if there is an infinite set which is an almost subset of every element. The *pseudointersection number* \mathfrak{p} is the least size of a family which has the strong finite intersection property but no pseudointersection. This is a weaker condition than being a maximal tower so $\mathfrak{p} \leq \mathfrak{t}$. It was shown by Malliaris and Shelah [22] that $\mathfrak{p} = \mathfrak{t}$ is in fact provable in ZFC, a rare case of a new ZFC relation between characteristics.

Recall that a filter base is a family of sets whose upwards closure forms a filter.

The *ultrafilter number* \mathfrak{u} is the least size of a filter base for a non-principal ultrafilter on ω . A family $\mathcal{I} \subseteq [\omega]^\omega$ is called *independent* if any finite intersection of its elements or their complements is infinite. The *independence number* \mathfrak{i} is the least size of a maximal independent family.

Blass [4] gives a survey of the theory of cardinal characteristics. It provides in-depth information about these and many other characteristics. In Figure 1, adapted from Blass' survey and adding the result of Malliaris and Shelah, we can see which relations between these and other combinatorial cardinal characteristics are known to be provable in ZFC.




Figure 1: Hasse diagram of many combinatorial cardinal characteristics

The result that $\mathfrak{p} = \mathfrak{t}$ is a truly rare case of an equality between characteristics being provable in ZFC. There is typically very little known evidence that any two cardinal characteristics should (not necessarily in a formal sense) be equal, unless one believes that CH is true. The rich structure of cardinal characteristics and the difficulty of obtaining equality between them could suggest that CH is not true in an intuitive sense. Perhaps the structure below the continuum has a natural significance.

1.3 Preliminaries on families in Boolean algebras

The analogues of cardinal characteristics that we focus on are *mass problems*, sets of functions on ω . Note that families of sets are a special case of this. We can compare relative computational complexity of these problems via the *Medvedev (strong) reduction*: $\mathcal{A} \leq_s \mathcal{B}$ for mass problems \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B} if there is a fixed Turing functional Θ such that $\Theta^B \in \mathcal{A}$ for any $B \in \mathcal{B}$. That is to say that there is a uniform reduction that takes elements of \mathcal{B} to elements of \mathcal{A} . Alternatively we can use the *Muchnik (weak) reduction* where a fixed Turing function is not necessary, simply $\mathcal{A} \leq_w \mathcal{B}$ if every element of \mathcal{B} computes an element of \mathcal{A} . Several cardinal characteristics can be associated with

mass problems, and we can observe that there is some correlation between the ordering of cardinal characteristics and the position of the mass problem in the Medvedev or Muchnik hierarchies.

In order to get mass problems from the cardinal characteristics defined in terms of families of sets we use some definitions. We fix a Boolean algebra \mathbb{B} of subsets of ω , and look at subsets of \mathbb{B} which will be our mass problems. When the Boolean algebra \mathbb{B} is not specified it is assumed to be the computable sets. It is important to be able to view sequences of sets as subsets of ω themselves. Given a suitable pairing function $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle : \omega \times \omega \rightarrow \omega$ (it should be bijective and always have $\langle x, e \rangle \geq x, e$) we can view a sequence $\langle F_e \rangle_{e \in \omega}$ as the set F precisely containing elements $\langle x, e \rangle$ where $x \in F_e$. Something similar can be done for functions, a sequence $\langle f_e \rangle_{e \in \omega}$ is identified with a function f where $f(e, x) = f_e(x)$.

Now we look at analogies of several of the combinatorial cardinal characteristics defined earlier.

Definition 1.1. A sequence $\langle F_e \rangle_{e \in \omega}$ is called a maximal almost disjoint (MAD) family in \mathbb{B} if for any e, k we have $F_e \cap F_k$ finite and for any infinite $R \in \mathbb{B}$ there is some e with $F_e \cap R$ infinite. Let $\mathcal{A}_{\mathbb{B}}$ be the mass problem of MAD families in \mathbb{B} .

Definition 1.2. A \mathbb{B} -tower is defined to be a sequence $\langle F_e \rangle_{e \in \omega}$ such that $F_0 = \omega$, $F_{e+1} \subseteq^* F_e$, and $F_e \setminus F_{e+1}$ infinite for each e . It is maximal if for every infinite $R \in \mathbb{B}$, there is e such that $R \setminus F_e$ is infinite. $\mathcal{T}_{\mathbb{B}}$ is the mass problem of maximal towers in \mathbb{B} .

Lempp et al. show that $\mathcal{A}_{\mathbb{B}} \leq_s \mathcal{T}_{\mathbb{B}} \leq_s \mathcal{A}_{\mathbb{B}}$ for any Boolean algebra \mathbb{B} of subsets of ω . This equivalence does not carry over to the set theoretic setting, where we have only that $\mathfrak{a} \geq \mathfrak{t}$.

Definition 1.3. A \mathbb{B} -ultrafilter base is defined to be a \mathbb{B} -tower $\langle F_e \rangle_{e \in \omega}$ such that for every $R \in \mathbb{B}$ there is an e such that either $F_e \subseteq^* \bar{R}$ or $F_e \subseteq^* R$. Let $\mathcal{U}_{\mathbb{B}}$ be the mass problem of \mathbb{B} -ultrafilter bases.

Definition 1.4. Given a sequence $\langle F_e \rangle_{e \in \omega}$, for each binary string σ define

$$F_{\sigma} = \bigcap_{\sigma(i)=0} \bar{F}_i \cap \bigcap_{\sigma(i)=1} F_i. \quad (1.1)$$

The sequence is called \mathbb{B} -independent if for every binary string σ , the set F_{σ} is infinite. The sequence is maximal independent in \mathbb{B} if for every $R \in \mathbb{B}$ there is σ such that $F_{\sigma} \subseteq^* R$ or $F_{\sigma} \subseteq^* \bar{R}$. Let $\mathcal{I}_{\mathbb{B}}$ be the mass problem of maximal independent families in \mathbb{B} .

Lempp et al. show that when \mathbb{B} is the Boolean algebra of computable sets modulo finite sets then $\mathcal{U}_{\mathbb{B}} =_s \mathcal{I}_{\mathbb{B}}$. This result is obtained by showing that both are Medvedev equivalent to the mass problem of dominating functions for computable sets.

A function $g : \omega \rightarrow \omega$ is called dominating if $g \geq^* f$ for every computable function f and $g(n) \geq n$ for all n . The mass problem of dominating functions is called DomFcn.

1.4 Recursive analogues of characteristics

Rupprecht in his PhD thesis [33] gave an exposition on what he called ‘Turing characteristics’. He defines a scheme for generalising the cardinal characteristics’ definitions, associating them to objects that he calls ‘debates’. We will look more closely at these objects later in this introduction. In particular, Rupprecht looks at the cardinals in Cichoń’s diagram, which shows relationships between \mathfrak{b} , \mathfrak{d} , and characteristics related to measure and Baire category. Using debates, he studies the analogues of these cardinals in the computability theory setting. Most of his work is only in his thesis, and otherwise unpublished.

Further work on this was done by Brendle et al. [7]. This paper made the theory more accessible and expanded on several interesting directions. They survey the theory regarding Cichoń’s diagram and relate the theory to other notions in both computability and set theory. They also outline further directions for research: open problems and set theoretic relations that were not known to hold or not in computability.

The theory of cardinal characteristics in computability is not isolated; it has applications to other areas of computability theory. The Gamma question comes from the field of coarse computability, and was resolved by Monin [23] using the theory of mass problems. It is an interesting example to show how uses of the theory of mass problems arise naturally, as will be seen in section 1.4.4.

1.4.1 Highness classes and Weihrauch problems

Greenberg, Kuyper, and Turetsky [14] studied how Weihrauch problems are used to find analogous results in set theory and computability. These Weihrauch problems are the debates that Rupprecht had studied, given the name by which they are known in reverse mathematics. A *Weihrauch problem* is a triple $A = (A_{\text{inst}}, A_{\text{sol}}, A)$ with $A_{\text{inst}}, A_{\text{sol}} \subseteq {}^\omega\omega$ and A is a binary relation between A_{inst} and A_{sol} . Elements of A_{inst} and A_{sol} are referred to as *instances* and *solutions* respectively. $b \in A_{\text{sol}}$ is a *solution for* $a \in A_{\text{inst}}$ if aAb . For example, the domination problem Dom is related to the characteristic \mathfrak{d} . An instance is a function $f \in {}^\omega\omega$ and a solution for it is a $g \in {}^\omega\omega$ such that $g \geq^* f$. A *complete solution set* for A is a set of solutions containing a solution for every instance of A . $\text{Card}(A) = \min\{|C| : C \text{ is a complete solution set for } A\}$. $\text{H}(A)$ is the collection of oracles $X \in {}^\omega 2$ that compute a solution which solves every computable instance of A . $\text{Card}(A)$ gives us a cardinal characteristics associated with A , and $\text{H}(A)$ a highness class associated with A . As one would expect, $\text{Card}(\text{Dom}) = \mathfrak{d}$. For Dom , we get $\text{H}(\text{Dom})$ to be the class of high degrees, which compute functions that dominate all computable functions.

This theory of Weihrauch problems gives us a scheme that highlights the analogy between these cardinal characteristics and interesting notions in computability. Rupprecht and Brendle et al. use different terminology and notation for these concepts, though the ideas remain the same. They are described here in this form, as by Greenberg, Kuyper, and Turetsky [14], as it is the most recent and tidy description and best integrates with similar structures in other areas of computability and logic.

Greenberg, Kuyper, and Turetsky also observe that the relations between cardinal characteristics provable in ZFC or reductions between highness properties can be described in this setting. An *effective morphism* between two Weihrauch problems A, B is a reduction from A to B in this setting. Given an instance a for A , it is effectively translated to an instance for B , and B -solutions for this instance are translated back to A -solutions for a . The effective morphism is thus a pair of maps $\varphi_{\text{inst}}, \varphi_{\text{sol}}$ such that $\varphi_{\text{inst}}(A_{\text{inst}}) \subseteq B_{\text{inst}}, \varphi_{\text{sol}}(B_{\text{sol}}) \subseteq A_{\text{sol}}$, and $\varphi_{\text{inst}}(a)Bb$ implies $aA\varphi_{\text{sol}}(b)$. The existence of




Figure 2: An effective morphism

an effective morphism from A to B is written $A \rightarrow B$. Greenberg, Kuyper, and Turetsky show that $A \rightarrow B$ implies that $\text{Card}(A) \leq \text{Card}(B)$ and $\text{H}(A) \supseteq \text{H}(B)$, justifying this scheme as a sufficient framework to study these analogies.

It is interesting to note that in the cases of dual characteristics such as \mathfrak{b} and \mathfrak{d} , there are two ways that analogues can be described via the above methods. Whereas Greenberg, Kuyper, and Turetsky [14] take high degrees as equivalent to \mathfrak{d} and hyperimmune degrees for \mathfrak{b} . Brendle et al. [7] do the reverse, \mathfrak{b} corresponding to high degrees and \mathfrak{d} to hyperimmune degrees. Both papers discuss this in some form. Greenberg, Kuyper, and Turetsky define both the highness class $\text{H}(A)$ and the non-lowness class $\text{NL}(A)$ and give similar results as above for the non-lowness class $\text{NL}(A)$ but with the direction flipped. They note that the non-lowness classes behave better in some ways and use them for the majority of the paper. Brendle et al. justify their choice via a comparison between building an oracle and building a generic object for forcing. The preferred method in this dissertation is to associate \mathfrak{d} with dominating functions and high degrees and \mathfrak{b} with hyperimmune degrees. This best aligns with the analogues of many of the characteristics in Figure 1.

1.4.2 Mass problems in the Medvedev lattice

While the highness classes in Turing degrees provide one system of analogues to cardinal characteristics, the theory of mass problems provides an alternative. Whereas $\text{H}(A)$ takes the class of oracles that compute a universal solution for computable instances of A , we could instead take the universal solutions themselves:

Definition 1.5. For a relation R on X, Y define

$$\mathcal{B}(R) = \{y \in Y : \forall x \text{ computable } (xRy)\}$$

$$\mathcal{D}(R) = \{x \in X : \forall y \text{ computable } (\neg xRy)\}$$

Here, we follow the convention of Brendle et al. as it will be convenient to refer to them later. In the case of the eventual domination relation, the former gives us the mass problem $\mathcal{B}(\leq^*) = \text{DomFcn}$ of dominating functions, which is used at length in the later chapters. We could also take the mass problem of the high sets themselves, which is equivalent to DomFcn in the Muchnik/Medvedev degrees, but includes elements higher in the Turing degrees that have nothing to do with Dom other than computing a dominating function. This further suggests the Muchnik degrees could be a more natural class of objects to study than the Turing degrees for these objects.

Instead of a mass problem equivalent of highness classes, it can be interesting to define an analogue of the set theoretic complete solution set defined above. Using a sequence identified with a single object (as described above), the analogue of a complete solution set for A will be a sequence $\langle a_e \rangle_{e \in \omega}$ of computable elements that contains a solution for any computable instance of A . The set of all such sequences is another mass problem associated with A . If we take the example of Dom as above, we get the mass problem of sequences $\langle g_e \rangle_{e \in \omega}$ such that for any computable function f there is some e such that $f \leq^* g_e$. This mass problem is equivalent in the Muchnik/Medvedev degrees to the mass problems of high sets or dominating functions.

This gives an idea of how to find analogues of cardinal characteristics that do not fit this framework. Many of the characteristics mentioned in Section 1.2 can be converted into computability theoretic objects by taking the families they bound the size of and converting them directly into families in computability. This gives us the notions described in Section 1.3, and the associated mass problems give us a natural way of studying their complexity. These are studied at length by Lempp et al. [21]. Notably, they show that the mass problems \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{T} of MAD families and maximal towers are Medvedev equivalent, and similarly that \mathcal{U} for ultrafilter bases and \mathcal{I} for independent sets are Medvedev equivalent.

1.4.3 Other work on cardinal characteristics in computability

There are many other cardinal characteristics that can be looked at in the setting of computability. The final comments of Brendle et al. [7] address some results regarding analogues of the splitting number \mathfrak{s} and the reaping number \mathfrak{r} . Valverde and Tveite [30] investigate correspondents of the evasion number \mathfrak{e} and the predicting number \mathfrak{v} . We can see in Figure 3 how the set theoretic and computability theoretic relations compare. Figure 3 follows the conventions of Brendle et al. to associate \mathfrak{b} to high degrees as $\mathcal{B}(\leq^*)$ and \mathfrak{d} to hyperimmune degrees as $\mathcal{D}(\leq^*)$ in Definition 1.5. The depicted set theoretic results are given by Blass [4]. We can see here some instances of being able to obtain more in the computability setting, as shown in Figure 3. Several of the results cited in the diagram are due to equivalences in the computability setting. For example, the hyperimmune degrees and weakly 1-generic degrees coincide, so to prove a property implies hyperimmune degree it is sometimes more instructive to show that it has weakly 1-generic degree. This is how prediction degree implies hyperimmune degree was shown by Valverde and Tveite [30].




Figure 3: Relations between some cardinal characteristics and their analogues

It is an important aspect of the cardinal characteristics program to see where it is possible to separate the cardinal characteristics in ZFC. Naturally, we want to see how this carries over into the computability theory case, but this is where more differences between set theory and computability arise. It is the case that several analogues of cardinal characteristics turn out to be equivalent, where strict relations are consistent in set theory. Several of the analogues of Cichoń's diagram collapse in the computability theory setting, as noted by Brendle et al. [7]. Perhaps this indicates that other analogues may be more fruitful; Kihara [19] has shown that in the setting of hyperarithmetical theory less collapsing occurs in analogues of Cichoń's diagram. Significant work has been done by Switzer [37, 38] describing analogues of Cichoń's diagram for generalised reduction concepts, in particular degrees of constructability relative to a fixed inner model of ZFC. He also considers relationships between cardinal characteristics of the space of functions ${}^\omega\omega \rightarrow {}^\omega\omega$.

1.4.4 The Gamma question and mass problems

The Gamma question asks about the Gamma value of Turing degrees, which in some sense measures how close a degree is to being computable. The *lower density* of $Z \subseteq \omega$ is defined to be the number

$$\underline{\rho}(Z) = \liminf_n \frac{|Z \cap [0, n]|}{n}$$

between 0 and 1. Given sequences A and R , let $A \leftrightarrow R$ be the set of indices n where the n -th element of A is equal to the n -th element of R . The *gamma value* of a sequence A is defined to be:

$$\gamma(A) = \sup_{R \text{ computable}} \underline{\rho}(A \leftrightarrow R)$$

Generalising this to Turing degrees, the *Gamma value* (with a capital 'G') of a degree with representative X is:

$$\Gamma(X) = \inf\{\gamma(A) : A \equiv_T X\}$$

The Gamma question asks if the Gamma value can be strictly between 0 and 1/2, if not then the only possible values are in $\{0, 1/2, 1\}$. Building on work by Rupprecht [32] on Schnorr engulfing sequences and hyperimmune degrees, Monin and Nies [25] made progress on the Gamma question. They give conditions on the Gamma value of oracles that lie in the families studied by Rupprecht. Work by Monin [23] builds on this and gives a negative answer to the Gamma question. There was more progress by Monin and Nies [24] which among other things gave a refined proof of this result.

The proof makes use of mass problems that had already been studied, and introduces mass problems directly related to the Gamma question. A function f is called IOE (“infinitely often equal”) if for any computable function r we have $\exists^\infty x(f(x) = r(x))$, that is f agrees with each computable function infinitely often. Dually, a function f is called AED (“almost everywhere different”) if $\forall^\infty x(f(x) \neq r(x))$. Given an order function h (non-decreasing, unbounded, computable) we define classes $\text{IOE}(h)$ and $\text{AED}(h)$ as above, but with the constraint that $r < h$. To fit with Definition 1.5, one can define a relation $f \neq_h^* g \iff f \neq^* g \wedge g < h$ that gives $\mathcal{D}(\neq_h^*) = \text{IOE}(h)$ and $\mathcal{B}(\neq_h^*) = \text{AED}(h)$.

In order to tie these previously studied objects to the Gamma question, note how the gamma value as a supremum of the lower density over all computable sequences is reminiscent of the universal solutions we use to obtain mass problems. To bring these together concretely, the relation $x \bowtie_p y \iff \rho(x \leftrightarrow y) > p$ is defined for $p \in [0, 1]$. The mass problems $\mathcal{B}(\bowtie_p)$ and $\mathcal{D}(\bowtie_p)$ are abbreviated as $\mathcal{B}(p)$ and $\mathcal{D}(p)$ respectively. The main result they seek to prove is that

$$\mathcal{D}(p) \equiv_w \text{IOE}(2^{2^n}) \text{ and } \mathcal{B}(p) \equiv_s \text{AED}(2^{2^n})$$

for arbitrary $p \in (0, 1/2)$. Once they have this, they have that the degrees of sequences with gamma value below 1/2 also have representatives with gamma value below any $p > 0$, so the infimum and hence Gamma value must be 0.

2 Combinatorial Mass Problems

The cardinal characteristics with definitions based on families of sets with self-contained properties did not fit into the frameworks based on relations that were described earlier. The work on finding correspondents to these done by Lempp et al. [21] shows that many of the relations between these cardinal characteristics collapse in the setting of mass problems.

Lempp et al. show that in any Boolean algebra of sets, the mass problems of MAD families and of maximal towers are Medvedev equivalent. In set theory, it is consistent for $\mathfrak{a} > \mathfrak{t}$ to hold, so this is one instance of collapsing in the computability setting. They also show that any non-computable c.e. set computes a MAD family and that this MAD family is even c.e. The Medvedev equivalence gives a co-c.e. maximal tower from this.

Specifically for the computable sets, by showing both are equivalent to the mass problem of dominating functions, Lempp et al. show that \mathcal{U} and \mathcal{I} are Medvedev equivalent. No pair of direct reductions between the two is known. The equivalence to dominating functions shows that ultrafilter bases (and maximal independent families) capture highness, that computing an ultrafilter base is just as good as computing a dominating function. They also construct a co-c.e. ultrafilter base for the computable sets to give an example that is quite simple in a descriptive sense.

The reductions that give the equivalence $\mathcal{I} \equiv_s \text{DomFcn}$ are described below with more detail to add clarity and to compare with the results of Section 3. In addition, we adapt their construction of a co-c.e. MAD family to the setting of ω -computably approximable sets.

2.1 Independent families and dominating functions

Define $\text{Tot} = \{e : \varphi_e \text{ is total}\}$. A binary function f is an approximation to Tot if $\chi_{\text{Tot}} = \lambda e. \lim_s f(e, s)$. The following result is adapted from Soare [36] to the setting of Medvedev degrees.

Lemma 2.1. *DomFcn is Medvedev equivalent to the mass problem of approximations to Tot.*

Proof. We first show that given an approximation f to Tot, we can define a dominating function h . For all $e \leq s$ let

$$t(e) = (\mu t \geq s)[(\forall x \leq s)\varphi_{e,t}(x) \downarrow \vee f(e, t) = 0],$$

and let $h(s) = \max\{t(e) : e \leq s\}$. $t(e)$ is always defined, as if φ_e is partial then $f(e, t) = 0$ for all but finitely many t . If φ_e is total then $f(e, t) = 1$ for all but finitely many t and so $h(s) > \varphi_e(s)$ for all but finitely many s .

Now suppose h is a dominating function. Define $f(e, s)$ as:

$$f(e, s) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } (\forall z \leq s)\varphi_{e,h(s)}(z) \downarrow \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

If φ_e is total then so is $\psi_e(y) = \mu s[(\forall x \leq y)\varphi_{e,s}(x) \downarrow]$, so h dominates ψ_e and so $f(e, s) = 1$ for all but finitely many s . If φ_e is partial then $\psi_e(y)$ must diverge for some y so $f(e, s) = 0$ for all $s \geq y$.

These constructions are determined only by the given approximation to Tot or dominating function, so there are two fixed Turing functionals which witness the Medvedev equivalence. \square

The following proofs are adapted from Lempp et al. [21, Th. 4.2–4.3]. The proofs are presented here with more detail as to be more approachable, and to compare to similar results on ideal independent families later. Lempp et al. prove the following result which is used in Theorem 2.3. The proof is omitted here as no changes would be made.

Lemma 2.2. *There is a uniformly computable sequence P_0, P_1, \dots of nonempty Π_1^0 -classes such that for every e ,*

- *if φ_e is total then P_e contains a single element, and*
- *if φ_e is not total then P_e contains only bi-immune elements.* □

It should be noted that if P_e contains only a single element, that element must be computable.

Recall the computability theoretic notion of independent families from Definition 1.4.

Theorem 2.3. *There is a fixed Turing functional that from every maximal independent family computes a dominating function. That is, $\text{DomFcn} \leq_s \mathcal{I}$.*

Proof. Exactly as in Lemma 2.2, let $\langle P_e \rangle_{e \in \omega}$ be a uniformly computable sequence of nonempty Π_1^0 -classes. Let $\langle Q_e \rangle_{e \in \omega}$ be the sequence of Π_1^0 -classes of complements of elements of P_e 's, that is: $Q_e = \{X : \bar{X} \in P_e\}$. For every set C , let $S_C = \{X \in 2^\omega : C \subseteq X\}$ be the family of subsets of C .

Now, let $F = \langle F_e \rangle_{e \in \omega}$ be a maximal independent family. Recall the definition of F_σ from (1.1). We observe the following claim for each e ,

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi_e \text{ total} &\iff \exists \sigma \exists n (F_\sigma \setminus [0, n] \subseteq X \text{ for some } X \in P_e \cup Q_e) \\ &\iff \exists \sigma \exists n (P_e \cap S_{F_\sigma \setminus [0, n]} \neq \emptyset \vee Q_e \cap S_{F_\sigma \setminus [0, n]} \neq \emptyset) \end{aligned}$$

The latter equivalence is easy to see; we justify the former as follows. If φ_e is total we have $P_e = \{X\}$ for some computable set X . As F is maximal independent, for every $\sigma \in 2^{<\omega}$ we have $F_\sigma \subseteq^* X$ or $F_\sigma \subseteq^* \bar{X}$. We can certainly leave out some finite initial segment of elements from F_σ and have it be a subset (not mod finite) so the forwards implication holds. If $F_\sigma \setminus [0, n]$ (an infinite computable set) is a subset of some element of P_e , then that element must not be immune and hence not bi-immune, so φ_e is total. If it is instead a subset of some element of Q_e , then the complement of that element in P_e cannot be co-immune and hence not bi-immune, so φ_e is total. The reverse implication holds.

$S_{F_\sigma \setminus [0, n]}$ is a $\Pi_1^0[F]$ -class uniformly in i and n . The emptiness of a $\Pi_1^0[F]$ class is a $\Pi_1^0[F]$ property, so by the above equivalence we get that $\text{Tot} = \{e : \varphi_e \text{ is total}\}$ is $\Sigma_2^0[F]$. This equivalence does not depend a single F , so the Σ_2^0 -index for Tot will be fixed. As Tot is also Π_2^0 it will be $\Delta_2^0[F]$ with a fixed pair of indices, so it is reducible to F' with a fixed reduction. Tot is therefore limit computable from F by the relativised limit lemma, and its proof shows that there is a Turing functional which computes an approximation to Tot given our maximal independent family. Hence by Lemma 2.1 we can uniformly compute a dominating function. □

Theorem 2.4. *There is a fixed Turing functional that from every dominating function computes a maximal independent family. That is, $\mathcal{I} \leq_s \text{DomFcn}$.*

It is more than sufficient to prove that a dominating function computes a family which generates freely (up to $=^*$ -equivalence) the Boolean algebra of computable sets mod finite sets. Were a finite set obtainable from finite intersections and complements of elements of this family, then one could obtain (up to $=^*$) one set in the family by finite intersections and complements of the others, and they would not freely generate the Boolean algebra. Maximality follows as we can get any other computable set by finite intersections and complements.

Proof. Let $\langle \psi_e \rangle_{e \in \omega}$ be an effective listing of the binary valued partial computable functions which are defined only on initial segments of ω . Let $V_{e,k} = \{x : \psi_e(x) = k\}$ for $k \in \{0, 1\}$. Let $h \in \text{DomFcn}$.

In each phase e we will define the computable set F_e , we will assume that in the previous stages we have constructed F_i where $i < e$, and hence F_σ for $|\sigma| = e$; recall the definition from (1.1). We will try to build F_e to be independent from the previous sets while putting in elements of $V_{e,0}$. We define a sequence $\langle r_n^e \rangle_{n \in \omega}$ using h as an oracle, though later proving that this sequence is actually computable on its own, but not necessarily with a computable index. From each of the intervals $[r_n^e, r_{n+1}^e)$ we will try to put in at least one element from $V_{e,0}$ and leave at least one out, if that is not possible then we simply try to maintain independence. The dominating function lets us eventually choose the next term of the sequence for this to occur when it is possible.

Construction: We build F_e as follows. Note that we use σ only refer to a string of length e . Define $r_0^e = 0$, and recursively define r_{n+1}^e in terms of r_n^e as the least $r > r_n^e$ such that for each σ :

- a) if there are $u, w \in \text{dom}(\psi_{e,h(r_n^e)}) \cap F_\sigma$ with $r_n^e \leq u < w$ and $u \in V_{e,1}, w \in V_{e,0}$ then $r > w$, and
- b) $|[r_n^e, r_{n+1}^e) \cap F_\sigma| \geq 2$.

Now, for $x \in [r_n^e, r_{n+1}^e)$ we define $F_e(x)$, for each σ ,

- if the antecedent of (a) holds and ψ_e is defined on $[r_n^e, r_{n+1}^e)$, then $F_e(x) = \psi_e(x)$,
- otherwise, if $x = \min([r_n^e, r_{n+1}^e) \cap F_\sigma)$ then $F_e(x) = 1$, otherwise $F_e(x) = 0$.

Verification: We now verify that this construction satisfies the desired properties. There are several things to check.

Claim 2.5. (1) Each set F_σ is infinite, and hence F is independent. (2) Each sequence $\langle r_n^e \rangle_{e \in \omega}$ is infinite, and hence for each e there is a total functional Θ_e that gives F_e .

We reason by induction on e . Suppose for all σ of length e that F_σ is infinite. We can see that $\langle r_n^e \rangle_{e \in \omega}$ is infinite as F_σ is infinite, so there is always a next r above r_n^e such that $[r_n^e, r) \cap F_\sigma \geq 2$, so we can satisfy (b). Whether (a) applies or not does not affect the existence of some next r , only how high it is, hence the sequence is infinite.

To see that $F_{\sigma \hat{\ } i}$ is infinite for $i \in \{0, 1\}$ consider the cases where ψ_e is partial and total. If ψ_e is partial, then as F_σ is infinite, infinitely often the intervals $[r_n^e, r_{n+1}^e)$ contain at least one element of F_e and one element of $\overline{F_e}$, so as $\langle r_n^e \rangle_{e \in \omega}$ is infinite, each $F_{\sigma \hat{\ } i}$ is also infinite. If ψ_e is total, then the antecedent of (a) will be satisfied infinitely often and each $F_{\sigma \hat{\ } i}$ will be infinite.

Claim 2.6. Each set F_e is computable.

We reason by induction e , so suppose for all $i < e$ that F_i is computable. Hence also each F_σ is computable for $|\sigma| = e$. If ψ_e is partial, then for all sufficiently large n , the antecedent of condition (a) fails. Hence $\langle r_n^e \rangle_{e \in \omega}$ is computable from F_σ and hence computable, and so F_e is computable.

Otherwise, ψ_e is total. Define $I_e = \{\sigma : |\sigma| = e \wedge |F_\sigma \cap V_{e,0}| = |F_\sigma \cap V_{e,1}| = \infty\}$. Define p_e a function such that $p_e(m)$ is the least stage s such that

- if $\sigma \notin I_e$ then (b) holds with $r_n^e = m$ and $r = s$,
- if $\sigma \in I_e$, there are $u, w \in \text{dom}(\psi_{e,s})$ such that $m \leq u < w$ as in (a).

Let $p_e(m) = 0$ if $m \neq r_n^e$ for any n . Note that $p_e(m)$ is computable as $F_\sigma, V_{e,0}, V_{e,1}$ are computable. By definition $p_e(r_n^e)$ is a stage at which changes to ψ_e will no longer affect (a). As for sufficiently large n we have $h(r_n^e) \geq p_e(r_n^e)$, and r is the minimum suitable value, it is sufficient to use this p_e instead of h to construct F_e . Hence the individual set F_e is computable.

It should be noted that the functions p_e are distinct so this does not mean that F is computable, it still depends on h as we use it uniformly to bound all p_e .

Claim 2.7. If ψ_e is total, then for every string $\tau = \sigma \hat{\ } a$ with $|\tau| = e + 1$, $F_\tau \subseteq^* V_{e,0}$ or $F_\tau \cap V_{e,0} =^* \emptyset$.

Define I_e as in Claim 2.6. If $\sigma \notin I_e$ then $F_\sigma \subseteq^* V_{e,i}$ for some i and the claim holds. Otherwise, by construction in Phase e we have $F_{\sigma \hat{\ } i} \subseteq^* V_{e,i}$. Hence $F_{\sigma \hat{\ } 0} \subseteq^* V_{e,0}$ and $F_{\sigma \hat{\ } 1} \cap V_{e,0} =^* \emptyset$, and the claim holds.

This claim shows that the $=^*$ -classes of the F_e freely generate the $=^*$ -classes of the computable sets, and in particular we have that F is a maximal independent family. \square

2.2 The Boolean algebra of ω -c.a. sets

We follow the treatment of ω -computably approximable sets given by Nies [29]. For a time, these were referred to as ω -c.e. sets; this was misleading so the term ω -c.a. was introduced by some authors, Greenberg and Downey [13] for example.

Definition 2.8. *A set Z is called ω -c.a. if it has a computable approximation $\langle Z_s \rangle$ such that there is some function f which bounds the number of changes of each element in Z . Precisely, that is*

$$f(x) \geq |\{s > x : Z_s(x) \neq Z_{s-1}(x)\}| \text{ for each } x.$$

We refer to f as the computable change bound for Z .

This notion is of interest as the ω -c.a. sets form a boolean algebra with unions and complements, whereas classes like the c.e. sets do not. Nies [29, Prop. 1.4.4] proves the following characterisation of ω -c.a. sets.

Proposition 2.9. Z is ω -c.a. $\iff Z \leq_{\text{wtt}} \emptyset' \iff Z \leq_{\text{tt}} \emptyset'$.

Moreover, the equivalences are effective. □

As each truth-table reduction is determined by a (partial) computable function, this provides us with an effective listing of the ω -c.a. sets. A rough summary follows, though more detail is given by Nies [29, Prop. 1.4.4]. Let $\langle \psi_e \rangle_{e \in \omega}$ be an effective listing of partial computable functions which are defined on an initial segment of ω . It is useful to restrict to these functions; it does not affect the presence of the total functions. Recall the notion of strong indices for finite sets, $D_e = \{x_1 < \dots < x_n\}$ for $e = 2^{x_1} + \dots + 2^{x_n}$. According to Nies [29, Prop. 1.2.21], $Z \leq_{\text{tt}} \emptyset'$ is equivalent to the existence of a computable g such that the elements x of Z are those such that $D_{g(x)}$ (as a finite set of strings) contains an initial segment of \emptyset' . In the original statement, this is written as a disjunctive normal form of a Boolean formula to fit with the definition of truth-table reductions. This gives us the required effective listing $\langle V_e, f_e \rangle_{e \in \omega}$ by defining:

$$V_e = \{x : x \in \text{dom}(\psi_e) \wedge (\exists \sigma \in D_{\psi_e(x)})[\sigma \preceq \emptyset']\},$$

$$f_e(x) = 2 \max\{|\sigma| : \sigma \in D_{\psi_e(x)}\}.$$

These f_e are twice the use bounds for the functional that gives the weak truth-table reduction to V_e , as described by Nies [29, Prop. 1.2.21]. Conveniently, this also gives us the computable approximations:

$$V_{e,s} = \{x : x \in \text{dom}(\psi_{e,s}) \wedge (\exists \sigma \in D_{\psi_{e,s}(x)})[\sigma \preceq \emptyset'[s]]\},$$

$$f_{e,s} = 2 \max\{|\sigma| : \sigma \in D_{\psi_{e,s}(x)}\}.$$

It is important to note that f_e converges exactly where and when ψ_e does.

One can generalise the definition of ω -c.a. to higher order types, as described in depth by Downey and Greenberg [13]. A slightly different approach is taken compared to Definition 2.8. Here, ω refers to the order type and \mathbb{N} to the underlying set.

Definition 2.10. Let $\mathcal{R} = \langle \mathbb{N}, <_{\mathcal{R}} \rangle$ be a computable well-ordering of \mathbb{N} . A set Z is called \mathcal{R} -computably approximable if there is a computable approximation $\langle Z_s \rangle$ for Z and there is a computable function $g : \mathbb{N}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ such that each map $\lambda s.g(x, s)$ for fixed x is non-increasing with respect to $<_{\mathcal{R}}$, and whenever $Z_s(x) \neq Z_{s-1}(x)$ we have $g(x, s) \neq g(x, s-1)$.

The existence of this function g with the well-foundedness of \mathcal{R} ensures that the changes for each element are finite, and hence the limit Z does exist. This definition agrees with the above definition of ω -c.a. Intuitively, this says that changes to $Z_s(x)$ are counting down below some ordinal, giving us a more complex structure of finite changes below Δ_2^0 . This is not always the same as ω -c.a. for transfinite order types, as when g ‘steps down’ from a limit ordinal we have the additional information of the step s at which this happens. Identifying ordinals with orderings of \mathbb{N} , for ordinals $\alpha < \beta$, the class of α -c.a. sets contains the class of β -c.a. sets, so the higher the ordinal, the looser the constraint on how the elements change. The following theorem describes a MAD family for the Boolean algebra of ω -c.a. sets in this way. The construction gives an example as low as possible in this hierarchy. It is interesting to note that by the Medvedev equivalence between MAD families and maximal towers shown by Lempp et al. [21, Fact 2.2] this also gives an $(\omega + 1)$ -c.a. maximal tower for the ω -c.a. sets.

Theorem 2.11. *There is a MAD family F for the ω -c.a. sets such that F is $(\omega + 1)$ -c.a.*

Proof. Let $\langle V_e, f_e \rangle_{e \in \omega}$ be a listing of the ω -c.a. sets and their computable change bounds given by truth-table reductions to \emptyset' , as described above and by Nies [29, Prop. 1.4.5]. We use the approximations $V_{e,s}, f_{e,s}$ to these as described above. Define the sequence $\langle M_e \rangle_{e \in \omega}$ such that $M_{2e} = V_e$ and $M_{2e+1} = \omega$ for each e . The construction builds ω -c.a. sets H_e using the sets M_e , with the choice of M_{2e+1} guaranteeing that H_{2e+1} is always infinite. The family F defined by $F_e = H_{2e} \cup H_{2e+1}$ will be constructed to have all desired properties, using H_{2e+1} to ensure each element is infinite while maintaining almost disjointness. In order to verify that F is maximal almost disjoint the construction will ensure the following requirements are met for every infinite M_e :

$$P_e : \forall n \left[M_e \setminus \bigcup_{i < n} H_i \text{ infinite} \right] \implies M_e \cap H_e \text{ infinite.}$$

Construction:

Stage 0: For all e , say that every $n > e$ is free to act on H_e .

Stage $s > 0$: We work on constructing the sets H_e for $e < s$ in parallel.

Substage $e < s$: Look for n with $e < n < s$ such that n is free to act on H_e , and such that there is an $x \geq 2n^2$ in $M_{e,s} \setminus \bigcup_{i < n} H_{i,s}$. If found then choose n least and then x least for n . Put x into H_e and say n is no longer free to act on H_e . If some y was added due to the action of m on H_e , and y was removed from M_e at stage s , then remove y from H_e and say m is free to act on H_e .

Verification: We verify that each condition P_e is met, and that all required properties of H and F hold.

Claim 2.12. *Each set H_e is ω -c.a.*

For each x , $H_e(x)$ can only change to respond to a change to $M_e(x)$, and only once per change to $M_e(x)$. Hence, if g is a computable function which bounds the number of changes of its input in M_e , it also bounds the number of changes of its input in H_e . Each column H_e is therefore ω -c.a.

Claim 2.13. *The union $\bigcup_i H_i$ is coinfinite.*

For each e , each $n > e$ contributes at most one x to H_e . Let $N \in \omega$ and say we have $x < 2N^2$ in this union. It must be due to the action of some $n < N$ on some H_e with $e < n$, so there are certainly less than N^2 many such x . Hence the union must be coinfinite. By the choice of each M_{2e+1} this also implies that each H_{2e+1} and hence each F_e is infinite.

Claim 2.14. *Each P_e is satisfied.*

Suppose its hypothesis holds, so for every n we have that $M_e \setminus \bigcup_{i < n} H_i$ is infinite. For every n there will eventually be some stage s where we have $x \geq 2n^2$ such that $x \in M_{e,s} \setminus \bigcup_{i < n} H_{i,s}$ and x does not leave M_e past stage s . The least such x that has not been included by a smaller n will be added to H_e . Every n will therefore act to add one new x from M_e into H_e , so $M_e \cap H_e$ is infinite, and P_e is satisfied.

Claim 2.15. *The family H , and hence also F , is almost disjoint.*

Suppose we have e, k with $e < k$, we show that $H_e \cap H_k$ is finite. If x last enters H_e due to the action of n at stage s , then $x \notin \bigcup_{i < n} H_{i,s}$. Existence of such an s is guaranteed as each element can only have finitely many changes. As $x \in H_k$, x must last enter H_k at some stage $t < s$, as it can never enter H_k after stage s . This implies that $n \leq k$, as otherwise $x \in \bigcup_{i < n} H_{i,s}$ which contradicts x entering H_e at stage s due to the action of n . As each n can only act to include one such x , there can only be k many such x , so $|H_e \cap H_k| \leq k$. Hence H is almost disjoint, and F must also be almost disjoint.

Claim 2.16. *F is maximal almost disjoint.*

It is sufficient that for every infinite M_e we find k such that $M_e \cap F_k$ is infinite. As every P_e is satisfied, if its hypothesis holds then $M_e \cap H_e$ and hence $M_e \cap F_{\lfloor e/2 \rfloor}$ is infinite. If its hypothesis does not hold, then $M_e \subseteq^* \bigcup_{i < n} H_i$ for some n , and hence there is some $i < n$ such that $M_e \cap H_i$ is infinite.

Claim 2.17. *F is $(\omega + 1)$ -c.a.*

For this claim we will refer to ω as the order type (and element of $\omega + 1$) and \mathbb{N} as the underlying set. Identify $\omega + 1$ with a computable well ordering of \mathbb{N} with the same order type. Define $g : \mathbb{N}^2 \rightarrow \omega + 1$ as follows, on each pair $\langle e, x \rangle$. Whenever the first input is not of the form $\langle e, x \rangle$, output 0. Define $g(\langle e, x \rangle, s) = \omega$ where $f_{e,s}(x)$ is

undefined (note that before $f_{e,s}(x)$ converges no elements may enter V_e). If s is the first stage such that $f_{e,s}(x)$ converges, then define $g(\langle e, x \rangle, s) = f_{e,s}(x) + 1$. This is the sum of the change bounds for H_{2e} and H_{2e+1} . For all stages $t > s$, if $F_{e,t}(x) \neq F_{e,t-1}(x)$ then set $g(\langle e, x \rangle, t) = g(\langle e, x \rangle, t - 1) - 1$. Otherwise set $g(\langle e, x \rangle, t) = g(\langle e, x \rangle, t - 1)$. Then g is a non-increasing function into $\omega + 1$, and when $F_{e,s}(x) \neq F_{e,s-1}(x)$ we have $g(\langle e, x \rangle, s) \neq g(\langle e, x \rangle, s - 1)$, hence F is $(\omega + 1)$ -c.a. \square

3 Ideal Independent Families

The cardinal characteristic \mathfrak{s}_{mm} of maximal ideal independent families was introduced by Monk [27]. A family $\mathcal{A} \subseteq [\omega]^\omega$ is said to be *ideal independent* if for every finite subfamily $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathcal{A}$ and $A \in \mathcal{A} \setminus \mathcal{X}$, the set $A \setminus \bigcup \mathcal{X}$ is infinite. Monk studied this and other cardinal characteristics in the setting of Boolean algebras. Given a Boolean algebra of sets \mathbb{B} , he defines:

$$\mathfrak{s}_{\text{mm}}(\mathbb{B}) = \min\{|\mathcal{A}| : \mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathbb{B}, \mathcal{A} \text{ is maximal ideal independent}\}.$$

The letter \mathfrak{s} is used due to similarities with the cardinal invariant of spread described by Monk [26], not because of any relation to the splitting number. It was originally written with a plain font as s_{mm} , though that nuance seems to have been lost in more recent work. It is simply referred to as \mathfrak{s}_{mm} in the case where the Boolean algebra is subsets of ω modulo finite sets.

The characteristic \mathfrak{s}_{mm} was studied in the setting of set theory by Monk [27, 28]; by Cancino, Guzmán, and Miller [8]; and by Bardyla et al. [1]. Their work includes proofs of relations such as $\mathfrak{d}, \mathfrak{u} \leq \mathfrak{s}_{\text{mm}}$, and that \mathfrak{s}_{mm} and \mathfrak{i} are independent. It is still an open question whether or not $\mathfrak{s}_{\text{mm}} < \mathfrak{a}$ is consistent with ZFC, as is the case with \mathfrak{i} . As Lempp et al. [21] did for the independence and ultrafilter numbers, we




Figure 4: Placement of \mathfrak{s}_{mm} among other cardinal characteristics

define a mass problem for the maximal ideal independent families in a Boolean algebra. Let \mathbb{B} be a Boolean algebra of sets modulo finite sets. It is useful to use the following characterisation of maximal ideal independent families. A sequence $\langle F_e \rangle_{e \in \omega}$ in \mathbb{B} is maximal ideal independent if it is ideal independent, and for any infinite and coinfinite set $R \in \mathbb{B}$, either there is an n such that $R \subseteq^* \bigcup_{i < n} F_i$, or there is some e and

finite set $B \subseteq \omega$ such that $F_e \subseteq^* R \cup \bigcup_{i \in B} F_i$. It should be noted that every almost disjoint or independent family is also ideal independent, but MAD families and maximal independent families are not necessarily maximal ideal independent. We denote by \mathcal{I}^{id} the mass problem of maximal ideal independent families for computable sets modulo finite sets. This notation is chosen to represent the similar behaviour it has to the mass problem of (full) independent sets.

The main results of this section show that $\mathcal{I}^{id} \equiv_s \text{DomFcn}$, and hence \mathcal{I}^{id} joins the equivalence with \mathcal{I} and \mathcal{U} , as per Lempp et al. [21]. The proofs follow similar approaches to those used by Lempp et al. for independent sets and ultrafilter bases. These results show that even more of Figure 4 collapses in the setting of computability. We also show that there is a Δ_2^0 maximal ideal independent family for the K -trivials, another Boolean algebra of sets that sits just barely above the computable sets.

3.1 Ideal independent families and dominating functions

Theorem 3.1. *There is a fixed Turing functional that from every maximal ideal independent family computes a dominating function. That is, $\text{DomFcn} \leq_s \mathcal{I}^{id}$.*

Proof. We use the setting from Theorem 2.3. Let $F = \langle F_e \rangle_{e \in \omega}$ be a maximal ideal independent family. Define the sets F_σ as in (1.1). Let $\langle P_e \rangle_{e \in \omega}$ and $\langle Q_e \rangle_{e \in \omega}$ be sequences of Π_1^0 -classes as in Lemma 2.2. As F is maximal ideal independent, for any infinite, co-infinite, computable R one of the following holds.

- (1) For some n we have $R \subseteq^* \bigcup_{i < n} F_i$.
This can also be written as $F_\sigma = \bigcap_{i < n} \overline{F}_i \subseteq^* \overline{R}$, where σ has 0 for every bit.
- (2) There is an e and finite set of indices B such that $F_e \subseteq^* R \cup \bigcup_{i \in B} F_i$.
Similarly, this can be written as $F_\sigma = \overline{F}_e \cap \bigcap_{i \in B} F_i \subseteq^* R$, where σ has 1 for at most one bit.

Now we restrict σ to only have the forms described above, and as in Theorem 2.3 we get exactly as before

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi_e \text{ total} &\iff \exists \sigma \exists n (F_\sigma \setminus [0, n] \subseteq X \text{ for some } X \in P_e \cup Q_e) \\ &\iff \exists \sigma \exists n (P_e \cap S_{F_\sigma \setminus [0, n]} \neq \emptyset \vee Q_e \cap S_{F_\sigma \setminus [0, n]} \neq \emptyset) \end{aligned}$$

Again we inspect the first equivalence. By the conditions on computable sets above, the forward implication follows just as in Theorem 2.3. The reverse implication is now weaker, a sufficient σ which meets our restrictions also works just fine in the general case, so the reverse implication holds. As we have already seen this is sufficient to provide a Turing functional which computes a dominating function from our maximal ideal independent family. \square

Theorem 3.2. *There is a fixed Turing functional that from every dominating function computes a maximal ideal independent family. That is, $\mathcal{I}^{id} \leq_s \text{DomFcn}$.*

Proof. The setting is the same as in Theorem 2.4. Let $\langle \psi_e \rangle_{e \in \omega}$ be an effective listing of the binary valued partial computable functions which are defined on an initial segment of ω . Let $V_{e,k} = \{x : \psi_e(x) = k\}$ for $k \in \{0, 1\}$. Let $h \in \text{DomFcn}$.

We define F inductively in e , so each F_e is constructed in terms of the F_i for $i < e$ which have already been constructed. We use the notation $F_{<e} = \bigcup_{i < e} F_i$, and in constructing F we ensure that for all e we have $F_e \cap F_{<e} = \emptyset$, so F is pairwise disjoint and hence ideal independent. We observe the sufficient conditions for a maximally ideal independent family used in Theorem 3.1. As we build F_e , if $V_{e,0}$ appears to lie in $F_{<e}$ then we just need to maintain independence as the first condition holds. Otherwise we follow $V_{e,0}$ so that we satisfy the second condition, introducing a new dependence when $V_{e,0}$ is added.

Construction: To build F_e , we assume that for $i < e$ we already have F_i . These F_i are disjoint, computable, and their union $F_{<e}$ is coinfinite. We use h to define a sequence $\langle r_n^e \rangle_{n \in \omega}$. Set $r_0^e = 0$. Define r_{n+1}^e in terms of r_n^e to be the least r such that:

- (a) if there are x, y with $r_n^e \leq x < y$ and $x, y \in \text{dom}(\psi_{e,h(r_n^e)}) \setminus F_{<e}$ then $r > y + 1$
- (b) $|\llbracket r_n^e, r \rrbracket \setminus F_{<e}| \geq 2$

Note that (a) implies (b) when the assumption in (a) holds. If the assumption of (a) holds, then we put x into F_e . Otherwise we put $\min(\llbracket r_n^e, r_{n+1}^e \rrbracket \setminus F_{<e})$ into F_e . At each step here we put in one element and leave one out, all outside of $F_{<e}$. As $\langle r_n^e \rangle_{n \in \omega}$ is infinite, we then have that F_e is infinite, and $F_{<e+1}$ is coinfinite.

This process is determined only by h so there is a Turing functional Θ_e , determined uniformly in e , such that $F_e = \Theta_e^h$.

Verification: We verify this construction for F has the desired properties. As all elements put into F_e are in the complement of $F_{<e}$, F is pairwise disjoint and hence ideal independent.

Claim 3.3. *Each set F_e is computable.*

We define $p_e(n)$ to be the least stage where $V_{e,0}$ ‘sees’ x and y . More formally, $p_e(n)$ is the least s where $\llbracket n, s \rrbracket$ witnesses (b) and there are $x, y \in V_{e,0,s}$ such that $n \leq x < y$ that are suitable for (a) (if n is not of the form r_n^e then just let $p_e(n) = 0$). This is computable, so as h eventually dominates p_e , for some n we will be defining r_{n+1}^e by checking $V_{e,0}$ at some stage $h(r_n) \geq p_e(r_n^e)$. We chose r_{n+1}^e to be minimal so we might as well check at stage $p_e(r_n^e)$, so $\langle r_n^e \rangle_{n \in \omega}$ is computable, and hence so is F_e .

Claim 3.4. *F is a maximal ideal independent family.*

It is sufficient for maximality that whenever $V_{e,0} \cup V_{e,1} = \omega$ (i.e. ψ_e is total) then $V_{e,0} \not\subseteq^* F_{<e}$ implies that $F_e \subseteq^* V_{e,0}$. If $V_{e,0}$ is not coinfinite then the consequent is

always true, and if it is not infinite then the antecedent is always false, so henceforth we assume $V_{e,0}$ is infinite and co-infinite. Suppose $V_{e,0} \not\subseteq^* F_{<e}$, so $V_{e,0} \setminus F_{<e}$ is infinite. Hence for any r_n^e there will by a stage $p_e(r_n^e)$ that is sufficient to check for the antecedent in (a) to hold. Then $h(r_n^e) > p_e(r_n^e)$ for sufficiently large n , so there are only finitely many n where the assumption in (a) fails and elements outside of $V_{e,0}$ are added to F_e . Hence $F_e \subseteq^* V_{e,0}$. \square

3.2 The Boolean algebra of K -trivial sets

Again, we follow the treatment of Nies [29]. A Turing machine M is called *prefix-free* if its domain is prefix-free, so for any strings σ, ρ in the domain of M , we have $\sigma \preceq \rho \rightarrow \sigma = \rho$. The shortest input to a prefix-free machine M that gives an output x is

$$K_M(x) = \min\{|\sigma| : M(\sigma) = x\}.$$

K is used to distinguish from C where the machine is not required to be prefix-free. A prefix-free machine R is called *optimal* if for every machine M

$$\forall x [K_R(x) \leq K_M(x) + d_M]$$

for some constant d_M . We fix an arbitrary optimal prefix-free machine R , then abbreviate $K(x) = K_R(x)$ as the *prefix-free complexity* of x .

A set A is called *K -trivial* if there is some fixed constant b such that

$$\forall n [K(A \upharpoonright n) \leq K(n) + b].$$

Here, we identify finite sets with their strong indices. This says that the complexity of initial segments of A grows about as slowly as possible, so the K -trivial sets lie very close to the computable sets.

The K -trivial sets form a Boolean algebra so we can study the complexity of certain families of them as we have done for the computable sets. Lempp et al. [21, Th. 6.1] show that there is a Δ_2^0 ultrafilter base for the K -trivial sets. The following result adapts this to the setting of maximal ideal independent families.

Theorem 3.5. *There is a maximal ideal independent family F for the Boolean algebra of the K -trivials such that F is Δ_2^0 .*

Proof. Let h be a function which dominates all K -trivial computable functions, as noted to exist by Kučera and Slaman [20]. Let $\langle V_{e,0}, V_{e,1} \rangle$ be a uniform listing of the K -trivials and their complements given by wtt-reductions to \emptyset' . Such a listing is shown to exist by Downey et al. [12], their listing includes the constants b but these are not necessary here. Let $T = \{0, 1\}^{<\omega}$.

Given any set $A = \{a_i : i \in I\}$ with $i < j \rightarrow a_i < a_j$ for any initial segment I of ω , we define $\ell(A)$ to be the set of elements of the form a_{2^i} . For each $\alpha \in T$ of length $|\alpha| = e$ we define the set S_α to be one attempt at constructing F_e for our maximal ideal

independent family. S_α will be K -trivial but not necessarily infinite. Of course, finite sets S_α will not be used in the constructed sequence F . Define $S_{\preceq\alpha} = \bigcup_{\beta \preceq\alpha} S_\beta$. We define $S_\emptyset = \ell(\omega)$ and $S_{\alpha \frown k} = \ell(V_{e,k} \setminus S_{\preceq\alpha})$ with $e = |\alpha|$, $k \in \{0, 1\}$. This definition allows us to maintain disjointness from previous stages, and leave out infinitely many elements for future stages to fit into.

We can see inductively that there is a path $g \in \{0, 1\}^\omega$ such that $S_{g \upharpoonright e}$ is infinite for all $e \in \omega$. S_\emptyset is infinite, so let $e \in \omega$ and suppose there is α of length e with S_α infinite, and such that $S_{\preceq\alpha}$ is coinfinite. If $V_{e,0} \not\subseteq^* S_{\preceq\alpha}$ then $S_{\alpha \frown 0}$ is coinfinite. If $V_{e,0} \subseteq^* S_{\preceq\alpha}$ then $V_{e,1} \setminus S_{\preceq\alpha}$ is infinite as $S_{\preceq\alpha}$ is coinfinite, so $S_{\alpha \frown 1}$ is infinite. Take $S_{\alpha \frown k}$ to be the infinite set, with preference given to the left path. Now we show that the next union is still coinfinite. $S_{\alpha \frown k} \cup S_{\preceq\alpha} = \ell(V_{e,k} \setminus S_{\preceq\alpha}) \cup S_{\preceq\alpha}$ which is coinfinite as $S_{\preceq\alpha}$ is coinfinite and $V_{e,k}$ contains infinitely many elements of $S_{\preceq\alpha}$, of which infinitely many will be left out.

Construction: F_e will be defined as $\{a_0^e, a_1^e, \dots\}$ for an increasing sequence $\langle a_k^e \rangle_{k \in \omega}$ defined as follows. Define $a_0^e = 0$. Given a_{k-1}^e already defined we attempt to set α the leftmost possible with length e such that there are at least $k+1$ elements in S_α that are less than $h(k)$. If such α exists then let a_k^e be the k -th element of S_α or a_{k-1}^e , whichever is greater. If there is no such α let $a_k^e = a_{k-1}^e$. This process is computable in \emptyset' , uniformly in e .

Verification: Let $g \in \{0, 1\}^\omega$ be the leftmost path such that $S_{g \upharpoonright e}$ is infinite for all e . Fix e and let $\alpha = g \upharpoonright e$. Let $p(k)$ be the $(k+1)$ -st element of S_α . This is computable in a K -trivial set so it is dominated by h so F_e will eventually always pick α to pull its elements from, so $F_e =^* S_\alpha$. This confirms that each F_e is K -trivial.

By construction each S_α is disjoint from the preceding S_β sets, so F is almost disjoint and hence ideal independent. Given an infinite K -trivial set R , let e be an index such that $V_{e,0} = R$, let $\alpha = g \upharpoonright (e-1)$. Suppose $R = V_{e,0} \not\subseteq^* F_{<e} =^* S_{\preceq\alpha}$ then $S_{\alpha \frown 0} = \ell(V_{e,0} \setminus S_{\preceq\alpha})$ is infinite. Hence $g(e) = 0$ and $F_e =^* S_{\alpha \frown 0} \subseteq V_{e,0} = R$. Using the conditions from Theorem 3.1 we see that if (1) does not hold, then (2) must hold, and so F is maximal ideal independent. \square

4 Conclusions

The results of Lempp et al. [21] and those in Section 3 show that the mass problem of maximal ideal independent families coincides with that of maximal independent families and ultrafilter bases in the Medvedev lattice. The diagram adapted from Blass' survey [4] in Figure 1 shows how rare it is for two cardinal characteristics to always be equal in ZFC. Perhaps unfortunately, in the framework used by Lempp et al. for finding analogues of characteristics relating to families of sets, it seems that the separation between characteristics is often lost. The equivalences shown in their paper and expanded on in Section 3 above give the following diagram:




Figure 5: The collapse of relations between several analogues of cardinal characteristics

The original work on analogues of Cichoń’s diagram by Rupperecht [33] and then Brendle et al. [7] seems to only have this problem to a lesser extent, still retaining separation between many of the analogues. This could suggest that the framework for analogues characteristics for families of sets is less effective in capturing the structure in the set theoretic setting or that there is some sense in which characteristics such as u and i are closer than independent characteristics in Cichoń’s diagram.

Other Boolean algebras, such as the ω -c.a. and K -trivial sets mentioned in this dissertation, could prove interesting to look at in more depth. The results discussed here regarding these concern only the complexities of certain families for them, but the relations between their respective mass problems could prove interesting. Lempp et al. prove the equivalence between \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{T} for an arbitrary Boolean algebra, though most of their results are for the computable sets specifically. It could be interesting to see which results hold for different Boolean algebras (or for arbitrary Boolean algebras) and how they relate to cardinal invariants on Boolean algebras as studied by Monk.

There are still many cardinal characteristics that have not yet had analogues studied in the setting of computability, those mentioned in Blass’ survey [4] but also in various other places in the literature, as was the case with s_{mm} . Also within the study of cardinal characteristics in set theory are higher cardinal characteristics between κ^+ and 2^κ for $\kappa > \omega$. Analogues of Cichoń’s diagram for generalised Baire and Cantor spaces have been studied in this way by Baumhauer, Goldstern, and Shelah [2]; Brendle et al. [5]; Brendle [6]; and Switzer [37]. Their work provides a similarly rich structure as the case $\kappa = \omega$. The rich structure of similar characteristics for higher cardinals could suggest that analogies in higher generalisations of computability may prove interesting alongside the computability case.

References

- [1] Serhii Bardyla, Jonathan Cancino-Manríquez, Vera Fischer, and Corey Bacal Switzer. *Filters, ideal independence and ideal Mrówka spaces*. 2023. arXiv: 2304.04651 [math.LO]. URL: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2304.04651>.
- [2] Thomas Baumhauer, Martin Goldstern, and Saharon Shelah. “The higher Cichoń diagram”. In: *Fundamenta Mathematicae* 252 (Jan. 2020). DOI: 10.4064/fm666-4-2020.

- [3] Stephen Binns. “A splitting theorem for the Medvedev and Muchnik lattices”. In: *Mathematical Logic Quarterly* 49.4 (2003), pp. 327–335. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1002/ma1q.200310034>.
- [4] Andreas Blass. “Combinatorial Cardinal Characteristics of the Continuum”. In: *Handbook of Set Theory*. Ed. by Matthew Foreman and Akihiro Kanamori. Springer Netherlands, 2010, pp. 395–489.
- [5] Jörg Brendle, Andrew Brooke-Taylor, Sy-David Friedman, and Diana Montoya. “Cichoń’s diagram for uncountable cardinals”. In: *Israel Journal of Mathematics* 225.2 (2018), pp. 959–1010.
- [6] Jörg Brendle. “The higher Cichoń diagram in the degenerate case”. In: *Tsukuba Journal of Mathematics* 46 (Dec. 2022). DOI: [10.21099/tkbjm/20224602255](https://doi.org/10.21099/tkbjm/20224602255).
- [7] Jörg Brendle, Andrew Brooke-Taylor, Keng Meng Ng, and André Nies. “An Analogy between Cardinal Characteristics and Highness Properties of Oracles”. In: *Proceedings of the 13th Asian Logic Conference*. 2015, pp. 1–28.
- [8] Jonathan Cancino, Osvaldo Guzmán, and Arnold Miller. “Ideal independent families and the ultrafilter number”. In: *The Journal of Symbolic Logic* 86.1 (2021), 128–136. DOI: [10.1017/jsl.2019.14](https://doi.org/10.1017/jsl.2019.14).
- [9] Paul Cohen. “The Independence Of The Continuum Hypothesis”. In: *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 50.6 (1963), pp. 1143–1148.
- [10] Joshua Cole and Stephen Simpson. “Mass Problems and Hyperarithmeticity”. In: *Journal of Mathematical Logic* 7.2 (2007), pp. 125–143. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1142/S0219061307000652>.
- [11] Eric Karel van Douwen. “Chapter 3 - The Integers and Topology”. In: *Handbook of Set-Theoretic Topology*. Ed. by Kenneth Kunen and Jerry Vaughan. Amsterdam: North-Holland, 1984, pp. 111–167.
- [12] Rod Downey, Denis Hirschfeldt, André Nies, and Frank Stephan. “Trivial Reals”. In: *Electronic Notes in Theoretical Computer Science* 66.1 (2002). CCA 2002, Computability and Complexity in Analysis (ICALP 2002 Satellite Workshop), pp. 36–52. DOI: [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1571-0661\(04\)80377-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1571-0661(04)80377-3).
- [13] Rodney Downey and Noam Greenberg. *A Hierarchy of Turing Degrees: A Transfinite Hierarchy of Lowness Notions in the Computably Enumerable Degrees, Unifying Classes, and Natural Definability*. June 2020. DOI: [10.23943/princeton/9780691199665.001.0001](https://doi.org/10.23943/princeton/9780691199665.001.0001).
- [14] Noam Greenberg, Rutger Kuyper, and Dan Turetsky. “Cardinal invariants, non-lowness classes, and Weihrauch reducibility”. In: *Computability* 8 (2019), pp. 305–346. DOI: [10.3233/COM-180219](https://doi.org/10.3233/COM-180219).
- [15] Kurt Gödel. “Consistency-Proof for the Generalized Continuum-Hypothesis¹”. In: *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 25.4 (1939), pp. 220–224.

- [16] Carl Jockusch. “The degrees of bi-immune sets”. In: *Mathematical Logic Quarterly* 15.7-12 (1969), pp. 135–140. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1002/malq.19690150707>.
- [17] Carl Jockusch. “Upward closure and cohesive degrees”. In: *Israel Journal of Mathematics* 15.3 (1973), pp. 332–335. DOI: 0.1007/BF02787575.
- [18] Miroslav Katětov. “Remarks on characters and pseudocharacters”. In: *Commentationes Mathematicae Universitatis Carolinae* 001.1 (1960), pp. 20–25.
- [19] Takayuki Kihara. “Higher randomness and lim-sup forcing within and beyond hyperarithmetical”. In: *Sets and Computations*. 2017, pp. 117–155. DOI: 10.1142/9789813223523_0006.
- [20] Antonín Kučera and Theodore Slaman. “Low Upper Bounds of Ideals”. In: *Journal of Symbolic Logic* 74.2 (2009), pp. 517–534. DOI: 10.2178/jsl/1243948325.
- [21] Steffen Lempp, Joseph S. Miller, André Nies, and Mariya I. Soskova. “Maximal Towers and Ultrafilter Bases in Computability Theory”. In: *The Journal of Symbolic Logic* 88.3 (2023), pp. 1170–1190. DOI: 10.1017/jsl.2022.60.
- [22] Maryanthe Malliaris and Saharon Shelah. “Cofinality spectrum theorems in model theory, set theory, and general topology”. In: *J. Amer. Math. Soc.* 29.1 (2016), pp. 237–297. DOI: 10.1090/jams830.
- [23] Benoit Monin. “An answer to the Gamma question”. In: *Proceedings of the 33rd Annual IEEE Symposium on LICS*. 2018, pp. 730–738.
- [24] Benoit Monin and André Nies. “Muchnik degrees and cardinal characteristics”. In: *The Journal of Symbolic Logic* 86.2 (2021), pp. 471–498. DOI: 10.1017/jsl.2020.1.
- [25] Benoit Monin and André Nies. “A Unifying Approach to the Gamma Question”. In: *2015 30th Annual ACM/IEEE Symposium on Logic in Computer Science*. 2015, pp. 585–596.
- [26] James Donald Monk. *Cardinal Invariants on Boolean Algebras*. 1996, p. 301. DOI: 10.1007/978-3-0346-0334-8.
- [27] James Donald Monk. “Maximal irredundance and maximal ideal independence in Boolean algebras”. In: *Journal of Symbolic Logic* 73.1 (2008), 261–275. DOI: 10.2178/jsl/1208358753.
- [28] James Donald Monk. “Remarks on continuum cardinals on Boolean algebras”. In: *Mathematical Logic Quarterly* 58.3 (2012), pp. 159–167. DOI: 10.1002/malq.201110064.
- [29] André Nies. *Computability and Randomness*. Oxford, England: Oxford University Press UK, 2008.
- [30] Iván Ongay-Valverde and Paul Tveite. “Computable analogs of cardinal characteristics: Prediction and rearrangement”. In: *Annals of Pure and Applied Logic* 172.1 (2021). DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apal.2020.102872>.

- [31] Fritz Rothberger. “Une remarque concernant l’hypothèse du continu”. FRA. In: *Fundamenta Mathematicae* 31.1 (1938), pp. 224–226.
- [32] Nicholas Rupprecht. “Relativized Schnorr tests with universal behavior”. In: *Arch. Math. Log.* 49.5 (2010), 555–570. ISSN: 0933-5846. DOI: 10.1007/s00153-010-0187-6.
- [33] Nicholas Andrew Rupprecht. “Effective Correspondents to Cardinal Characteristics in Cichoń’s Diagram”. PhD thesis. University of Michigan, 2010.
- [34] Stephen Simpson. “Mass Problems and Intuitionism”. In: *Notre Dame Journal of Formal Logic* 49.2 (2008), pp. 127–136. DOI: 10.1215/00294527-2008-002.
- [35] Stephen Simpson. “Mass Problems and Randomness”. In: *Bulletin of Symbolic Logic* 11.1 (2005), pp. 1–27. DOI: 10.2178/bs1/1107959497.
- [36] Robert Soare. *Recursively Enumerable Sets and Degrees: A Study of Computable Functions and Computably Generated Sets*. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 1987.
- [37] Corey Bacal Switzer. “Alternative Cichoń Diagrams and Forcing Axioms Compatible with CH”. PhD thesis. The City University of New York, 2020.
- [38] Corey Bacal Switzer. “The Cichoń diagram for degrees of relative constructibility”. In: *Mathematical Logic Quarterly* 66.2 (2020), pp. 217–234. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1002/malq.201900062>.
- [39] William Hugh Woodin. “In Search Of Ultimate-L The 19th MidrashA Mathematicae Lectures”. In: *The Bulletin of Symbolic Logic* 23.1 (2017), 1–109. DOI: 10.1017/bs1.2016.34.
- [40] William Hugh Woodin. “Set Theory after Russell: The Journey Back to Eden”. In: *One Hundred Years of Russell’s Paradox*. Ed. by Godehard Link. Berlin, New York: De Gruyter, 2004, pp. 29–48.
- [41] William Hugh Woodin. “The Continuum Hypothesis I”. In: *Notices of the American Mathematical Society* 48 (Jan. 2001).