

TURING DEGREES AND RANDOMNESS FOR CONTINUOUS MEASURES

MINGYANG LI AND JAN REIMANN

ABSTRACT. We study degree-theoretic properties of reals that are not random with respect to any continuous probability measure (NCR). To this end, we introduce a family of generalized Hausdorff measures based on the iterates of the “dissipation” function of a continuous measure and study the effective nullsets given by the corresponding Solovay tests. We introduce two constructions that preserve non-randomness with respect to a given continuous measure. This enables us to prove the existence of NCR reals in a number of Turing degrees. In particular, we show that every Δ_2^0 -degree contains an NCR element.

MSC classes: 03D32, 03D25, 03D28

Keywords: Algorithmic randomness, continuous measures, Turing degrees, recursively enumerable and above, moduli of computation

1. INTRODUCTION

Martin-Löf’s 1966 paper [10] put the notion of an individual random sequence on a sound mathematical footing. He gave a rigorous definition of what it means for an infinite binary sequence (which we also refer to as a *real*) to be random with respect to a Bernoulli measure. Zvonkin and Levin [18] extended the definition to computable measures on $2^{\mathbb{N}}$ and showed that every non-computable real $X \in 2^{\mathbb{N}}$ that is random with respect to computable probability measure is Turing equivalent to a sequence random with respect to Lebesgue measure on $2^{\mathbb{N}}$, the measure induced by a fair coin toss on $\{0, 1\}$. This marked one of the first results connecting randomness and the degrees of unsolvability. Over the following decades, our understanding of how randomness (in the sense of Martin-Löf and related, algorithmically based notions) and computability interact has grown tremendously. Two recent monographs attest to this [4, 12]. However, most investigations focused on the computational properties sequences that *are* random with respect to some kind of measure: Lebesgue measure (the vast majority of results), but also other computable probability measures and

Hausdorff measures. This leaves the question whether we can characterize, in terms of computability theory, the reals which do not exhibit any random behavior *at all*. The notion of “begin far from random” so far has mostly been studied from the point of view of *triviality* and *lowness*, which characterize reals by having low initial-segment Kolmogorov complexity or by having little derandomization power as oracles, respectively. We again refer to the monographs [4, 12] for an overview of a large number of results in this direction.

This paper focuses on a different kind of question: *Given a real $X \in 2^{\mathbb{N}}$, and a family of probability measures \mathcal{M} , is X random with respect to a measure in \mathcal{M} , and if not, what is the computational power of X ?*

Levin [7] was the first to define Martin-Löf randomness for arbitrary probability measures. Levin defined *uniform tests* of randomness. Such a test is a left-enumerable function t that maps pairs of measures and reals to non-negative real numbers or infinity such that for any probability measure μ on $2^{\mathbb{N}}$, $\int t(\mu, X) d\mu(X) \leq 1$. A sequence X is random for μ if for all uniform test t , $t(\mu, X) < \infty$. A different approach to randomness with respect to arbitrary measures was given by Reimann and Slaman [14]. Their approach represents measures as reals and makes these available as oracles in relativized Martin-Löf tests. We will present more details on this approach in Section 2. Day and Miller [3] showed that the two approaches are equivalent, that is, they define the same set of random reals.

It is a trivial fact that any real X that is an *atom* of a measure μ , i.e., $\mu\{X\} > 0$, is random with respect to μ . Reimann and Slaman [14] showed that a real X is non-trivially random with respect to some probability measure μ if and only if X is non-computable. In other words, if we do not further restrict the family of probability measures, a real has *some* non-trivial random content if and only if it is not computable. Day and Miller [3] gave an alternative proof of this result using Levin’s neutral measures (a single measure relative to which *every* sequence is random).

A more intricate structure emerges when we ask which sequences are random with respect to a *continuous*, i.e. non-atomic, probability measure. Reimann and Slaman [14] showed that if a sequence $X \in 2^{\mathbb{N}}$ is not Δ_1^1 , it is random with respect to a continuous measure. We use the term *NCR* to denote those reals which are not random with respect to any continuous measure. Kjos-Hanssen and Montalbán [11] showed every member of a countable Π_1^0 set of sequence is NCR. Cenzer, Clote, Smith, Soare, and Wainer [2] showed that members of countable Π_1^0 sets

of reals exist in every Turing degree $\mathbf{0}^{(\alpha)}$, where α is any computable ordinal. Therefore, the Kjos-Hanssen-Montalbán result implies the set of NCR reals is cofinal in Δ_1^1 Turing-degrees.

On the other hand, Barmpalias, Greenberg, Montalbán and Slaman [1] connected computational lowness with NCR by showing that any real Turing below an incomplete r.e. degree is NCR. In particular, every K-trivial is NCR. Their result makes use of a close connection between the granularity function of a continuous measure (introduced in the next section) and the settling time of a Δ_2^0 real, which was first observed by Reimann and Slaman [15]. The granularity function (along with its “companion”, the dissipation function of a measure), will also play a central role in this paper.

The previous results suggest an attempt to classify the Δ_1^1 Turing degrees along the following lines:

- (1) Which Turing degrees consist entirely of NCR reals?
- (2) Which Turing degrees do not contain any NCR reals?
- (3) Which Turing degrees contain NCR reals?

Haken [5] studied these questions with respect to stronger randomness tests for arbitrary (not necessarily continuous) measures, in particular difference and weak- n -randomness for $n \geq 2$. He also linked continuous randomness to higher randomness by showing that NCR reals are not 3-randomizable, i.e. for any (possibly atomic) measure μ and any representation R_μ of μ , NCR reals are not μ -random with respect to any Martin-Löf μ -test relative to R_μ'' .

Regarding Question (2), Reimann and Slaman [16] showed that every real Turing below a (Lebesgue) 3-random real and not recursive in $0'$ is random with respect to a continuous measure.

In this paper, we mainly focus on Question (3). We construct NCR reals in certain families of Turing degrees. Our main technique is to recursively approximate non-random reals using other non-random reals which are, in a certain sense, even “more non-random” reals. For this purpose, we quantify non-randomness with respect to a given measure. We introduce a new randomness test parameterized by a natural number n which corresponds to the level of non-randomness. We should point out that the level n of non-randomness we define in this paper is not related to the notion of Martin-Löf n -randomness.

This paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we introduce the new randomness test which quantifies the level of non-randomness and prove some basic facts about it which we will need later. In Sections 3 and 4, respectively, we present two constructions of reals based on levels of non-randomness, one for reals r.e. above (REA) a given real,

the other one for reals with a self-modulus. Finally, in Section 5, we infer the existence of NCR reals in certain Turing degrees using the construction in Sections 3 and 4. In particular, our constructions can be used to prove the following theorem.

Theorem 1.1.

- (a) *Any n -REA Turing degree contains an NCR real.*
- (b) *Any self-modulus degree contains an NCR real.*

The theorem in particular implies

Corollary 1.2. *Every Δ_2^0 degree contains an NCR element.*

Acknowledgments. We would like to thank Ted Slaman for many helpful discussions, and for first observing the relation between the granularity function of a measure and the settling time of a real. This crucial initial insight inspired much of the work presented here.

Notation. In the following, we list the notation used in this paper. The reader can refer to [17] for more details.

- We use \log to denote the binary logarithm.
- Lower case Roman letters denote natural numbers, except f, g, h (and sometimes s, t), which denote functions.
- We use capital Roman letters X, Y, Z, A, B, C, R to denote set of natural numbers as well as infinite binary strings (reals).
- We use Greek letters σ, τ to denote finite binary strings. The length of a string σ will be denoted by $|\sigma|$. We use $[\![\sigma]\!]$ to denote the set of all infinite binary strings extending σ .
- We use $\text{dom}(f)$ to denote the domain of a partial recursive function f .
- We fix an effective enumeration $\{\Phi_i\}$ of all oracle Turing machines.
- We use Φ_e^A to denote the machine with oracle A and Gödel number e . We write $\Phi_e^A(x) = y$ if the machine halts on input x and outputs y . If $\Phi_e^A(x)$ does not halt, we write $\Phi_e^A(x) = \uparrow$. Finally, we let $W_e^A = \text{dom}(\Phi_e^A)$.
- We use $\Phi_{e,k}^A(x)$ to denote the e -th machine with oracle A running for k steps. Without loss of generality, $\Phi_{e,k}^A(x) = \uparrow$ when $x > k$. We put $W_{e,s}^A = \text{dom}(\Phi_{e,s}^A) \upharpoonright_s$.
- We use $\sigma \frown \tau$ to denote the concatenation of strings σ and τ .

2. QUANTIFYING NON-RANDOMNESS

In this section, we first briefly review the definition of randomness with respect to arbitrary measures given by [14]. We refer the readers for [14] and [3] for more details.

First of all, we define a metrical structure on the set of all probability measure on 2^ω .

Definition 2.1. For any probability measures μ and ν on 2^ω , define the *distance function* $d(\mu, \nu)$ as

$$d(\mu, \nu) = \sum_{\sigma \in 2^{<\omega}} 2^{-|\sigma|} |\mu[\sigma] - \nu[\sigma]|.$$

Let $\mathcal{P}(2^\omega)$ be the set of all probability measures on 2^ω , and let μ_σ be the measure which is identical with the characteristic function of the principal filter of $\{\sigma \cap 0^\omega\}$, that is, for any $H \subset 2^\omega$,

$$\mu_\sigma(H) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \sigma \cap 0^\omega \in H, \\ 0 & \text{if } \sigma \cap 0^\omega \notin H. \end{cases}$$

The following properties hold.

Proposition 2.2.

- (1) $d(\mu, \nu)$ is a metric on $\mathcal{P}(2^\omega)$.
- (2) $\mathcal{P}(2^\omega)$ with the topology generated by $d(\mu, \nu)$ is a Polish space.
- (3) The closure of all μ_σ under binary average forms a countable dense subset of $(\mathcal{P}(2^\omega), d)$.

For the proof, refer to [14] or [3]. The proposition allows for representing any element of $\mathcal{P}(2^\omega)$ by a Cauchy sequences of elements in (3). Let us assume $\{\mu_0, \mu_1, \mu_2, \dots\}$ is a fixed effective enumeration of the set in (3). Any sequence of measures in (3) can then be represented by its sequence of indices in $\{\mu_0, \mu_1, \mu_2, \dots\}$. If one develops this correspondence carefully it is possible to prove the following [3].

Proposition 2.3. *There exists a Turing functional Γ , such that for any real X and any natural number n , $\Gamma^X(m) \downarrow$, and the following hold.*

- (1) $d(\mu_{\Gamma^X(n)}, \mu_{\Gamma^X(n+1)}) \leq 2^{-n}$;
- (2) the function $\rho : 2^\omega \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(2^\omega)$ defined as

$$\rho(X) = \lim_n \mu_{\Gamma^X}^X(n)$$

is a continuous surjection.

- (3) for any X , $\rho^{-1}(\{\rho(X)\})$ is $\Pi_1^0(X)$.

From now on, we fix a mapping ρ as given by Proposition 2.3.

Definition 2.4. A *representation* of a probability measure μ is a real R such that $\rho(R) = \mu$.

Note that for a given probability measure μ , its representation might not be unique. However, any representation of μ can compute a two-sided effective approximation to $\mu[\![\sigma]\!]$, for any given σ .

Using representations as oracles, one can define randomness tests and computability relative to a given probability measure.

Definition 2.5. A *Martin-Löf- μ -test relative to a representation R_μ* (or simply *Martin-Löf- R_μ -test*) is a sequence of uniformly $\Sigma_1^0(R_\mu)$ sets $(V_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ such that for all n , $\mu(V_n) \leq 2^{-n}$.

$X \in 2^\omega$ *passes* a Martin-Löf- R_μ -test if $X \notin \bigcap_{n \in \omega} V_n$.

For any probability measure μ on 2^ω and a representation R_μ of μ , $X \in 2^\omega$ is *R_μ - μ -random* if X passes every Martin-Löf- μ test relative to R_μ .

Definition 2.6. A set or function is *μ -computable* (*μ -c.e.*) if it is computable (computably enumerable) in any representation of μ .

Finally, we can formally introduce the property NCR (not random w.r.t. any continuous measure).

Definition 2.7. A measure μ is *continuous* if every singleton has μ -measure 0. $X \in 2^\omega$ is *NCR* if and only if X is not R_μ - μ -random w.r.t. any continuous probability measure μ and any representation R_μ of μ .

Next, we introduce a new family of randomness tests. We will need two functions for this, the dissipation function g and the granularity h of a measure.

Definition 2.8. For any continuous probability measure μ , define the *granularity function* $g_\mu(n) := \min\{l : \forall |\sigma| = l, \mu[\![\sigma]\!] < 2^{-n}\}$, and define the *dissipation function* $h_\mu(l) := \max\{n : \forall |\sigma| = l, \mu[\![\sigma]\!] < 2^{-n+1}\}$.

We simply write $g(n)$ or $h(n)$ when the underlying measure is clear. The function g is well-defined by compactness of 2^ω . For any natural number n , $g(n)$ gives a length l by which the measure of any cylinder set of length l is less than 2^{-n} . Given a length l , the dissipation function $h(l)$ gives the binary upper bound of the measure for cylinder sets of length l .

Fact 2.9. Here are some easy facts about g and h .

- (1) $\forall n, n < g(n) < g(n+1) < g(g(n+1))$
- (2) $\forall l, h(l) \leq h(l+1) \leq h(l) + 1 \leq l + 1$

- (3) $\forall n, h(g(n)) = n + 1$
- (4) $\lim_{l \rightarrow \infty} h(l) = \infty$
- (5) $g \equiv_T h$

Proof. Properties (1)-(4) follow directly from the definition or via an easy induction.

For (5), $h(l)$ equals the largest n such that $g(n-1) \leq l$, and $g(n)$ is equal to the least l such that $h(l) = n + 1$, so $g \equiv_T h$. \square

Notice that g_μ and h_μ are in general only μ -c.e. But we have the following lemma, which will be useful in Section 4.

Lemma 2.10. *For any continuous measure μ , there are μ -computable, non-decreasing functions $\hat{h}_\mu(n), \hat{g}_\mu(n)$ such that for all n ,*

$$\begin{aligned} h_\mu(n) &\leq \hat{h}_\mu(n) \leq \min\{n, h_\mu(n) + 1\}, \\ g_\mu(n) &\leq \hat{g}_\mu(n) \leq g_\mu(n + 1). \end{aligned}$$

Proof. To define \hat{h}_μ , note that any representation of μ can effectively find an n such that $2^{-n} < \mu([\sigma]) < 2^{-n+2}$, uniformly for any σ . Let $\hat{h}_\mu(l)$ be the maximum such $n \leq l$ for all σ with length l .

Now let $\hat{g}_\mu(n)$ be the minimum l such that $\hat{h}_\mu(l) = n + 2$. Since $\hat{h}_\mu \geq h_\mu$, it follows from the observation in the proof of Fact 2.9(5) that $\hat{g}_\mu(n) \leq g_\mu(n + 1)$.

On the other hand, by Fact 2.9, we have

$$h(\hat{g}_\mu(n)) \leq \hat{h}(\hat{g}_\mu(n)) = n + 2.$$

We also know $h_\mu(g_\mu(n)) = n + 1$, and h_μ is monotonic, so $h(\hat{g}_\mu(n)) \geq g_\mu(n)$. \square

A straightforward induction yields the following.

Corollary 2.11. *For the function \hat{h}_μ from Lemma 2.10, we have that for all $l, n \in \mathbb{N}$,*

$$h_\mu^{(n)}(l) \leq \hat{h}_\mu^{(n)}(l) \leq h_\mu^{(n)}(l) + n.$$

We will now define a new randomness test. The reader should keep in mind our main aim is to study not the random reals for a measure, but the non-random reals. In particular, we want to devise a quantitative measure of *how non-random* a real is.

The main difference between our test and a regular Martin-Löf test is how we weigh cylinders. In Martin-Löf tests, we set upper bounds on the measure of a union of cylinders. Thus, for any finite string σ , its weight is $\mu[\![\sigma]\!]$ under measure μ . When μ is Lebesgue measure, strings with the same length would have the same weight, but this is not

generally true for other measures. However, in our new test, we assign the same weight to strings with the same length. This means we assign a measure μ a corresponding *Hausdorff measure*. The weight of each cylinder is determined by the dissipation function h_μ . To obtain the desired stratification, we consider iterates of h_μ . The more we iterate h_μ , the slower the induced function goes to infinity, and the harder it will be to cover reals. For technical reasons, we need to multiply by a coefficient that is also completely determined by h_μ and the level of iteration. As mentioned before, we will write h and \hat{h} for h_μ and \hat{h}_μ , respectively, if the underlying measure μ is clear.

Definition 2.12. For any continuous measure μ , a *level- n Solovay test* for μ is a μ -c.e. sequence T_n of finite binary strings such that

$$\sum_{\sigma \in T_n} (h^{(n)}(|\sigma|))^{\log n} 2^{-h^{(n)}(|\sigma|)} < \infty.$$

We say $A \in 2^{\mathbb{N}}$ *fails* T_n if $A \in \llbracket \sigma \rrbracket$ for infinitely many $\sigma \in T_n$. We say A is *non- μ -random of level n* if it fails some level- n randomness test for μ , and we say A is *non- μ -random of level ω* if it is non- μ -random of level n test for all natural numbers n .

Please note that the level of a test defined as above has nothing to do with what sometimes called the level of a Martin-Löf test (i.e., the n -th uniformly c.e. set in a Martin-Löf test). In our definition, it is a parameter which used to measure how non-random a real is with respect to a specific continuous measure. In the following, we assume, without loss of generality, that all tests are infinite.

If μ is Lebesgue measure, we have $h_\mu(n) = n$ and thus,

$$\sum_{\sigma \in T_n} (h^{(n)}(|\sigma|))^{\log n} 2^{-h^{(n)}(|\sigma|)} = \sum_{\sigma \in T_n} |\sigma|^{\log n} 2^{-|\sigma|},$$

so in this case a level-1 Solovay test coincides with the standard notion of a Solovay test [4, 6.2.7]

We next establish some basic properties of the new test notion. The following Lemma follows easily by analyzing the derivative.

Lemma 2.13. *The function $f(x) := x^{\log n} 2^{-x}$ is decreasing to 0 from above for $x > \log n$.*

We first show that μ -computable reals are non- μ random of level ω .

Proposition 2.14. *If a real A is computable in μ , then A is non- μ random of level ω for all continuous measures μ .*

Proof. If A is a μ -computable real, then we can compute arbitrary long initial segments of A from any representation of μ . By Fact 2.9, the μ -computable function $\hat{h}(l)$ is non-decreasing, $h(l) \leq \hat{h}(l) \leq h(l) + 1$, and $\lim_{l \rightarrow \infty} \hat{h}(l)$ and $\lim_{l \rightarrow \infty} h(l)$ are both infinite. Then for any natural number n , if σ is an initial segment of A and $\hat{h}^{(n)}(|\sigma|)$ is greater than $n + \log n$, by Lemma 2.13 and Corollary 2.11, we have the following inequality:

$$(h^{(n)}(|\sigma|))^{\log n} 2^{-h^{(n)}(|\sigma|)} \leq (\hat{h}^{(n)}(|\sigma|) - n)^{\log n} 2^{-\hat{h}^{(n)}(|\sigma|) + n}.$$

So, for fixed n , let $\{\sigma_i\}$ be a μ -computable sequence of initial segments of A such that the following two inequalities are satisfied, for all $i \in \omega$:

$$\begin{aligned} (\hat{h}^{(n)}(|\sigma_i|)) &> n + \log n, \\ (\hat{h}^{(n)}(|\sigma_i|) - n)^{\log n} 2^{-\hat{h}^{(n)}(|\sigma_i|) + n} &< 2^{-i}. \end{aligned}$$

Then $\{\sigma_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ is a level- n test which covers A . Therefore, A is non- μ -random of level ω . \square

The next proposition shows the relation between level tests and Martin-Löf tests.

Proposition 2.15. *If a real A is non- μ -random of level 1, then A is not μ -Martin-Löf random.*

Proof. If $n = 1$, the sum in Definition 2.12 becomes

$$\sum_{\sigma \in T_1} 2^{-h(|\sigma|)}.$$

By the definition of h , we have $\mu[\llbracket \sigma \rrbracket] < 2^{-h(|\sigma|)+1}$, thus any level-1 test is a standard Solovay test. Moreover, for a probability measure, any real covered by a Solovay test is also covered by a Martin-Löf test, see for example [4, Theorem 6.2.8]. \square

Next, we show that the level tests are indeed nested.

Proposition 2.16. *Every level- n test is also a level- $(n - 1)$ test.*

Proof. Assume $\{\sigma_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ is a level- n test. By Fact 2.9, for all but finitely many i ,

$$h^{(n-1)}(|\sigma_i|) \geq h^{(n)}(|\sigma_i|) > \log(n - 1).$$

By Lemma 2.13 and the inequality above, for all but finitely many i , the following holds:

$$(h^{(n-1)}(|\sigma_i|))^{\log n - 1} 2^{-h^{(n-1)}(|\sigma_i|)} < (h^{(n)}(|\sigma_i|))^{\log n - 1} 2^{-h^{(n)}(|\sigma_i|)}.$$

Furthermore, we know $h^{(n)}(|\sigma_i|)$ is positive and $\log(n-1) < \log n$, so we have

$$(h^{(n)}(|\sigma_i|))^{\log n-1} 2^{-h^{(n)}(|\sigma_i|)} < (h^{(n)}(|\sigma_i|))^{\log n} 2^{-h^{(n)}(|\sigma_i|)}.$$

Finally, since $\{\sigma_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ is an level- n test,

$$\sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}} (h^{(n-1)}(|\sigma_i|))^{\log n-1} 2^{-h^{(n-1)}(|\sigma_i|)} < \sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}} (h^{(n)}(|\sigma_i|))^{\log n} 2^{-h^{(n)}(|\sigma_i|)} < \infty.$$

So $\{\sigma_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ is also a level- $(n-1)$ test. \square

The previous results justify thinking of level tests as a hierarchy of non-randomness for continuous measures. In particular, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & X \text{ is non-}\mu \text{ random of level } \omega \\ & \Downarrow \\ & X \text{ is non-}\mu \text{ random of level } n+1 \\ & \Downarrow \\ & X \text{ is non-}\mu \text{ random of level } n \\ & \Downarrow \\ & X \text{ is not } \mu\text{-random.} \end{aligned}$$

It is not too hard to construct a measure for which this hierarchy is proper (see [8]), while for other measures (such as Lebesgue measure on $2^{\mathbb{N}}$) it collapses.

One can define a similar hierarchy for NCR instead of for individual measures, saying that a real $X \in 2^{\omega}$ is *NCR of level n (ω)* if and only if X is non- μ random of level n (ω) for every continuous probability measure μ . Interestingly, this hierarchy for NCR overall collapses, mostly due to the correspondence between continuous measures and Hausdorff measures established by *Frostman's Lemma* (see [13]). This is shown in a different paper by the authors [9], where the generalized Solovay test introduced in Definition 2.12.

3. CONSTRUCTING NON-RANDOM R.E.A. REALS

The goal of this section is to construct level- n non-random reals that are recursively enumerable above (*r.e.a.*) a given level- $2n$ non-random real A . In fact, we can construct such a real in any Turing degree r.e.a. A .

To this end, we first introduce a general construction technique which builds a real C r.e.a. a given real A .

The basic idea is to add a large amount of “1”s between each bit of B , where the number of “1”s is still computable by B .

Construction 3.1. Assume for a given A and a real B r.e. above A , we have $W_e^A = B$ for some e . Without loss of generality, we may assume the first bit of B is “1” and it takes Φ_e^A only one step to halt on input “0” with no use of the oracle. We also assume that B is infinite.

Denote the i -th bit of A by a_i and the i -th bit of B by b_i . By our assumption, $b_0 = 1$.

Let

$$m_i = \min\{j > i : \Phi_e^A(j) \downarrow\},$$

that is, m_i is the least element of B which is greater than i . Define the function $f : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ as

$$f(i) = \begin{cases} \min\{s \mid \forall j \leq m_i (\Phi_e^A(j) \downarrow \implies \Phi_{e,s}^A(j) \downarrow)\} & \text{if } i \in B, \\ 1 & \text{if } i \notin B. \end{cases}$$

When $i \in B$, $f(i)$ is the minimum number such that for all $j \leq m_i$ and $j \in B$, $\Phi_e^A(j)$ halts within $f(i)$ many steps. Since $A \leq_T B$, f is B -computable. Define a sequence of finite binary strings C_i as follows:

$$C_i = b_0^{f(0)} \frown 0 \frown b_1^{f(1)} \frown 0 \frown b_2^{f(2)} \frown 0 \frown \dots \frown b_i^{f(i)}.$$

Let $C = \lim_i C_i$. Since b_i and $f(i)$ are B -computable, so is C . On the other hand, the first i bits of B are coded in C_i : Each block of ones corresponds to exactly one element in B less than i . Therefore, $C \equiv_T B$.

We illustrate Construction 3.1 with an example. Let A be a real and $B = W_e^A$ as in Construction 3.1 and let $s_A(n)$ be the settling time of $\Phi_e^A(n)$. Assume the first few values of B and s_A are as given in the following table.

n	0	1	2	3	4	...
Φ_e^A	$\Phi_e^A(0) \downarrow$	$\Phi_e^A(1) \downarrow$	$\Phi_e^A(2) \uparrow$	$\Phi_e^A(3) \downarrow$	$\Phi_e^A(4) \downarrow$...
s_A	1	37	∞	134	28	...

Following Construction 3.1, we obtain the first few bits of C as follows.

n	0	1	2	3	4	...
B	1 \frown	1 \frown	0 \frown	1 \frown	1 \frown	...
f	37	134	1	134
	\Downarrow	\Downarrow	\Downarrow	\Downarrow	\Downarrow	
C	$\underbrace{1\dots 1}_{37}0\frown$	$\underbrace{1\dots 1}_{134}0\frown$	00 \frown	$\underbrace{1\dots 1}_{134}0\frown$	1...	...

We now show that non-randomness properties of A carry over to C . Intuitively, if we know σ is an initial segment of A , we can use it to “approximate” some initial segment of B by calculating waiting for $\Phi_e^\sigma(*)$ to converge, until the use exceeds σ . But we cannot effectively get any initial segment of B in this way, as we have no upper bound on the settling time of Φ_e^σ , therefore we cannot find a effective cover of B by using this approximation.

We address this problem in the construction of C by adding long series of ones, thereby decreasing the cost in measure of adding an incorrect string to a test. Consider the case when we use a long enough initial segment of A to approximate the first n bits of B for s steps, but the approximation τ we got for B turns out to be wrong. Let m be the index of the first incorrect bit. Then the settling time of $\Phi_e^\sigma(m)$ must be greater than s . By Construction 3.1, an initial segment of C is of the form

$$b_0^{f(0)} \frown 0 \frown b_1^{f(1)} \frown 0 \frown b_2^{f(2)} \frown 0 \frown \dots \frown \underbrace{111\dots 1}_{\text{more than } s}.$$

By picking a large s , the total measure of all possible strings of the above form is small. Eventually, we can effectively find a cover of C from any initial segment of A .

Theorem 3.2. *For any continuous measure μ , if A is non- μ random of level $2n$, B is r.e.a. A , and C is obtained from B via Construction 3.1, then C is non- μ random of level n .*

Proof. We define an auxiliary function t from $2^{<\omega} \times \mathbb{N}$ to finite subsets of $2^{<\omega}$:

$$t(\sigma, n) := \begin{cases} \{\sigma\} & \text{if } |\sigma| < n; \\ \{\sigma \upharpoonright_n\} \cup \bigcup_{i=0}^n \{\sigma \upharpoonright_i \frown 1^{|\sigma|-i}\} & \text{if } |\sigma| \geq n. \end{cases}$$

Lemma 3.3. *If $\{\sigma_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ is a level- $2n$ randomness test of μ , then*

$$\bigcup_{i \in \mathbb{N}} t(\sigma_i, \hat{h}^{(n)}(|\sigma_i|))$$

is a level- n randomness test of μ .

Proof of Lemma 3.3. By Fact 2.9 (4) and Lemma 2.10, we have

$$\lim_n \hat{h}(n) \rightarrow \infty.$$

Hence, for fixed n it holds that for all but finitely many i ,

$$\hat{h}^{(2n)}(|\sigma_i|) > \log 2n + 2n.$$

Fact 2.9 and Lemma 2.10 also imply that

$$\hat{h}^{(n)}(|\sigma_i|) \leq |\sigma_i|.$$

Therefore, for all i ,

$$t(\sigma_i, \hat{h}^{(n)}(|\sigma_i|)) = \{\sigma_i \upharpoonright_{\hat{h}^{(n)}(|\sigma_i|)}\} \cup \bigcup_{j=0}^{\hat{h}^{(n)}(|\sigma_i|)} \{\sigma_i \upharpoonright_j \frown 1^{|\sigma_i|-j}\}.$$

The contribution of $\sigma_i \upharpoonright_{\hat{h}^{(n)}(|\sigma_i|)}$ to a level- n test is

$$\begin{aligned} & (h^{(n)}(|\sigma_i \upharpoonright_{\hat{h}^{(n)}(|\sigma_i|)}|)) \log n 2^{-h^{(n)}(|\sigma_i \upharpoonright_{\hat{h}^{(n)}(|\sigma_i|)}|)} \\ &= (h^{(n)}(\hat{h}^{(n)}(|\sigma_i|))) \log n 2^{-(h^{(n)}(\hat{h}^{(n)}(|\sigma_i|)))}. \end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 2.13, for all but finitely many i ,

$$\begin{aligned} & (h^{(n)}(\hat{h}^{(n)}(|\sigma_i|))) \log n 2^{-(h^{(n)}(\hat{h}^{(n)}(|\sigma_i|)))} \\ (*) \quad & \leq (h^{(2n)}(|\sigma_i|)) \log n 2^{-h^{(2n)}(|\sigma_i|)} \\ & \leq (h^{(2n)}(|\sigma_i|)) \log 2n 2^{-h^{(2n)}(|\sigma_i|)}. \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, the contribution of $\bigcup_{j=0}^{\hat{h}^{(n)}(|\sigma_i|)} \{\sigma_i \upharpoonright_j \frown 1^{|\sigma_i|-j}\}$ to a level- n test is

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{j=0}^{\hat{h}^{(n)}(|\sigma_i|)} (h^{(n)}(|\sigma_i \upharpoonright_j \frown 1^{|\sigma_i|-j}|)) \log n 2^{-h^{(n)}(|\sigma_i \upharpoonright_j \frown 1^{|\sigma_i|-j}|)} \\ &= (\hat{h}^{(n)}(|\sigma_i|) + 1) ((h^{(n)}(|\sigma_i|)) \log n 2^{-h^{(n)}(|\sigma_i|)}) \end{aligned}$$

By Corollary 2.11, for all but finitely many i , we have

$$(\hat{h}^{(n)}(|\sigma_i|) + 1) < 2 \cdot h^{(n)}(|\sigma_i|).$$

Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} & (\hat{h}^{(n)}(|\sigma_i|) + 1) ((h^{(n)}(|\sigma_i|)) \log n 2^{-h^{(n)}(|\sigma_i|)}) \\ & \leq 2 \cdot h^{(n)}(|\sigma_i|) ((h^{(n)}(|\sigma_i|)) \log n 2^{-h^{(n)}(|\sigma_i|)}) \\ & = 2 \cdot (h^{(n)}(|\sigma_i|)) \log 2n 2^{-h^{(n)}(|\sigma_i|)}. \end{aligned}$$

By Fact 2.9, $h^{(n)}(|\sigma_i|) \geq h^{(2n)}(|\sigma_i|)$ and $\lim_i h(i) = \infty$. Together with Lemma 2.13, for all but finitely many σ_i , we have the following upper bound.

$$\begin{aligned}
 (**) \quad & 2 \cdot (h^{(n)}(|\sigma_i|))^{\log 2n 2^{-h^{(n)}(|\sigma_i|)}} \\
 & \leq 2 \cdot (h^{(2n)}(|\sigma_i|))^{\log 2n 2^{-h^{(2n)}(|\sigma_i|)}}.
 \end{aligned}$$

Together, equations (*) and (**) yield the following upper bound for the contribution of $t(\sigma_i, \hat{h}^{(n)}(|\sigma_i|))$ to a level- n test:

$$\begin{aligned}
 & (h^{(n)}(|\sigma_i \upharpoonright_{\hat{h}^{(n)}(|\sigma_i|)}|))^{\log 2n 2^{-h^{(n)}(|\sigma_i \upharpoonright_{\hat{h}^{(n)}(|\sigma_i|)}|)}} \\
 & \quad + \sum_{j=0}^{\hat{h}^{(n)}(|\sigma_i|)} (h^{(n)}(|\sigma_i \upharpoonright_j \cap 1^{|\sigma_i|-j}|))^{\log 2n 2^{-h^{(n)}(|\sigma_i \upharpoonright_j \cap 1^{|\sigma_i|-j}|)}} \\
 & \leq (h^{(2n)}(|\sigma_i|))^{\log 2n 2^{-h^{(2n)}(|\sigma_i|)}} + 2 \cdot (h^{(2n)}(|\sigma_i|))^{\log 2n 2^{-h^{(2n)}(|\sigma_i|)}} \\
 & \leq 3 \cdot (h^{(2n)}(|\sigma_i|))^{\log 2n 2^{-h^{(2n)}(|\sigma_i|)}}.
 \end{aligned}$$

Hence if $\{\sigma_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ is a level- $2n$ test, $\bigcup_{i \in \mathbb{N}} t(\sigma_i, h_0^{(n)}(|\sigma_i|))$ is a level- n test. \square

We continue the proof of Theorem 3.2. Assume $\{\sigma_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ is a level- $2n$ test that A fails. For each i , consider the set $W_{e, |\sigma_i|}^{\sigma_i}$. Write the characteristic sequence of $W_{e, |\sigma_i|}^{\sigma_i}$ as $b_{i,0} b_{i,1} b_{i,2} \dots b_{i,|\sigma_i|}$, and put $b_{i,|\sigma_i|+1} = 1$ for convenience. For $k \leq |\sigma_i|$, define $m_{i,k} := \min\{j > k \mid b_{i,j} = 1\}$, and define the function $f_i : \{1, 2, 3, \dots, |\sigma_i|\} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ as

$$f_i(k) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } b_{i,k} = 0; \\ \min\{l \mid \forall j \leq m_{i,k} (b_{i,j} = 1 \implies W_{e,l}^{\sigma_i}(j) = 1)\} & \text{if } (b_{i,k} = 1) \wedge (m_{i,k} \neq |\sigma_i| + 1); \\ |\sigma_i| & \text{if } (b_{i,k} = 1) \wedge (m_{i,k} = |\sigma_i| + 1). \end{cases}$$

Lastly, define

$$\tau_i = b_{i,0}^{f_i(0)} \cap 0 \cap b_{i,1}^{f_i(1)} \cap 0 \cap b_{i,2}^{f_i(2)} \cap 0 \cap \dots \cap b_{i,|\sigma_i|}^{f_i(|\sigma_i|)} \upharpoonright_{|\sigma_i|}.$$

Since $|\tau_i| = |\sigma_i|$, $\{\tau_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ is also a V_{2n} -test. By Lemma 3.3, $\bigcup_{i \in \mathbb{N}} t(\tau_i, \hat{h}^{(n)}(|\tau_i|))$ is a level- n test.

Claim: C fails the test $\bigcup_{i \in \mathbb{N}} t(\tau_i, \hat{h}^{(n)}(|\tau_i|))$.

We will show that if $\sigma_i \sqsubset A$, $t(\tau_i, \hat{h}^{(n)}(|\tau_i|))$ contains an initial segment of C .

By the assumption on B in Construction 3.1, we have $b_{i,0} = 1$ for all i . Since we assume $\sigma_i \sqsubset A$, it follows that for any $a \leq |\sigma_i|$, $b_{i,a} = 1$ implies $b_a = 1$.

If $\tau_i \upharpoonright_{\hat{h}^{(n)}(|\tau_i|)}$ is an initial segment of C , then by the definition of t , it is trivial. So let us assume $\tau_i \upharpoonright_{\hat{h}^{(n)}(|\tau_i|)}$ is not an initial segment of C . Define

$$k_i = \max\{l \mid \forall j < l (b_{i,j} = b_j) \wedge (b_{i,l} = 1)\}.$$

Thus, k_i is the maximal length for which $b_{i,k_i} = 1$ and

$$b_0 b_1 b_2 \dots b_{k_i-1} = b_{i,0} b_{i,1} b_{i,2} \dots b_{i,k_i-1}.$$

Then for any $k < k_i$, by the definition of f_i , we have $f_i(k) = f(k)$. As we assumed $\tau_i \upharpoonright_{\hat{h}^{(n)}(|\tau_i|)}$ is not an initial segment of C , by comparing lengths, we know that

$$k_i < \hat{h}^{(n)}(|\tau_i|).$$

Let j be the minimum number such that $b_j \neq b_{i,j}$, thus $b_j = 1$, $b_{i,j} = 0$ and $k_i < j < \hat{h}^{(n)}(|\tau_i|)$. We have that

$$\Phi_{e,|\sigma_i|}^A(j) = \Phi_{e,|\sigma_i|}^{\sigma_i}(j) = b_{i,j} = 0$$

$$\Phi_{e,f(k_i)}^A(j) = b_j = 1.$$

This means $f(k_i) \geq |\sigma_i|$, so we can find an element of $t(\tau_i, \hat{h}^{(n)}(|\tau_i|))$ which is also an initial segment of C as follows.

$$\begin{aligned} & \tau_i \upharpoonright_{\Sigma_{t=0}^{k_i-1}(f_i(t)+1)} \frown 1^{|\sigma_i| - \Sigma_{t=0}^{k_i-1}(f_i(t)+1)} \\ &= b_{i,0}^{f_i(0)} \frown 0 \frown b_{i,1}^{f_i(1)} \frown 0 \frown \dots \frown b_{i,k_i-1}^{f_i(k_i-1)} \frown 0 \frown 1^{|\sigma_i| - \Sigma_{t=0}^{k_i-1}(f_i(t)+1)} \\ &\sqsubset b_{i,0}^{f_i(0)} \frown 0 \frown b_{i,1}^{f_i(1)} \frown 0 \frown \dots \frown b_{i,k_i-1}^{f_i(k_i-1)} \frown 0 \frown 1^{|\sigma_i|} \\ &\sqsubset b_{i,0}^{f_i(0)} \frown 0 \frown b_{i,1}^{f_i(1)} \frown 0 \frown \dots \frown b_{i,k_i-1}^{f_i(k_i-1)} \frown 0 \frown 1^{f(k_i)} \\ &= b_0^{f(0)} \frown 0 \frown b_1^{f(1)} \frown 0 \frown b_2^{f(2)} \frown 0 \frown \dots \frown b_{k_i-1}^{f(k_i-1)} \frown 0 \frown b_{k_i}^{f(k_i)} \\ &\sqsubset C. \end{aligned}$$

It follows that C is covered by the level- n test $\bigcup_{i \in \mathbb{N}} t(\tau_i, \hat{h}^{(n)}(|\tau_i|))$ and therefore non- μ -random of level n . This completes the proof of Theorem 3.2. \square

4. CONSTRUCTING NON-RANDOM REALS USING A SELF-MODULUS

We begin this section by reviewing the concepts of modulus and self-modulus.

Definition 4.1. For any function $f, g : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$, we say f *dominates* g if $f(n) > g(n)$ for all but finitely many $n \in \mathbb{N}$. For any real A , we say a function f is a *modulus (of computation)* for A if every function dominating f can compute A . We say A has a *self-modulus* if there is a modulus f_A of A such that $f_A \equiv_T A$.

Arguably the best-known class of reals with a self-modulus is Δ_2^0 , see, for example, [17, Theorem 5.6.6].

Our second construction method will take real A with a self-modulus f_A and define another real $B \equiv_T A$.

Construction 4.2. Assume $A = a_0 a_1 a_2 a_3 \dots$ and $f_A \equiv_T A$ is a self-modulus of A . Without loss of generality, we can assume $f_A(n)$ is increasing.

We define our first string B_0 as

$$B_0 = 1^{f_A(0)} \frown 0 \frown a_0,$$

and inductively put

$$B_{n+1} = B_n \frown 1^{f_A(|B_n|)} \frown 0 \frown a_{n+1}.$$

Let

$$B = \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} B_i.$$

In the following, l_n will denote the length of B_n .

As each a_i is coded into B_i immediately following a block of the form $1^{f_A(|B_i|)} \frown 0$, it follows that $A \leq_T B$. Since the B_i are uniformly computable in A , $B \leq_T A$. Therefore, $B \equiv_T A$.

We have the following property of Construction 4.2.

Theorem 4.3. *If A has a self-modulus f_A and B is defined from A and f_A as in Construction 4.2, then B is non- μ random of level ω for any continuous μ .*

Proof. Let μ be a continuous measure. If there is a μ -computable function dominating f_A , then μ can compute B as well as A , so B is not μ -random of level ω . Therefore, let us assume there is no μ -computable function dominating f_A . As before, we write g and h to denote the granularity and dissipation function g_μ and h_μ , respectively.

Lemma 4.4. *If there is no μ -computable function dominating f_A , then for any $k \in \mathbb{N}$, there are infinitely many n such that $\hat{g}^{(k)}(2l_n + 1) < f_A(l_n)$, where l_n is the length of B_n as defined in Construction 4.2 and \hat{g} is as defined in Lemma 2.10.*

Proof of Lemma 4.4. Suppose for a contradiction there is an n_0 such that for any $m > n_0$, it holds that

$$\hat{g}^{(k)}(2l_m + 1) > f_A(l_m).$$

Define a function G as follows. Put $G(0) = \hat{g}^{(k)}(2l_{n_0} + 1)$ and inductively define $G(i+1) = G(i) + \hat{g}^{(k)}(2G(i) + 1) + 2$. Since \hat{g} is computable in μ , $G \leq_T \mu$.

We claim that $G(i) \geq l_i$ for $i \geq n_0$. For $i = n_0$,

$$G(n) > G(0) = \hat{g}^{(k)}(2l_{n_0} + 1) \geq l_{n_0}.$$

For $i > n$, if $G(i) > l_i$,

$$\begin{aligned} G(i+1) &= G(i) + \hat{g}^{(k)}(2G(i) + 1) + 2 \\ &> l_i + \hat{g}^{(k)}(2l_i + 1) + 2 > l_i + f_A(l_i) + 2 = l_{i+1}. \end{aligned}$$

So $G(i)$ dominates l_i for $i \geq n$. Moreover, by the definition of B_i , $l_i > f_A(i)$ for all i .

Combining the previous two facts, we obtain a μ -computable function G such that $G(i+n) \geq f_A(i)$, a contradiction. So there are infinitely many n such that

$$\hat{g}^{(k)}(2l_n + 1) < f_A(l_n).$$

□

To complete the proof of Theorem 4.3, for any $k \in \mathbb{N}$, we define the following set of strings:

$$T_k = \{\sigma \frown 1^{\hat{g}^{(k)}(2|\sigma|)} \mid \sigma \in 2^{<\omega}\}.$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{\tau \in T_k} (h^{(k)}(|\tau|))^{\log k} 2^{-h^{(k)}(|\tau|)} \\ &= \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} 2^i (h^{(k)}(i + \hat{g}^{(k)}(2i)))^{\log k} 2^{-h^{(k)}(i + \hat{g}^{(k)}(2i))} \\ &= \sum_{i > \log k} 2^i (h^{(k)}(i + \hat{g}^{(k)}(2i)))^{\log k} 2^{-h^{(k)}(i + \hat{g}^{(k)}(2i))} + \gamma_k, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\gamma_k = \sum_{i \leq \log k} 2^i (h^{(k)}(i + \hat{g}^{(k)}(2i)))^{\log k} 2^{-h^{(k)}(i + \hat{g}^{(k)}(2i))} < \infty.$$

Moreover, by Fact 2.9 and Lemma 2.10,

$$h^{(k)}(i + \hat{g}^{(k)}(2i)) \geq h^{(k)}(\hat{g}^{(k)}(2i)) \geq h^{(k)}(g^{(k)}(2i)) \geq 2i.$$

By Lemma 2.13, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{i > \log k} 2^i (h^{(k)}(i + \hat{g}^{(k)}(2i)))^{\log k} 2^{-h_\mu^{(k)}(i + \hat{g}^{(k)}(2i))} + \gamma_k \\
& \leq \sum_{i > \log k}^{\infty} 2^i (2i)^{\log k} 2^{-2i} + \gamma_k \\
& = \sum_{i > \log k} (2i)^{\log k} 2^{-i} + \gamma_k < \infty.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, T_k is a level- k test. Finally, when $\hat{g}^{(k)}(2l_n + 1) < f_A(l_n)$, we have

$$B_n \cap 1^{\hat{g}^{(k)}(2l_n)} \sqsubset B_n \cap 1^{f_A(l_n)} \sqsubset B.$$

By the definition of T_k , any string of the form $B_n \cap 1^{\hat{g}^{(k)}(2l_n)}$ is in T_k . By Lemma 4.4, for any k , $\hat{g}^{(k)}(2l_n + 1) < f_A(l_n)$ is true for infinitely many n . Therefore, B fails T_k . Since k was arbitrary, B is non- μ -random of level ω . \square

5. TURING DEGREES OF NCR REALS

Using the constructions presented in the previous two sections, we exhibit a large class of Turing degrees that contain NCR elements, as formulated in the Introduction.

Definition 5.1. A real is *1-REA* if it is recursively enumerable. A real is $(n+1)$ -*REA* if it is r.e.a. some n -REA real. A Turing degree is n -REA if it contains an n -REA real.

Theorem 1.1.

- (a) Any n -REA Turing degree contains an NCR real.
- (b) Any self-modulus degree contains an NCR real.

Proof. By Proposition 2.14 and Theorem 3.2, every 1-REA degree contains an NCR real. Part (a) now follows inductively using Theorem 3.2. Part (b) follows from Theorem 4.3. \square

The result actually holds in a slightly stronger form in that both kind of degrees contain NCR reals *of level ω* , that is, reals that are non- μ -random of level ω for every continuous measure μ (see [8]). However, for our main applications the form stated here is quite sufficient.

Since every Δ_2^0 degree has a self-modulus, we obtain

Corollary 1.2. Every Δ_2^0 degree contains an NCR element.

Furthermore, if a real B has a self-modulus, by using the relativized version of Shoenfield's Limit Lemma, we can prove the above result also holds for any $\Delta_2^0(B)$ real above B , so we have the following.

Corollary 5.2. *If a real B has a self-modulus, then every $\Delta_2^0(B)$ real above B contains an NCR element.*

We can also apply our techniques to prove the existence of weakly generic reals in NCR.

Theorem 5.3. *For every self-modulus degree above $0'$, there exists a weakly 1-generic NCR real in it.*

Proof. Assume $A = a_0 a_1 a_2 a_3 \dots$ and $f_A \equiv_T A$ is a self-modulus of A . Without loss of generality, we can assume $f_A(n)$ is increasing. Let W_n be n -th Σ_1^0 set of binary strings.

We define our first string B_0 as

$$B_0 = 1^{f_A(0)} \frown 0 \frown a_0,$$

And define σ_i, B_i inductively as

$$\sigma_i := \begin{cases} \text{the smallest such } \tau & \text{if } \exists \tau \in W_i(B_i \frown 1 \sqsubset \tau); \\ B_i \frown 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

$$B_{i+1} := \sigma_i \frown 1^{f_A(|\sigma_i|)} \frown 0 \frown a_{i+1}.$$

Finally define B as

$$B := \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} B_i.$$

Since $A >_T 0'$ we can compute all σ_i , thus compute B . And B can effectively recover all B_i , So B also compute A , thus $A \equiv_T B$.

Moreover, the proof of Theorem 4.3 also can be applied to the B we constructed here, so B is NCR.

Lastly we show B is weakly 1-generic. If W_i is a dense Σ_1^0 set, then $\sigma_i \in W_i$ and σ_i is an initial segment of B , so B is weakly 1-generic. \square

Using similar ideas, one can construct 1-generic NCR reals. It is also possible, albeit more complicated, to construct an NCR real of minimal Turing degree. These constructions are given in [8].

6. FURTHER APPLICATIONS AND OPEN QUESTIONS

We can apply the techniques introduced in this paper to address a question asked by Adam Day and Andrew Marks (private communication).

Definition 6.1. Two reals $X_1, X_2 \in 2^{\mathbb{N}}$ are *simultaneously continuously random* if there exists a real Z and a measure μ such that Z computes μ and both X_1 and X_2 are μ -random relative to Z . If such Z and μ do not exist, X_1, X_2 are called *never simultaneously continuously random* (NSCR).

Day and Marks conjectured that X_1 and X_2 are NSCR if and only if at least one of them is in NCR. We refute this conjecture by constructing two reals X_1 and X_2 such that they are both random with respect to some continuous measure, but for every measure μ for which X_2 is random, any representation of μ computes X_1 .

Let $f(n)$ be a self-modulus of $0'$ and X_1 be a λ -random Δ_2^0 real, where λ is Lebesgue measure. It suffices to find a real X_2 which random for some continuous μ and every representation of a continuous measure ν for which X_2 is random can compute a function which dominates $f(n)$.

We define

$$S_0 := \{1^{f(0)} \cap 0 \cap x : x \in \{0, 1\}\}.$$

And

$$S_{n+1} := \{\sigma \cap 1^{f(|\sigma|)} \cap 0 \cap x : \sigma \in S_n, x \in \{0, 1\}\}.$$

Finally define

$$S := \{Y \in 2^{\mathbb{N}} : \forall n \exists \sigma_n \in S_n (\sigma_n \sqsubset Y)\}.$$

Suppose μ is a continuous measure with a representation R_μ that does not compute any function dominating f . An argument similar to the proof of Theorem 4.3 yields that the set T_k defined there is a level- k test. Moreover, by the definition of S , every real in S is covered by T_k . Therefore, any element in S can only be random for a measure all of whose representations compute a function dominating f . It follows that any element of S is NSCR with X_1 .

It remains to show that there is a element in S which is random with respect to a continuous measure. This easily follows from the fact that NCR is countable (see [14]), but we can give a direct argument as follows: It follows from the construction of S that S is a perfect subset of $2^{\mathbb{N}}$. By distributing a unit mass uniformly along S , we obtain a continuous measure whose support is S and we can choose any real that is random with respect to this measure and obtain

Corollary 6.2. *There are non-NCR reals X_1 and X_2 which are NSCR.*

The exact distribution of NCR reals in Δ_1^1 remains unknown. Taking into account the results of this paper, the following questions seem particularly interesting.

Following the results of Section 5, we can ask how strong the relation between Δ_1^1 degrees containing NCR reals degrees with a self-modulus is. In particular, does the following hold:

If \mathcal{D} contains an NCR real, must \mathcal{D} have a self-modulus?

If the answer to this question is negative, then we can ask a weaker one:

If \mathcal{D} contains a real that is NCR of level ω , must \mathcal{D} have a self-modulus?

On the other hand, our results only concern the *existence* of *some* NCR elements in Turing degrees, while [1] shows that *all* reals in an incomplete r.e. degree are NCR. Thus, we may also ask:

Are there any other Turing degree not below any incomplete r.e. degree in which every real is in NCR?

As NCR is Π_1^1 set of reals, it has a Π_1^1 rank function (see for example [6]). It is an open problem to find a “natural” rank function for NCR which reflects the stratified complexities of elements in NCR in a more informative way. Such a rank function is arguably needed to shed more light on the structure of NCR in the Turing degrees. Theorem 5.3 immediately implies that a rank based on the Cantor-Bendixson derivative will not work – NCR is a proper superset of the members of countable Π_1^0 classes. (This follows also from the Barmpalias-Greenberg-Montalbán-Slaman result [1], of course.)

Restricted to Δ_2^0 , the picture is a little clearer. We now know that every Δ_2^0 Turing degree contains an NCR real (Corollary 5.2), and every degree below an incomplete r.e. degree is completely NCR [1]. Moreover, using the connection between the granularity function and the settling function, it is possible to show that $\text{NCR} \cap \Delta_2^0$ is an arithmetic set of reals [15]¹. Unfortunately, few of the techniques developed so far (including the ones developed in this paper) seem to extend easily higher up the arithmetic hierarchy. The question whether, for example, $\text{NCR} \cap \Delta_2^0$ is arithmetic remains open.

REFERENCES

- [1] G. Barmpalias, N. Greenberg, A. Montalbán, and T. A. Slaman. K-trivials are never continuously random. In *Proceedings Of The 11Th Asian Logic Conference: In Honor of Professor Chong Chitat on His 60th Birthday*, pages 51–58. World Scientific, 2012.
- [2] D. Cenzer, P. Clote, R. L. Smith, R. I. Soare, and S. S. Wainer. Members of countable π_1^0 classes. *Annals of Pure and Applied Logic*, 31:145–163, 1986.

¹A full proof of this result will appear in [8].

- [3] A. Day and J. Miller. Randomness for non-computable measures. *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society*, 365(7):3575–3591, 2013.
- [4] R. G. Downey and D. R. Hirschfeldt. *Algorithmic randomness and complexity*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2010.
- [5] I. R. Haken. *Randomizing Reals and the First-Order Consequences of Randoms*. PhD thesis, UC Berkeley, 2014.
- [6] A. S. Kechris. *Classical Descriptive Set Theory*. Springer, 1995.
- [7] L. A. Levin. Uniform tests of randomness. *Doklady Akademii Nauk SSSR*, 227(1):33–35, 1976.
- [8] M. Li. *Randomness and complexity for continuous measures*. PhD thesis, Pennsylvania State University, in preparation.
- [9] M. Li and J. Reimann. In preparation.
- [10] P. Martin-Löf. The definition of random sequences. *Information and control*, 9(6):602–619, 1966.
- [11] A. Montalbán. *Beyond the arithmetic*. PhD thesis, Cornell University, 2005.
- [12] A. Nies. *Computability and randomness*, volume 51 of *Oxford Logic Guides*. Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2009.
- [13] J. Reimann. Effectively closed sets of measures and randomness. *arXiv preprint arXiv:0804.2656*, 2008.
- [14] J. Reimann and T. Slaman. Measures and their random reals. *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society*, 367(7):5081–5097, 2015.
- [15] J. Reimann and T. A. Slaman. Unpublished work, 2008.
- [16] J. Reimann and T. A. Slaman. Effective randomness for continuous measures. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1808.10102*, 2018.
- [17] R. I. Soare. *Turing computability*. Springer, 2016.
- [18] A. K. Zvonkin and L. A. Levin. The complexity of finite objects and the development of the concepts of information and randomness by means of the theory of algorithms. *Russian Mathematical Surveys*, 25(6):83–124, 1970.