

# THE COMBINATORIAL EQUIVALENCE OF A COMPUTABILITY THEORETIC QUESTION

LU LIU

ABSTRACT. We show that a question of Miller and Solomon—that whether there exists a coloring  $c : d^{<\omega} \rightarrow k$  that does not admit a  $c$ -computable variable word infinite solution, is equivalent to a natural, nontrivial combinatorial question. The combinatorial question asked whether there is an infinite sequence of integers such that each of its initial segment satisfies a Ramsian type property. This is the first computability theoretic question known to be equivalent to a natural, nontrivial question that does not concern complexity notions. It turns out that the negation of the combinatorial question is a generalization of Hales-Jewett theorem. We solve some special cases of the combinatorial question and obtain a generalization of Hales-Jewett theorem on some particular parameters.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

In this paper, we show that a question of Miller and Solomon—that whether there exists a coloring  $c : d^{<\omega} \rightarrow k$  that does not admit a  $c$ -computable variable word infinite solution (see Definition 2.3), is equivalent to a natural, nontrivial combinatorial question (Theorem 3.5). The combinatorial question asked whether there is an infinite sequence of integers such that each of its initial segment satisfies a Ramsian type property. We should point out that it is not unseen that a computability theoretic question is equivalent to a non computability theoretic question. However, all known examples are somewhat trivial in the following ways.

- (1) Given a computability theoretic assertion, we can translate “computability” into its plain definition (say, the definition using Turing machine) and obtain a long, unnatural combinatorial assertion.
- (2) The non computability theoretic question is trivial. Every true computability theoretic proposition is, of course, equivalent to the trivial assertion  $1=1$ . In another word, once the equivalence relation is established, the computability theoretic question is solved.
- (3) One of the directions of the equivalence is trivial. In many cases, there exists an object satisfying a property  $P$  implies there exists a computable such object. Usually, this is done by showing that there exists a computable tree  $T$  in  $\omega^{<\omega}$  such that the infinite paths through  $T$  consist of the collection of objects satisfying  $P$ , and for every  $\rho \in T$ ,  $\rho$  admits some successor in  $T$ . It is trivial that there exists a computable  $X \in P$  implies that  $P \neq \emptyset$ .

---

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 03D80; Secondary 68Q30, 03D32.

*Key words and phrases.* computability theory, combinatorics, reverse mathematics, Hales-Jewett theorem.

In our example, both the combinatorial question and the computability theoretic question are natural and nontrivial (yet unsolved). Moreover, both directions of the equivalence relation are nontrivial.

It turns out that disproving the combinatorial property on certain sequences is equivalent to Hales-Jewett theorem (see Proposition 4.2). Therefore, the negation of the combinatorial question, namely every infinite sequence of integers admits an initial segment that does not satisfy the combinatorial property is a generalization of Hales-Jewett theorem. Hales-Jewett theorem states that given  $d, k, n \in \omega$ , there exists an  $N \in \omega$  such that for every coloring  $c : d^N \rightarrow k$ , there exists an  $n$ -dimensional combinatorial subspace of  $d^N$  that is monochromatic for  $c$ <sup>1</sup>. An equivalent statement in terms of the combinatorial property (Proposition 4.2) says that the combinatorial subspace can be chosen to satisfy certain property (the set of the smallest coordinates of each dimension can be very specific). Hales-Jewett theorem is of fundamental importance in combinatorics. It implies van der Waerden theorem (which states that for every partition of integers, every  $r \in \omega$ , there exists an arithmetical progression of length  $r$  in one part); actually it implies the multidimensional van der Waerden theorem, namely Gallai's theorem. Density Hales-Jewett theorem implies density van der Waerden theorem, namely Szemerédi's theorem, which states that for every set  $A$  of integers of positive density (meaning  $\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} |A \cap n|/n > 0$ ), every  $r \in \omega$ , there exists an arithmetical progression in  $A$  of length  $r$  (conjectured by Erdős and Turán). See [4] for more details on Hales-Jewett theorem. We prove that for every infinite sequence of positive integers  $n_0 n_1 \cdots$  with  $n_0 = 2$ , the combinatorial property does not hold on  $n_0 \cdots n_r$  for some  $r$  (Theorem 4.6). This generalizes Hales-Jewett theorem on parameters:  $d = 2, k = 2, n = 2$ .

**Connections between computability theory and combinatorics.** Computability theory starts from Church-Turing thesis which clarifies what is computability (what is an algorithm or effectiveness). Early study of computability theory includes the complexity of certain objects such as the set of integer-coefficient equations that admit integer roots, the set of algorithms that halt etc. The concept of computability naturally generalizes to relative computability— $X$  computes  $Y$  (that is  $Y$  can be computed using the information of  $X$ ), and therefore gives rise to the concept of Turing degree ( $X, Y$  belong to the same Turing degree if and only if they compute each other). Computability theory characterizes the complexity of various objects in terms of Turing degree; and studies many structures related to the Turing degree and the relation between different complexity notions.

Computability theory is rarely connected to other branch of mathematics. For example, it is now easy to construct a computably enumerable (henceforth c.e.) set  $X$  such that  $X$  has Turing degree strictly between  $\mathbf{0}$  and  $\mathbf{0}'$  (where  $\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{0}'$  are the Turing degree of computable sets and the halting problem respectively). However, we do not know of a naturally defined (or non logically defined) such c.e. set. Currently, there is no evidence that the collection of computable sets can be

---

<sup>1</sup>In many references, this is referred to as multidimensional Hales-Jewett theorem; and Hales-Jewett theorem refers to the conclusion that there exists a 1-dimensional combinatorial subspace that is monochromatic.

combinatorially or algebraically defined. This situation is changing. Computability theory is having more and more connection to combinatorics. To name a few:

- (1) Some complexity notions can be characterized in terms of some combinatorial notions. It is well known that an oracle  $D$  is hyperarithmetic if and only if there is a function  $f \in \omega^\omega$  such that for every function  $g \in \omega^\omega$  with  $g(n) \geq f(n)$  for all  $n$ ,  $g$  computes  $D$ . Solovay [17] proved that an oracle  $D$  is hyperarithmetic if and only if for every infinite set  $X \subseteq \omega$ , there exists a  $Y \subseteq X$  such that  $Y$  computes  $D$ . Here  $g \geq f$  and subset relation are combinatorial notions. Recently, Dorais, Dzhafarov, Hirst, Mileti, Shafer [5]; Wang [18]; and Cholak, Patey [2] characterize the set that is encodable by a Ramsey type theorem:  $\text{RT}_{k,l}^n$  (where an instance is a coloring  $c : [\omega]^n \rightarrow k$  and a solution is an infinite set  $G \subseteq \omega$  such that  $|c([G]^n)| \leq l$ ). An oracle  $D$  is P-encodable if there is a P-instance  $X$  such that every solution of  $X$  computes  $D$ . They showed that the  $\text{RT}_{<\infty,l}^n$ -encodable sets are exactly the hyperarithmetic sets when  $l < 2^{n-1}$  [5]; the arithmetic sets when  $2^{n-1} \leq l < d_n$  [5] (where  $d_0, d_1, \dots$  is the sequence of Catalan numbers); the computable sets when  $l \geq d_n$  [18].
- (2) Many computability theoretic researches study the complexity of certain combinatorial notions. Jockusch [9] proved that there exists a computable coloring  $c : [\omega]^3 \rightarrow 2$  such that for every infinite set  $G$  so that  $|c([G]^3)| = 1$ ,  $G$  computes  $\emptyset'$ . This can be read as that some computable coloring  $c : [\omega]^3 \rightarrow 2$  encode  $\emptyset'$ . Kumabe and Lewis [11] proved that there exists a DNR  $Y$  that has minimal Turing degree (a Turing degree is minimal if below which there is no nonzero Turing degree). Recently, Miller and Khan [10] showed that actually, for every DNR-instance  $X$  (which is simply an  $X \in \omega^\omega$ ), there exists a solution  $Y$  to  $X$  (which is a  $Y \in \omega^\omega$  such that  $Y(n) \neq X(n)$  for all  $n$ ) such that  $Y$  has minimal Turing degree. Here “DNR-solution to  $X$ ” is a combinatorial notion.
- (3) Researches in computability theory use more and more sophisticated combinatorial or probability technique. For example, Csima, Dzhafarov, Hirschfeldt, Jockusch, Solomon and Westrick [3] proved that there is a computable coloring  $c : \omega \rightarrow 2$  such that for every infinite set  $G$  with  $G + G = \{x + y : x \neq y \in G\}$  being monochromatic for  $c$ ,  $G$  is not computable. Their proof heavily relies on Lovasz Local Lemma. Monin, Liu and Patey [12] computes, using a particular arithmetic oracle, an ordered variable word solution of a given computable coloring  $c : 2^{<\omega} \rightarrow 2$  (which is an  $\omega$ -variable word  $v$  such that the set  $\{v(\vec{a}) : \vec{a} \in 2^{<\omega}\}$  is monochromatic for  $c$  and all occurrence of  $x_m$  is before that of  $x_{m+1}$ , see Definition 2.3). Their construction uses a similar technique as Shelah’s proof of Hales-Jewett theorem [15].

**Organization.** In section 2 we introduce the computability theoretic question (Question 2.4) and present some related results in computability theory and reverse mathematics. In section 3, we introduce the Ramsian type property (Definition 3.1) and show that the computability theoretic question is equivalent to a related combinatorial question (Theorem 3.5). In section 4, we firstly explain how the combinatorial question is related to Hales-Jewett theorem (Proposition 4.2 and Remark 4.3). Then we prove, in section 4.1, the negation of the combinatorial

question in some special case (Theorem 4.6), which turns out to be a generalization of Hales-Jewett theorem (on some parameters).

**Notation.** For a sequence  $X$  (of any objects), we write  $X \upharpoonright r$  for the sequence  $X(0) \cdots X(r-1)$ ; for a set  $P = \{r_0 < r_1 < \cdots\} \subseteq \omega$ , we write  $X \upharpoonright P$  for the sequence  $X(r_0)X(r_1) \cdots$ ; we write  $X \upharpoonright_s^r$  (where  $r \geq s$ ) for the sequence  $X(s) \cdots X(r)$ . For two sequences  $\vec{a}, \vec{b}$ , we write  $\vec{a} \hat{\ } \vec{b}$  (or  $\vec{a}\vec{b}$ ) for the concatenation of  $\vec{a}, \vec{b}$ . For two sets  $P_0, P_1 \subseteq \omega$ , we write  $P_0 < P_1$  if  $x < y$  for all  $x \in P_0$  and all  $y \in P_1$  (note that  $\emptyset < P, P < \emptyset$  hold trivially).

## 2. VARIABLE WORD PROBLEM

This section introduces a question of Miller and Solomon. The question asked that whether every computable coloring  $c : d^{<\omega} \rightarrow k$  admits a computable variable word infinite solution (Question 2.4). Before giving a concrete definition, we need some notation on variable words.

**Definition 2.1** (variable word). Given  $d, k \in \omega$ ,

- A *variable word over  $d$*  is a sequence  $v$  (finite or infinite) of  $\{0, \dots, d-1\} \cup \{x_0, x_1, \dots\}$ <sup>2</sup>. We say  $x_m$  *occurs* in  $v$  if  $v(t) = x_m$  for some  $t$ .
- We write  $P_{x_m}(v)$  for the set of coordinates of  $x_m$  in  $v$ , namely  $\{t : v(t) = x_m\}$ ; the *first occurrence* of a variable  $x_m$  in  $v$  refers to the integer  $\min P_{x_m}(v)$ .
- An  *$n$ -variable word over  $d$*  is a variable word over  $d$  such that there are exactly  $n$  many variables occurring in  $v$ ; without loss of generality we assume that the first occurrence of  $x_m$  is smaller than that of  $x_{\hat{m}}$  for all  $m < \hat{m}$  whenever they both occur in  $v$ .
- Given an  $\vec{a} \in d^{\hat{n}}$ , an  $n$ -variable word  $v$ , suppose  $x_{m_0}, x_{m_1}, \dots, x_{m_{n-1}}$  occur in  $v$  with  $m_{\hat{n}-1} < m_{\hat{n}}$  for all  $\hat{n} < n$ . We write  $v(\vec{a})$  for the  $\{0, \dots, d-1\}$ -string obtained by substituting  $x_{m_{\hat{n}}}$  with  $\vec{a}(\hat{n})$  in  $v$  for all  $\hat{n} < \min\{n, \hat{n}\}$  and then truncating the result just before the first occurrence of  $x_{m_{\hat{n}}}$  (when  $\hat{n} \geq n$ , the first occurrence of  $x_{m_{\hat{n}}}$  is set to be  $|v|$ )<sup>3</sup>.

Given an  $n$ -variable word  $v$  over  $d$  of length  $N$ , the set  $\{v(\vec{a}) : \vec{a} \in d^n\}$  is called an  $n$ -dimensional combinatorial subspace of  $d^N$ . The following is an example of the variable word notation.

**Example 2.2.** An infinite variable word over  $\{0, 1\}$ :

$$\begin{aligned} v &= 011 \ x_0x_0 \ 011 \ x_1 \ x_0x_0 \ x_1x_1 \ 00 \ x_2x_2 \ \cdots \\ \text{let } \vec{a} &= 10, \text{ then} \\ v(\vec{a}) &= 011 \ 11 \ 011 \ 0 \ 11 \ 00 \ 00; \\ P_{x_0}(v) &= \{3, 4, 9, 10, \dots\}; \\ P_{x_1}(v) &= \{8, 11, 12, \dots\}. \end{aligned}$$

In [1], Carlson and Simpson introduced the Variable Word problem, where they use it to prove the Dual Ramsey theorem. Friedman and Simpson [7], and later Montalban [14], asked about the proof strength of the Variable Word problem.

**Definition 2.3** (VWI, VW, OVW). Given  $k, d \in \omega$ ,

<sup>2</sup>When  $d$  is clear, we omit “over  $d$ ”.

<sup>3</sup>We emphasise that  $v(\vec{a})$  is defined even when  $\hat{n} > n$ .

- an instance of Variable Word Infinite (henceforth  $\text{VWI}(d, k)$ ), Variable Word (henceforth  $\text{VW}(d, k)$ ) or Ordered Variable Word (henceforth  $\text{OVW}(d, k)$ ) is a coloring  $c : d^{<\omega} \rightarrow k$ ;
- a  $\text{VWI}(d, k)$ -solution of  $c$  is a  $\omega$ -variable word  $v$  over  $d$  such that the set  $\{v(\vec{a}) : \vec{a} \in 2^{<\omega}\}$  is monochromatic for  $c$ ;
- moreover,  $v$  is a  $\text{VW}$  ( $\text{OVW}$  respectively)-solution of  $c$  if, in addition:  $P_{x_m}(v)$  is finite ( $P_{x_m}(v) < P_{x_{m+1}}(v)$  respectively) for all  $m \in \omega$ .

We present some computability theoretic results on the proof strength of variable word problems. We assume that readers are familiar with the basics of reverse mathematics such as Recursion Comprehension Axiom (denoted as  $\text{RCA}_0$ ) and Weak König's Lemma (denoted as  $\text{WKL}$ ). But not knowing these knowledge does not affect reading the main result (Theorem 3.5, Theorem 4.6) of this paper. For an introduction to reverse mathematics, see [16]; or see [8] for a recent development in this area. Clearly  $\text{OVW}$  has the strongest requirement on its solution while  $\text{VWI}$  has the weakest requirement on its solution. Therefore, over  $\text{RCA}_0$ ,  $\text{OVW}(d, k) \rightarrow \text{VW}(d, k) \rightarrow \text{VWI}(d, k)$ . However, their relation is unknown when the dimension index  $d$  are different. On the other hand, the variable word problems admit, as many other Ramsian type problems, an iterative property, i.e., a  $k$ -coloring problem can be solved by repeatedly invoking a 2-coloring problem explained as following. Given a  $k$ -coloring  $c : d^{<\omega} \rightarrow k$ , merge  $k - 1$  many colors into color 0 and get a 2-coloring  $\hat{c} : d^{<\omega} \rightarrow 2$ . Let  $v$  be a solution to  $\hat{c}$ . Suppose  $c(\{v(\vec{a}) : \vec{a} \in d^{<\omega}\}) \subseteq \{0, \dots, k - 1\}$  (otherwise we are done). Now  $v$  together with  $c$  give rise to a  $(k - 1)$ -coloring  $\tilde{c}$  on  $d^{<\omega}$  defined as following:

$$\tilde{c}(\vec{a}) = c(v(\vec{a})) \text{ for all } \vec{a} \in d^{<\omega}.$$

Clearly, given a solution  $\tilde{v}$  to  $\tilde{c}$ , we can compute a solution to  $c$  using  $\tilde{v}$  and  $v$ . Thus, we have, over  $\text{RCA}_0$ ,  $\text{V}(d, k) \leftrightarrow \text{V}(d, k + 1)$  for all  $k \geq 2$  where  $\text{V}$  is  $\text{OVW}$ ,  $\text{VW}$  or  $\text{VWI}$ .

In [13], Miller and Solomon proved that there is a computable  $\text{OVW}(2, 2)$ -instance that does not admit a  $\Delta_2^0$  solution. This implies that over  $\text{RCA}_0$ ,  $\text{WKL}$  does not prove  $\text{VW}(2, 2)$ . To see this, note that for every  $\text{VW}(2, 2)$ -solution  $v$  of  $c$ ,  $v'$  computes a  $\text{OVW}(2, 2)$ -solution of  $c$  in the way that  $v'$  could compute a sequence  $m_0 < m_1 < \dots$  of integers such that  $P_{x_{m_r}}(v) < P_{x_{m_{r+1}}}(v)$  for all  $r \in \omega$ . On the other hand, if  $\text{WKL}$  proves  $\text{VW}(2, 2)$ , then every computable  $\text{VW}(2, 2)$ -instance admits a low solution, thus every computable  $\text{OVW}(2, 2)$ -instance admits a  $\Delta_2^0$  solution, a contradiction.

In [12], Liu, Monin and Patey showed that  $\text{ACA}$  proves  $\text{OVW}(2, 2)$ . Actually, they showed that for every computable  $\text{OVW}(2, 2)$ -instance  $c$ , every  $\emptyset'$ -PA degree computes a solution of  $c$ . On the other hand, they also construct a computable  $\text{OVW}(2, 2)$ -instance such that every solution is of  $\emptyset'$ -DNC degree. The variable word problems are closely related to Hindman's theorem and the Dual Ramsey theorem (see e.g. [6]).

A lot of questions on variable word problems are unknown, say the proof strength lower bound, the relations between the three versions of the variable word problem, the proof strength upper bound of  $\text{VWI}$  etc. Miller and Solomon asked the following questions

*Question 2.4* (Miller and Solomon). Does  $\text{RCA}_0$  prove  $\text{VWI}(2, 2)$ ? Or, in terms of computability theoretic language, does every  $\text{VWI}(2, 2)$ -instance  $c$  admit a  $c$ -computable solution?

We will show that Question 2.4 is equivalent to a natural combinatorial question. Concerning the lower bound of these problems,

*Question 2.5* (Miller and Solomon). Is there a  $d \in \omega$  such that  $\text{OVW}(d, 2)$  proves  $\text{ACA}$ ? On the other hand, it is not even known that whether  $\text{VWI}(2, 2)$  proves  $\text{ACA}$ .

Usually, Question 2.5 is closely related to the question whether a computable  $\text{OVW}(d, 2)$ -instance could encode an incomputable oracle, i.e., whether there is an incomputable oracle  $D$  and a computable  $\text{OVW}(d, 2)$ -instance such that every solution computes  $D$ . However, we don't even know if an arbitrary instance (not necessarily computable) of  $\text{OVW}(d, 2)$  could encode an incomputable oracle.

*Question 2.6*. Is there an incomputable oracle  $D$ , a  $d \in \omega$  and a  $\text{OVW}(d, 2)$ -instance  $c$  (not necessarily computable) such that every solution of  $c$  computes  $D$ .

We also wonder the relation between the three versions of the variable word problem.

*Question 2.7*. Given a  $d \in \omega$ , over  $\text{RCA}_0$ , does  $\text{VW}(d, 2)$  prove  $\text{OVW}(2, 2)$ ; does  $\text{VWI}(d, 2)$  prove  $\text{VW}(2, 2)$ ?

We also wonder whether the dimension affects the proof strength of variable word problem.

*Question 2.8*. Given a  $d \in \omega$ , over  $\text{RCA}_0$ , does  $\text{OVW}(d, 2)$  ( $\text{VW}(d, 2)$ ,  $\text{VWI}(d, 2)$  respectively) prove  $\text{OVW}(d+1, 2)$  ( $\text{VW}(d+1, 2)$ ,  $\text{VWI}(d+1, 2)$  respectively)?

### 3. THE COMBINATORIAL EQUIVALENCE

In this section, we show that Question 2.4 is equivalent to a combinatorial question (see Theorem 3.5). The combinatorial question asked whether there is an infinite sequence of integers such that every initial segment of the sequence satisfies a Ramsian type combinatorial property defined in Definition 3.1.

**Definition 3.1** ( $\text{ENSH}_k^d$ ). Let  $n_0, n_1, \dots, n_{r-1}$  be a sequence of positive integers, let  $N_0 = \{0, \dots, n_0 - 1\}$ ,  $N_1 = \{n_0, \dots, n_0 + n_1 - 1\}$ ,  $\dots$ ,  $N_{r-1} = \{n_0 + \dots + n_{r-2}, \dots, n_0 + \dots + n_{r-1} - 1\}$ , and  $N = \cup_{s \leq r-1} N_s$ ; let  $f : d^N \rightarrow k$ . We say  $n_0 \cdots n_r$  is *sectionally-homogeneous* for  $f$  if there exists an  $s \leq r - 1$ , an  $n_s$ -variable word  $v$  over  $d$  of length  $N$  such that the first occurrence of variables in  $v$  consist of  $N_s$ , i.e.,

$$\{\min P_{x_m}(v) : m \in \omega\} = N_s,$$

and  $v$  is monochromatic for  $f$ .

We write  $\text{ENSH}_k^d(n_0 \cdots n_{r-1})$  iff there exists a coloring  $f : d^N \rightarrow k$  such that  $n_0 \cdots n_{r-1}$  is *not* sectionally-homogeneous for  $f$ <sup>4</sup>. In that case we say  $f$  witnesses  $\text{ENSH}_k^d(n_0 \cdots n_{r-1})$ .

---

<sup>4</sup>ENSH is short for: existence of a coloring  $f$  such that the sequence is non-sectionally-homogeneous for  $f$ .

We give some intuition of  $ENSH_k^d$  by giving some simple observations and examples. For  $\vec{n}, \vec{\hat{n}} \in \omega^{<\omega}$  we write  $\vec{n} \leq \vec{\hat{n}}$  if  $|\vec{n}| = |\vec{\hat{n}}|$  and  $\vec{n}(s) \leq \vec{\hat{n}}(s)$  for all  $s < |\vec{n}|$ . We say  $\vec{n}$  is a subsequence of  $\vec{\hat{n}}$  if there are integers  $s_0 < s_1 < \dots < s_{m-1} < |\vec{\hat{n}}|$  such that  $\vec{n} = \vec{\hat{n}}(s_0) \cdot \dots \cdot \vec{\hat{n}}(s_{m-1})$ . It's obvious that:

**Proposition 3.2.** *If  $\vec{n}$  is a subsequence of  $\vec{\hat{n}}$  or  $\vec{n} \geq \vec{\hat{n}}$ , then  $ENSH_k^d(\vec{\hat{n}})$  implies  $ENSH_k^d(\vec{n})$ .*

*Proof.* For  $\vec{n}$  being a subsequence of  $\vec{\hat{n}}$ , suppose  $\vec{n} = \vec{\hat{n}}(s_0) \cdot \dots \cdot \vec{\hat{n}}(s_{r-1})$  and  $\hat{f}$  witnesses  $ENSH_k^d(\vec{\hat{n}})$ . We will construct a witness for  $ENSH_k^d(\vec{n})$  according to  $f$ . Let  $N = \vec{n}(0) + \dots + \vec{n}(r-1)$ ,  $\hat{N} = \vec{\hat{n}}(0) + \dots + \vec{\hat{n}}(|\vec{\hat{n}}| - 1)$ . The function  $f$  is constructed by embedding  $d^N$  in to  $d^{\hat{N}}$  (see (3.1)). For every  $\vec{a} \in d^N$ , suppose  $\vec{a} = \vec{a}_0 \vec{a}_1 \dots \vec{a}_{r-1}$  where  $|\vec{a}_s| = \vec{n}(s)$  for all  $s < r$ , let

$$(3.1) \quad \vec{a} = \underbrace{0 \dots 0}_{\vec{n}(0) + \dots + \vec{n}(s_0-1)} \quad \vec{a}_0 \quad \underbrace{0 \dots 0}_{\vec{n}(s_0+1) + \dots + \vec{n}(s_1-1)} \quad \vec{a}_1 \quad \underbrace{0 \dots 0}_{\vec{n}(s_1+1) + \dots + \vec{n}(s_2-1)} \quad \vec{a}_2 \dots$$

and set

$$f(\vec{a}) = \hat{f}(\vec{a}).$$

To show that  $f$  witnesses  $ENSH_k^d(\vec{n})$ , let  $s < r$  and let  $v$  be an  $\vec{n}(s)$ -variable word over  $d$  of length  $N$  with  $\{\min P_{x_m}(v) : m \in \omega\} = N_s$ . Let  $\hat{v}$  be the  $\vec{\hat{n}}(s)$ -variable word over  $d$  of length  $\hat{N} = \vec{\hat{n}}(0) + \dots + \vec{\hat{n}}(|\vec{\hat{n}}| - 1)$  defined in the same fashion as (3.1). Since  $\hat{f}$  witnesses  $ENSH_k^d(\vec{\hat{n}})$ , there exists  $\vec{b}_0, \vec{b}_1 \in d^{\vec{\hat{n}}(s)}$  such that  $\hat{f}(\hat{v}(\vec{b}_0)) \neq \hat{f}(\hat{v}(\vec{b}_1))$ . Clearly, we have  $f(v(\vec{b}_0)) \neq f(v(\vec{b}_1))$ , thus we are done.

For  $\vec{n} = n_0 \dots n_{r-1} \geq \vec{\hat{n}} = \hat{n}_0 \dots \hat{n}_{r-1}$ , suppose  $\hat{f}$  witness  $ENSH_k^d(\vec{\hat{n}})$ . Note that we can project  $d^N$  into  $d^{\hat{N}}$  as following. For every  $\vec{a} = \vec{a}_0 \dots \vec{a}_{r-1} \in d^N$  where  $|\vec{a}_s| = \vec{n}(s)$  for all  $s < r$ , let  $\vec{a}_s = \vec{a}_s \upharpoonright \hat{n}_s$ , and let  $\vec{a} = \vec{a}_0 \dots \vec{a}_{r-1}$ . Set  $f(\vec{a}) = \hat{f}(\vec{a})$  for all  $\vec{a} \in d^N$ . It's easy to verify that  $f$  witnesses  $ENSH_k^d(\vec{n})$ .  $\square$

**Proposition 3.3.** *If  $\hat{d} \geq d, \hat{k} \geq k$ , then  $ENSH_k^d(\vec{n})$  implies  $ENSH_{\hat{k}}^{\hat{d}}(\vec{n})$ .*

*Proof.* Obviously, we can embed  $d^N$  into  $\hat{d}^N$ . Thus the proof follows in a similar fashion as Proposition 3.2.  $\square$

**Proposition 3.4.** *We have  $ENSH_2^2(22), ENSH_2^2(222)$  and  $ENSH_2^2(n)$  for all  $n > 0$ .*

*Proof.* To see  $ENSH_2^2(22)$ , consider

$$f(\vec{a}) = \vec{a}(0) + \vec{a}(1) + \vec{a}(2) \text{ mod } 2.$$

To see  $ENSH_2^2(222)$ , consider

$$f(\vec{a}) = I(\vec{a}(0) + \vec{a}(1) > 0) + \vec{a}(2) + \vec{a}(3) + \vec{a}(4) \text{ mod } 2.$$

Where  $I$  is the indication function. To see  $ENSH_2^2(n)$ , simply consider  $f(\vec{a}) = \vec{a}(0) \text{ mod } 2$ .  $\square$

Now comes our main result. Let  $ENSH_k^d$  denote the set of  $\omega$ -sequences  $X$  of positive integers such that for every  $r > 0$ ,  $ENSH_k^d(X \upharpoonright r)$ .

**Theorem 3.5.** *The followings are equivalent:*

- (1) *There exists an  $X \in ENSH_k^d$ .*

- (2) *There exists a  $\text{VWI}(d, k)$ -instance  $c$  that does not admit a  $c$ -computable solution.*

We emphasize that in item (1) of Theorem 3.5, there is no complexity restriction on  $X$ . Therefore item (1) is a natural combinatorial assertion. It's also clear that item (2) of Theorem 3.5 is a negation of Question 2.4. We say a Turing functional on an oracle  $X$ , namely  $\Psi^X$ , computes a variable word if  $\Psi^X$  is an  $X$ -c.e. set (possibly finite)  $\{v_0, v_1, \dots\}$  of finitely long variable words such that  $v_0 \preceq v_1 \preceq \dots$ ; we write  $\Psi^X[t]$  to denote this enumerable set computed by time  $t$ ; for convenience, we assume that  $x_{m+1}$  occurs in  $v_n$  implies  $x_m$  occurs in  $v_n$  for all  $m, n \in \omega$ . We say  $\Psi^X$  is total if  $\cup_{v \in \Psi^X} v$  is an  $\omega$ -variable word;  $\Psi^X$  is a  $\text{VWI}(d, k)$ -solution to  $c : d^{<\omega} \rightarrow k$  if it is total and for every  $v \in \Psi^X$ ,  $|c(\{v(\vec{a}) : \vec{a} \in d^{<\omega}\})| = 1$ .

*Proof.* (1) $\Rightarrow$ (2): We will use  $X$  to compute a coloring  $c : d^{<\omega} \rightarrow k$  such that  $c$  does not admit  $X$ -computable  $\text{VWI}(d, k)$ -solution. We need  $c$  to diagonal against  $\Psi_0^X, \Psi_1^X, \dots$  where each Turing functional is computing a variable word.

To illustrate the combinatorial idea of the proof (and put priority argument aside), we temporarily assume that each Turing functional is total. Therefore,

$$(3.2) \quad \text{for each } r \in \omega, \text{ let } v_r \in \Psi_r^X \text{ be such that } v_r \text{ contains } X(r) \text{ many variables whose first occurrence is after } |v_{r-1}|.$$

<sup>5</sup> Without loss of generality, assume that all variables in  $v_r$  occur after  $|v_{r-1}|$  (otherwise substitute the exceptional variables by 0); moreover, suppose the variables occurring in  $v_r$  are  $\{x_m : m < X(r)\}$ . Suppose  $f_r$  witnesses  $ENSH_k^d(X|r)$ , we will transform these  $(f_r : r > 0)$  into a coloring  $c$  such that none of these  $v_r$  can be extended to a solution in the sense that

$$(3.3) \quad \text{there is no } X(r)\text{-variable word } v \succeq v_r \text{ such that } v \text{ is monochromatic for } c, \text{ namely } |c(\{v(\vec{a}) : \vec{a} \in d^{X(r)}\})| = 1.$$

For each  $r \in \omega$ , let  $P_r$  be the set  $\{\min P_{x_m}(v_r) : m < X(r)\}$  of the first occurrence of the variables in  $v_r$ . Clearly  $|P_r| = X(r)$  and  $P_r < P_{r+1}$  for all  $r \in \omega$ . For every  $n \in \omega$ , let  $r(n)$  be the maximal integer such that  $|v_{r(n)}| \leq n$ , we define  $c$  on  $d^n$  so that no  $v_r$  with  $r \leq r(n)$  can be extended to a  $v$  with  $|v| = n$  that is monochromatic for  $c$ . If  $r(n)$  is undefined, then define  $c$  on  $d^n$  arbitrarily. Otherwise, we define  $c$  on  $d^n$  so that  $c(\vec{a})$  depends on  $\vec{a} \upharpoonright \cup_{r \leq r(n)} P_r$ . More specifically, for  $\vec{a} \in d^n$ , let

$$(3.4) \quad c(\vec{a}) = f_{r(n)+1}(\vec{a} \upharpoonright \cup_{r \leq r(n)} P_r).$$

We now verify (3.3). Fix an  $r \in \omega$ , an  $X(r)$ -variable word  $v \succeq v_r$ . Suppose  $|v| = n$ . It suffices to show that there are  $\vec{b}_0, \vec{b}_1 \in d^{X(r)}$  such that  $c(v(\vec{b}_0)) \neq c(v(\vec{b}_1))$ .

Let  $j$  be the 1-1 order preserving map from  $P = \cup_{r \in \omega} P_r$  to  $\omega$ . Let

$$\hat{v} = v \upharpoonright \cup_{r \leq r(n)} P_r$$

and note that  $\hat{v}$  is an  $X(r)$ -variable word of length  $X(0) + \dots + X(r(n))$  (variables occurring in  $\hat{v}$  are  $\{x_m : m < X(r)\}$ ) such that, for every  $m < X(r)$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \min P_{x_m}(\hat{v}) &= \min j(P_{x_m}(v) \cap (\cup_{r \leq r(n)} P_r)) \\ &= j(\min P_{x_m}(v)) = X(0) + \dots + X(r-1) + m. \end{aligned}$$

---

<sup>5</sup>We set  $|v_{-1}| = 0$ .

Thus,

$$\{\min P_{x_m}(\hat{v}) : m < X(r)\} = N_r$$

where  $N_r = \{X(0) + \dots + X(r-1), \dots, X(0) + \dots + X(r) - 1\}$ . By definition of  $f_{r(n)+1}$ , there exist  $\vec{b}_0, \vec{b}_1 \in d^{X(r)}$  such that

$$f_{r(n)+1}(\hat{v}(\vec{b}_0)) \neq f_{r(n)+1}(\hat{v}(\vec{b}_1)).$$

But  $\hat{v}(\vec{b}) = v(\vec{b}) \upharpoonright \cup_{r \leq r(n)} P_r$  for all  $\vec{b} \in d^{X(r)}$ . Thus, combine with the definition of  $c$  (see (3.4)), we have

$$\begin{aligned} & c(v(\vec{b}_0)) \\ &= f_{r(n)+1}(v(\vec{b}_0) \upharpoonright \cup_{r \leq r(n)} P_r) \\ &= f_{r(n)+1}(\hat{v}(\vec{b}_0)) \\ &\neq f_{r(n)+1}(\hat{v}(\vec{b}_1)) \\ &= f_{r(n)+1}(v(\vec{b}_1) \upharpoonright \cup_{r \leq r(n)} P_r) \\ &= c(v(\vec{b}_1)). \end{aligned}$$

Thus we are done.

For the general case where (3.2) is not necessarily true, we maintain, at each time  $t$  a finite set  $W[t] = \{w_0 < w_1 < \dots\} \subseteq \{0, \dots, t-1\}$  such that (3.2) is true for all  $r < |W[t]|$ . i.e.,

(3.5)

for each  $r < |W[t]|$ , there exists a  $v_r \in \Psi_{w_r}^X[t]$  such that  $v_r$  contains  $X(r)$  many variables whose first occurrence is after  $|v_{r-1}|$ .

Moreover, we assume that

(3.6) for every  $r < |W[t]|$ ,  $|v_r| < t$ .

If  $W[t] = \emptyset$ , define  $c$  on  $d^t$  arbitrarily. Otherwise, define  $c$  on  $d^t$  as

$$c(\vec{a}) = f_{|W[t]|}(\vec{a} \upharpoonright \cup_{r < |W[t]|} P_r).$$

Note that as we argued before, if for some  $w, t \in \omega$ ,  $W[\hat{t}] \cap [0, w] = W[t] \cap [0, w]$  for all  $\hat{t} \geq t$ , suppose  $W[t] \cap [0, w] = \{w_0 < w_1 < \dots < w_r < \dots\}$ , we have that  $v_r \in \Psi_{w_r}^X$  can not be extended to a solution in a similar sense of (3.3). i.e.,

there is no  $X(r)$ -variable word  $v \succeq v_r$  with  $|v| \geq t$   
that is monochromatic for  $c$ .

Thus  $c$  must diagonal against  $\Psi_{w_r}^X$  if  $\Psi_{w_r}^X$  is total. By a simple priority argument, we can  $X$ -compute a sequence  $(W[t] : t \in \omega)$  of finite sets such that

- property (3.5) and (3.6) follow;
- $W[t] \cap [0, w]$  converges as  $t$  tends to infinity for all  $w \in \omega$ ;
- let  $W$  be the limit of  $W[t]$ , we have  $W$  is maximal in the sense that  $\Psi_w^X$  is not total for all  $w \notin W$ .

Thus this means, for every  $w$ , either  $c$  diagonal againsts  $\Psi_w^X$  or  $\Psi_w^X$  is not total.

At last we notice that the proof actually shows that for an oracle  $D$  such that  $D'$  computes some  $X \in ENSH_k^d$ , there is a  $D$ -computable coloring  $c : d^{<\omega} \rightarrow k$  such that  $c$  does not admit  $D$ -computable  $VWI(d, k)$ -solution (see Theorem 3.6). To see

this, we  $D$ -compute a sequence  $(W[t] : t \in \omega)$  of finite sets such that for every  $t$ , let  $W[t] = \{w_0 < w_1 < \dots\}$ , we have

for each  $r < |W[t]|$ , there exists a  $v_r \in \Psi_{w_r}^D[t]$  such that  $v_r$  contains  $X[t](r)$  many variables whose first occurrence is after  $|v_{r-1}|$ .

(2) $\Rightarrow$ (1): Fix a  $c : d^{<\omega} \rightarrow k$  that does not admit a  $c$ -computable  $\text{VWI}(d, k)$ -solution. We will take advantage of some particular algorithms  $\Phi_0^c, \Phi_1^c, \dots$  and show that their failure (to compute a solution to  $c$ ) give rise to a sequence  $X \in \text{ENSH}_k^d$ . Roughly speaking, the algorithms  $\Phi_0^c, \Phi_1^c, \dots$  are greedy algorithms in the sense that

they extend their current computation (which is a finitely long variable word) whenever possible. i.e.,

$\Phi_{r+1}^c$  extends its current computation from  $v$  to some  $\hat{v} \succeq v$   
 where  $\hat{v}$  has more variables than  $v$ ,  
 whenever it is found that for *some*  $\vec{a} \in d^{|v_r|+1}$ ,  $\hat{v}/\vec{a}$  is monochromatic for  $c$   
 where  $v_r$  is the current computation of  $\Phi_r^c$ .

Moreover,  $\Phi_{r+1}^c$  will build its solution  $v_{r+1}^*$  based on  $\Phi_0^c, \dots, \Phi_r^c$  in the sense that

all variables in  $v_{r+1}^*$  occur after  $|v_r|$  and  
 if some  $\Phi_{\tilde{r}}^c$  extends its current computation,  
 then all  $\Phi_r^c$  (where  $r > \tilde{r}$ ) will restart all over again.

Since  $c$  does not admit a  $c$ -computable solution, for every  $r \in \omega$ , the computation of  $\Phi_r^c$  sticks at some  $v_r$ . More concretely,

- There is no  $\hat{v} \succeq v_r$  with  $\hat{v}$  containing more variables than  $v_r$  such that for some  $\vec{a} \in d^{|v_{r-1}|+1}$ ,  $\hat{v}/\vec{a}$  is monochromatic for  $c$ .
- All variables in  $v_r$  occur after  $|v_{r-1}|$  (meaning  $P_{x_m}(v_r) > |v_{r-1}|$  for all  $m \in \omega$ ) and  $|v_r| > |v_{r-1}|$ .

Let  $\hat{v}_r$  be  $\vec{v}_r \widehat{x}_{n_{r-1}}$ , where we assume that the variables occurring in  $v_r$  are  $\{x_0, \dots, x_{n_{r-2}}\}$ . Then the first item transforms into:

(3.7) there is no  $n_r$ -variable word  $\hat{v} \succeq \hat{v}_r$  such that for some  $\vec{a} \in d^{|\hat{v}_{r-1}|}$ ,  
 $\hat{v}/\vec{a}$  is monochromatic for  $c$ .

We show that  $n_0 n_1 n_2 \dots \in \text{ENSH}_k^d$ . Fix an  $r \in \omega$ , we need to construct an  $f : d^N \rightarrow k$  witnessing  $\text{ENSH}_k^d(n_0 \dots n_r)$  where  $N = n_0 + \dots + n_r$ . For every  $\vec{a} \in d^N$ , to define  $f(\vec{a})$ ,

we map  $\vec{a}$  to a word  $\vec{\hat{a}} = h(\vec{a}) \in d^{|\hat{v}_r|}$  and let  $f(\vec{a}) = c(\vec{\hat{a}})$ .

Intuitively,  $h$  is defined by connecting each element of  $N$  to a set of elements of  $|\hat{v}_r|$ , namely  $P_{x_m}(\hat{v}_s)$  for some  $m, s \in \omega$ . Suppose  $\vec{a} = \vec{a}_0 \dots \vec{a}_r$  where  $|\vec{a}_s| = n_s$  for all  $s \leq r$ . Let

$$\vec{\hat{a}}_s = \hat{v}_s(\vec{a}_s) \upharpoonright_{|\hat{v}_{s-1}|}^{|\hat{v}_s|-1} \text{ and } h(\vec{a}) = \vec{\hat{a}}_0 \dots \vec{\hat{a}}_r.$$

Let  $s \leq r$  and  $\tilde{v}$  be a  $n_s$ -variable word such that  $\{\min P_{x_m}(\tilde{v}) : m \in \omega\} = N_s$  where  $N_s = \{X(0) + \dots + X(s-1), \dots, X(0) + \dots + X(s) - 1\}$ . Without loss of generality,

we assume that the variables occurring in  $\tilde{v}$  are the same as that of  $\hat{v}_s$ ; moreover, the order of their occurrence is also identical. Note that  $h$  naturally extends to a map defined on any sequence of length  $N$ . Consider the variable word  $\hat{v} = h(\tilde{v})$  and note that  $\hat{v}|_{|\hat{v}_{s-1}|}^{|\hat{v}_s|-1} = \hat{v}_s|_{|\hat{v}_{s-1}|}^{|\hat{v}_s|-1}$ . Therefore, since variables in  $\hat{v}_s$  occurs after  $|\hat{v}_s| - 1$  for all  $\hat{s} > s$ , let  $\vec{a} = \hat{v}_s|_{|\hat{v}_{s-1}|}$ , we have

$$\hat{v}/\vec{a} \text{ is an } n_s\text{-variable word extending } \hat{v}_s.$$

By (3.7), there are  $\vec{b}_0, \vec{b}_1 \in d^{n_s}$  such that  $c(\hat{v}(\vec{b}_0)) \neq c(\hat{v}(\vec{b}_1))$ . Since  $h(\tilde{v}(\vec{b})) = \hat{v}(\vec{b})$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} (3.8) \quad f(\tilde{v}(\vec{b}_0)) &= c(h(\tilde{v}(\vec{b}_0))) \\ &= c(\hat{v}(\vec{b}_0)) \\ &\neq c(\hat{v}(\vec{b}_1)) \\ &= c(h(\tilde{v}(\vec{b}_1))) \\ &= f(\tilde{v}(\vec{b}_1)). \end{aligned}$$

Thus we are done.

It worth mention that  $c$  does not necessarily compute  $n_0 n_1 \cdots$  since  $c$  can not decide whether  $\Phi_r^c$  will ever extend its current computation. However, we have that  $c'$  computes  $n_0 n_1 \cdots$  (see Theorem 3.6). □

As we mentioned in the proof of Theorem 3.5, we actually have the following.

**Theorem 3.6.** *The following classes of oracles are identical:*

- $\{D \subseteq \omega : D' \text{ computes a member in } ENSH_k^d\}$ .
- $\{D \subseteq \omega : D \text{ computes a } \forall\text{MI}(d, k)\text{-instance } c \text{ that does not admit } c\text{-computable solution}\}$ .

*Remark 3.7.* In Theorem 3.5, direction (2) $\Rightarrow$ (1) is particularly interesting. It is an example that a computability theoretic assertion has some corollary outside computability theory.

On the other hand, experience in computability theory gives us some clue about the complexity of the members in  $ENSH_k^d$  (without analyzing  $ENSH_k^d$ ). It suggests that if  $ENSH_k^d$  is nonempty, then  $ENSH_k^d$  admits a  $\emptyset'$ -computable member. This is because almost all computability theoretic assertions relativize. Therefore, if there is a  $\forall\text{MI}(d, k)$ -instance  $c$  that does not admit a  $c$ -computable solution, then it is likely that such  $c$  can be chosen to be computable. Thus, by Theorem 3.6, if  $ENSH_k^d$  is nonempty, then it is likely that  $ENSH_k^d$  admits a  $\emptyset'$ -computable member.

#### 4. ON THE $ENSH_k^d$ PROPERTY

It turns out that disproving  $ENSH_k^d$  on certain sequences is equivalent to Hales-Jewett theorem (see Remark 4.3). For  $d, k, n \in \omega$ , let  $HJ(d, k, n)$  denote the assertion that

$$(4.1) \quad \text{there exists an } N \text{ such that for every } c : d^N \rightarrow k,$$

there exists an  $n$ -variable word  $v$  of length  $N$  that is monochromatic for  $c$ .

Hales-Jewett theorem states that

**Theorem 4.1** (Hales-Jewett theorem). *For every  $d, k, n \in \omega$ ,  $HJ(d, k, n)$  holds.*

See [4] for a proof of Hales-Jewett theorem. Using Hales-Jewett theorem, we prove the following Proposition 4.2, which also directly implies Hales-Jewett theorem. When there is no ambiguity, we use  $n_r$  to denote  $n \cdots n$  ( $r$  many).

**Proposition 4.2.** *For every  $d, k, n \in \omega$ , there exists an  $r$  such that  $ENSH_k^d(n_r)$  does not hold.*

*Proof.* We prove the Lemma for  $d = 2, n = 2$ . The general case follows similarly. By  $HJ(4, k, 1)$ , let  $r$  be a witness (as  $N$  in (4.1)). We show that  $ENSH_k^2(2_r)$  does not hold. This is done by coding the space  $2^{2r}$  into  $4^r$  in the obvious way where  $\vec{a}(2t)\vec{a}(2t+1)$  is coded into  $\vec{a}(t)$ . i.e., for every  $\vec{a} \in 2^{2r}$ , let  $\vec{a} = h(\vec{a}) \in 4^r$  be such that  $\vec{a}(t) = 0, 1, 2, 3$  respectively depending on  $\vec{a}(2t)\vec{a}(2t+1) = 00, 01, 10, 11$  respectively. Given a coloring  $c : 2^{2r} \rightarrow k$ , consider

$$\hat{c} : 4^r \ni \vec{a} \mapsto c(h^{-1}(\vec{a})) \in k$$

and suppose (by definition of  $r$ )  $\hat{v}$  is a 1-variable word (over 4) of length  $r$  that is monochromatic for  $\hat{c}$ . Without loss of generality, suppose  $x_0$  occurs in  $\hat{v}$ . We transform  $\hat{v}$  back to a 2-variable word (over 2)  $v$  of length  $2r$  such that

$$v(2t)v(2t+1) = 00, 01, 10, 11, x_0x_1 \text{ respectively if } \hat{v}(t) = 0, 1, 2, 3, x_0 \text{ respectively.}$$

Note that for every  $\vec{a} \in 2^2$ , there exists an  $\vec{a} \in 4$  such that  $\hat{v}(\vec{a}) = h(v(\vec{a}))$ . Thus,  $v$  is monochromatic for  $c$ . Moreover, it's clear that  $\{\min P_{x_m}(v) : m \in \omega\} = \{2t^*, 2t^* + 1\}$  where  $t^* = \min P_{x_0}(\hat{v})$ . Thus we are done.  $\square$

*Remark 4.3.* Note that given  $d, k, n$ , the existence of  $r$  (as Lemma 4.2) clearly implies  $HJ(d, k, n)$  where the witness  $N$  could be  $n \cdot r$ . i.e., the assertion  $n^\omega \notin ENSH_k^d$  for all  $d, k, n$  is equivalent to Hales-Jewett theorem. Thus the assertion  $ENSH_k^d = \emptyset$  for all  $d, k$  is a generalization of Hales-Jewett theorem.

One possible way to show that  $ENSH_k^d \neq \emptyset$  is by proving that if  $n_0 \cdots n_{r-1} \in ENSH_k^d$ , then there exists an  $n$  such that  $n_0 \cdots n_{r-1}n \in ENSH_k^d$ . However, this clearly doesn't work.

**Proposition 4.4.** *For every  $n$ ,  $ENSH_2^2(1n)$  does not hold.*

*Proof.* Fix an  $f : 2^{n+1} \rightarrow 2$ . Without loss of generality, assume that  $f(0 \cdots 0) = 0$ . Suppose there is a  $\vec{a} \in 2^{n+1}$  with  $\vec{a}(0) = 0$  such that  $f(\vec{a}) = 1$  (otherwise the variable word  $v = 0x_0 \cdots x_{n-1}$  is monochromatic for  $f$  in color 0). If  $f(1 \cdots 1) = 0$ , then the variable word  $v = x_0 \cdots x_0$  is monochromatic for  $f$  in color 0. Otherwise, let  $v$  be the 1-variable word such that  $v(0) = \vec{a}, v(1) = 1 \cdots 1$ , we have  $v$  is monochromatic for  $f$ . Thus we are done.  $\square$

We refer to the argument where we show that there is a  $\vec{a}$  with  $\vec{a}(0) = 0$  so that  $f(\vec{a}) = 1$  as *searching argument*. More generally, by searching argument, we have:

**Lemma 4.5.** *Let  $n_0 \cdots n_r$  be a sufficiently long positive integer sequence that is not sectionally-homogeneous for  $f$ . Then there exist  $(\vec{a}_m \in 2^{n_0} : m < n_0)$  such that  $\vec{a}_m^{-1}(1)$  are mutually disjoint and  $f(\vec{a}_m) = 0, m \in \vec{a}_m^{-1}(1)$  for all  $m < n_0$ .*

For Lemma 4.5, to be sufficiently long, it suffices that  $r \geq n_0$ . However, in the following subsection, to be sufficiently long could be very complex. In some cases, we reduce a stronger statement to a weaker one, and to be sufficiently long in that stronger statement depends on the weaker statement. For example, to be sufficiently long in that stronger statement means there are sufficiently many mutually disjoint subsequences of  $n_0 \cdots n_r$  so that each is sufficiently long in the sense of that weaker statement. Since where these subsequences locate do not matter, therefore, to avoid unnecessary complication and an ocean of notation, we use the term sufficiently long. In this term,  $ENSH_k^d = \emptyset$  can be stated as for every sufficiently long  $n_0 \cdots n_r$ , every  $f : d^N \rightarrow k$ ,  $n_0 \cdots n_r$  is sectionally-homogeneous for  $f$ .

**4.1. A generalization of Hales-Jewett theorem on  $d = 2, k = 2, n = 2$ .** Our goal of this subsection is to prove the following generalization of Hales-Jewett theorem on the parameters  $d = 2$ .

**Theorem 4.6.** *For every  $\omega$ -sequence of positive integers  $n_0 n_1 \cdots$  with  $n_0 = 2$ ,  $n_0 n_1 \cdots \notin ENSH_2^2$ .*

As explained in Remark 4.3, this generalizes  $HJ(2, 2, 2)$ . For convenience, we prove the following equivalent version of Theorem 4.6. In this section, a  $[0, n]$ -variable word  $v$  is a variable word such that the variables occurring in  $v$  is a subset of  $\{x_0, \dots, x_{n-1}\}$ . Abusing the notation, we write  $v(\vec{a})$  for the string obtained by substituting  $x_m$  by  $\vec{a}(m)$  for all  $m < n$ . For example, let variable word  $v = 0x_10$  and  $\vec{a} = 01$ , then  $v(\vec{a}) = 010$  (although Definition 2.1 gives  $v(\vec{a}) = 000$ ).

**Theorem 4.7.** *Let  $n_0 \cdots n_r$  be sufficiently long and colorings  $f_{00}, f_{01}, f_{10}, f_{11} : 2^N \rightarrow 2$ . Then, either  $n_0 \cdots n_r$  is sectionally-homogeneous for  $f_{\vec{b}}$  for some  $\vec{b} \in 2^2$ ; or there exists a  $[0, 2]$ -variable word  $v$  such that  $f_{\vec{b}}(v(\vec{b})) = f_{\vec{b}}(v(\vec{b}))$  for all  $\vec{b}, \vec{b} \in 2^2$ .*

*Proof of Theorem 4.6 from Theorem 4.7.* Fix an  $f : 2^N \rightarrow 2$ . Let

$$f_{\vec{b}} : 2^{N-2} \ni \vec{a} \mapsto f(\vec{b}\vec{a}).$$

If  $n_1 \cdots n_r$  is sectionally-homogeneous for  $f_{\vec{b}}$  for some  $\vec{b}$ , then clearly we are done (since it means  $n_0 \cdots n_r$  is sectionally-homogeneous for  $f$ ). Otherwise, by Theorem 4.7, let  $v$  be a  $[0, 2]$ -variable word of length  $N-2$  such that for some  $j \in 2$ ,  $f_{\vec{b}}(v(\vec{b})) = j$  for all  $\vec{b} \in 2^2$ . Let  $\hat{v} = x_0 x_1 v$ . Clearly  $f(\hat{v}(\vec{b})) = f(\vec{b} \cdot v(\vec{b})) = f_{\vec{b}}(v(\vec{b})) = j$ . Thus  $f$  does not witness  $ENSH_2^2(n_0 \cdots n_r)$ . The conclusion follows since  $f$  is arbitrary.  $\square$

Of course, Theorem 4.6 implies Theorem 4.7 in the same fashion. The remaining of section 4.1 will prove Theorem 4.7. For every  $\vec{a} \in 2^{<\omega}$ , we think of  $\vec{a}$  as a finite set  $\vec{a}^{-1}(1)$  (and vice versa when the length of  $\vec{a}$  is clear), therefore it makes sense to write  $\vec{a}_0 \cup \vec{a}_1, \vec{a}_0 \cap \vec{a}_1, \vec{a}_0 \setminus \vec{a}_1$ <sup>6</sup>.

Assume otherwise that  $n_0 \cdots n_r$  is not sectionally-homogeneous for  $f_{\vec{b}}$  for all  $\vec{b} \in 2^2$  and the  $[0, 2]$ -variable word does not exist. The basic idea to prove Theorem 4.7 is to reduce it to some simpler cases. i.e., to construct some sequence  $\hat{n}_0 \cdots \hat{n}_r$  and colorings  $\hat{f}_{00}, \hat{f}_{01}, \hat{f}_{10}, \hat{f}_{11} : 2^{\hat{N}} \rightarrow 2$  with  $\hat{n}_0 \cdots \hat{n}_r, (\hat{f}_{\vec{b}} : \vec{b} \in 2^2)$  preserving the

<sup>6</sup>We only use this sort of notation when  $|\vec{a}_0| = |\vec{a}_1|$ .

otherwise hypothesis while acquiring some additional restriction on  $(\hat{f}_{\vec{b}} : \vec{b} \in 2^2)$ . More specifically, we firstly try to find a  $\vec{a}_0$  with  $\vec{a}_0^{-1}(1) \subseteq \cup_{s \leq r/2} \mathcal{N}_s$  such that

$$f_{00}(\vec{a}_0) = f_{01}(\vec{a}_0) = 0.$$

If  $\vec{a}_0$  exists, then consider the sequence  $n_{r/2+1} \cdots n_r$  and the colorings

$$\hat{f}_{\vec{b}} : 2^{n_{r/2+1} + \cdots + n_r} \ni \vec{a} \mapsto f_{\vec{b}}((\vec{a}_0 \upharpoonright n) \wedge \vec{a})$$

where  $n = n_0 + \cdots + n_r$ . Note that the otherwise hypothesis is preserved by the sequence  $n_{r/2+1} \cdots n_r$  and the colorings  $(\hat{f}_{\vec{b}} : \vec{b} \in 2^2)$ . i.e., for all  $\vec{b} \in 2^2$ ,  $n_{r/2+1} \cdots n_r$  is not sectionally-homogeneous for  $\hat{f}_{\vec{b}}$ ; and there does not exist a  $[0, 2]$ -variable word of length  $n_{r/2+1} + \cdots + n_r$  such that  $\hat{f}_{\vec{b}}(v(\vec{b})) = \hat{f}_{\vec{b}}(v(\vec{b}))$  for all  $\vec{b}, \vec{b} \in 2^2$ <sup>7</sup>. In addition, for every  $\vec{a} \in 2^{n_{r/2+1} + \cdots + n_r}$ ,

$$(4.2) \quad \neg(\hat{f}_{10}(\vec{a}) = \hat{f}_{11}(\vec{a}) = 0)^8. \quad \begin{array}{ccc} & f_{11} & \\ & 0 & \\ f_{01} & & f_{10} \\ & f_{00} & \end{array}$$

To see this, suppose  $\hat{f}_{10}(\vec{a}) = \hat{f}_{11}(\vec{a}) = 0$ . Consider the 1-variable word  $v$  of length  $N$  such that  $v(00) = v(01) = \vec{a}_0$ ,  $v(10) = v(11) = (\vec{a}_0 \upharpoonright n) \wedge \vec{a}$ , we have that  $f_{\vec{b}}(v(\vec{b})) = 0$  for all  $\vec{b} \in 2^2$ . Thus, if  $\vec{a}_0$  exists, we proceed the proof with the sequence  $n_{r/2+1} \cdots n_r$  (which will still be sufficiently long) and the colorings  $(\hat{f}_{\vec{b}} : \vec{b} \in 2^2)$ . The good thing is that not only do we still have the otherwise hypothesis, we also have the additional (4.2).

If  $\vec{a}_0$  does not exist, we proceed the proof with the sequence  $n_0 \cdots n_{r/2}$  and the colorings

$$\hat{f}_{\vec{b}} : 2^{n_0 + \cdots + n_{r/2}} \ni \vec{a} \mapsto f_{\vec{b}}(\vec{a}0 \cdots 0).$$

Note that the otherwise hypothesis is preserved. In addition, since  $\vec{a}_0$  does not exist, for every  $\vec{a} \in 2^n$ ,

$$\neg \hat{f}_{00}(\vec{a}) = \hat{f}_{01}(\vec{a}) = 0. \quad \begin{array}{ccc} & f_{11} & \\ & 0 & \\ f_{01} & & f_{10} \\ & f_{00} & \end{array}$$

Whichever is the case, we preserve the otherwise hypothesis and acquire an additional restriction on the behavior of the colorings. Suppose it is the case of (4.2), for simplicity, denote  $n_{r+1} \cdots n_r, \hat{f}_{\vec{b}}$  as  $n_0 \cdots n_r, f_{\vec{b}}$  respectively. Apply the above argument again (with respect to the new sequence and colorings) against the edges  $(f_{00}, f_{10}), (f_{01}, f_{11})$  and color 0 (where the above argument is against  $(f_{00}, f_{01}), (f_{10}, f_{11})$  and color 0 and results in some sequence and colorings so that the joint behavior of either  $(f_{00}, f_{01})$  or  $(f_{10}, f_{11})$  is further restricted). We have that there exists a sequence  $\hat{n}_0 \cdots \hat{n}_{\hat{r}}$  and colorings  $\hat{f}_{00}, \hat{f}_{01}, \hat{f}_{10}, \hat{f}_{11} : 2^{\hat{N}} \rightarrow 2$  preserving

<sup>7</sup>Also note that  $n_{r/2+1} \cdots n_r$  is still sufficiently long in the sense of whatever needed in the following proof since  $n_0 \cdots n_r$  is sufficiently long.

<sup>8</sup>We use the diagram beside this formula to assist the reader to remember the restriction. The label "0" on the edge  $(f_{10}, f_{11})$  refers to the fact that  $\neg(\hat{f}_{10}(\vec{a}) = \hat{f}_{11}(\vec{a}) = 0)$  for all  $\vec{a} \in 2^{\hat{N}}$ .

the otherwise hypothesis and (4.2). In addition

$$(4.3) \quad \text{either } \neg \hat{f}_{00}(\vec{a}) = \hat{f}_{10}(\vec{a}) = 0 \text{ for all } \vec{a} \in 2^{\hat{N}}; \quad \begin{array}{ccc} & f_{11} & \\ f_{01} & 0 & f_{10} \\ & f_{00} & \end{array}$$

$$\text{or } \neg \hat{f}_{01}(\vec{a}) = \hat{f}_{11}(\vec{a}) = 0 \text{ for all } \vec{a} \in 2^{\hat{N}}; \quad \begin{array}{ccc} & f_{11} & \\ f_{01} & 0 & f_{10} \\ & f_{00} & \end{array}$$

Keeping applying this argument for each pair of non adjunctive edges and each color, we have the following.

**Lemma 4.8.** *Let  $n_0 \cdots n_r$  be sufficiently long and is not sectionally-homogeneous for the colorings  $f_{00}, f_{10}, f_{01}, f_{11} : 2^N \rightarrow 2$ . Suppose there does not exist a  $[0, 2]$ -variable word  $v$  such that for every  $\vec{b}, \vec{\tilde{b}} \in 2^2$ ,  $f_{\vec{b}}(v(\vec{b})) = f_{\vec{\tilde{b}}}(v(\vec{\tilde{b}}))$ . Then there exists a sufficiently long sequence  $\hat{n}_0 \cdots \hat{n}_r$  and colorings  $\hat{f}_{00}, \hat{f}_{10}, \hat{f}_{01}, \hat{f}_{11} : 2^{\hat{N}} \rightarrow 2$  such that the hypothesis of this lemma is preserved. In addition, one of the following is true:*

- for every  $\vec{a} \in 2^{\hat{N}}$ ,

$$(4.4) \quad \neg \hat{f}_{01}(\vec{a}) = \hat{f}_{11}(\vec{a}) = 0, \neg \hat{f}_{10}(\vec{a}) = \hat{f}_{11}(\vec{a}) = 0. \quad \begin{array}{ccc} & f_{11} & 0 \\ f_{01} & 0 & f_{10} \\ & f_{00} & \end{array}$$

- for every  $\vec{a} \in 2^{\hat{N}}$ ,

$$(4.5) \quad \neg \hat{f}_{00}(\vec{a}) = \hat{f}_{01}(\vec{a}), \neg \hat{f}_{01}(\vec{a}) = \hat{f}_{11}(\vec{a}). \quad \begin{array}{ccc} & f_{11} & \\ f_{01} & 01 & f_{10} \\ & 01 & \\ & f_{00} & \end{array}$$

- for every  $\vec{a} \in 2^{\hat{N}}$ ,

$$(4.6) \quad \neg \hat{f}_{00}(\vec{a}) = \hat{f}_{01}(\vec{a}) = 0, \neg \hat{f}_{00}(\vec{a}) = \hat{f}_{10}(\vec{a}) = 1,$$

$$\neg \hat{f}_{01}(\vec{a}) = \hat{f}_{11}(\vec{a}) = 0, \neg \hat{f}_{10}(\vec{a}) = \hat{f}_{11}(\vec{a}) = 1. \quad \begin{array}{ccc} & f_{11} & \\ f_{01} & 0 & 1 & f_{10} \\ & 0 & 1 & \\ & f_{00} & \end{array}$$

*Proof.* The point is that for every pair of non adjunctive edges say  $(f_{00}, f_{01}), (f_{10}, f_{11})$ , every color  $j \in 2$ ,  $j$  appears on one of the edges.

Clearly, some cases are reduced to one of the three cases due to symmetry. For example, we may obtain  $\hat{n}_0 \cdots \hat{n}_r$  and colorings  $\hat{f}_{00}, \hat{f}_{10}, \hat{f}_{01}, \hat{f}_{11}$  so that for every  $\vec{a} \in 2^{\hat{N}}$ ,

$$\neg \hat{f}_{01}(\vec{a}) = \hat{f}_{11}(\vec{a}) = 1, \neg \hat{f}_{10}(\vec{a}) = \hat{f}_{11}(\vec{a}) = 1. \quad \begin{array}{ccc} & f_{11} & \\ f_{01} & 1 & 1 & f_{10} \\ & f_{00} & \end{array}$$

This clearly reduces to (4.4) by considering the colorings  $\tilde{f}_{\vec{b}} = 1 - \hat{f}_{\vec{b}}$ .

Other two symmetry cases are less trivial but still easy. One of the symmetry case is for every  $\vec{a} \in 2^{\hat{N}}$ ,

$$\neg \hat{f}_{00}(\vec{a}) = \hat{f}_{10}(\vec{a}), \neg \hat{f}_{10}(\vec{a}) = \hat{f}_{11}(\vec{a}). \quad \begin{array}{ccc} & f_{11} & \\ f_{01} & \begin{array}{c} 01 \\ 01 \end{array} & f_{10} \\ & f_{00} & \end{array}$$

This can be reduced to (4.5) by considering  $\tilde{f}_{bb} = \hat{f}_{bb}$ ,  $\tilde{f}_{b \cdot 1-b} = \hat{f}_{1-b \cdot b}$ . Note that for every  $[0, 2]$ -variable word  $v$ , if  $\tilde{f}_{\vec{b}}(v(\vec{b})) = j$  for some  $j$  for all  $\vec{b} \in 2^2$ , then consider the variable word  $\hat{v}$  such that  $\hat{v}(bb) = v(bb)$ ,  $\hat{v}(b \cdot 1-b) = v(1-b \cdot b)$ , we have that  $\hat{f}_{\vec{b}}(v(\vec{b})) = j$  for all  $\vec{b} \in 2^2$ .

Another symmetry case is that, say for every  $\vec{a} \in 2^{\hat{N}}$ ,

$$(4.7) \quad \neg \hat{f}_{00}(\vec{a}) = \hat{f}_{01}(\vec{a}) = 0, \neg \hat{f}_{00}(\vec{a}) = \hat{f}_{10}(\vec{a}) = 0. \quad \begin{array}{ccc} & f_{11} & \\ f_{01} & \begin{array}{c} 0 \\ 0 \end{array} & f_{10} \\ & f_{00} & \end{array}$$

This can be reduced to (4.4). Let  $h(\vec{a}) = \vec{\bar{a}}$  be such that  $\vec{\bar{a}}(t) = 1 - \vec{a}(t)$  for all  $t < |\vec{a}|$ . Consider  $\tilde{f}_{\vec{b}} = \hat{f}_{\vec{b}} \circ h$ . Where  $\vec{\bar{b}}(t) = 1 - \vec{b}(t)$ . Now (4.7) transforms into (4.4) with respect to  $\tilde{f}_{\vec{b}}$  and clearly  $\hat{n}_0 \cdots \hat{n}_{\hat{r}}$  is not sectionally-homogeneous for  $\tilde{f}_{\vec{b}}$  for all  $\vec{b} \in 2^2$ . On the other hand, suppose for some  $[0, 2]$ -variable word  $v$ ,  $\tilde{f}_{\vec{b}}(v(\vec{b})) = j$  for all  $\vec{b} \in 2^2$ . Consider the variable word  $\bar{v}$  such that  $\bar{v}(t) = 1 - v(t)$  if  $v(t) \in 2$  and  $\bar{v}(t) = v(t)$  if  $v(t)$  is a variable. We have that

$$\hat{f}_{\vec{b}}(\bar{v}(\vec{b})) = \tilde{f}_{\vec{b}}(h^{-1}(\bar{v}(\vec{b}))) = \tilde{f}_{\vec{b}}(v(\vec{b})) = j.$$

□

By Lemma 4.8, to prove Theorem 4.7, it remains to derive a contradiction for each of the three cases. We start with case (4.4) (which might be the simplest case) in section 4.1.1 and the other cases in section 4.1.2, 4.1.3 respectively. Each case of (4.5)(4.6) is further reduced to some  $\hat{n}_0 \cdots \hat{n}_{\hat{r}}$ ,  $(\hat{f}_{\vec{b}} : \vec{b} \in 2^2)$  preserving the case hypothesis while imposing further restrictions on the behavior of the colorings. Using the diagram symbol, the three cases proceed as following:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \begin{array}{ccc} & f_{11} & \\ f_{01} & \begin{array}{c} 0 \\ 0 \end{array} & f_{10} \\ & f_{00} & \end{array} & \xRightarrow{\text{Lemma 4.10}} & \text{contradiction;} \\ \\ \begin{array}{ccc} & f_{11} & \\ f_{01} & \begin{array}{c} 01 \\ 01 \end{array} & f_{10} \\ & f_{00} & \end{array} & \xRightarrow{\text{Lemma 4.11}} & \begin{array}{ccc} & f_{11} & \\ f_{01} & \begin{array}{c} 01 \\ 01 \end{array} & f_{10} \\ & f_{00} & \end{array} & \xRightarrow{\text{Lemma 4.15}} & \text{contradiction;} \\ \\ \begin{array}{ccc} & f_{11} & \\ f_{01} & \begin{array}{c} 0 \\ 0 \end{array} & f_{10} \\ & f_{00} & \end{array} & \xRightarrow{\text{Lemma 4.16}} & \begin{array}{ccc} & f_{11} & \\ f_{01} & \begin{array}{c} 0 \\ 0 \end{array} & f_{10} \\ & f_{00} & \end{array} & \xRightarrow{\text{Lemma 4.18}} & \text{contradiction.} \end{array}$$

4.1.1. *Case (4.4)*. The following lemma serves as a warm up and its idea will be further used.

**Lemma 4.9.** *Let  $n_0 \cdots n_r$  be sufficiently long and is not sectionally-homogeneous for coloring  $f : 2^N \rightarrow 2$ . Then there exist  $\vec{a}_0, \vec{a}_1 \in 2^N$  with  $\vec{a}_0 \cap \vec{a}_1 = \emptyset$  such that  $f(\vec{a}_0) = f(\vec{a}_1) = 0, f(\vec{a}_0 \cup \vec{a}_1) = 1$ .*

*Proof.* Suppose otherwise. It suffices to show that there exist  $\vec{a}_0, \dots, \vec{a}_{n_0+n_1-1}$  with  $\vec{a}_m^{-1}(1)$  being mutually disjoint and  $\min \vec{a}_m^{-1}(1) = m$  for all  $m < n_0 + n_1$  such that

$$(4.8) \quad \text{for every nonempty set } I \subseteq n_0 + n_1, f(\cup_{m \in I} \vec{a}_m) = 0.$$

Because this implies  $n_0 \cdots n_r$  is sectionally-homogeneous for  $f$ , a contradiction.

We define  $\vec{a}_0, \dots, \vec{a}_{n_0+n_1-1}$  by induction. Let  $\vec{a}_0$  satisfy  $0 \in \vec{a}_0^{-1}(1) \subseteq N_2 \cup \{0\}$  (where  $N_s = \{n_0 + \dots + n_{s-1}, \dots, n_0 + \dots + n_s - 1\}$ ) and  $f(\vec{a}_0) = 0$  (which must exist since  $n_0 \cdots n_r$  is not sectionally-homogeneous for  $f$  and by searching argument). Note that by the otherwise hypothesis,

$$(4.9)$$

for every  $\vec{a} \in 2^N$  with  $\vec{a} \cap \vec{a}_0 = \emptyset$  and with  $f(\vec{a}) = 0$ , we have  $f(\vec{a} \cup \vec{a}_0) = 0$ .

Let  $\vec{a}_1$  satisfy  $1 \in \vec{a}_1^{-1}(1) \subseteq N_3 \cup \{1\}$  and  $f(\vec{a}_1) = 0$ ; and let  $\vec{a}_2, \dots, \vec{a}_{n_0+n_1-1}$  be defined in the same fashion. We verify (4.8) by induction on  $|I|$ . For  $I \subseteq n_0 + n_1$  with  $|I| = 1$  the conclusion clearly follows by definition of  $(\vec{a}_m : m < n_0 + n_1)$ . Suppose the conclusion follows when  $|I| \leq n$  and now  $|I| = n + 1$  with  $m \in I$ . Consider  $\vec{a} = \cup_{\hat{m} \in I \setminus \{m\}} \vec{a}_{\hat{m}}$  and note that  $\vec{a} \cap \vec{a}_m = \emptyset$ . By induction,  $f(\vec{a}) = 0$ . Therefore, by (4.9),  $f(\vec{a} \cup \vec{a}_m) = 0$ . Thus we are done.  $\square$

Note that for Lemma 4.9, to be sufficiently long, it suffices that  $r - 1 \geq n_0 + n_1$ .

**Lemma 4.10.** *Let  $n_0 \cdots n_r$  be sufficiently long and is not sectionally-homogeneous for colorings  $f_{00}, f_{10}, f_{01}, f_{11} : 2^N \rightarrow 2$ . Suppose there does not exist a  $[0, 2]$ -variable word  $v$  such that for every  $\vec{b}, \tilde{b} \in 2^2$ ,  $f_{\vec{b}}(v(\vec{b})) = f_{\tilde{b}}(v(\tilde{b}))$ . Suppose for every  $\vec{a} \in 2^N$ ,*

$$(4.10) \quad \neg f_{01}(\vec{a}) = f_{11}(\vec{a}) = 0, \neg f_{10}(\vec{a}) = f_{11}(\vec{a}) = 0. \quad \begin{array}{ccc} & f_{11} & \\ & 0 & 0 \\ f_{01} & & f_{10} \\ & f_{00} & \end{array}$$

*Then there is a contradiction.*

*Proof.* For the sake of a contradiction, it suffices to show that there exists a  $[0, 2]$ -variable word  $v$  such that

$$(4.11) \quad f_{00}(v(00)) = f_{11}(v(11)) = 1, f_{11}(v(01)) = f_{11}(v(10)) = 0$$

since by (4.10), this implies that  $f_{\vec{b}}(v(\vec{b})) = 1$  for all  $\vec{b} \in 2^2$ . Without loss of generality, assume that  $f_{00}(0 \cdots 0) = 1$  otherwise let (by searching argument)  $\vec{a} \in 2^N$  satisfy  $\vec{a}^{-1}(1) \subseteq N_0$ ,  $f_{00}(\vec{a}) = 1$  and proceed the proof with the sequence  $n_1 n_2 \cdots n_r$  and the four colorings  $f_{\vec{b}} : 2^{N-n_0} \ni \vec{a} \mapsto f_{\vec{b}}((\vec{a} \upharpoonright n_0) \cap \vec{a})$ . Since  $n_0 \cdots n_r$  is sufficiently long, by Lemma 4.9, let  $\vec{a}_0, \vec{a}_1 \in 2^N$  be such that  $\vec{a}_0 \cap \vec{a}_1 = \emptyset$  and

$$(4.12) \quad f_{11}(\vec{a}_0) = f_{11}(\vec{a}_1) = 0, f_{11}(\vec{a}_0 \cup \vec{a}_1) = 1.$$

Clearly there is a  $[0, 2]$ -variable word  $v$  such that

$$(4.13) \quad v(00) = 0 \cdots 0, v(01) = \vec{a}_0, v(10) = \vec{a}_1, v(11) = \vec{a}_0 \cup \vec{a}_1.$$

Thus (4.12)(4.13) and “ $f_{00}(0 \cdots 0) = 1$ ” together verify (4.11). So we are done.  $\square$

Note that for Lemma 4.10, to be sufficiently long, it suffices that  $r - 2 \geq n_1 + n_2$ .

4.1.2. *Case (4.5).* In the following lemma, we further reduce case (4.5) to some  $\hat{n}_0 \cdots \hat{n}_r$  and colorings  $\hat{f}_{00}, \hat{f}_{10}, \hat{f}_{01}, \hat{f}_{11} : 2^{\hat{N}} \rightarrow 2$  so that some additional restriction is imposed.

**Lemma 4.11.** *Let  $n_0 \cdots n_r$  be sufficiently long and is not sectionally-homogeneous for colorings  $f_{00}, f_{10}, f_{01}, f_{11} : 2^N \rightarrow 2$ . Suppose there does not exist a  $[0, 2]$ -variable word  $v$  such that  $f_{\vec{b}}(v(\vec{b})) = f_{\vec{b}}(v(\vec{b}))$  for all  $\vec{b}, \vec{b} \in 2^2$ . Suppose for every  $\vec{a} \in 2^N$ ,*

$$(4.14) \quad \neg f_{00}(\vec{a}) = f_{01}(\vec{a}), \neg f_{01}(\vec{a}) = f_{11}(\vec{a}). \quad \begin{array}{ccc} & f_{11} & \\ f_{01} & \begin{array}{c} 01 \\ 01 \end{array} & f_{10} \\ & f_{00} & \end{array}$$

*Then there exists a sufficiently long sequence  $\hat{n}_0 \cdots \hat{n}_r$  and colorings  $\hat{f}_{00}, \hat{f}_{10}, \hat{f}_{01}, \hat{f}_{11} : 2^{\hat{N}} \rightarrow 2$  such that the hypothesis of this lemma is preserved. In addition,*

$$\neg \hat{f}_{10}(\vec{a}) = \hat{f}_{01}(\vec{a}) \text{ for all } \vec{a} \in 2^{\hat{N}}. \quad \begin{array}{ccc} & f_{11} & \\ f_{01} & \begin{array}{c} 01 \\ 01 \end{array} & f_{10} \\ & f_{00} & \end{array}$$

*Proof.* It suffices to show that there exists a sufficiently long sequence  $\hat{n}_0 \cdots \hat{n}_r$  and colorings  $\hat{f}_{00}, \hat{f}_{10}, \hat{f}_{01}, \hat{f}_{11} : 2^{\hat{N}} \rightarrow 2$  such that the hypothesis of this lemma is preserved and in addition, for every  $\vec{a} \in 2^{\hat{N}}$ ,

$$(4.15) \quad \neg \hat{f}_{10}(\vec{a}) = \hat{f}_{01}(\vec{a}) = 0.$$

The conclusion follows by applying the proof of (4.15) twice. Without loss of generality, assume that  $f_{00}(0 \cdots 0) = 0$  otherwise let  $\vec{a} \in 2^N$  satisfy  $\vec{a}^{-1}(1) \subseteq N_0$ ,  $f_{00}(\vec{a}) = 0$  and proceed the proof with the four colorings  $\tilde{f}_{\vec{b}} : 2^{N-n_0} \ni \vec{a} \mapsto f_{\vec{b}}((\vec{a} \setminus n_0) \hat{\ } \vec{a})$  (note that the hypothesis of this lemma holds for  $(\tilde{f}_{\vec{b}} : \vec{b} \in 2^2)$ ). Assume otherwise that

(4.16) the sequence and the four colorings as (4.15) do not exist.

**Claim 4.12.** *There exist  $\vec{a}_0, \dots, \vec{a}_{n_0+n_1-1} \in 2^N$  with  $\vec{a}_m^{-1}(1)$  being mutually disjoint such that for every  $m < n_0 + n_1$ ,  $\min \vec{a}_m^{-1}(1) = m$  and  $f_{01}(\vec{a}_m) = f_{10}(\vec{a}_m) = 0$ .*

*Proof.* This is done by searching argument. Let  $\{(n_s : s \in J_m)\}_{m < n_0+n_1}$  be  $n_0 + n_1$  many mutually disjoint subsequences of  $n_0 \cdots n_r$  (meaning  $J_m$  are mutually disjoint) with  $0, 1 \notin J_m$  such that each is sufficiently long. For each  $m < n_0 + n_1$ , there must be a  $\vec{a}_m$  with  $m \in \vec{a}_m^{-1}(1) \subseteq (\cup_{s \in J_m} N_s) \cup \{m\}$  such that  $f_{01}(\vec{a}_m) = f_{10}(\vec{a}_m) = 0$ . Otherwise, suppose say  $\vec{a}_0$  does not exist. For convenience, suppose  $J_0 = \{2, 3, \dots, \tilde{r}\}$ . Then consider the sequence  $(n_s : s \in J_0)$  and the colorings

$$\hat{f}_{\vec{b}} : 2^{n_2+\dots+n_{\tilde{r}}} \ni \vec{a} \mapsto f_{\vec{b}}(10_{n_0+n_1-1} \vec{a} 0 \cdots 0).$$

We have that  $(n_s : s \in J_0)$  and  $(\hat{f}_{\vec{b}} : \vec{b} \in 2^2)$  are as desired in (4.15), a contradiction to (4.16). □

It suffices to show that

**Claim 4.13.** *For every nonempty  $I \subseteq n_0 + n_1$ ,  $f_{11}(\cup_{m \in I} \vec{a}_m) = 1$ .*

Because this implies that  $n_0 \cdots n_r$  is sectionally-homogeneous for  $f_{11}$ , a contradiction.

*Proof.* We prove Claim 4.13 similarly as in the proof of Lemma 4.9. When  $|I| = 1$ , the conclusion clearly follows since  $f_{11}(\vec{a}_m) \neq f_{01}(\vec{a}_m) = 0$  (by (4.14)). The point is,

$$(4.17) \quad \begin{aligned} & \text{for every } m < n_0 + n_1, \text{ every } \vec{a} \in 2^N \text{ with } \vec{a} \cap \vec{a}_m = \emptyset, \\ & \text{and with } f_{11}(\vec{a}) = 1, \text{ we have } f_{11}(\vec{a} \cup \vec{a}_m) = 1. \end{aligned}$$

To see this, note that  $f_{11}(\vec{a}) = 1$  implies  $f_{01}(\vec{a}) = 0$ . By definition of  $\vec{a}_m$ ,  $f_{10}(\vec{a}_m) = 0$  and recall that  $f_{00}(0 \cdots 0) = 0$ . Therefore, if on the other hand,  $f_{11}(\vec{a} \cup \vec{a}_m) = 0$ , then let  $v$  be the  $[0, 2]$ -variable word such that

$$v(00) = 0 \cdots 0, v(01) = \vec{a}, v(10) = \vec{a}_m, v(11) = \vec{a} \cup \vec{a}_m,$$

we have  $f_{\vec{b}}(v(\vec{b})) = 0$  for all  $\vec{b} \in 2^2$ , a contradiction to the hypothesis of this lemma.

Suppose the claim holds when  $|I| \leq n$  and now  $|I| = n + 1$  with  $m \in I$ . Consider  $\vec{a} = \cup_{\hat{m} \in I \setminus \{m\}} \vec{a}_{\hat{m}}$  and note that  $\vec{a} \cap \vec{a}_m = \emptyset$ . By induction,  $f_{11}(\vec{a}) = 1$ . Therefore, by (4.17),  $f_{11}(\vec{a} \cup \vec{a}_m) = 1$ . Thus we are done.  $\square$

$\square$

In Lemma 4.11, to be sufficiently long, it suffices that there are  $n_1 + n_2$  many mutually disjoint subsequences  $\{(n_s : s \in J_m)\}_{m < n_1 + n_2}$  (meaning  $J_m$  are mutually disjoint) of  $n_0 \cdots n_r$  with  $0, 1, 2 \notin J_m$  such that each subsequence, say  $(n_s : s \in J_0) = \hat{n}_0 \cdots \hat{n}_{\hat{r}}$ , is sufficiently long in the sense that there are  $\hat{n}_0 + \hat{n}_1$  many mutually disjoint subsequences of  $\hat{n}_0 \cdots \hat{n}_{\hat{r}}$  such that each is sufficiently long in the sense of Lemma 4.15<sup>9</sup>. Before Lemma 4.15, we need a lemma similar to Lemma 4.9.

**Lemma 4.14.** *Let  $n_0 \cdots n_r$  be sufficiently long and is not sectionally-homogeneous for coloring  $f : 2^N \rightarrow 2$ . Then there exist  $\vec{a}_0, \vec{a}_1 \in 2^N$  with  $\vec{a}_0 \cap \vec{a}_1 = \emptyset$  such that  $\neg f(\vec{a}_0) = f(\vec{a}_1)$  and  $f(\vec{a}_0 \cup \vec{a}_1) = 1$ .*

*Proof.* Assume otherwise. By searching argument, let  $\vec{a}$  be such that  $\vec{a}^{-1}(1) \supseteq \cup_{s \leq \hat{r}} N_s$  (where  $n_0 \cdots n_{\hat{r}}$  is a sufficiently long subsequence of  $n_0 \cdots n_r$ , say  $\hat{r} \geq n_0$ ) and  $f(\vec{a}) = 1$ . By searching argument, let  $\vec{a}_0 \cdots \vec{a}_{n_0-1}$  be such that  $\vec{a}_m^{-1}(1)$  are mutually disjoint; and for every  $m < n_0$ ,  $\min \vec{a}_m^{-1}(1) = m$ ,  $\vec{a}_m^{-1}(1) \subseteq \vec{a}^{-1}(1)$ ,  $f(\vec{a}_m) = 1$ . It suffices to show that for every  $I \subseteq n_0$ ,

$$f(\vec{a} \setminus (\cup_{m \in I} \vec{a}_m)) = 1$$

since this implies that  $n_0 \cdots n_r$  is sectionally-homogeneous for  $f$ , a contradiction. Since  $f(\vec{a}) = 1$ , the conclusion follows when  $|I| = 0$ . Suppose it follows when  $|I| \leq n$  and now  $|I| = n + 1$  with  $m \in I$ . Consider

$$\vec{\hat{a}} = \vec{a} \setminus (\cup_{\hat{m} \in I \setminus \{m\}} \vec{a}_{\hat{m}}), \vec{\hat{a}}_0 = \vec{a}_m, \vec{\hat{a}}_1 = \vec{a} \setminus \vec{a}_0.$$

Note that  $\vec{\hat{a}}_0 \cap \vec{\hat{a}}_1 = \emptyset$ ; and  $f(\vec{\hat{a}}_0 \cup \vec{\hat{a}}_1) = f(\vec{\hat{a}}) = 1$  (by induction) and  $f(\vec{\hat{a}}_0) = 1$  (by definition of  $\vec{a}_m$ ). Thus by the otherwise assumption,  $f(\vec{\hat{a}}_1) = f(\vec{a} \setminus (\cup_{m \in I} \vec{a}_m)) = 1$  and we are done.  $\square$

$\square$

In Lemma 4.14, to be sufficiently long, it suffices that  $r \geq n_0 + 1$ .

<sup>9</sup>Don't forget that the first section  $n_0$  is used in the "without loss of generality assumption".

**Lemma 4.15.** *Let  $n_0 \cdots n_r$  be sufficiently long and is not sectionally-homogeneous for colorings  $f_{00}, f_{10}, f_{01}, f_{11} : 2^N \rightarrow 2$ . Suppose there does not exist a  $[0, 2]$ -variable word  $v$  such that  $f_{\vec{b}}(v(\vec{b})) = f_{\vec{\tilde{b}}}(v(\vec{\tilde{b}}))$  for all  $\vec{b}, \vec{\tilde{b}} \in 2^2$ . Suppose for every  $\vec{a} \in 2^N$ ,*

$$(4.18) \quad \begin{aligned} \neg f_{00}(\vec{a}) &= f_{01}(\vec{a}), & \neg f_{01}(\vec{a}) &= f_{11}(\vec{a}), \\ \neg f_{10}(\vec{a}) &= f_{10}(\vec{a}). \end{aligned} \quad \begin{array}{ccc} & f_{11} & \\ & 01 & \\ f_{01} & 01 & f_{10} \\ & 01 & \\ & f_{00} & \end{array}$$

Then there is a contradiction.

*Proof.* We use (4.18) to show that a  $[0, 2]$ -variable word (as in the hypothesis of this lemma) exists, thus a contradiction. Without loss of generality, suppose  $f_{00}(0 \cdots 0) = 0$ . By Lemma 4.14, there exist  $\vec{a}_0, \vec{a}_1$  with  $\vec{a}_0 \cap \vec{a}_1 = \emptyset$  such that

$$f_{01}(\vec{a}_0) = 0, f_{01}(\vec{a}_1) = 1 \text{ and } f_{01}(\vec{a}_0 \cup \vec{a}_1) = 1.$$

By (4.18),

$$f_{10}(\vec{a}_1) = 0, f_{11}(\vec{a}_0 \cup \vec{a}_1) = 0.$$

Thus let  $v$  be a  $[0, 2]$ -variable word such that  $v(\vec{b}) = \cup_{i \in \vec{b}} \vec{a}_i$ , we have  $f_{\vec{b}}(v(\vec{b})) = 0$  for all  $\vec{b} \in 2^2$ , a contradiction.  $\square$

In Lemma 4.15, to be sufficiently long, it suffices that  $r - 1 \geq n_1 + 1$ .

4.1.3. *Case (4.6).* This case is similar to (4.5).

**Lemma 4.16.** *Let  $n_0 \cdots n_r$  be sufficiently long and is not sectionally-homogeneous for colorings  $f_{00}, f_{10}, f_{01}, f_{11} : 2^N \rightarrow 2$ . Suppose there does not exist a  $[0, 2]$ -variable word  $v$  such that  $f_{\vec{b}}(v(\vec{b})) = f_{\vec{\tilde{b}}}(v(\vec{\tilde{b}}))$  for all  $\vec{b}, \vec{\tilde{b}} \in 2^2$ . Suppose for every  $\vec{a} \in 2^N$ ,*

$$(4.19) \quad \begin{aligned} \neg f_{00}(\vec{a}) &= f_{01}(\vec{a}) = 0, \neg f_{00}(\vec{a}) = f_{10}(\vec{a}) = 1, \\ \neg f_{01}(\vec{a}) &= f_{11}(\vec{a}) = 0, \neg f_{10}(\vec{a}) = f_{11}(\vec{a}) = 1. \end{aligned} \quad \begin{array}{ccc} & f_{11} & \\ & 0 & 1 \\ f_{01} & 0 & f_{10} \\ & 0 & 1 \\ & f_{00} & \end{array}$$

Then there exists a sufficiently long sequence  $\hat{n}_0 \cdots \hat{n}_{\hat{r}}$  and colorings  $\hat{f}_{00}, \hat{f}_{10}, \hat{f}_{01}, \hat{f}_{11} : 2^{\hat{N}} \rightarrow 2$  such that the hypothesis of this lemma is preserved. In addition,

$$(4.20) \quad \neg \hat{f}_{01}(\vec{a}) = \hat{f}_{10}(\vec{a}) \text{ for all } \vec{a} \in 2^{\hat{N}}. \quad \begin{array}{ccc} & f_{11} & \\ & 0 & 1 \\ f_{01} & 0 & f_{10} \\ & 0 & 1 \\ & f_{00} & \end{array}$$

*Proof.* It suffices to show that there exists a sufficiently long sequence  $\hat{n}_0 \cdots \hat{n}_{\hat{r}}$  and colorings  $\hat{f}_{00}, \hat{f}_{10}, \hat{f}_{01}, \hat{f}_{11} : 2^{\hat{N}} \rightarrow 2$  preserving the hypothesis and in addition,

$$(4.21) \quad \neg \hat{f}_{01}(\vec{a}) = \hat{f}_{10}(\vec{a}) = 0 \text{ for all } \vec{a} \in 2^{\hat{N}}.$$

The conclusion follows by applying the proof of (4.21) twice. Without loss of generality, assume that  $f_{00}(0 \cdots 0) = 0$ . Assume otherwise that the four colorings as (4.21) does not exist. Then, by searching argument (as in Claim 4.12), there

exist  $\vec{a}_0, \dots, \vec{a}_{n_0+n_1-1} \in 2^N$  with  $\vec{a}_m^{-1}(1)$  being mutually disjoint such that for every  $m < n_0 + n_1$ ,  $\min \vec{a}_m^{-1}(1) = m$  and

$$f_{01}(\vec{a}_m) = f_{10}(\vec{a}_m) = 0.$$

It suffices to show that

**Claim 4.17.** *For every nonempty  $I \subseteq n_0 + n_1$ ,  $f_{11}(\cup_{m \in I} \vec{a}_m) = 1$ .*

Because this implies that  $n_0 \cdots n_r$  is sectionally-homogeneous for  $f_{11}$ , a contradiction.

*Proof.* We prove Claim 4.17 in the same way as Claim 4.13. When  $|I| = 1$ , the conclusion clearly follows since  $f_{11}(\vec{a}_m) \neq f_{01}(\vec{a}_m) = 0$  (by (4.19)). The point is,

$$(4.22) \quad \begin{aligned} &\text{for every } m < n_0 + n_1, \text{ every } \vec{a} \in 2^N \text{ with } \vec{a} \cap \vec{a}_m = \emptyset, \\ &\text{and with } f_{11}(\vec{a}) = 1, \text{ we have } f_{11}(\vec{a} \cup \vec{a}_m) = 1. \end{aligned}$$

To see this, note that  $f_{11}(\vec{a}) = 1$  implies  $f_{10}(\vec{a}) = 0$ . If on the other hand,  $f_{11}(\vec{a} \cup \vec{a}_m) = 0$ , then let  $v$  be the  $[0, 2]$ -variable word such that

$$v(00) = 0 \cdots 0, v(10) = \vec{a}, v(01) = \vec{a}_m, v(11) = \vec{a} \cup \vec{a}_m,$$

we have  $f_{\vec{b}}(v(\vec{b})) = 0$  for all  $\vec{b} \in 2^2$ , a contradiction to the hypothesis of this lemma.

Suppose the claim holds when  $|I| \leq n$  and now  $|I| = n + 1$  with  $m \in I$ . Consider  $\vec{a} = \cup_{\hat{m} \in I \setminus \{m\}} \vec{a}_{\hat{m}}$  and note that  $\vec{a} \cap \vec{a}_m = \emptyset$ . By induction,  $f_{11}(\vec{a}) = 1$ . Therefore, by (4.22),  $f_{11}(\vec{a} \cup \vec{a}_m) = 1$ . Thus we are done.  $\square$

$\square$

In Lemma 4.16, the definition of sufficiently long is similar as that of Lemma 4.11.

**Lemma 4.18.** *Let  $n_0 \cdots n_r$  be sufficiently long and is not sectionally-homogeneous for colorings  $f_{00}, f_{10}, f_{01}, f_{11} : 2^N \rightarrow 2$ . Suppose for every  $\vec{a} \in 2^N$ ,*

$$(4.23) \quad \begin{aligned} \neg f_{00}(\vec{a}) = f_{01}(\vec{a}) = 0, & \quad \neg f_{00}(\vec{a}) = f_{10}(\vec{a}) = 1, \\ \neg f_{01}(\vec{a}) = f_{11}(\vec{a}) = 0, & \quad \neg f_{10}(\vec{a}) = f_{11}(\vec{a}) = 1, \end{aligned}$$

$$\neg f_{01}(\vec{a}) = f_{10}(\vec{a}). \quad \begin{array}{ccccc} & & f_{11} & & \\ & 0 & & 1 & \\ f_{01} & & 01 & & f_{10} \\ & 0 & & 1 & \\ & & f_{00} & & \end{array}$$

*Then there is a contradiction.*

*Proof.* This is simply because given  $\vec{a} \in 2^N$ , the only value of  $f_{01}(\vec{a}), f_{10}(\vec{a})$  consistent with (4.23) is

$$f_{01}(\vec{a}) = 1, f_{10}(\vec{a}) = 0.$$

Thus  $n_0 \cdots n_r$  is sectionally-homogeneous for  $f_{01}, f_{10}$ .  $\square$

In Lemma 4.18, to be sufficiently long, it suffices that  $r \geq 0$ .

**4.2. Questions and further discussion.** There are mainly two difficulties to generalize Theorem 4.6 (say, to  $n_0 = 3$ ). (1) The restriction given by an analog of Lemma 4.8 is not strong enough; (2) Even if  $(f_{\vec{b}} : \vec{b} \in 2^{n_0})$  satisfies a very strong restriction, say for some coloring  $f : 2^N \rightarrow 2$ ,  $f_{\vec{b}}(\vec{a}) = f(\vec{a}) + |\vec{b}^{-1}(1)| \pmod{2}$ , the corresponding Lemma 4.9 is unknown:

*Question 4.19.* Let  $n > 0$ ; let  $n_0 \cdots n_r$  be sufficiently long and is not sectionally-homogeneous for coloring  $f : 2^N \rightarrow 2$ . Does there exist a  $[0, n]$ -variable word  $v$  and an  $i \in 2$  such that  $f(v(\vec{b})) = |\vec{b}^{-1}(1)| + i \pmod{2}$  for all  $\vec{b} \in 2^n$ .

Actually we do not even know the following:

*Question 4.20.* Let  $n_0 \cdots n_r$  be sufficiently long and is not sectionally-homogeneous for coloring  $f : 2^N \rightarrow 2$ . Does there exist a  $[0, 3]$ -variable word  $v$  and an  $i \in 2$  such that  $f(v(\vec{b})) = |\vec{b}^{-1}(1)| + i \pmod{2}$  for all  $\vec{b} \in 2^3$  with  $|\vec{b}^{-1}(1)| \in \{1, 2\}$ .

On the other hand, we don't know if Theorem 4.7 follows with more than two colors. Actually we don't even know whether Lemma 4.9 follows with three colors:

*Question 4.21.* Let  $n_0 \cdots n_r$  be sufficiently long and is not sectionally-homogeneous for coloring  $f : 2^N \rightarrow 3$ . Does there exist  $\vec{a}_0, \vec{a}_1 \in 2^N$  with  $\vec{a}_0 \cap \vec{a}_1 = \emptyset$  such that  $f(\vec{a}_0) = f(\vec{a}_1) = 0, f(\vec{a}_0 \cup \vec{a}_1) = 1$ .

In Theorem 4.7, to be sufficiently long means containing a subsequence that is sufficiently long in a weaker sense; and to be sufficiently long in that weaker sense means containing a subsequence that is sufficiently long in a yet weaker sense and so forth. The iteration goes for four times and in the last iteration, to be sufficiently long means something like  $r > n_0$ . Roughly speaking, this can be seen as a sufficiently long notion of cardinal 4. On the other hand, we don't know if a sufficiently long notion of cardinal 1 suffices. i.e.,

*Question 4.22.* Is it true that for some  $r \in \omega$ , for every  $n > 0$ ,  $ENSH_2^2(2n_r)$  does not hold; actually we wonder whether  $ENSH_2^2(2nnn)$  is not true for all  $n > 0$ . More generally, is it true that for every  $\hat{n} > 0$ , there exists an  $r \in \omega$  such that for every  $n > 0$ ,  $ENSH_2^2(\hat{n}n_r)$  does not hold.

For  $n = 2$ , although we don't know how to prove, Adam P. Goucher, using SAT solver, showed that  $ENSH_2^2(2222)$  is not true

(<https://mathoverflow.net/questions/293112/ramsey-type-theorem>). Note that  $ENSH_2^2(222)$  is true (see Proposition 3.4).

## REFERENCES

1. Timothy J. Carlson and Stephen G. Simpson, *A dual form of Ramsey's theorem*, *Advances in Mathematics* **53** (1984), no. 3, 265–290. MR 753869
2. Peter Cholak and Ludovic Patey, *Thin set theorems and cone avoidance*, *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society* **373** (2020), no. 4, 2743–2773.
3. Barbara F Csima, Damir D Dzhalafarov, Denis R Hirschfeldt, Carl G Jockusch Jr, Reed Solomon, and Linda Brown Westrick, *The reverse mathematics of hindman's theorem for sums of exactly two elements*, *Computability* **8** (2019), no. 3-4, 253–263.
4. Pandelis Dodos and Vassilis Kanellopoulos, *Ramsey theory for product spaces*, vol. 212, American Mathematical Soc., 2016.
5. François G. Dorais, Damir D. Dzhalafarov, Jeffrey L. Hirst, Joseph R. Mileti, and Paul Shafer, *On uniform relationships between combinatorial problems*, *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society* **368** (2016), no. 2, 1321–1359. MR 3430365

6. Damir Dzhafarov, Stephen Flood, Reed Solomon, and Linda Brown Westrick, *Effectiveness for the dual ramsey theorem*, arXiv preprint arXiv:1710.00070 (2017).
7. Harvey Friedman and Stephen G. Simpson, *Issues and problems in reverse mathematics*, Computability theory and its applications (Boulder, CO, 1999), Contemp. Math., vol. 257, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2000, pp. 127–144. MR 1770738
8. Denis R Hirschfeldt, *Slicing the truth*, Lecture Notes Series, Institute for Mathematical Sciences, National University of Singapore **28** (2015).
9. Carl G. Jockusch, *Ramsey's theorem and recursion theory*, Journal of Symbolic Logic **37** (1972), no. 2, 268–280.
10. Mushfeq Khan and Joseph S Miller, *Forcing with bushy trees*, Bulletin of Symbolic Logic **23** (2017), no. 2, 160–180.
11. Masahiro Kumabe and Andrew EM Lewis, *A fixed point free minimal degree*, Journal of the London Mathematical Society **80** (2009), no. 3, 785–797.
12. Lu Liu, Benoit Monin, and Ludovic Patey, *A computable analysis of variable words theorems*, Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society **147** (2019), no. 2, 823–834.
13. Joseph S. Miller and Reed Solomon, *Effectiveness for infinite variable words and the dual Ramsey theorem*, Archive for Mathematical Logic **43** (2004), no. 4, 543–555. MR 2060398
14. Antonio Montalbán, *Open questions in reverse mathematics*, Bulletin of Symbolic Logic **17** (2011), no. 03, 431–454.
15. Saharon Shelah, *Primitive recursive bounds for van der waerden numbers*, Journal of the American Mathematical Society **1** (1988), no. 3, 683–697.
16. Stephen G. Simpson, *Subsystems of Second Order Arithmetic*, Cambridge University Press, 2009.
17. Robert M. Solovay, *Hyperarithmetically encodable sets*, Transactions of the American Mathematical Society **239** (1978), 99–122. MR 0491103
18. Wei Wang, *Some logically weak Ramseyan theorems*, Advances in Mathematics **261** (2014), 1–25.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS AND STATISTICS, CENTRAL SOUTH UNIVERSITY, CITY CHANGSHA, HUNAN PROVINCE, CHINA. 410083

*Email address:* g.jiayi.liu@gmail.com