

A NOTE ON THE DEGREE STRUCTURE OF PRIMITIVE RECURSIVE m -REDUCIBILITY

BIRZHAN S. KALMURZAYEV, NIKOLAY A. BAZHENOV,
AND ALIBEK M. ISKAKOV

ABSTRACT. Let \mathbf{C}_m^{pr} be the upper semilattice of degrees of computable sets with respect to primitive recursive m -reducibility. We prove that the first-order theory of \mathbf{C}_m^{pr} is hereditarily undecidable.

1. INTRODUCTION

Let A and B be subsets of natural numbers. We say that A is *primitively recursively m -reducible* to B (or *pr- m -reducible*, for short, and denoted $A \leq_m^{pr} B$) if there exists a primitive recursive function $f(x)$ such that

$$\forall x (x \in A \Leftrightarrow f(x) \in B).$$

By \mathbf{C}_m^{pr} we denote the upper semilattice of all computable degrees of sets under primitive recursive m -reducibility. As usual, we do not include the degrees $\deg_m^{pr}(\emptyset)$ and $\deg_m^{pr}(\omega)$ into \mathbf{C}_m^{pr} .

For the background on computability theory, the reader is referred to [Odi92]. Notice that a standard proof (see, e.g., Proposition VI.1.8 in [Odi92]) gives the following:

Lemma 1.1. *The upper semilattice \mathbf{C}_m^{pr} is distributive.*

Following the outline from [DN00], this note proves the following main result:

Theorem 1. *The first-order theory of \mathbf{C}_m^{pr} is hereditarily undecidable.*

The proof consists of three sections. Note that here we tried to make our exposition as *self-contained* as possible.

Section 2 briefly describes the general proof scheme. In Section 3, we define an appropriate modification of the notion of a *super sparse* set taken from [AS86, DN00]. We also establish some useful properties of the modified notion.

In the last section, we prove our main lemma (Lemma 4.1) which allows us to interpret (with parameters) an appropriate structure $\mathcal{I}(\mathcal{B})$, having hereditarily undecidable theory, inside the semilattice \mathbf{C}_m^{pr} .

Date: November 28, 2023.

Key words and phrases. Primitive recursive function, m -reducibility, first-order theory, undecidability.

1.1. Some preliminary facts. We use the list $(p_e)_{e \in \omega}$ which effectively (but not primitively recursively) lists all unary primitive recursive functions. We can also effectively list the primitive recursive time-bound functions $r_e(x) \geq p_e(x)$, where $r_e(x)$ gives the number of computational steps needed for $p_e(x)$ to converge. We note that for any partial computable function $\varphi_e(x)$, including the primitive recursive functions p_e , the stage s approximation $\varphi_{e,s}(x)$ is primitive recursive (in e , s , and x).

In the constructions of some computable sets, we will use the following

Lemma 1.2 (folklore). *Let $f(x)$ be a strictly increasing, total computable function such that the graph of f is a primitive recursive set. Then there is a primitive recursive procedure which given an element $y \in \omega$, computes the following:*

- (1) *whether y belongs to the set $\text{rng}(f)$;*
- (2) *if $y \in \text{rng}(f)$, then the procedure finds the number x such that $f(x) = y$.*

Proof. Since f is strictly increasing, it is clear that $f(y+1) \geq y+1 > y$. Thus, in order to check whether $y \in \text{rng}(f)$, it is sufficient to search for the minimal $x \leq y$ such that $(x, y) \in \text{graph}(f)$. If such an x exists, then $y = f(x)$. Otherwise, $y \notin \text{rng}(f)$. Observe that the described procedure is primitive recursive. \square

2. THE OUTLINE OF THE PROOF

For the preliminaries on countable Boolean algebras, we refer to, e.g., the monograph [Gon97].

Let $n \geq 1$. Then a structure $\mathcal{B} = (\omega; \vee, \wedge, \overline{(\cdot)}; \approx)$ is called a Σ_n^0 -Boolean algebra, if:

- the functions $\vee, \wedge, \overline{(\cdot)}$ are computable;
- the binary relation \approx belongs to Σ_n^0 ;
- \approx is a congruence of the structure $\mathcal{B}^\# = (\omega; \vee, \wedge, \overline{(\cdot)})$;
- the quotient structure $\mathcal{B}^\# / \approx$ is Boolean algebra

The (natural) preorder relation \preceq on a Σ_n^0 -Boolean algebra \mathcal{B} is introduced as follows: $x \preceq y$ if and only if $x \vee y \approx y$. It is not hard to check that $(x \approx y)$ holds if and only if $(x \preceq y)$ and $(y \preceq x)$.

By $0_{\mathcal{B}}$ we denote the least element in the algebra \mathcal{B} (here we identify the element $0_{\mathcal{B}}$ from ω and its image $[0_{\mathcal{B}}]_{\approx}$ in the quotient algebra $\mathcal{B}^\# / \approx$).

Definition 2.1 ([Nie97]). A Σ_n^0 -Boolean algebra \mathcal{B} is called *effectively dense* if there is total Δ_n^0 -computable function $F(x)$ such that

$$\forall x [x \not\approx 0_{\mathcal{B}} \rightarrow 0_{\mathcal{B}} \prec F(x) \prec x].$$

Let $\mathcal{C} = (C; \vee, \wedge, \overline{(\cdot)})$ be a Boolean algebra. Recall that a non-empty set $I \subseteq C$ is an *ideal* of the algebra \mathcal{C} if:

- (1) $(\forall x, y \in I)[x \vee y \in I]$;

(2) if $x \leq_c y$ and $y \in I$, then $x \in I$.

Let \mathcal{B} be a Σ_n^0 -Boolean algebra. A set $J \subseteq \omega$ is called a Σ_n^0 -ideal of the algebra \mathcal{B} if $J \in \Sigma_n^0$ and $J = \{x : [x]_\approx \in I\}$ for some ideal I in the Boolean algebra $\mathcal{B}^\#/\approx$. It is known that the set of all Σ_n^0 -ideals of \mathcal{B} forms a lattice under the following operations:

- the set-theoretic intersection $J \cap K$,
- the operation $J \vee K = \{x \vee y : x \in J, y \in K\}$.

This lattice is distributive.

Notation 2.2. For a Σ_n^0 -Boolean algebra \mathcal{B} , by $\mathcal{I}(\mathcal{B})$ we denote the lattice of all Σ_n^0 -ideals of \mathcal{B} .

The proof of Theorem 1 will use the following result:

Theorem 2 (Nies [Nie97]). *Let \mathcal{B} be an effectively dense Σ_n^0 -Boolean algebra. Then the theory $Th(\mathcal{I}(\mathcal{B}))$ is hereditarily undecidable.*¹

The proof of Theorem 1 consists of two main stages.

Let \mathbf{a} be the pr - m -degree of a computable, non-primitive recursive set A . We define the set $\mathcal{B}(\mathbf{a})$ of all complemented elements in the lower cone of \mathbf{a} :

$$(1) \quad \mathcal{B}(\mathbf{a}) = \{\mathbf{b} \in \mathbf{C}_m^{pr} : \exists \mathbf{c}(\mathbf{b} \wedge \mathbf{c} = \mathbf{0} \ \& \ \mathbf{b} \vee \mathbf{c} = \mathbf{a})\}.$$

The first stage (Section 3) establishes that for some appropriate sets A , the structure $\mathcal{B}(\mathbf{a})$ is an effectively dense Σ_2^0 -Boolean algebra.

The second stage (Section 4) shows that the constructed set A also allows us to interpret (with one parameter \mathbf{a}) the lattice $\mathcal{I}(\mathcal{B}(\mathbf{a}))$ inside the structure \mathbf{C}_m^{pr} . This fact and Theorem 2 together imply (see, e.g., [ELTT65, BS75]) that the theory $Th(\mathbf{C}_m^{pr})$ is hereditarily undecidable.

3. SUPER PR-SPARSE SETS AND THEIR PROPERTIES

The notion of a super sparse set (introduced in [AS86]) plays an important role in the proofs of [DN00]. Here we give a modification of this notion, which is suitable for our primitive recursive setting.

Definition 3.1. Let $A \subseteq \omega$ be a computable set, and let $f(x)$ be a strictly increasing computable function. We say that the set A is *super pr -sparse via f* if:

- the set A is not primitive recursive;
- the graph Γ_f of the function f is primitive recursive;
- $A \subseteq \text{range}(f)$ and the value $\chi_A(f(x))$ can be computed in at most $f(x+1)$ steps;
- for each primitive recursive function $p_i(x)$, there is $n_i \in \omega$ such that

$$(\forall n \geq n_i)(f(n+1) > p_i(f(n))).$$

The main result of this section is the following:

¹Note that Nies [Nie00] proved that $Th(\mathcal{I}(\mathcal{B})) \equiv_m Th(\mathbb{N}, +, \times)$.

Proposition 3.2. *If A is a super pr-sparse set, then the structure $\mathcal{B}(\mathbf{a})$ from Eq. (1) is an effectively dense Σ_2^0 -Boolean algebra.*

3.1. Existence of super pr-sparse sets. Before proving Proposition 3.2, we establish the following necessary result.

Lemma 3.3. *There exists a super pr-sparse set.*

Proof. We construct (stage-by-stage) a strictly increasing computable function $f(x)$ and a computable set $A \subseteq \text{range}(f)$.

At stage 0 we set $f(0) = 0$. We assume that the following objects are defined by the beginning of stage $s + 1$:

- the values $f(0) < f(1) < \dots < f(s)$;
- the value $\chi_A(x)$, for each $x < f(s)$.

In addition, the following conditions are satisfied:

- (*) $A \cap \{x : x \leq f(s) - 1\} \subseteq \text{range}(f)$;
- (**) $f(t) > p_j(f(t - 1))$ for all $0 \leq j < t \leq s$.

Our main goal at the stage $s + 1$ is to appropriately define $\chi_A(f(s))$ and $f(s + 1)$. To do this, we successively compute the following values:

- (a) $p_0(f(s)), p_1(f(s)), \dots, p_s(f(s))$;
- (b) $z = 1 + \max(f(s), p_0(f(s)), \dots, p_s(f(s)))$;
- (c) the number of steps N which is necessary for successively computing $f(0), f(1), \dots, f(s)$ and all the values from (a)–(b).

Without loss of generality, we may assume that $N \geq z$.

While the values (a)–(c) are being computed (in general, these computation processes are ‘slow’ for us), for the numbers $y \in \{f(s) + 1, f(s) + 2, f(s) + 3, \dots\}$, one-by-one, we ‘quickly’ declare the following:

$$y \notin \text{range}(f) \text{ and } y \notin A.$$

Such a declaration ensures that the graph of the constructed function f will be primitive recursive.

After the required values have been computed, we take the least $w \geq N$ such that the values $\chi_{\text{range}(f)}(w)$ and $\chi_A(w)$ have not been defined yet. We set $f(s + 1) = w$ and

$$(2) \quad \chi_A(f(s)) = \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if } p_s(f(s)) \geq 1, \\ 1, & \text{if } p_s(f(s)) = 0. \end{cases}$$

It is clear that $f(s + 1) \geq z > p_j(f(s))$ for all $j \leq s$. Therefore, the corresponding conditions (*) and (**) will remain true at the beginning of the next stage $s + 2$. In addition, the value $\chi_A(f(s))$ can be computed in at most $N \leq f(s + 1)$ steps.

The stage $s + 1$ is finished. This concludes the construction.

Eq. (2) guarantees that the constructed set A is not primitive recursive. Condition (**) implies that the function f satisfies the last condition of

Definition 3.1. The other conditions of Definition 3.1 can be easily deduced from an analysis of the construction. Lemma 3.3 is proved. \square

3.2. Proof of Proposition 3.2. We prove that for a super pr -sparse set A , the partial order $\mathcal{B}(\mathbf{a})$ is (effectively) isomorphic to the quotient structure $\mathcal{C}^\#/\approx$, where $\mathcal{C} = (\mathcal{C}^\#; \approx)$ is the Σ_2^0 -Boolean algebra given below. Thus, the structure $\mathcal{B}(\mathbf{a})$ can be identified with the Σ_2^0 -algebra \mathcal{C} . After that, it will be sufficient to check that the Σ_2^0 -algebra \mathcal{C} is effectively dense.

Notation 3.4. (1) The auxiliary Boolean algebra $\mathcal{C}^\#$ consists of all sets of the form $A \cap X$, where X is a primitive recursive set. The Boolean operations $\vee, \wedge, \overline{(\cdot)}$ on $\mathcal{C}^\#$ are defined as follows:

- $(A \cap X) \vee (A \cap Y) = A \cap (X \cup Y)$;
- $(A \cap X) \wedge (A \cap Y) = A \cap (X \cap Y)$;
- the complement of $A \cap X$ (inside the algebra $\mathcal{C}^\#$) is equal to $A \cap (\omega \setminus X)$.

Fix a (standard) effective list $(X_e)_{e \in \omega}$ of all primitive recursive sets. By identifying the set $A \cap X_e$ with the index $e \in \omega$, we may assume that the domain of $\mathcal{C}^\#$ is equal to ω .

(2) The Σ_2^0 -Boolean algebra $\mathcal{C} = (\omega; \vee, \wedge, \overline{(\cdot)}; \approx)$ is defined as follows:

- the structure $\mathcal{C}^\# = (\omega; \vee, \wedge, \overline{(\cdot)})$ is given above;
- $i \approx j$ if and only if the symmetric difference $(A \cap X_i) \Delta (A \cap X_j)$ is a primitive recursive set.

Note that indeed, \mathcal{C} is a Σ_2^0 -Boolean algebra:

- There is a computable function $f_\vee(x, y)$ such that $X_i \cup X_j = X_{f_\vee(i, j)}$. A similar fact is true for \wedge and $\overline{(\cdot)}$.
- The condition $(i \approx j)$ is equivalent to the following Σ_2^0 -formula:

$$\exists k \forall x [\chi_{X_k}(x) = \chi_A(x) \cdot \max(\chi_{X_i}(x) \cdot (1 - \chi_{X_j}(x)), \chi_{X_j}(x) \cdot (1 - \chi_{X_i}(x)))].$$

In order to establish an isomorphism between $\mathcal{B}(\mathbf{a})$ and \mathcal{C} , it is sufficient to prove the following result.

Lemma 3.5. Suppose that a set A is super pr -sparse via a function f .

(i) Let \mathbf{b} and \mathbf{c} be degrees from $\mathcal{B}(\mathbf{a})$ such that

$$(3) \quad \mathbf{b} \wedge \mathbf{c} = \mathbf{0} \text{ and } \mathbf{b} \vee \mathbf{c} = \mathbf{a}.$$

Then there exists a primitive recursive set X such that $A \cap X \in \mathbf{b}$ and $A \cap \overline{X} \in \mathbf{c}$.

(ii) Let X be a primitive recursive set. Then Condition (3) holds for the degrees $\mathbf{b} = \deg_m^{pr}(A \cap X)$ and $\mathbf{c} = \deg_m^{pr}(A \cap \overline{X})$.

(iii) Let X, Y be primitive recursive sets. Then the condition $(A \cap X) \leq_m^{pr} (A \cap Y)$ holds if and only if:

- either $A \cap Y \neq \emptyset$ and the set $A \cap (X \setminus Y)$ is primitive recursive,
- or $A \cap Y = A \cap X = \emptyset$.

In particular, the properties (i)–(iii) imply that the map $e \mapsto \deg_m^{pr}(A \cap X_e)$ induces an isomorphism from \mathcal{C} onto $\mathcal{B}(\mathbf{a})$.

Before proving Lemma 3.5, we establish some simple properties of pr - m -reducibility:

Proposition 3.6. *Let $B \subsetneq \omega$, and let X be a primitive recursive set. Then*

- (a) $B \cap X \leq_m^{pr} B$;
- (b) $B \equiv_m^{pr} (B \cap X) \oplus (B \cap \overline{X})$.

Proof. (a) We choose an element $c \notin B$. The reduction $g: B \cap X \leq_m^{pr} B$ is defined as follows:

$$g(x) = \begin{cases} x, & \text{if } x \in X, \\ c, & \text{if } x \notin X. \end{cases}$$

(b) By item (a), it is sufficient to construct a reduction $h: B \leq_m^{pr} (B \cap X) \oplus (B \cap \overline{X})$. We define

$$h(x) = \begin{cases} 2x, & \text{if } x \in X, \\ 2x + 1, & \text{if } x \notin X. \end{cases}$$

□

Proof of Lemma 3.5. (i) We choose computable sets $B \in \mathbf{b}$ and $C \in \mathbf{c}$. If one of the sets B or C is primitive recursive, then the desired fact is obvious. (For example, if B is primitive recursive, then we choose $X = \{a\}$ for some element $a \in A$.) Thus, we may assume that B and C are not primitive recursive.

Since $\mathbf{b} \vee \mathbf{c} = \mathbf{a}$, there is a reduction $g: A \leq_m^{pr} B \oplus C$. We define a primitive recursive set

$$X = \{x : g(x) \text{ is even}\}.$$

It is clear that the function $g_1(x) = \lfloor g(x)/2 \rfloor$ provides two reductions: $A \cap X \leq_m^{pr} B$ and $A \cap \overline{X} \leq_m^{pr} C$.

We show that $B \leq_m^{pr} A \cap X$ (the proof for $C \leq_m^{pr} A \cap \overline{X}$ is similar). Since $B \leq_m^{pr} A \equiv_m^{pr} (A \cap X) \oplus (A \cap \overline{X})$ (see Proposition 3.6), we obtain that $B \equiv_m^{pr} B_1 \oplus B_2$, where $B_1 \leq_m^{pr} A \cap X$ and $B_2 \leq_m^{pr} A \cap \overline{X}$.

The fact that $B_2 \leq_m^{pr} B$ and $B_2 \leq_m^{pr} A \cap \overline{X} \leq_m^{pr} C$ implies that the set B_2 is primitive recursive (recall that $\mathbf{b} \wedge \mathbf{c} = \mathbf{0}$). Therefore, we have $B \equiv_m^{pr} B_1 \oplus B_2 \equiv_m^{pr} B_1 \leq_m^{pr} A \cap X$. Hence, we conclude that $B \equiv_m^{pr} A \cap X$ and $C \equiv_m^{pr} A \cap \overline{X}$.

(ii) Let X be a primitive recursive set. Proposition 3.6 implies that $A \equiv_m^{pr} (A \cap X) \oplus (A \cap \overline{X})$, that is $\mathbf{a} = \mathbf{b} \vee \mathbf{c}$. Recall that the set A is super pr -sparse via the function $f(x)$.

Now let D be an arbitrary set such that $p: D \leq_m^{pr} A \cap X$ and $q: D \leq_m^{pr} A \cap \overline{X}$. We describe a primitive recursive algorithm for computing the characteristic function $\chi_D(x)$.

1) Compute the values $p(x)$ and $q(x)$. By Lemma 1.2, the set $\text{range}(f)$ is primitive recursive. If $p(x) \notin \text{range}(f)$ or $q(x) \notin \text{range}(f)$, then it is clear that $\{p(x), q(x)\} \not\subseteq A$ and thus, $x \notin D$.

If $p(x) \notin X$ or $q(x) \notin \overline{X}$, then in a similar way, we can obtain that $x \notin D$.

2) Hence, we may assume that $p(x) \in \text{range}(f) \cap X$ and $q(x) \in \text{range}(f) \cap \overline{X}$ (in particular, $p(x) \neq q(x)$). By Lemma 1.2, we can find (via a primitive recursive algorithm) the numbers k and l such that $p(x) = f(k)$ and $q(x) = f(l)$. Without loss of generality, we assume that $k < l$ (the case when $k > l$ is treated similarly).

3) By Property (c) of Definition 3.1, one can find the value $\chi_A(f(k))$ in $q(x) = f(l)$ computation steps. Then the fact that $p: D \leq_m^{pr} A \cap X$ implies that $\chi_D(x) = \chi_A(f(k)) \cdot \chi_X(f(k))$.

The algorithm described above shows that the set D is primitive recursive. Therefore, we have $\mathbf{b} \wedge \mathbf{c} = \mathbf{0}$.

(iii) For the case when $A \cap Y = \emptyset$, the desired property is clearly satisfied. Thus, we may assume that $A \cap Y \neq \emptyset$.

(\Leftarrow). Suppose that the set $A \cap (X \setminus Y)$ is primitive recursive. We choose elements $c \in A \cap Y$ and $d \notin A$. Then the function

$$h(x) = \begin{cases} c, & \text{if } x \in A \cap (X \setminus Y), \\ d, & \text{if } x \notin X, \\ x, & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

provides a reduction $A \cap X \leq_m^{pr} A \cap Y$. In order to show that h is indeed a reduction, it is sufficient to notice the following: if $h(x) \notin \{c, d\}$, then we have either $x \in A \cap X \cap Y$ or $x \notin A$.

(\Rightarrow). Let $A \cap X \leq_m^{pr} A \cap Y$. By Proposition 3.6, we have $A \cap X \equiv_m^{pr} (A \cap X \cap Y) \oplus (A \cap (X \setminus Y))$. Similarly,

$$(4) \quad A \cap \overline{Y} \equiv_m^{pr} (A \cap (X \setminus Y)) \oplus (A \cap \overline{Y} \cap \overline{X}).$$

By item (ii), the infimum of $\deg_m^{pr}(A \cap \overline{Y})$ and $\deg_m^{pr}(A \cap Y)$ is equal to $\mathbf{0}$. By Eq. (4), we obtain that the infimum for $\deg_m^{pr}(A \cap (X \setminus Y))$ and $\deg_m^{pr}(A \cap Y)$ is also equal to $\mathbf{0}$. Now, since $A \cap (X \setminus Y) \leq_m^{pr} A \cap X \leq_m^{pr} A \cap Y$, we deduce that $A \cap (X \setminus Y)$ is primitive recursive. Lemma 3.5 is proved. \square

Now, in order to prove Proposition 3.2, it remains to establish the following result.

Lemma 3.7. *The Σ_2^0 -Boolean algebra $\mathcal{B}(\mathbf{a})$ is effectively dense.*

Proof. For a given primitive recursive set $X = X_e$, we construct a new primitive recursive set $Y = X_{F(e)} \subset X$ with the following properties: if $A \cap X$ is not primitive recursive, then $A \cap Y$ is also non-primitive recursive and $A \cap Y <_m^{pr} A \cap X$. We also establish that (in this construction) the function $e \mapsto F(e)$ is $\mathbf{0}'$ -computable: this gives us precisely the notion of effective density for our Σ_2^0 -Boolean algebra $\mathcal{B}(\mathbf{a})$.

For a primitive recursive set X , we satisfy the following requirements:

R_i : if there are infinitely many x such that $\chi_{A \cap X}(x) \neq p_i(x)$, then there exist x' and x'' such that $\chi_{A \cap Y}(x') \neq p_i(x')$ and $\chi_{A \cap (X \setminus Y)}(x'') \neq p_i(x'')$.

If the set $A \cap X$ is not primitive recursive, then $\exists^\infty x(\chi_{A \cap X}(x) \neq p_i(x))$. Hence, for such $A \cap X$ the requirements R_i ensure the following:

- the set $A \cap Y$ is not primitive recursive,
- the set $A \cap (X \setminus Y)$ is not primitive recursive — by Lemma 3.5.(iii), this guarantees that $A \cap X \not\leq_m^{pr} A \cap Y$.

In addition, in the construction we will build a primitive recursive function $h: A \cap Y \leq_m^{pr} A \cap X$. This will imply all the desired properties for $A \cap Y$.

We fix an element $d \notin A$.

The construction consists of R_i -stages for $i \in \omega$ (the stages are carried out one-by-one, in ascending order of the index i).

Let m_0 be the least number such that $\chi_Y(m_0)$ has not been defined by the beginning of the R_i -stage. For the numbers $x \in \{m_0, m_0 + 1, m_0 + 2, \dots\}$, we successively ‘promptly’ define $\chi_Y(x) := \chi_X(x)$ and $h(x) := x$. In other words, the constructed set Y promptly ‘copies’ the set X .

At the same time, we run the computation processes (that are ‘slow’ for us) for the following values:

$$p_i(m_0), \chi_{A \cap X}(m_0), p_i(m_0 + 1), \chi_{A \cap X}(m_0 + 1), p_i(m_0 + 2), \chi_{A \cap X}(m_0 + 2), \dots$$

The procedures described above continue, until one of the following two cases is met:

- (a) we have found a (least) $y \geq m_0$ such that $\chi_{A \cap X}(y) = 0$ and $p_i(y) \neq 0$;
- (b) we have found $z \geq m_0$ such that $\chi_{A \cap X}(z) = 1$ and $p_i(z) \neq 1$.

Case (a). In this case, we have $y \notin A \cap X$; hence, $y \notin A \cap (X \setminus Y)$. Since the set Y had copied X , we also get that $y \notin A \cap Y$. Since $p_i(y) \neq 0$, we conclude that we can choose $x' = x'' = y$ for the requirement R_i . Our R_i is forever satisfied, and we proceed to the R_{i+1} -stage.

Case (b). Since Y had copied X , we deduce that we have found z such that $\chi_{A \cap Y}(z) = 1 \neq p_i(z)$. Let m_1 be the least number such that $\chi_Y(m_1)$ has not been defined by the moment when this z was found.

Then for the numbers $w \in \{m_1, m_1 + 1, m_1 + 2, \dots\}$, we successively define $\chi_Y(w) = 0$ and $h(w) = d$. At the same time, we run computations for

$$p_i(m_1), \chi_{A \cap X}(m_1), p_i(m_1 + 1), \chi_{A \cap X}(m_1 + 1), \dots$$

We continue this procedure until we find a number $z_1 \geq m_1$ such that $\chi_{A \cap X}(z_1) \neq p_i(z_1)$. Then, since $z_1 \notin Y$, we get that $\chi_{A \cap (X \setminus Y)}(z_1) = \chi_{A \cap X}(z_1) \neq p_i(z_1)$. The requirement R_i is forever satisfied (for $x' = z$ and $x'' = z_1$), and we proceed to the R_{i+1} -stage.

The construction is described.

Verification. If the set $A \cap X$ is not primitive recursive, then each R_i -requirement will be satisfied with the help of the R_i -stage. Indeed, there are infinitely many x such that $\chi_{A \cap X}(x) \neq p_i(x)$. Therefore, at the R_i -stage, one of Cases (a) or (b) will be eventually satisfied. In Case (b) we will also eventually find a suitable number z_1 .

Notice that for the case when $A \cap X$ is primitive recursive, the construction may ‘get stuck’ (forever) at some R_i -stage. Nevertheless, it is easy to show that the constructed function h always provides a reduction $A \cap Y \leq_m^{pr} A \cap X$.

We show that the function $e \mapsto F(e)$ (where $Y = X_{F(e)}$) is $\mathbf{0}'$ -computable. In order to (uniformly) find the index $F(e)$, it is sufficient to check for a given $i \in \omega$, whether the R_i -stage for our $X = X_e$ eventually stops. It is clear that this checking procedure is effective in the oracle $\mathbf{0}'$. Hence, the function F is $\mathbf{0}'$ -computable.

Lemma 3.7 and Proposition 3.2 are proved. \square

We note that the proof of Proposition 3.2 never uses the item (d) of Definition 3.1.

4. THE MAIN LEMMA

As in the proof of [DN00, Theorem 3.2], it is sufficient to prove the following result:

Lemma 4.1. *Suppose that a set A is super pr-sparse via the function f . Then for every Σ_2^0 -ideal I of the algebra $\mathcal{B}(\mathbf{a})$, there exists a degree $\mathbf{c}_I \leq \mathbf{a}$ such that*

$$(\forall x \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbf{a}))[\mathbf{x} \in I \Leftrightarrow \mathbf{x} \leq \mathbf{c}_I].$$

Then, indeed, the lattice $\mathcal{I}(\mathcal{B}(\mathbf{a}))$ has the following interpretation (with parameter \mathbf{a}) inside the structure \mathbf{C}_m^{pr} :

- the formula $\varphi_{dom}(x) = (x \leq \mathbf{a})$ defines the domain of the lattice;
- the formula

$$\varphi_{\leq}(x, y) = \forall z[\exists w(z \vee w = \mathbf{a} \ \& \ z \wedge w = \mathbf{0}) \rightarrow (z \leq x \rightarrow z \leq y)]$$

defines the ordering on $\mathcal{I}(\mathcal{B}(\mathbf{a}))$

(See more details in [DN00].) Theorem 2 and Proposition 3.2 together imply that the theory $Th(\mathbf{C}_m^{pr})$ is hereditarily undecidable.

Proof of Lemma 4.1. Recall that $(X_i)_{i \in \omega}$ is the list of all primitive recursive sets (see Subsection 3.2). Let $\psi(x)$ be a total Δ_2^0 -computable function such that $\text{range}(\psi) = \{i : \deg_m^{pr}(A \cap X_i) \in I\}$. Such a function ψ exists, since I is a Σ_2^0 -ideal. We fix a primitive recursive function $\psi_1(x, s)$ such that $\psi(x) = \lim_s \psi_1(x, s)$.

As in [DN00, Lemma 3.12], we satisfy the following requirements:

$$R_e: A \cap X_{\psi(e)} \leq_m^{pr} C_I;$$

$$H_{\langle i, j \rangle}: \text{ if } p_j: A \cap X_i \leq_m^{pr} C_I, \text{ then } A \cap X_i \leq_m^{pr} \bigoplus_{m \leq \langle i, j \rangle} (A \cap X_{\psi(m)}).$$

The R_e -requirements ensure that $\deg_m^{pr}(C_I)$ is an upper bound for the ideal I . The $H_{\langle i, j \rangle}$ -requirements guarantee that for every degree $\deg_m^{pr}(A \cap X_i)$ below C_I , there is a finite collection of elements from I computing this degree.

We construct the set C_I as follows: we build a primitive recursive function $g(x)$, and we set $C_I := g^{-1}(A)$. It is clear that in this case $g: C_I \leq_m^{pr} A$.

For $e \in \omega$, we define an auxiliary primitive recursive function r_e as in Subsection 1.1. The value $r_e(x)$ is equal to the number of steps needed to compute $p_e(x)$. Without loss of generality, we may assume that $p_e(x) \leq r_e(x)$ and $r_e(x) \leq r_{e+1}(x)$ for all $e, x \in \omega$.

Let $r_{-1}(x) = 0$. Without loss of generality, we assume that $f(0) = 0$ and $0 \notin A \cup C_I$. Recall that

$$\langle i, j \rangle = 2^i \cdot (2j + 1).$$

In particular, for a fixed $i \in \omega$, the distance between a pair of ‘neighbours’ of the form $\langle i, \cdot \rangle$ is equal to $\langle i, j + 1 \rangle - \langle i, j \rangle = 2^{i+1}$.

Now we describe the construction.

A *requirement* R_e is satisfied as follows. For each number $w \in \text{range}(f)$, we define the finite set of R_e -coding locations associated with w . We say that a number n is an R_e -coding location for the number $f(m)$ if the following conditions hold:

- (i) $n = \langle e, l \rangle$ for some $l \geq e$;
- (ii) $f(m) \leq n < f(m + 1)$;
- (iii) n is strictly greater than the number of steps needed to compute $r_{e-1}(f(m))$; in particular, this implies that $n > r_{e-1}(f(m))$.

Intuitively speaking, the R_e -coding locations are used to encode the set $A \cap X_{\psi(e)}$ inside our C_I . In addition, the R_e -coding locations will help us to build $g: C_I \leq_m^{pr} A$.

Similar to Lemma 3.12 of [DN00], Condition (iii) will be important for satisfying the $H_{\langle i, j \rangle}$ -requirements (see below). Informally speaking, to satisfy the R_e -requirements, it suffices to work only with Conditions (i) and (ii).

Claim 4.2. $[(a)]$

- (1) *Checking whether n is an R_e -coding location for a number $f(m)$ is a primitive recursive procedure (in e, m, n).*
- (2) *For sufficiently large m , the set of R_e -coding locations for $f(m)$ is non-empty.*

Proof. (a) One can primitively recursively check Condition (i). By Lemma 1.2, one can primitively recursively find the largest number v such that $v \leq n$ and $v \in \text{range}(f)$. Moreover, we can promptly find the number k such that $f(k) = v$. Condition (ii) holds if and only if $k = m$.

After that, to check (iii), we take precisely $(n-1)$ steps in the computation process for $r_{e-1}(v)$. The number n is an appropriate R_e -coding location if and only if the value $r_{e-1}(v)$ has been computed in at most $(n-1)$ steps.

(b) We may assume that $m > \langle e, e \rangle$. We define a primitive recursive function q as follows: $q(x)$ equals to $3 \cdot 2^{e+1} + M(x)$, where $M(x)$ is equal to the number of steps needed to compute $r_{e-1}(x)$.

By item (d) of Definition 3.1, for a sufficiently large m , we always have $f(m+1) > q(f(m))$. Then the interval $[M(f(m)) + 1, f(m+1))$ (whose length is $> 2^{e+1} + 1$) will definitely have an appropriate R_e -coding location of the form $\langle e, l \rangle$. \square

Recall that $0 \notin A$. We define a function $g(x)$ (and the corresponding set C_I) as follows.

- (1) For a given x , we find the greatest m such that $f(m) \leq x$. By Lemma 1.2, this procedure is primitive recursive. We also find e' and l such that $n = \langle e', l \rangle$.
- (2) If x is not an $R_{e'}$ -coding location for the number $f(m)$, then we set $g(x) = 0$ and $x \notin C_I$.
- (3) Let x be an $R_{e'}$ -coding location for $f(m)$. We compute the value $u = \psi_1(e', x)$. We proceed with x computational steps for the value $\chi_{X_u}(f(m))$.

If the value is computed in x steps and $f(m) \in X_u$, then we set $g(x) = f(m)$ and $\chi_{C_I}(x) = \chi_A(f(m))$. Otherwise, we define $g(x) = 0$ and $x \notin C_I$.

Claim 4.2 implies that the function $g(x)$ is primitive recursive.

We show that the choice of our R_e -coding locations allows us to ‘encode’ $A \cap X_{\psi(e)}$ inside the constructed C_I .

Claim 4.3. *There is a primitive recursive function $h(y)$ with the following property:*

$$\exists y_0 (\forall y \geq y_0) [y \in A \cap X_{\psi(e)} \leftrightarrow h(y) \in C_I].$$

In particular, this implies $A \cap X_{\psi(e)} \leq_m^{pr} C_I$.

Proof. We define an auxiliary primitive recursive function $L(y)$: the value $L(y)$ is equal to the number of steps needed to compute the values $\chi_{X_{\psi(e)}}(y)$ and $r_{e-1}(y)$.

Choose a number y_0 with the following three properties:

- $\psi_1(e, y) = \psi(e)$ for all $y \geq y_0$;
- $y_0 = f(m_0)$, and for every $m \geq m_0$, the set of R_e -coding locations for $f(m)$ is non-empty;
- if $m \geq m_0$, then $f(m+1)$ is strictly greater than $\langle e, L(f(m)) \rangle$ (the existence of such m_0 is guaranteed by item (d) of Definition 3.1).

Recall our assumption that $0 \notin C_I$. For $y \geq y_0$, we define the value $h(y)$ via the following rules:

- (1) If $y \notin \text{range}(f)$ or $y \notin X_{\psi(e)}$, then it is clear that $y \notin A \cap X_{\psi(e)}$. Set $h(y) = 0$ for such y .
- (2) If $y \in \text{range}(f) \cap X_{\psi(e)}$, then define $h(y) = \langle e, L(y) \rangle$.

It is clear that the function h is primitive recursive. Moreover, for Case (2), our choice of y_0 ensures the following. Let m be the number such that $y = f(m) \geq y_0$. In the definition of the value $g(x)$ for the element $x := \langle e, L(y) \rangle$, the construction of g (described above) ensures that

$$y = f(m) \in A \Leftrightarrow x \in C_I.$$

Therefore, we obtain the equivalence $y \in A \cap X_{\psi(e)} \Leftrightarrow h(y) \in C_I$. \square

Claim 4.3 shows that every R_e -requirement is met.

$H_{\langle i, j \rangle}$ -requirements. We show that Conditions (i)-(iii) of the definition of R_e -coding locations allow us to satisfy the $H_{\langle i, j \rangle}$ -requirements.

Claim 4.4. *Every $H_{\langle i, j \rangle}$ -requirement is met.*

Proof. Let p_j be a pr - m -reduction from $A \cap X_i$ to C_I . We build a primitive recursive function

$$(5) \quad h: A \cap X_i \leq_m^{pr} \bigoplus_{m \leq \langle i, j \rangle} (A \cap X_{\psi(m)}).$$

Similar to Claim 4.3, it is sufficient to define the value $h(x)$ only for sufficiently large x . In particular, we may assume that $\psi_1(m, x) = \psi(m)$ for every $m \leq \langle i, j \rangle$. Recall that $0 \notin A \cup C_I$.

If $x \notin \text{range}(f)$ or $x \notin X_i$, then it is clear that $x \notin A \cap X_i$, and one can set $h(x) = 0$. Therefore, we assume that $x \in X_i$ and $x = f(m)$ for some (sufficiently large) m .

We compute the values $y := p_j(x)$ and $g(y)$. If $g(y) = 0$ or $g(y) \notin \text{range}(f)$, then $g(y) \notin A$ and $y \notin C_I$ (hence, we define $h(x) := 0$). Thus, we may assume that $g(y) = f(k)$ for some $k > 0$ (recall that $f(0) = 0$).

Case 1. Suppose that $k < m$. Then by item (c) of Definition 3.1, the value $\chi_A(g(y)) = \chi_A(f(k))$ can be computed in at most $f(m) = x$ steps. We have

$$x \in A \cap X_i \Leftrightarrow y = p_j(x) \in C_I \Leftrightarrow f(k) = g(y) \in A.$$

We promptly compute $\chi_A(g(y))$ in x steps, and we set: $h(x) := 0$ if $g(y) \notin A$; and $h(x) := a_0$ if $g(y) \in A$. Here a_0 is some fixed element from $A \cap X_{\psi(0)}$.

Case 2. Suppose that $k \geq m$. Since $g(y)$ is equal to $f(k)$, the number y is an R_e -coding location for $f(k)$, for some $e \in \omega$. Hence, $y \geq f(k) \geq f(m) = x$.

By item (d) of Definition 3.1, we may further assume that we work with sufficiently large x such that $f(l+1) > r_j(f(l))$ for $l \geq m$. This implies that $f(m+1) > r_j(f(m)) \geq p_j(f(m)) = p_j(x) = y$.

We obtain $f(m) \leq y < f(m+1)$, and hence, $k = m$.

Assume that $e > \langle i, j \rangle$. But then each R_e -coding location z for $f(m)$ must satisfy $z > r_{e-1}(f(m)) = r_{e-1}(x) \geq r_{\langle i, j \rangle}(x) \geq r_j(x) \geq p_j(x) = y$, and the number y cannot be an R_e -coding location. We deduce that $e \leq \langle i, j \rangle$.

We know that $x \in A \cap X_i \Leftrightarrow y = p_j(x) \in C_I$. If the value $\chi_{X_{\psi(e)}}(g(y)) = \chi_{X_{\psi(e)}}(f(m))$ can be computed in $\leq y$ steps, then we have

$$y \in C_I \Leftrightarrow g(y) \in A \cap X_{\psi(e)}, \text{ where } e \leq \langle i, j \rangle.$$

Using this fact, we can define $h(x)$ in a suitable manner (as the number from the e -th component of the set $\bigoplus_m (A \cap X_{\psi(m)})$ corresponding to $g(y)$). If $\chi_{X_{\psi(e)}}(g(y))$ cannot be computed in $\leq y$ steps, then $y \notin C_I$ and $h(x) := 0$.

A simple analysis of the described construction shows that the desired property (5) is satisfied. \square

Lemma 4.1 and Theorem 1 are proved. \square

REFERENCES

- [AS86] K. Ambos-Spies. Inhomogeneities in the polynomial time degrees: The degrees of super sparse sets. *Inf. Process. Lett.*, 22(3):113–117, 1986.
- [BS75] S. Burris and H. P. Sankappanavar. Lattice-theoretic decision problems in universal algebra. *Algebra Univers.*, 5:163–177, 1975.
- [DN00] R. Downey and A. Nies. Undecidability results for low complexity time classes. *J. Comput. Syst. Sci.*, 60(2):465–479, 2000.
- [ELTT65] Yu. L. Ershov, I. A. Lavrov, A. D. Taimanov, and M. A. Taitslin. Elementary theories. *Russ. Math. Surv.*, 20(4):35–105, 1965.
- [Gon97] S. S. Goncharov. *Countable Boolean Algebras and Decidability*. Consultants Bureau, New York, 1997.
- [Nie97] A. Nies. Intervals of the lattice of computably enumerable sets and effective Boolean algebras. *Bull. Lond. Math. Soc.*, 29(6):683–692, 1997.
- [Nie00] A. Nies. Effectively dense Boolean algebras and their applications. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 352(11):4989–5012, 2000.
- [Odi92] P. Odifreddi. *Classical Recursion Theory*, volume 125 of *Stud. Logic Found. Math.* Elsevier, Amsterdam, 1992.

KAZAKH-BRITISH TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY, 59 TOLE BI STREET, ALMATY, 050000, KAZAKHSTAN

AL-FARABI KAZAKH NATIONAL UNIVERSITY, 71 AL FARABI AVENUE, ALMATY, 050040, KAZAKHSTAN

Email address: birzhan.kalmurzayev@gmail.com

KAZAKH-BRITISH TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY, 59 TOLE BI STREET, ALMATY, 050000, KAZAKHSTAN

Email address: n.bazhenov.1@gmail.com

KAZAKH-BRITISH TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY, 59 TOLE BI STREET, ALMATY, 050000, KAZAKHSTAN

AL-FARABI KAZAKH NATIONAL UNIVERSITY, 71 AL FARABI AVENUE, ALMATY, 050040, KAZAKHSTAN

Email address: bheadr73@gmail.com