Generic Muchnik reducibility

Joseph S. Miller
University of Wisconsin–Madison

(Joint work with Andrews, Schweber, and M. Soskova)

Dagstuhl Seminar 17081
Computability Theory
February 19–24, 2017

Muchnik reducibility between structures

Definition

If $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{B}$ are countable structures, then $\mathcal{A}$ is Muchnik reducible to $\mathcal{B}$ (written $\mathcal{A} \leqslant_w \mathcal{B}$) if every ω-copy of $\mathcal{B}$ computes an ω-copy of $\mathcal{A}$.

- $\mathcal{A} \leqslant_w \mathcal{B}$ can be interpreted as saying that $\mathcal{B}$ is intrinsically at least as complicated as $\mathcal{A}$.
- This is a special case of Muchnik reducibility; it might be more precise to say that the problem of presenting the structure $\mathcal{A}$ is Muchnik reducible to the problem of presenting $\mathcal{B}$.
- Muchnik reducibility doesn't apply to uncountable structures.

Various approaches have been used to extend computable structure theory beyond the countable:

- Computability on admissible ordinals (aka α-recursion theory)
- Computability on separable structures, as in computable analysis
- ...

Generic Muchnik reducibility

Noah Schweber extended Muchnik reducibility to arbitrary structures (see Knight, Montalbán, Schweber):

Definition (Schweber)

If $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{B}$ are (possibly uncountable) structures, then $\mathcal{A}$ is generically Muchnik reducible to $\mathcal{B}$ (written $\mathcal{A} \leqslant_w^* \mathcal{B}$) if $\mathcal{A} \leqslant_w \mathcal{B}$ in some forcing extension of the universe in which $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{B}$ are countable.

It follows from Shoenfield absoluteness that generic Muchnik reducibility is robust.

Lemma (Schweber)

If $\mathcal{A} \leqslant_w^* \mathcal{B}$, then $\mathcal{A} \leqslant_w \mathcal{B}$ in *every* forcing extension that makes $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{B}$ countable.

Note that for countable structures, $\mathcal{A} \leqslant_w^* \mathcal{B} \iff \mathcal{A} \leqslant_w \mathcal{B}$.

Initial example

Definition (Cantor space)

Let $\mathcal{C}$ be the structure with universe 2^ω and predicates $P_n(X)$ that hold if and only if $X(n) = 1$.

Observation (Knight, Montalbán, Schweber)

$$\mathcal{C} \leqslant_w^* (\mathbb{R}, +, \cdot).$$

To understand this example, say that we take a forcing extension that collapses the continuum.

The Turing degrees from the ground model now form a countable ideal I. By absoluteness, this ideal has many of the properties it has in the ground model. It's a jump ideal and much more.

Let $\mathbb{R}_I$ be the reals in I (the ground model's version of $\mathbb{R}$). Similarly, let $\mathcal{C}_I$ denote the restriction of $\mathcal{C}$ to sets in I (the ground model's version of $\mathcal{C}$).

Initial example

Facts

- From a copy of $(\mathbb{R}_I, +, \cdot)$, or even $(\mathbb{R}_I, +, <)$, we can compute an *injective* listing of the sets in I, i.e., one with no repetitions.
- A degree $\mathbf{d}$ computes a copy of $\mathcal{C}_I$ iff it computes an (injective) listing of the sets in I.

This shows that $\mathcal{C}_I \leqslant_w (\mathbb{R}_I, +, <)$. It is even easier to see that $(\mathbb{R}_I, +, <) \leqslant_w (\mathbb{R}_I, +, \cdot)$.

Therefore, $\mathcal{C} \leqslant_w^* (\mathbb{R}, +, <) \leqslant_w^* (\mathbb{R}, +, \cdot)$.

Question (Knight, Montalbán, Schweber)

$$\text{Is } (\mathbb{R}, +, \cdot) \leqslant_w^* \mathcal{C}?$$

No! This was answered by Igusa and Knight, and independently (though later) by Downey, Greenberg, and M.

Facts about $\mathcal{C}$ and $\mathcal{B}$

Definition (Baire space)

Let $\mathcal{B}$ be the structure with universe ω^ω and, for each finite string $\sigma \in \omega^{<\omega}$, a predicate $P_\sigma(f)$ that holds if and only if $\sigma \prec f$.

The following facts were proved by Igusa, Knight; Downey, Greenberg, M.; Igusa, Knight, Schweber; Andrews, Knight, Kuyper, Lempp, M., Soskova.

- $\mathcal{B} \equiv_w^* (\mathbb{R}, +, <) \equiv_w^* (\mathbb{R}, +, \cdot)$. This degree also contains every closed/continuous expansion of $(\mathbb{R}, +, \cdot)$.
- $\mathcal{C} <_w^* \mathcal{B}$.
- $\mathcal{C}' \equiv_w^* \mathcal{B}$.
- The closed expansions of $\mathcal{C}$ lie in the interval between $\mathcal{C}$ and $\mathcal{B}$.

Question

Is there a generic Muchnik degree strictly between $\mathcal{C}$ and $\mathcal{B}$?

Definability and post-extension complexity

It is going to be important to understand the complexity of definable sets both before and after the forcing extension.

Definition

We say that a relation R on a structure $\mathcal{M}$ is $\Sigma^c_n(\mathcal{M})$ if it is definable by a computable Σ_n formula in $\mathcal{L}_{\omega_1\omega}$ with finitely many parameters.

Theorem (Ash, Knight, Manasse, Slaman; Chisholm)

If $\mathcal{M}$ is countable, then R is $\Sigma^c_n(\mathcal{M})$ if and only if it is relatively intrinsically Σ^0_n, i.e., its image in any ω-copy of $\mathcal{M}$ is Σ^0_n relative to that copy.

Computable objects and satisfaction on a structure are absolute, so:

Corollary

A relation R is $\Sigma^c_n(\mathcal{M})$ if and only if it is relatively intrinsically Σ^0_n in any/every forcing extension that makes $\mathcal{M}$ countable.

Definability and pre-extension complexity

In structures like $\mathcal{C}$ and $\mathcal{B}$, we can also measure the complexity of $\Sigma^c_n(\mathcal{M})$ relations in topological terms.

The calculation depends on the structure:

	Σ^c_2	Σ^c_3	Σ^c_4	Σ^c_5	Σ^c_6	$\dots$
$\mathcal{B}$	$\boldsymbol{\Sigma^1_1}$	$\boldsymbol{\Sigma^1_2}$	$\boldsymbol{\Sigma^1_3}$	$\boldsymbol{\Sigma^1_4}$	$\boldsymbol{\Sigma^1_5}$	$\dots$
$\mathcal{C}$	$\boldsymbol{\Sigma^0_2}$	$\boldsymbol{\Sigma^1_1}$	$\boldsymbol{\Sigma^1_2}$	$\boldsymbol{\Sigma^1_3}$	$\boldsymbol{\Sigma^1_4}$	$\dots$

- These bounds are sharp, e.g., every $\boldsymbol{\Sigma^1_1}$ relation on $\mathcal{B}$ is $\Sigma^c_2(\mathcal{B})$.
- The "lost quantifiers" correspond to the first order quantifiers needed in the normal form for Σ^1_n relations with function/set quantifiers.
- This leads to an easy (and essentially different) separation between the generic Muchnik degrees of $\mathcal{C}$ and $\mathcal{B}$.

A degree strictly between $\mathcal{C}$ and $\mathcal{B}$ (ver. 1.0)

Lemma

There is a linear order $\mathcal{L}$ such that $\mathcal{L} \leqslant^*_w \mathcal{B}$ but $\mathcal{L} \nleqslant^*_w \mathcal{C}$.

Idea: code a $\mathbf{\Pi^1_2}$ complete set into $\mathcal{L}$ so that it can be extracted in a Σ^c_4 way.

Lemma

If $\mathcal{L}$ is a linear order, then $\mathcal{B} \nleqslant^*_w \mathcal{C} \sqcup \mathcal{L}$.

Similar to the Downey, Greenberg, M. proof that $\mathcal{B} \nleqslant^*_w \mathcal{C}$; we show that a generic countable presentation of $\mathcal{C} \sqcup \mathcal{L}$ does not compute a copy of $\mathcal{B}$. The key fact used about linear orders is that their $\sim_2$-equivalence classes are tame (Knight 1986).

Now let $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{C} \sqcup \mathcal{L}$, where $\mathcal{L}$ is the linear order from the first lemma.

Corollary

There is a structure $\mathcal{M}$ such that $\mathcal{C} <^*_w \mathcal{M} <^*_w \mathcal{B}$.

Degrees strictly between $\mathcal{C}$ and $\mathcal{B}$ (ver. 2.0)

Joining $\mathcal{C}$ with the right linear order was a (somewhat awkward) way of making a new set Σ^c_4 definable (without lifting us up to $\mathcal{B}$).

There is a more natural way to do this:

Theorem (Gura)

Using marker extensions, we can build structures

$$\mathcal{C} <^*_w \cdots <^*_w \mathcal{M}_3 <^*_w \mathcal{M}_2 <^*_w \mathcal{M}_1 <^*_w \mathcal{B}$$

with the following "complexity profiles":

	Σ^c_2	Σ^c_3	Σ^c_4	Σ^c_5	Σ^c_6	$\dots$
$\mathcal{B}$	$\mathbf{\Sigma^1_1}$	$\mathbf{\Sigma^1_2}$	$\mathbf{\Sigma^1_3}$	$\mathbf{\Sigma^1_4}$	$\mathbf{\Sigma^1_5}$	$\dots$
$\mathcal{M}_1$	$\mathbf{\Sigma^0_2}$	$\mathbf{\Sigma^1_2}$	$\mathbf{\Sigma^1_3}$	$\mathbf{\Sigma^1_4}$	$\mathbf{\Sigma^1_5}$	$\dots$
$\mathcal{M}_2$	$\mathbf{\Sigma^0_2}$	$\mathbf{\Sigma^1_1}$	$\mathbf{\Sigma^1_3}$	$\mathbf{\Sigma^1_4}$	$\mathbf{\Sigma^1_5}$	$\dots$
$\mathcal{M}_3$	$\mathbf{\Sigma^0_2}$	$\mathbf{\Sigma^1_1}$	$\mathbf{\Sigma^1_2}$	$\mathbf{\Sigma^1_4}$	$\mathbf{\Sigma^1_5}$	$\dots$
$\vdots$			$\vdots$			
$\mathcal{C}$	$\mathbf{\Sigma^0_2}$	$\mathbf{\Sigma^1_1}$	$\mathbf{\Sigma^1_2}$	$\mathbf{\Sigma^1_3}$	$\mathbf{\Sigma^1_4}$	$\dots$

Open questions

1. Can an *expansion* of $\mathcal{C}$ be strictly between $\mathcal{C}$ and $\mathcal{B}$?
2. Are the degrees of $\mathcal{M}_1, \mathcal{M}_2, \mathcal{M}_3, \ldots$ the only degrees strictly between $\mathcal{C}$ and $\mathcal{B}$?
3. Are there incomparable degrees between $\mathcal{C}$ and $\mathcal{B}$?

Expansions of $\mathcal{C}$ above $\mathcal{B}$

Let $\mathcal{M} = (\mathcal{C}, \text{Stuff})$ be an expansion of $\mathcal{C}$. First, we want a criterion that guarantees that $\mathcal{M} \geqslant^*_w \mathcal{B}$.

- If the set $\mathcal{F} \subset 2^\omega$ of sequences with finitely many ones is $\Delta^c_1(\mathcal{M})$, i.e., computable in every ω-copy of $\mathcal{M}$, then $\mathcal{M} \geqslant^*_w \mathcal{B}$.
  - Why? There is a natural bijection between $\mathcal{B}$ and $\mathcal{C} \setminus \mathcal{F}$.
- If $\mathcal{F}$ is $\Delta^c_2(\mathcal{M})$, then $\mathcal{M} \geqslant^*_w \mathcal{B}$.
  - Add a little injury.
  - This lets us show, for example, that $(\mathcal{C}, \oplus) \geqslant^*_w \mathcal{B}$.
- If any countable dense set is $\Delta^c_2(\mathcal{M})$, then $\mathcal{M} \geqslant^*_w \mathcal{B}$.
- If there is a perfect set $\mathcal{P} \subseteq \mathcal{C}$ with a countable dense $\mathcal{Q} \subset \mathcal{P}$ that is $\Delta^c_2(\mathcal{M})$, then $\mathcal{M} \geqslant^*_w \mathcal{B}$.

Expansions of $\mathcal{C}$ above $\mathcal{B}$

- If there is a perfect set $\mathcal{P} \subseteq \mathcal{C}$ with a countable dense $\mathcal{Q} \subset \mathcal{P}$ that is $\Delta_2^c(\mathcal{M})$, then $\mathcal{M} \geqslant_w^* \mathcal{B}$.

Lemma

If $\mathcal{M} \leqslant_w^* \mathcal{B}$ and $R \subseteq \mathcal{C}$ is $\Delta_2^c(\mathcal{M})$, then it is $\Delta_2^c(\mathcal{B})$, i.e., Borel.

Lemma (Hurewicz)

If $R \subseteq \mathcal{C}$ is Borel but not $\mathbf{\Delta_2^0}$, then there is a perfect set $\mathcal{P} \subseteq \mathcal{C}$ such that either $\mathcal{P} \cap R$ or $\mathcal{P} \setminus R$ is countable and dense in $\mathcal{P}$.

Putting it all together (and noting that arity doesn't matter):

Lemma

If $\mathcal{M} \leqslant_w^* \mathcal{B}$ is an expansion of $\mathcal{C}$ and $R \subseteq \mathcal{C}^n$ is $\Delta_2^c(\mathcal{M})$ but not $\mathbf{\Delta_2^0}$, then $\mathcal{M} \geqslant_w^* \mathcal{B}$.

Tameness and dichotomy

In the contrapositive (and using the fact that $\mathbf{\Delta^0_2} = \Delta^c_2(\mathcal{C})$):

Tameness Lemma

If $\mathcal{M} <^*_w \mathcal{B}$ is an expansion of $\mathcal{C}$, then $\Delta^c_2(\mathcal{M}) = \Delta^c_2(\mathcal{C})$.

Dichotomy Theorem for Closed Expansions

If $\mathcal{M} \leqslant^*_w \mathcal{B}$ is an expansion of $\mathcal{C}$ by closed relations (and/or continuous functions), then either $\mathcal{M} \equiv^*_w \mathcal{C}$ or $\mathcal{M} \equiv^*_w \mathcal{B}$.

Combined with work of Greenberg, Igusa, Turetsky, and Westrick:

Dichotomy Theorem for Unary Expansions

If $\mathcal{M} \leqslant^*_w \mathcal{B}$ is an expansion of $\mathcal{C}$ by countably many unary relations, then either $\mathcal{M} \equiv^*_w \mathcal{C}$ or $\mathcal{M} \equiv^*_w \mathcal{B}$.

These dichotomy results take care of most natural (and many unnatural) examples of expansions.

Open questions

1. Can an *expansion* of $\mathcal{C}$ be strictly between $\mathcal{C}$ and $\mathcal{B}$? (In particular, the non-unary $\mathbf{\Delta^0_2}$ case is open.)
2. Are the degrees of $\mathcal{M}_1, \mathcal{M}_2, \mathcal{M}_3, \ldots$ the only degrees strictly between $\mathcal{C}$ and $\mathcal{B}$?
3. Are there incomparable degrees between $\mathcal{C}$ and $\mathcal{B}$?

These questions are related. For example:

Fact. Any Borel expansion of $\mathcal{C}$ that is not above $\mathcal{B}$ has the same complexity profile as $\mathcal{C}$. So a positive answer to 1 gives a negative answer to 2.

We have focused on $\mathcal{C}$ and $\mathcal{B}$ (and a couple of other degrees). What else are generic Muchnik degrees good for?

Thank you!