

The higher sharp II: on $M_2^\#$

Yizheng Zhu

Institut für mathematische Logik und Grundlagenforschung
Fachbereich Mathematik und Informatik
Universität Münster
Einsteinstr. 62
48149 Münster, Germany

March 4, 2024

Abstract

We establish the descriptive set theoretic representation of the mouse $M_n^\#$, which is called $0^{(n+1)\#}$. This part partially deals with the case $n = 2$ by proving the many-one equivalence of $M_2^\#$ and the theory of $L_{\delta_3^1}[T_3]$ with the higher level analogs of L -indiscernibles.

1 Introduction

This is the second part of a series starting with [27]. It defines the higher level analogs of order indiscernibles for L . They are level-3 indiscernibles for $L_{\delta_3^1}[T_3]$. The theory of $L_{\delta_3^1}[T_3]$ with these level-3 indiscernibles will be called $0^{3\#}$. We will then show its many-one equivalence with $M_2^\#$.

As advertised in the introduction of [27], the structure of the level-3 indiscernibles for $L_{\delta_3^1}[T_3]$ resembles structure of the $\mathbb{L}[T_3]$ -homogeneous trees on $\omega \times \delta_3^1$ that project to a Π_3^1 set. Under AD, these trees are defined in [14] and [6]. In this paper, we will define them again using slightly different notations. To a new reader, the combinatorial definitions with homogeneous trees in this paper may seem like unnecessarily complications of very simple facts. However these definitions will fit in well with the generalized Jackson's analysis in the third paper of this series. We urge the reader to bear with the cumbersome notations and possibly have a couple of simple examples in mind. The price is very low, whereas the effort will pay off in the third paper of this series.

2 Backgrounds and preliminaries

All the notations of this paper will follow [27]. We introduce additional background knowledge for this paper.

Suppose $A \subseteq \mathbb{R}$. A norm on A is a function $\varphi : A \rightarrow \text{Ord}$. φ is regular iff $\text{ran}(\varphi)$ is an ordinal. A scale on A is a sequence of norms $\vec{\varphi} = (\varphi_n)_{n < \omega}$ on A such that if $(x_i)_{i < \omega} \subseteq A$, $x_i \rightarrow x (i \rightarrow \infty)$ in the Baire topology, and for all n , $\varphi_n(x_i) \rightarrow \lambda_n (i \rightarrow \infty)$ in the discrete topology, then $x \in A$ and $\forall n \varphi_n(x) \leq \lambda_n$. $\vec{\varphi}$ is regular iff each φ_n is regular. If $A = p[T]$, T is a tree on $\omega \times \lambda$, the λ -scale associated to T is $(\varphi_n)_{n < \omega}$ where $\varphi_n(x) = \langle \alpha_x^0, \dots, \alpha_x^n \rangle$, $(\alpha_x^n)_{n < \omega}$ is the leftmost branch of $T_x =_{\text{DEF}} \{ \vec{\beta} : (x, \vec{\beta}) \in [T] \}$, $\langle \dots \rangle : \lambda^{n+1} \rightarrow \text{Ord}$ is order preserving with respect to the lexicographic order and is onto an ordinal. Suppose Γ is a pointclass. If φ is a norm on A , then φ is a Γ -norm iff the relations

$$\begin{aligned} x \leq_{\varphi} y &\leftrightarrow x \in A \wedge (y \in A \rightarrow \varphi(x) \leq \varphi(y)), \\ x <_{\varphi} y &\leftrightarrow x \in A \wedge (y \in A \rightarrow \varphi(x) < \varphi(y)). \end{aligned}$$

are both in Γ . $\vec{\varphi} = (\varphi_n)_{n < \omega}$ is a Γ -scale iff the relations $x \leq_{\varphi_n} y$ and $x <_{\varphi_n} y$ in (x, y, n) are both in Γ . Γ has the prewellordering property iff every set in Γ has a Γ -norm. Γ has the scale property iff every set in Γ has a Γ -scale. Assuming PD, Moschovakis [18] shows that the pointclasses Π_{2n+1}^1 , Π_{2n+1}^1 , Σ_{2n+2}^1 , Σ_{2n+2}^1 have the scale property.

For a nonempty finite tuple $t = (a_0, \dots, a_k)$, put $t^- = (a_0, \dots, a_{k-1})$. This notation will be followed throughout this paper. If $<_i$ is a linear ordering on A_i for $i < \omega$, then $<_{BK}^{(<_i)_i}$ is the Brouwer-Kleene order on $\bigcup_{n < \omega} (\Pi_{i < n} A_i)$ where $(a_0, \dots, a_n) <_{BK}^{(<_i)_i} (b_0, \dots, b_m)$ iff either (a_0, \dots, a_n) is a proper lengthening of (b_0, \dots, b_m) or there exists $k \leq \min(m, n)$ such that $\forall i < k \ a_i = b_i \wedge a_k <_k b_k$. In our applications, these orderings $<_i$ will be apparent enough so that $(<_i)_i$ can be omitted from the superscript without confusion.

Put $\mathbb{L} = \bigcup_{x \in \mathbb{R}} L[x]$, $\mathbb{L}_\alpha = \bigcup_{x \in \mathbb{R}} L_\alpha[x]$. If A is a set, put $\mathbb{L}[A] = \bigcup_{x \in \mathbb{R}} L[A, x]$, $\mathbb{L}_\alpha[A] = \bigcup_{x \in \mathbb{R}} L_\alpha[A, x]$. \mathbb{L} and $\mathbb{L}[A]$ are in general not models of ZF . Nonetheless, cardinality and cofinality in $\mathbb{L}[A]$ are well defined. So for example, $\text{cf}^{\mathbb{L}[A]}(\alpha) = \min\{\text{cf}^{L[A, x]}(\alpha) : x \in \mathbb{R}\}$.

If R is a wellfounded relation, $\|x\|_R$ denotes the R -rank of x , i.e., $\|x\|_R = \sup\{\|y\|_R + 1 : yRx\}$. If $<$ is a linear order, then $\text{pred}_<(a)$, $\text{succ}_<(a)$ denote the $<$ -predecessor and $<$ -successor of a respectively, if exists.

2.1 Q -theory

For $x \in \mathbb{R}$, $L_{\kappa_3^x}[T_2, x]$ is the minimum admissible set containing (T_2, x) . We recall the following model theoretic representation of Π_3^1 sets in [1, 10, 12].

Theorem 2.1 (Becker-Kechris-Martin). *Assume Δ_2^1 -determinacy. Then for each $A \subseteq u_\omega \times \mathbb{R}$, the following are equivalent.*

1. A is Π_3^1 .
2. There is a Σ_1 formula φ such that $(\alpha, x) \in A$ iff $L_{\kappa_3^x}[T_2, x] \models \varphi(T_2, \alpha, x)$.

We will need further results on Theorem 2.1. The original proof of $2 \Rightarrow 1$ in Theorem 2.1 is based on Theorem 2.2 and Corollary 2.3.

Theorem 2.2 (Kechris-Martin, [10, 12]). *Assume Δ_2^1 -determinacy. Let $x \in \mathbb{R}$. If A is a nonempty $\Pi_3^1(x)$ subset of u_ω , then $\exists w \in \Delta_3^1(x) \cap WO_\omega(|w| \in A)$.*

Corollary 2.3 (Kechris-Martin, [10, 12]). *Assume Δ_2^1 -determinacy. Then Π_3^1 is closed under quantifications over u_ω , i.e., if $A \subseteq (u_\omega)^2 \times \mathbb{R}$ is Π_3^1 , then so are*

$$B = \{(\alpha, x) : \exists \beta < u_\omega (\beta, \alpha, x) \in A\},$$

$$C = \{(\alpha, x) : \forall \beta < u_\omega (\beta, \alpha, x) \in A\}.$$

Suppose \mathcal{X} is a Polish space. For $x \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\alpha < u_\omega$, $A \subseteq \mathcal{X}$ is $\Sigma_3^1(x, \alpha)$ iff there is a $\Sigma_3^1(x)$ set $B \subseteq u_\omega \times \mathcal{X}$ such that $y \in A$ iff $(\alpha, y) \in B$. Or equivalently, A is $\Sigma_3^1(x, \alpha)$ iff there is a $\Sigma_3^1(x)$ set $B \subseteq \mathbb{R} \times \mathcal{X}$ such that $y \in A$ iff $\exists w \in WO_\omega(|w| = \alpha \wedge (w, \alpha) \in B)$. A is $\Pi_3^1(x, \alpha)$ iff $\mathcal{X} \setminus A$ is $\Sigma_3^1(x, \alpha)$. A is $\Delta_3^1(x, \alpha)$ iff A is both $\Sigma_3^1(x, \alpha)$ and $\Pi_3^1(x, \alpha)$. $\Sigma_3^1(x, < \beta)$ means $\Sigma_3^1(x, \alpha)$ for some $\alpha < \beta$. Similarly define $\Pi_3^1(x, < \beta)$ and $\Delta_3^1(x, < \beta)$.

In the proof of Theorem 2.1, the prewellordering property for Π_3^1 subsets of $\omega \times u_\omega$, originally proved by Solovay, is used.

Theorem 2.4 (Solovay, [13, Theorem 3.1]). *Assume Δ_2^1 -determinacy. Suppose $A \subseteq u_\omega \times \mathbb{R}$ is $\Pi_3^1(x, \alpha)$, where $x \in \mathbb{R}$, $\alpha < u_\omega$. Then there is a $\Pi_3^1(x, \alpha)$ norm $\varphi : A \rightarrow \text{Ord}$, i.e., the relations*

$$(\beta, y) \leq_\varphi^* (\gamma, z) \leftrightarrow (\beta, y) \in A \wedge ((\gamma, z) \in A \rightarrow \varphi(\beta, y) \leq \varphi(\gamma, z))$$

$$(\beta, y) <_\varphi^* (\gamma, z) \leftrightarrow (\beta, y) \in A \wedge ((\gamma, z) \in A \rightarrow \varphi(\beta, y) < \varphi(\gamma, z))$$

are $\Pi_3^1(x, \alpha)$.

We use the above theorems to establish a Σ_3^1 -boundedness theorem with parameters in u_ω .

Corollary 2.5 (Reduction). *Assume Δ_2^1 -determinacy. Suppose $A, B \subseteq u_\omega \times \mathbb{R}$ are both $\Pi_3^1(x, \alpha)$, where $x \in \mathbb{R}$, $\alpha < u_\omega$. Then there exist $\Pi_3^1(x, \alpha)$ sets $A', B' \subseteq u_\omega \times \mathbb{R}$ such that $A' \subseteq A$, $B' \subseteq B$, $A \cup B = A' \cup B'$ and $A' \cap B' = \emptyset$.*

Corollary 2.6 (Easy uniformization). *Assume Δ_2^1 -determinacy. Suppose $A \subseteq (u_\omega \times \mathbb{R}) \times u_\omega$ is $\Pi_3^1(x, \alpha)$, where $x \in \mathbb{R}$, $\alpha < u_\omega$. Then A can be uniformized by a $\Pi_3^1(x, \alpha)$ function, i.e., there is a $\Pi_3^1(x, \alpha)$ function f such that $\text{dom}(f) = \{(\beta, y) : \exists \gamma ((\beta, y), \gamma) \in A\}$ and that $((\beta, y), f(\beta, y)) \in A$ for all $(\beta, y) \in \text{dom}(f)$.*

The Π_3^1 coding system for Δ_3^1 sets (e.g., [2, Theorem 3.3.1]) applies to the larger pointclass $\Delta_3^1(< u_\omega)$. The proof is similar.

Corollary 2.7 (Π_3^1 -codes for $\Delta_3^1(< u_\omega)$). *Assume Δ_2^1 -determinacy. Then there is a Π_3^1 set $C \subseteq u_\omega$ and sets $P, S \subseteq u_\omega \times \mathbb{R}$ in Π_3^1, Σ_3^1 respectively such that for any $\alpha \in C$,*

$$P_\alpha = S_\alpha =_{DEF} D_\alpha$$

and

$$\{D_\alpha : \alpha \in C\} = \{A \subseteq \mathbb{R} : A \text{ is } \Delta_3^1(< u_\omega)\}.$$

Proof. Let $U \subseteq \omega \times \mathbb{R}^2$ be a good universal Π_3^1 set. Define

$$\begin{aligned} ((n, \alpha), (m, \beta), x) \in A &\leftrightarrow \forall w \in \text{WO}_\omega (|w| = \alpha \rightarrow (n, w, x) \in U) \\ ((n, \alpha), (m, \beta), x) \in B &\leftrightarrow \forall w \in \text{WO}_\omega (|w| = \beta \rightarrow (m, w, x) \in U) \end{aligned}$$

Then A, B are Π_3^1 subsets of $(\omega \times u_\omega)^2$. Reduce them to A', B' according to Corollary 2.5. Define

$$((n, \alpha), (m, \beta)) \in C \leftrightarrow (A')_{(n, \alpha), (m, \beta)} \cup (B')_{(n, \alpha), (m, \beta)} = \mathbb{R}$$

C is a Π_3^1 subset of $(\omega \times u_\omega)^2$. Let $P = A', S = (\omega \times u_\omega)^2 \times \mathbb{R} \setminus B'$. Identifying $(\omega \times u_\omega)^2$ with u_ω with the Gödel pairing function, C, P, S are as desired. \square

Theorem 2.1 provides a model-theoretic view of Q -theory [15] at the level of Q_3 -degrees. We give an exposition of these results, probably with simple strengthenings thereof.

The higher level analog of the hyperarithmetic reducibility on reals is Q_3 reducibility. Q_3 -degrees are coarser than Δ_3^1 -degrees. $y \in Q_3(x)$ iff y is $\Delta_3^1(x)$ in a countable ordinal, i.e., there is $\alpha < \omega_1$ such that $\forall w \in \text{WO}(|w| = \alpha \rightarrow y \in \Delta_3^1(x))$. y is $\Delta_3^1(x)$ in an ordinal $< u_\omega$ iff there is $\alpha < u_\omega$ such that $\forall w \in \text{WO}_\omega(|w| = \alpha \rightarrow y \in \Delta_3^1(x))$. $y \leq_{\Delta_3^1} x$ iff $y \in \Delta_3^1(x)$. $y \equiv_{\Delta_3^1} x$ iff $y \leq_{\Delta_3^1} x \leq_{\Delta_3^1} y$. $y \leq_{Q_3} x$ iff $y \in Q_3(x)$. $y \equiv_{Q_3} x$ iff $y \leq_{Q_3} x \leq_{Q_3} y$.

Proposition 2.8 ([9, 10, 12, 15, 25]). *1. Let $x, y \in \mathbb{R}$. Then $y \in L_{\kappa_3^x}[T_2, x]$ iff $y \in M_1^\#(x)$ iff y is $\Delta_3^1(x)$ in a countable ordinal iff y is $\Delta_3^1(x)$ in an ordinal $< u_\omega$.*

2. The relation $y \in L_{\kappa_3^x}[T_2, x]$ is Π_3^1 , where x, y ranges over \mathbb{R} .

3. The relation $y \in \Delta_3^1(x)$ is Π_3^1 , where x, y ranges over \mathbb{R} .

κ_3^x is the higher level analog of ω_1^x , the least x -admissible. It is defined in a different way in [15, Section 14]. As in [12, 15], we define

$$\begin{aligned}\lambda_3^x &= \sup\{|W| : W \text{ is a } \Delta_3^1(x) \text{ prewellordering on } \mathbb{R}\} \\ &= \sup\{\xi < \kappa_3^x : \xi \text{ is } \Delta_1\text{-definable over } L_{\kappa_3^x}[T_2, x] \text{ from } \{T_2, x\}\}.\end{aligned}$$

The equivalence of these two definitions of κ_3^x is proved in [12]:

$$\begin{aligned}\kappa_3^x &= \sup\{\text{o.t.}(W) : W \text{ is a } \Delta_3^1(x, < u_\omega) \text{ prewellordering on } \mathbb{R}\} \\ &= \sup\{\lambda_3^{x,y} : M_1^\#(x) \not\leq_{\Delta_3^1} (x, y)\}.\end{aligned}$$

Moreover,

$$\forall \alpha < u_\omega \exists w \in \text{WO}_\omega (|w| = \alpha \wedge \lambda_3^{x,w} < \kappa_3^x).$$

Note that $\kappa_3^x < \lambda_3^{M_1^\#(x)} < \delta_3^1$, as proved in [15, Lemma 14.2].

The Kunen-Martin theorem implies that κ_3^x is a bound on the rank of any $\Sigma_3^1(x, < u_\omega)$ wellfounded relation.

Theorem 2.9 (Kunen-Martin, [18, 2G.2]). *Suppose W is a wellfounded relation on \mathbb{R} . Suppose γ is an ordinal and T is a tree on $(\omega \times \omega) \times \gamma$ such that $W = p[T]$. Let $L_\kappa[T]$ be the least admissible set containing T as an element. Then the rank of W is smaller than*

$$\sup\{\xi < \kappa : \xi \text{ is } \Delta_1\text{-definable over } L_\kappa[T] \text{ from } \{T\}\}.$$

Corollary 2.10. *Suppose W is a $\Sigma_3^1(x, < u_\omega)$ wellfounded relation on \mathbb{R} . Then the rank of W is smaller than κ_3^x .*

We finally note down the complexity of subsets of ordinals as a consequence of Theorem 2.1. Assume Δ_2^1 -determinacy. Every subset of u_ω in $\mathbb{L}_{\delta_3^1}[T_2]$ is Δ_3^1 . Solovay's game shows that every subset of ω_1 in $\mathbb{L}_{\delta_3^1}[T_2]$ is in \mathbb{L} : Let $A \subseteq \omega_1$ be in $\mathbb{L}_{\delta_3^1}[T_2]$. Let B and C be Π_2^1 such that $w \in \text{WO} \wedge \|w\| \in A$ iff $\exists z(w, z) \in B$ iff $\neg \exists z(w, z) \in C$. Play the game in which I produces v , II produces w, z , and II wins iff $v \in \text{WO} \rightarrow (w \in \text{WO} \wedge \|w\| \geq \|v\| \wedge \forall \alpha < \|w\| \exists (w', z') \leq_T z (\|w'\| = \alpha \wedge (w', z') \in B \cup C))$. I does not win by boundedness. If σ is a winning strategy for II, then $A \in L[\sigma]$.

2.2 Silver's dichotomy on Π_3^1 equivalence relations

Harrington's proof [11], [7, Chapter 32] of Silver's dichotomy [23] on Π_1^1 equivalence relations generalizes to Π_3^1 in a straightforward fashion. This folklore generalization is stated in [4, 5] in a slightly weaker form.

An equivalence relation E on \mathbb{R} is thin iff there is no perfect set P such that $\forall x, y \in P (xEy \rightarrow x = y)$. If Γ is a pointclass, for equivalence relations E, F (possibly on different spaces of the form $\mathbb{R}^m \times (u_\omega)^n$), E is Γ -reducible to F iff there is a function π in Γ such that $xEy \leftrightarrow \pi(x)F\pi(y)$.

Theorem 2.11 (Folklore). *Assume Δ_2^1 -determinacy. Let $x \in \mathbb{R}$. If E is a thin $\Pi_3^1(x)$ equivalence relation on \mathbb{R} , then E is $\Delta_3^1(x)$ reducible to a $\Pi_3^1(x)$ equivalence relation on a $\Pi_3^1(x)$ subset of u_ω .*

Proof. For simplicity, let $x = 0$. The generalization of Harrington's proof of Silver's dichotomy shows that for every $y \in \mathbb{R}$, there is a $\Delta_3^1(<u_\omega)$ set A such that $y \in A \subseteq [y]_E$.

Let $C, P, S, (D_\alpha)_{\alpha \in C}$ be the Π_3^1 coding system for $\Delta_3^1(<u_\omega)$ subsets of \mathbb{R} , given by Corollary 2.7. Let $\alpha \in C'$ iff $\alpha \in C$ and $\forall y \in D_\alpha \forall z \in D_\alpha (yEz)$. C' is Π_3^1 . The set

$$A = \{(y, \alpha) : \alpha \in C' \wedge y \in D_\alpha\}$$

is Π_3^1 . By Corollary 2.6, A can be uniformized by a Π_3^1 function π . Let $\alpha F \beta$ iff $\alpha \in C', \beta \in C'$, and $\forall y \in D_\alpha \forall z \in D_\beta (yEz)$. F is a Π_3^1 equivalence relation on C' . π is a reduction from E to F . To see that π is also Σ_3^1 , apply Corollary 2.3 and use the fact that π is a total function taking values in u_ω . \square

The reduction π and the target equivalence relation F in Theorem 2.11 are uniformly definable from the $\Pi_3^1(x)$ definition of E , independent of x . A similar uniformity applies to the following corollary.

Corollary 2.12. *Assume Δ_2^1 -determinacy. Let $x \in \mathbb{R}$. If E is a thin $\Delta_3^1(x)$ equivalence relation on \mathbb{R} , then E is $\Delta_3^1(x)$ reducible to $=_{u_\omega}$. Here $\alpha =_{u_\omega} \beta$ iff $\alpha = \beta < u_\omega$.*

Proof. Assume $x = 0$. Proceed as in the proof of Theorem 2.11 until we reach the set A . We now show that A can be uniformized by a Π_3^1 function π such that yEz iff $\pi(y) = \pi(z)$. Indeed, let φ be a Π_3^1 -norm on A , given by Theorem 2.4, and let $\pi(y) = \alpha$ iff $(y, \alpha) \in A$ and $(\varphi(y, \alpha), \alpha)$ is lexicographically minimal among the set $\{(\varphi(z, \beta), \beta) : zEy \wedge (z, \beta) \in A\}$. Similarly to the proof of Corollary 2.6, π is Π_3^1 (we use $E \in \Delta_3^1$ here). Again, π is Σ_3^1 . π is the desired reduction from E to $=_{u_\omega}$. \square

It should be possible to give an alternative proof of Corollary 2.12 using the forceless proof of the dichotomy of chromatic numbers of graphs in [17], but the author has not checked the details.

Corollary 2.13. *Assume Δ_2^1 -determinacy. Let $x \in \mathbb{R}$. If \leq^* is a $\Delta_3^1(x)$ prewellordering on \mathbb{R} and A is a $\Sigma_3^1(x)$ subset of \mathbb{R} , then $|\leq^*|$ and $\{\|y\|_{\leq^*} : y \in A\}$ are both in $L_{\kappa_3}^{M_1^\#(x)}[T_2, M_1^\#(x)]$ and Δ_1 -definable over $L_{\kappa_3}^{M_1^\#(x)}[T_2, M_1^\#(x)]$ from parameters in $\{T_2, M_1^\#(x)\}$.*

Proof. The equivalence relation $a \equiv^* b \leftrightarrow a \leq^* b \leq^* a$ is thin. By Corollary 2.12, we get a $\Delta_3^1(x)$ -function $\pi : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow u_\omega$ such that $a \equiv^* b$ iff $\pi(a) = \pi(b)$. π induces a wellordering $<^{**}$ on $\text{ran}(\pi)$ where $\pi(a) <^{**} \pi(b)$ iff $a <^* b$. $|\leq^*|$ is then the order type of $<^{**}$. $\text{ran}(\pi)$ and $<^{**}$ are Σ_3^1 , hence Π_1 -definable over $L_{\kappa_3^x}[T_2, x]$ from $\{T_2, x\}$ by Theorem 2.1. Put $w = M_1^\#(x)$. By [15, Lemma 14.2], $\kappa_3^x < \kappa_3^w$. So $\text{ran}(\pi)$ and $<^{**}$ are Δ_1 -definable over $L_{\kappa_3^w}[T_2, w]$ from $\{T_2, w\}$. By admissibility, $|\leq^*|$ is Δ_1 -definable in $L_{\kappa_3^w}[T_2, w]$ from $\{T_2, w\}$. The part concerning $\{\|y\|_{\leq^*} : y \in A\}$ is similar. \square

Remark 2.14. *We do not know if $M_1^\#(x)$ can be replaced by x in the conclusion of Corollary 2.13.*

2.3 N -homogeneous trees

As this paper and its sequels deal with restricted ultrapowers and “restricted homogeneous trees” over and over again, it is convenient to abstract the relevant properties.

A transitive set or class N is *admissibly closed* iff

$$\forall M \in N \exists M' \in N (M' \text{ is admissible} \wedge M \in M')$$

Suppose N is admissibly closed and $X \in N$. ν is an N -filter on X iff there is a filter ν^* on X such that $\nu = \nu^* \cap N$. An N -filter ν is an N -measure on X iff ν is countably complete and for any $A \in \mathcal{P}(X) \cap N$, either $A \in \nu$ or $X \setminus A \in \nu$. If ν is an N -measure on X , then $\text{Ult}(N, \nu)$ is the ultrapower consisting of equivalence classes of functions $f : X \rightarrow N$ that lie in N . Denote by $j_N^\nu : N \rightarrow \text{Ult}(N, \nu)$ the ultrapower map and $[f]_N^\nu$ the ν -equivalence class of f in $\text{Ult}(N, \nu)$. The ultrapower is well-defined by admissibly closedness of N , and is wellfounded by countable completeness of ν . The usual Łoś proof shows for any transitive $M \in N$ containing $\{X\}$, for any first order formula φ , for any $f_i : X \rightarrow M$ that belongs to N , $1 \leq i \leq n$,

$$j_N^\nu(M) \models \varphi([f_1]_N^\nu, \dots, [f_n]_N^\nu)$$

iff

$$\text{for } \nu\text{-a.e. } a \in X, M \models \varphi(f_1(a), \dots, f_n(a)).$$

Suppose ν is an N -measure on X^n and μ is an N -measure on X^m , $m \leq n$. ν projects to μ iff for all $A \subseteq X^m$, $A \in \mu$ iff $\{\vec{\alpha} : \vec{\alpha} \restriction m \in A\} \in \nu$. $\vec{\nu} = (\nu_n)_{n < \omega}$ is a tower of N -measures on X iff for each n , ν_n is an N -measure on X^n and ν_n projects to ν_m for all $m < n$.

Suppose N is admissibly closed, $X \in N$, and $\vec{\nu} = (\nu_n)_{n < \omega}$ is a tower of N -measures on X . This naturally induces factor maps $j_N^{\nu_m, \nu_n}$ from $\text{Ult}(N, \nu_m)$ to $\text{Ult}(N, \nu_n)$. We say $\vec{\nu}$ is close to N iff whenever $(A_n)_{n < \omega}$ is a sequence such that $A_n \in \nu_n \cap N$ for all n , there exists $(B_n)_{n < \omega} \in N$ such that $B_n \subseteq A_n$ and $B_n \in \nu_n$ for all n . If $\vec{\nu}$ is close to N , we say $\vec{\nu}$ is N -countably complete iff whenever $(A_n)_{n < \omega}$ is a sequence such that $A_n \in \nu_n \cap N$ for all n , there exists $(a_n)_{n < \omega}$ such that $(a_1, \dots, a_n) \in A_n$ for all n . The usual homogeneous tree argument shows:

Proposition 2.15. *Suppose $\vec{\nu} = (\nu_n)_{n < \omega}$ is close to N . Then $\vec{\nu}$ is N -countably complete iff the direct limit of $(j_N^{\nu_m, \nu_n})_{m < n < \omega}$ is wellfounded.*

Proof. The new part is to show N -countable completeness of $\vec{\nu}$ from wellfoundedness of the direct limit of $(j_N^{\nu_m, \nu_n})_{m < n < \omega}$. Given $(A_n)_{n < \omega}$ such that $A_n \in \nu_n \cap N$ for all n , suppose towards contradiction that there does not exist $(a_n)_{n < \omega}$ such that $(a_1, \dots, a_n) \in A_n$ for all n . By closedness of $\vec{\nu}$ to N , let $(B_n)_{n < \omega} \in N$ such that $B_n \subseteq A_n$ and $B_n \in \nu_n$ for all n . The tree T consisting of (a_1, \dots, a_n) such that $a_i \in B_i$ for all i is wellfounded. The ranking function f of T belongs to N by admissible closedness. From f we can construct $f_n : X^n \rightarrow N$ so that $f_n \in N$ and $[f_n]_{\nu_n} > [f_{n+1}]_{\nu_{n+1}}$ as usual, contradicting to wellfoundedness of $(j_N^{\nu_m, \nu_n})_{m < n < \omega}$. \square

An N -homogeneous system is a sequence $(\nu_s)_{s \in \omega < \omega}$ such that for any $x \in \mathbb{R}$, $\nu_x =_{DEF} (\nu_{x \restriction n})_{n < \omega}$ is a tower of N -measures which is close to N . For $X \in N$, a tree T on $\omega \times X$ is N -homogeneous iff there is an N -homogeneous system $(\nu_s)_{s \in \omega < \omega}$ such that $T_s \in \nu_s$ for all $s \in \omega < \omega$ and for all $x \in p[T]$, ν_x is N -countably complete. If T is N -homogeneous, by Proposition 2.15 and standard arguments, $x \in p[T]$ iff the direct limit of $(j_N^{\nu_{x \restriction m}, \nu_{x \restriction n}})_{m < n < \omega}$ is wellfounded.

2.4 $L[T_{2n+1}]$ as a mouse

We recall the Moschovakis tree T_{2n+1} and Steel's computation of $\mathbb{L}[T_{2n+1}]$.

Assuming Δ_{2n}^1 -determinacy, T_{2n+1} is the tree of the Moschovakis Π_{2n+1}^1 -scale on a good universal Π_{2n+1}^1 set, defined in [18, Chapter 6].

Assuming Π_{2n+1}^1 -determinacy, $\mathcal{F}_{2n,z}$ is the direct system consisting of non-dropping countable iterates of $M_{2n}^\#(z)$. $M_{2n,\infty}^\#(z)$ is the direct limit of $\mathcal{F}_{2n,z}$. $M_{2n,\infty}^-(z) = M_{2n,\infty}^\#(z) \restriction \delta_{2n+1}^1$. $(\mathcal{F}_{2n}, \mathcal{M}_{2n,\infty}^\#, \mathcal{M}_{2n,\infty}^-) = (\mathcal{F}_{2n,0}, \mathcal{M}_{2n,\infty}^\#(0), \mathcal{M}_{2n,\infty}^-(0))$.

Theorem 2.16. *Assuming Π_{2n+1}^1 -determinacy. Assume z is a real.*

1. δ_{2n+1}^1 is the least $< \delta_{2n,\infty}^z$ -strong cardinal of $M_{2n,\infty}^\#(z)$, where $\delta_{2n,\infty}^z$ is the least Woodin cardinal of $M_{2n,\infty}^\#(z)$.
2. $M_{2n,\infty}^-(z) = L_{\delta_{2n+1}^1}[T_{2n+1}, z]$.

The notations concerning inner model theory follow [26]. If \mathcal{M} is a premouse, $o(\mathcal{M})$ denotes $\text{Ord} \cap \mathcal{M}$. $\mathcal{M} \trianglelefteq \mathcal{N}$ means that \mathcal{M} is an initial segment of \mathcal{N} . In Steel [25], the level-wise projective complexity associated to mice is discussed in detail. In this paper, we find it more convenient to work with Π_{n+1}^1 -iterability rather than Π_n^{HC} -iterability in [25].

We recall the level-wise complexity of projective mice in [25]. A premouse is by definition Π_1^1 -iterable and also Π_1^1 -iterable above any ordinal in the premouse. A countable normal iteration tree \mathcal{T} on a countable premouse is Π_{2k+1}^1 -guided iff for any limit $\lambda \leq \text{lh}(\mathcal{T})$, there is $\xi \leq o(\mathcal{M}_\lambda^\mathcal{T})$ such that $\mathcal{M}_\lambda^\mathcal{T} \restriction \xi$ is a Π_{2k+1}^1 -iterable above $\mathcal{T} \restriction \alpha$ and $\text{rud}(\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{T} \restriction \alpha)) \models \text{“}\delta(\mathcal{T} \restriction \alpha) \text{ is not Woodin”}$. A countable stack of countable normal iteration trees $\vec{\mathcal{T}}$ is Π_{2k+1}^1 -guided iff every normal component of $\vec{\mathcal{T}}$ is Π_{2k+1}^1 -guided.

A countable premouse \mathcal{P} is Π_{2k+2}^1 -iterable above $\eta \in \mathcal{P}$ iff for any Π_{2k+1}^1 -guided stack of normal iteration trees $\vec{\mathcal{T}} = (\mathcal{T}_i)_{i < \alpha}$ on \mathcal{P} with critical points above η , either

1. the wellfounded model $\mathcal{M}_\infty^{\vec{\mathcal{T}}}$ exists, either as the last model of $\mathcal{T}_{\alpha-1}$ when α is a successor or as the direct limit of $(\mathcal{M}_i^\mathcal{T} : i < \alpha)$ when α is a limit.
2. α is a successor ordinal, $\text{lh}(\mathcal{T}_{\alpha-1})$ is limit and for any $\mathcal{N} \triangleright \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{T}_\alpha)$ which is sound above $\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{T}_\alpha)$, projects to $\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{T}_\alpha)$, has $o(\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{T}_\alpha))$ as a strong cutpoint and is Π_{2k+1}^1 -iterable above $o(\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{T}_\alpha))$, there is a cofinal branch b through \mathcal{T}_α such that either $\mathcal{N} \trianglelefteq \mathcal{M}_b^\mathcal{T}$ or $\mathcal{M}_b^\mathcal{T} \trianglelefteq \mathcal{N}$.

Π_{2k+2}^1 -iterability above η is enough to compare countable $(2k+1)$ -small premice that project to η , agree below η , and have η as a strong cutpoint. A countable normal iteration tree \mathcal{T} on a countable premouse is Π_{2k+2}^1 -guided iff for any limit $\lambda \leq \text{lh}(\mathcal{T})$, there is $\xi \leq o(\mathcal{M}_\lambda^\mathcal{T})$ such that $\mathcal{M}_\lambda^\mathcal{T} \restriction \xi$ is Π_{2k+2}^1 -iterable above $\delta(\mathcal{T} \restriction \lambda)$ and $\text{rud}(\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{T} \restriction \alpha)) \models \text{“}\delta(\mathcal{T} \restriction \alpha) \text{ is not Woodin”}$. A countable stack of countable normal iteration trees $\vec{\mathcal{T}}$ is Π_{2k+2}^1 -guided iff every normal component of $\vec{\mathcal{T}}$ is Π_{2k+2}^1 -guided.

Assume Δ_{2k+2}^1 -determinacy. $x \in \mathbb{R}$ codes a Π_{2k+3}^1 -iterable mouse above η iff x codes a countable $(2k+2)$ -small premouse \mathcal{P}_x and $\eta \in \mathcal{P}_x$ such that for any $v \in \mathbb{R}$ coding Π_{2k+2}^1 -guided stack of normal iteration trees $\vec{\mathcal{T}} = (\mathcal{T}_i)_{i < \alpha}$ on \mathcal{P}_x with critical points above η , either

1. the wellfounded model $\mathcal{M}_\infty^{\vec{\mathcal{T}}}$ exists, either as the last model of $\mathcal{T}_{\alpha-1}$ when α is a successor or as the direct limit of $(\mathcal{M}_i^{\vec{\mathcal{T}}} : i < \alpha)$ when α is a limit, and there is $\mathcal{Q} \triangleright \mathcal{M}_\infty^{\vec{\mathcal{T}}}$ such that $\mathcal{Q} \in M_{2k+1}^\#(x, v)$, \mathcal{Q} is Π_{2k+2}^1 -iterable above $o(\mathcal{M}_\infty^{\vec{\mathcal{T}}})$, $\text{rud}(\mathcal{Q}) \models$ “there is no Woodin cardinal $\leq o(\mathcal{M}_\infty^{\vec{\mathcal{T}}})$ ”, or
2. α is a successor ordinal and there is $b \in M_1^\#(x, v)$ such that b is a maximal branch through $\mathcal{T}_{\alpha-1}$, and there is $\mathcal{Q} \triangleright \mathcal{M}_b^{\vec{\mathcal{T}}_{\alpha-1}}$ such that $\mathcal{Q} \in M_{2k+1}^\#(x, v)$, \mathcal{Q} is Π_{2k+2}^1 -iterable above $o(\mathcal{M}_b^{\vec{\mathcal{T}}_{\alpha-1}})$, $\text{rud}(\mathcal{Q}) \models$ “there is no Woodin cardinal $\leq o(\mathcal{M}_b^{\vec{\mathcal{T}}_{\alpha-1}})$ ”.

Π_{2k+3}^1 -iterability is a Π_{2k+3}^1 property by restricted quantification [18, 4D.3]. “countable” and “ $(2k+2)$ -small” are usually omitted from prefixing “ Π_{2k+3}^1 -iterable mouse”. Note that Π_{2k+3}^1 -iterable mice are genuinely (ω_1, ω_1) -iterable.

\leq_{DJ} is the Dodd-Jensen prewellordering on Π_{2k+3}^1 -iterable mice. $\mathcal{M} \leq_{DJ} \mathcal{N}$ iff \mathcal{M}, \mathcal{N} are Π_{2k+3}^1 -iterable mice and in the comparison between \mathcal{M} and \mathcal{N} , the main branch on the \mathcal{M} -side does not drop. $\mathcal{M} \sim_{DJ} \mathcal{N}$ iff $\mathcal{M} \leq_{DJ} \mathcal{N} \leq_{DJ} \mathcal{M}$. $\mathcal{M} <_{DJ} \mathcal{N}$ iff $\mathcal{M} \leq_{DJ} \mathcal{N} \not\leq_{DJ} \mathcal{M}$. The norm $x \mapsto \|\mathcal{P}_x\|_{<_{DJ}}$ for x coding a Π_{2k+3}^1 -iterable mouse \mathcal{P}_x is Π_{2k+3}^1 . For instance, $(\mathcal{P}_x \text{ is a } \Pi_{2k+3}^1\text{-iterable mouse} \wedge (\mathcal{P}_y \text{ is a } \Pi_{2k+3}^1\text{-iterable mouse} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}_x \leq_{DJ} \mathcal{P}_y))$ iff \mathcal{P}_x is a Π_{2k+3}^1 -iterable mouse and for any Π_{2k+2}^1 -guided normal iteration trees \mathcal{T}, \mathcal{U} on $\mathcal{P}_x, \mathcal{P}_y$ respectively, if \mathcal{T}, \mathcal{U} have the common last model \mathcal{Q} and the main branch of \mathcal{T} drops, then the main branch of \mathcal{U} also drops.

If \mathcal{N} is a Π_{2k+3}^1 -iterable mouse, then $\mathcal{I}_\mathcal{N}$ is the direct system consisting of countable nondropping iterates of \mathcal{N} , and \mathcal{N}_∞ is the direct limit of $\mathcal{I}_\mathcal{N}$, $\pi_{\mathcal{N}, \infty} : \mathcal{N} \rightarrow \mathcal{N}_\infty$ is the direct limit map. $o(\mathcal{N}_\infty) < \delta_{2k+3}^1$ as it is the length of a Δ_{2k+3}^1 -prewellordering.

For a real z , all the iterability notions relativize to z -mice. $<_{DJ(z)}$ is the Dodd-Jensen prewellordering on Π_{2k+3}^1 -iterable z -mice.

2.5 Kunen’s analysis on subsets of u_ω

Kunen’s Δ_3^1 -coding of subsets of u_ω under AD has an effective version under Δ_3^1 -determinacy.

Theorem 2.17 (Kunen [24]). *Assume Δ_3^1 -determinacy. There is Δ_3^1 set $X \subseteq \mathbb{R} \times u_\omega$ such that $\{X_v : v \in \mathbb{R}\} = \mathcal{P}(u_\omega) \cap \mathbb{L}_{\delta_3^1}[T_2]$. Here $X_v = \{\alpha < u_\omega : (x, \alpha) \in X\}$.*

The proof in [24] generalizes easily. The only difference is that instead of taking a surjection $h : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(u_\omega)$ in [24, Lemma 3.7] under AD by Moschovakis Coding Lemma, we take a surjection $h : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(u_\omega) \cap \mathbb{L}_{\delta_3^1}[T_2]$, where G is a universal Π_3^1 subset of $\mathbb{R} \times u_\omega$ and $h(z) = G_z = \{\alpha : (z, \alpha) \in G\}$. Surjectivity of h follows from the fact that every subset of u_ω in $\mathbb{L}_{\delta_3^1}[T_2]$ is Π_3^1 . In fact, every subset of u_ω in $\mathbb{L}_{\delta_3^1}[T_2]$ is Δ_3^1 . The critical step in the proof of Theorem 2.17 corresponds to [24, Lemma 3.7]. This step works under Δ_3^1 -Turing determinacy. This is why Δ_3^1 -determinacy is an assumption in Theorem 2.17. We don't know if it can be weakened to Δ_2^1 -determinacy.

3 More on the level-1 analysis

We present the usual arguments of Martin's proof of Π_1^1 -determinacy in a form that conveniently generalizes to higher levels.

3.1 The tree S_1 , level-1 description analysis

We are working under ZF + DC.

The technical definition of *tree of uniform cofinalities* is extracted from [14], defined in [6], and redefined in our paper in a more convenient way. A tree of uniform cofinality pinpoints a particular measure that appears in a homogeneity system for a projective set. A *level-1 tree of uniform cofinalities*, or a *level-1 tree*, is a set $P \subseteq \omega^{<\omega}$ such that:

1. $\emptyset \notin A$.
2. If $(i_1, \dots, i_{k+1}) \in T$, $k \geq 1$, then $(i_1, \dots, i_k) \in T$ and for every $j < i_{k+1}$, $(i_1, \dots, i_k, j) \in T$.

Any countable linear ordering is isomorphic to $<_{BK} \upharpoonright P$ for some level-1 tree P . If P, P' are finite level-1 trees, $s \notin P$, $P' = P \cup \{s\}$, then the $<_{BK} \upharpoonright P'$ -predecessor of s^- is s . Level-1 trees are just convenient representations of countable linear orderings and their extensions.

A level-1 tree P is said to be *regular* iff $(1) \notin P$. In other words, when P is regular and $P \neq \emptyset$, (0) must be the $<_{BK}$ -maximal node of P .

The *ordinal representation* of P is

$$\text{rep}(P) = \{(p) : p \in P\} \cup \{(p, n) : p \in P, n < \omega\}.$$

$\text{rep}(P)$ is endowed with the ordering

$$<^P = <_{BK} \upharpoonright \text{rep}(P).$$

Thus, for $p \in P$, (p) is the $<^P$ -supremum of (p, n) for $n < \omega$. If $B \subseteq \omega_1$ is in \mathbb{L} , let $B^{P\uparrow}$ the set of functions $f : \text{rep}(P) \rightarrow B$ which are continuous, order preserving (with respect to $<^P$ and $<$) and belong to \mathbb{L} . If $f \in \omega_1^{P\uparrow}$, let

$$[f]^P = ([f]_p^P)_{p \in P},$$

where $[f]_p^P = f((p))$ for $p \in P$. Let $[B]^{P\uparrow} = \{[f]^P : f \in B^{P\uparrow}\}$. P is said to be Π_1^1 -wellfounded iff $P \cup \{\emptyset\}$ is a wellfounded tree, or equivalently, $<^P$ is a wellordering. Π_1^1 -wellfoundedness of a level-1 tree is a Π_1^1 property in the real coding the tree. A tuple $\vec{\alpha} = (\alpha_p)_{p \in P}$ is said to *respect* P iff $\vec{\alpha} \in [\omega_1]^{P\uparrow}$. In other words, each α_p is a countable limit ordinal, and the map $p \mapsto \alpha_p$ is an isomorphism between $(P; <_{BK} \upharpoonright P)$ and $(\{\alpha_p : p \in P\}; <)$. In particular, when P is regular, $P \neq \emptyset$ and $\vec{\alpha}$ respects P , then $\alpha_{(0)} > \alpha_p$ whenever $p \in P \setminus \{(0)\}$.

A *finite level-1 tower* is a tuple $(P_i)_{i \leq n}$ such that $n < \omega$, P_i is a level-1 tree of cardinality i for any i , and $i < j \rightarrow P_i \subseteq P_j$. An *infinite level-1 tower* is $(P_i)_{i < \omega}$ such that $(P_i)_{i \leq n}$ is a finite level-1 tower for any $n < \omega$. A *level-1 system* is a sequence $\vec{P} = (P_s)_{s \in \omega^{<\omega}}$ such that for each $s \in \omega^{<\omega}$, $(P_{s \restriction i})_{i < \text{lh}(s)}$ is a finite level-1 tower. \vec{P} is *regular* iff each P_s is regular. Associated to a Π_1^1 set A we can assign a regular level-1 system $(P_s)_{s \in \omega^{<\omega}}$ so that $x \in A$ iff the infinite regular level-1 tree $P_x =_{\text{DEF}} \bigcup_{n < \omega} P_{x \restriction n}$ is Π_1^1 -wellfounded. If A is lightface Π_1^1 , then $(P_s)_{s \in \omega^{<\omega}}$ can be picked effective.

Definition 3.1. S_1 is the tree on $V_\omega \times \omega_1$ such that $(\emptyset, \emptyset) \in S_1$ and a nonempty node

$$(\vec{P}, \vec{\alpha}) = ((P_i)_{i \leq n}, (\alpha_i)_{i \leq n}) \in S_1$$

iff $(P_i)_{i \leq n}$ is a finite regular level-1 tower and putting $p_i \in P_{i+1} \setminus P_i$, $\beta_{p_i} = \alpha_i$, then $(\beta_p)_{p \in P_n}$ respects P_n .

Since every tree occurring in S_1 is regular, for a nonempty node $(\vec{P}, \vec{\alpha}) \in S_1$, we must have $\alpha_0 > \max(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n)$.

S_1 projects to the universal Π_1^1 set:

$$p[S_1] = \{\vec{P} : \vec{P} \text{ is a } \Pi_1^1\text{-wellfounded regular level-1 tower}\}.$$

The (non-regular) ω_1 -scale associated to S_1 is Π_1^1 .

Definition 3.2. 1. Suppose P is a level-1 tree. The set of P -descriptions is $\text{desc}(P) =_{\text{DEF}} P \cup \{\emptyset\}$. The constant P -description is \emptyset .

2. $p \prec p'$ iff $p, p' \in \text{desc}(P)$ and $p <_{BK} p'$.
3. Suppose P, W are level-1 trees. A function $\sigma : P \cup \{\emptyset\} \rightarrow W \cup \{\emptyset\}$ is said to factor (P, W) iff $\sigma(\emptyset) = \emptyset$ and σ preserves the $<_{BK}$ -order. (σ does not necessarily preserve the tree order.)
4. Suppose P is a level-1 tree. σ factors $(P, *)$ iff σ factors (P, W) for some level-1 tree W .

Suppose P, W are Π_1^1 -wellfounded. Then $\text{o.t.}(<^P) \leq \text{o.t.}(<^W)$ is equivalent to “ $\exists \sigma$ (σ factors (P, W))”. $\text{o.t.}(<^P) < \text{o.t.}(<^W)$ is equivalent to “ $\exists \sigma \exists w \in W$ (σ factors $(P, W) \wedge \forall p \in P \sigma(p) \prec^W w$)”. The higher level analog of this simple fact will be established in the third paper of this series, which will be an ingredient in the axiomatization of $0^{3\#}$.

If $\sigma : \{1, \dots, n\} \rightarrow \{1, \dots, n'\}$ is order preserving, recall that

$$j^\sigma : \mathbb{L} \rightarrow \mathbb{L}$$

where $j^\sigma(\tau^{L[x]}(u_1, \dots, u_n)) = \tau^{L[x]}(u_{\sigma(1)}, \dots, u_{\sigma(n)})$. We let

$$j_{\text{sup}}^\sigma : u_{n+1} \rightarrow u_{n'+1}$$

where $j_{\text{sup}}^\sigma(\beta) = \sup(j^\sigma)''\beta$. So j^σ is continuous at β iff $j^\sigma(\beta) = j_{\text{sup}}^\sigma(\beta)$. The continuity points of j^σ are characterized by their \mathbb{L} -cofinalities:

Lemma 3.3. *Suppose $\sigma : \{1, \dots, n\} \rightarrow \{1, \dots, n'\}$ is order preserving, $\beta < u_{n+1}$. Put $\sigma(0) = 0$. Then $j^\sigma(\beta) \neq j_{\text{sup}}^\sigma(\beta)$ iff for some k , $\text{cf}^\mathbb{L}(\beta) = u_k$ and $\sigma(k) > \sigma(k-1) + 1$. If $\text{cf}^\mathbb{L}(\beta) = u_k$ and $\sigma(k) > \sigma(k-1) + 1$, then $j_{\text{sup}}^\sigma(\beta) = j^{\sigma_k} \circ j_{\text{sup}}^{\tau_k}(\beta)$, where $\sigma = \sigma_k \circ \tau_k$, $\sigma_k(i) = \sigma(i)$ for $1 \leq i < k$, $\sigma_k(k) = \sigma(k-1) + 1$, $\sigma_k(i) = \sigma(i-1)$ for $k < i \leq n+1$.*

The second half of this lemma states that j_{sup}^σ acting on points of \mathbb{L} -cofinality u_k is factored into the “continuous part” j^{σ_k} and the “discontinuous part” $j_{\text{sup}}^{\tau_k}$. This simple fact about factoring j_{sup}^σ is essentially part of effectivized Kunen’s analysis on u_ω in [24].

3.2 Homogeneity properties of S_1

From now on, we assume Π_1^1 -determinacy. This is equivalent to $\forall x \in \mathbb{R} (x^\# \text{ exists})$ by Martin [16] and Harrington [3].

The first ω uniform indiscernibles $(u_n)_{n < \omega}$ can be generated by restricted ultrapowers of \mathbb{L} . Recall that $\mathbb{L} = \bigcup_{x \in \mathbb{R}} L[x]$, which is admissibly closed.

Then for every subset $A \subseteq \omega_1$ in \mathbb{L} , there is a real x such that A is Σ_1 -definable over $(L_{\omega_1}[x]; \in, x)$. Let

$$\mu_{\mathbb{L}}$$

be the \mathbb{L} -club measure on ω_1 , i.e., $A \in \mu_{\mathbb{L}}$ iff $A \in \mathbb{L}$ and $\exists C \in \mathbb{L}$ ($C \subseteq A \wedge C$ is a club in ω_1). When P is a finite level-1 tree, μ^P is the \mathbb{L} -measure on $\text{card}(P)$ -tuples in ω_1 given by: $A \in \mu^P$ iff there is $C \in \mu_{\mathbb{L}}$ such that $[C]^{P^\dagger} \subseteq A$. So μ^P is essentially a variant of the $\text{card}(P)$ -fold product of $\mu_{\mathbb{L}}$, concentrating on tuples whose ordinals are ordered according to the $<_{BK}$ -order of P . In particular, μ^\emptyset is the principal ultrafilter concentrating on $\{\emptyset\}$. Put $j^P = j_{\mathbb{L}}^{\mu^P}$, $[f]_{\mu^P} = [f]_{\mathbb{L}}^{\mu^P}$ for $f \in \mathbb{L}$. Standard arguments show that $\text{Ult}(\mathbb{L}, \mu^P) = \mathbb{L}$, and $j^P(\omega_1) = u_{\text{card}(P)+1}$. For any real x , $j^P \restriction L[x]$ is elementary from $L[x]$ to $L[x]$.

The set of uncountable \mathbb{L} -regular cardinals below u_ω is $\{u_n : 1 \leq n < \omega\}$. The relation “ $\beta = \text{cf}^{\mathbb{L}}(\alpha)$ ” is Δ_3^1 (in the sharp codes). Suppose P is a finite level-1 tree, $p \in \text{desc}(P)$. Then

$$\text{seed}_p^P \in \mathbb{L}$$

is the element represented modulo μ^P by the projection map sending $\vec{\alpha} = (\alpha_{p'})_{p' \in P}$ to α_p if $p \in P$, by the constant function with value ω_1 if $p = \emptyset$. We have $\text{seed}_p^P = u_{\|p\|_{\prec^P}+1}$, where $\|p\|_{\prec^P}$ is the \prec^P -rank of p . In particular, $\text{seed}_\emptyset^P = u_{\text{card}(P)+1} = j^P(\omega_1)$. For each $p \in P$, μ^P projects to $\mu_{\mathbb{L}}$ via the map $\vec{\alpha} \mapsto \alpha_p$.

$$p^P : \mathbb{L} \rightarrow \mathbb{L}$$

is the induced factoring map that sends $j_{\mu_{\mathbb{L}}}(h)(\omega_1)$ to $j^P(h)(\text{seed}_p^P)$. Thus, p^P is the unique map such that for any $z \in \mathbb{R}$, p^P is elementary from $L[z]$ to $L[z]$ and $p^P \circ j_{\mu_{\mathbb{L}}} = j^P$, $p^P(\omega_1) = \text{seed}_p^P$. If p is the \prec^P -predecessor of p' , then $(p^P)''u_2$ is a cofinal subset of $\text{seed}_{p'}^P$. Put

$$\text{seed}^P = (\text{seed}_p^P)_{p \in \text{desc}(P)},$$

So $p \prec^P p'$ iff $\text{seed}_p^P < \text{seed}_{p'}^P$. Every element in \mathbb{L} is expressible in the form $j^P(h)(\text{seed}^P)$ for some $h \in \mathbb{L}$.

If P, P' are finite level-1 trees, P is a subtree of P' , then $\mu^{P'}$ projects to μ^P in the language of Section 2.3, i.e., the identity map factors (P, P') . Let

$$j^{P, P'} = j_{\mathbb{L}}^{\mu^P, \mu^{P'}} : \mathbb{L} \rightarrow \mathbb{L}$$

be the factor map given by Section 2.3 and let

$$j_{\text{sup}}^{P, P'} : u_\omega \rightarrow u_\omega$$

be $j_{\sup}^{P,P'}(\alpha) = \sup(j^{P,P'})''\alpha$. Thus, for any real x ,

$$j^{P,P'} \restriction L[x] : L[x] \rightarrow L[x]$$

is elementary and

$$j^{P,P'}(\tau^{L[x]}(\text{seed}_{p_1}^P, \dots, \text{seed}_{p_n}^P)) = \tau^{L[x]}(\text{seed}_{p_1}^{P'}, \dots, \text{seed}_{p_n}^{P'})$$

for $p_1, \dots, p_n \in P$. If $(P_n)_{n < \omega}$ is an infinite level-1 tower, the associated measure tower $(\mu^{P_n})_{n < \omega}$ is easily seen close to \mathbb{L} .

The proof of Π_1^1 -determinacy [16] shows that

Theorem 3.4 (Martin). *Assume Π_1^1 -determinacy. Let $(P_n)_{n < \omega}$ be an infinite level-1 tower. The following are equivalent.*

1. $(P_n)_{n < \omega}$ is Π_1^1 -wellfounded.
2. $[\omega_1]^{\cup\{P_n : n < \omega\}^\uparrow} \neq \emptyset$.
3. $(\mu^{P_n})_{n < \omega}$ is \mathbb{L} -countably complete.
4. The direct limit of $(j^{P_m, P_n})_{m < n < \omega}$ is wellfounded.

The next two lemmas compute the “effective uniform cofinality” of the image of certain ordinals under level-1 tree factoring maps.

Lemma 3.5. *Suppose (P^-, p) is a partial level ≤ 1 tree whose completion is P . σ, σ' both factor (P, W) . σ and σ' agree on P^- , $\sigma'(p)$ is the \prec^W -predecessor of $\sigma(p)$. Then for any $\beta < j^{P^-}(\omega_1)$ such that $\text{cf}^{\mathbb{L}}(\beta) = \text{seed}_{p^-}^{P^-}$,*

$$\sigma^W \circ j_{\sup}^{P^-, P}(\beta) = (\sigma')_{\sup}^W \circ j^{P^-, P}(\beta).$$

Proof. Note that $\text{cf}^{\mathbb{L}}(j^{P^-, P}(\beta)) = \text{seed}_{p^-}^P$. As in Lemma 3.3, $(\sigma')_{\sup}^W$ acting on points of \mathbb{L} -cofinality $\text{seed}_{p^-}^P$ is decomposed into the discontinuous part j_{\sup}^{P, P^+} and the continuous part $(\sigma^+)^W$, where P^+ is the completion of the partial level ≤ 1 tree (P, p^+) , $(p^+)^- = p^-$, σ^+ factors (P^+, W) , σ' and σ^+ agree on P , $\sigma^+(p^+) = \sigma(p)$. Let ι factor (P, P^+) where $\iota \restriction P^- = \text{id}$, $\iota(p) = p^+$. So $\sigma^+ \circ \iota = \sigma$. By considering the $\text{seed}_{p^-}^{P^-}$ -cofinal sequence in β , it is not hard to show that $j_{\sup}^{P, P^+} \circ j^{P^-, P}(\beta) = \iota^{P^+} \circ j_{\sup}^{P^-, P}(\beta)$. Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} (\sigma')_{\sup}^W \circ j^{P^-, P}(\beta) &= (\sigma^+)^W \circ j_{\sup}^{P, P^+} \circ j^{P^-, P}(\beta) \\ &= (\sigma^+)^W \circ \iota^{P^+} \circ j_{\sup}^{P^-, P}(\beta) \\ &= \sigma^W \circ j_{\sup}^{P^-, P}(\beta). \end{aligned}$$

□

Lemma 3.6. Suppose (P, p) is a partial level ≤ 1 tree, σ factors (P, W) . Suppose $\beta < j^{P^-}(\omega_1)$ and either

1. $p = -1$, $P^+ = P$, $\sigma' = \sigma$, $\text{cf}^{\mathbb{L}}(\beta) = \omega$, or
2. $p \neq -1$, P^+ is the completion of (P, p) , σ' factors (P^+, W) , $\sigma = \sigma' \upharpoonright P$, $\sigma'(p)$ is the \prec^W -predecessor of $\sigma(p^-)$, $\text{cf}^{\mathbb{L}}(\beta) = \text{seed}_{p^-}^P$.

Then

$$\sigma^W(\beta) = (\sigma')_{\sup}^W \circ j^{P, P^+}(\beta).$$

Proof. By commutativity of factoring maps, $\sigma^W(\beta) = (\sigma')^W \circ j^{P, P^+}(\beta)$. Note that $\text{cf}^{\mathbb{L}}(j^{P, P^+}(\beta)) = \text{seed}_{p^-}^{P^+}$ when $p \neq -1$, $\text{cf}^{\mathbb{L}}(j^{P, P^+}(\beta)) = \omega$ when $p = -1$. In either case, by Lemma 3.3, $(\sigma')^W$ is continuous at $j^{P, P^+}(\beta)$. \square

Definition 3.7. Suppose W is a finite level-1 tree, $\vec{w} = (w_i)_{i < m}$ is a distinct enumeration of a subset of W . Suppose $f : [\omega_1]^{W^\uparrow} \rightarrow \omega_1$ is a function which lies in \mathbb{L} .

series=f The signature of f is \vec{w} iff there is $C \in \mu_{\mathbb{L}}$ such that

- (a) for any $\vec{\alpha}, \vec{\beta} \in [C]^{W^\uparrow}$, if $(\alpha_{w_0}, \dots, \alpha_{w_{m-1}}) <_{BK} (\beta_{w_0}, \dots, \beta_{w_{m-1}})$ then $f(\vec{\alpha}) < f(\vec{\beta})$;
- (b) for any $\vec{\alpha}, \vec{\beta} \in [C]^{W^\uparrow}$, if $(\alpha_{w_0}, \dots, \alpha_{w_{m-1}}) = (\beta_{w_0}, \dots, \beta_{w_{m-1}})$ then $f(\vec{\alpha}) = f(\vec{\beta})$.

In particular, f is constant on a μ^W -measure one set iff the signature of f is \emptyset .

Suppose the signature of f is $\vec{w} = (w_i)_{i < m}$.

resume=f* f is essentially continuous iff $m > 0$ and for μ^W -a.e. $\vec{\alpha}$, $f(\vec{\alpha}) = \sup\{f(\vec{\beta}) : (\beta_{w_0}, \dots, \beta_{w_{m-1}}) < (\alpha_{w_0}, \dots, \alpha_{w_{m-1}})\}$. Otherwise, f is essentially discontinuous.

resume=f* Put $[B]^{W^\uparrow-1} = [B]^{W^\uparrow} \times \omega$. For $w \in \text{dom}(W)$, put $[B]^{W^\uparrow w} = \{(\vec{\beta}, \gamma) : \vec{\beta} \in [B]^{W^\uparrow}, \gamma < \beta_w\}$. For $v \in \{-1\} \cup W$, say that the uniform cofinality of f is v iff there is $g : [\omega_1]^{W^\uparrow v} \rightarrow \omega_1$ such that $g \in \mathbb{L}$ and for μ^W -a.e. $\vec{\alpha}$, $F(\vec{\alpha}) = \sup\{G(\vec{\alpha}, \beta) : (\vec{\alpha}, \beta) \in [\omega_1]^{W^\uparrow v}\}$ and the function $\beta \mapsto G(\vec{\alpha}, \beta)$ is order preserving.

It is essentially shown in [24] that f has a unique signature and uniform cofinality. Let $(P_i, p_i)_{i < m} \frown (P_m)$ be the partial level ≤ 1 tower of continuous type and let σ factor (P_m, W) such that $\sigma(p_i) = w_i$ for each $i < m$. Note that $w_i \prec^W w_0$ for $0 < i < m$, so each P_i is indeed a regular level-1 tree.

$\text{resume}^*=f \vec{P} = (P_i)_{i \leq m}$ is called the level-1 tower induced by f .

$\text{resume}^*=f \sigma$ is called the factoring map induced by f .

Note that $\sigma \upharpoonright P_i$ factors (P_i, W) for each i .

$\text{resume}^*=f$ The potential partial level ≤ 1 tower induced by f is

- (a) $(P_m, (p_i)_{i < m})$, if f is essentially continuous;
- (b) $(P_m, (p_i)_{i < m} \smallfrown (-1))$, if f is essentially discontinuous and has uniform cofinality -1 ;
- (c) $(P_m, (p_i)_{i < m} \smallfrown (p^+))$, if f is essentially discontinuous and has uniform cofinality $w_* \in W$, (P_m, p^+) is a partial level ≤ 1 tree, $\sigma((p^+)^-) = w_*$.

In particular, if $w_* \in W$, $f(\vec{\alpha}) = \alpha_{w_*}$ is the projection map, then the potential partial level ≤ 1 tower induced by f is $(\emptyset, (0))$.

$\text{resume}^*=f$ The approximation sequence of f is $(f_i)_{i \leq m}$ where $\text{dom}(f_i) = [\omega_1]^{P_i \uparrow}$, f_0 is the constant function with value ω_1 , $f_i(\vec{\alpha}) = \sup\{f(\vec{\beta}) : \vec{\beta} \in [\omega_1]^{W \uparrow}, (\beta_{w_0}, \dots, \beta_{w_{i-1}}) = (\alpha_{p_0}, \dots, \alpha_{p_{i-1}})\}$ for $1 \leq i \leq m$.

In particular, $f_m(\vec{\beta}_\sigma) = f(\vec{\beta})$ for μ^W -a.e. $\vec{\beta}$.

Note that all the relevant properties of f depend only on the value of f on a μ^W -measure one set. We will thus be free to say the signature, etc. of f when f is defined on a μ^W -measure one set.

Definition 3.8. Suppose $\omega_1 \leq \beta < u_\omega$ is a limit ordinal. Suppose W is a finite level-1 tree, $\beta = [f]_{\mu^W} < u_{\text{card}(W)+1}$, the signature of f is $(w_i)_{i < m}$, the approximation sequence of f is $(f_i)_{i \leq m}$, the level-1 tower induced by f is $(P_i)_{i \leq m}$, the factoring map induced by f is σ . Then:

1. The signature of β is $(\text{seed}_{w_i}^W)_{i < m}$.
2. The approximation sequence of β is $([f_i]_{\mu^{P_i}})_{i \leq m}$.
3. β is essentially continuous iff f is essentially continuous.
4. The uniform cofinality of β is ω if f has uniform cofinality -1 . $\text{seed}_{w_*}^W$ if f has uniform cofinality $w_* \in W \cup \{\emptyset\}$.
5. The potential partial level ≤ 1 tower induced by β is the potential partial level ≤ 1 tower induced by f .

The uniform cofinality of β is exactly $\text{cf}^{\mathbb{L}}(\beta)$. The signature, approximation sequence and essential continuity of β are independent of the choice of (W, f) in Definition 3.8, and moreover Δ_3^1 in β uniformly.

3.3 The tree S_2

In this section, we redefine the tree S_2 introduced in [14, Section 2] in the language of trees of uniform cofinalities in [6].

A *partial level ≤ 1 tree* is a pair (P, t) such that P is a finite regular level-1 tree, and either

1. $t \notin P \wedge P \cup \{t\}$ is a regular level-1 tree, or
2. $P \neq \emptyset, t = -1$.

-1 is regarded as the “level-0” component, hence the name “level ≤ 1 ”. (P, t) is of degree 0 if $t = -1$, of degree 1 otherwise. We put $\text{dom}(P, t) = P \cup \{t\}$. $\vec{\alpha} = (\alpha_s)_{s \in P \cup \{t\}}$ *respects* (P, t) iff $\vec{\alpha} \upharpoonright P$ respects P and $t = -1 \rightarrow \alpha_t < \omega, t \neq -1 \rightarrow \vec{\alpha}$ respects $P \cup \{t\}$. The *cardinality* of (P, t) is $\text{card}(P, t) = \text{card}(P) + 1$. The unique partial level ≤ 1 tree of cardinality 1 is $(\emptyset, (0))$. If (P, t) is of degree 1, its *completion* is $P \cup \{t\}$. $(P, -1)$ has no completion. (P, t) is a *partial subtree* of P' iff the completion of (P, t) exists and is a subtree of P' .

A *partial level ≤ 1 tower of discontinuous type* is a nonempty finite sequence $(\vec{P}, \vec{p}) = (P_i, p_i)_{i \leq k}$ such that $\text{card}(P_0, p_0) = 1$, each (P_i, p_i) is a partial level ≤ 1 tree, and P_{i+1} is the completion of (P_i, p_i) . A *partial level ≤ 1 tower of continuous type* is $(P_i, p_i)_{i < k} \frown (P_*)$ such that either $k = 0 \wedge P_* = \emptyset$ or $(P_i, p_i)_{i < k}$ is a partial level ≤ 1 tower of discontinuous type $\wedge P_*$ is the completion of (P_{k-1}, p_{k-1}) . For notational convenience, the information of a partial level ≤ 1 tower is compressed into a potential partial level ≤ 1 tower. We say a *potential partial level ≤ 1 tower* is $(P_*, \vec{p}) = (P_*, (p_i)_{i < \text{lh}(\vec{p})})$ such that for some level-1 tower $\vec{P} = (P_i)_{i \leq k}$, either $P_* = P_k \wedge (\vec{P}, \vec{p})$ is a partial level ≤ 1 tower of discontinuous type or $(\vec{P}, \vec{p}) \frown (P_*)$ is a partial level ≤ 1 tower of continuous type. If $(P_*, (p_i)_{i \leq k})$ is a potential partial level ≤ 1 tower of discontinuous type, its *completion* is the completion of (P_*, p_k) .

Clearly, a potential partial level ≤ 1 tower (P_*, \vec{p}) is of continuous type iff $\text{card}(P_*) = \text{lh}(\vec{p})$, of discontinuous type iff $\text{card}(P_*) = \text{lh}(\vec{p}) - 1$.

A *tree of level-1 trees* is a tree T on $\omega^{<\omega}$ (i.e., $T \subseteq (\omega^{<\omega})^{<\omega}$ and closed under \subseteq) and such that for any $s \in T$, $\{a \in \omega^{<\omega} : s \frown (a) \in T\}$ is a level-1 tree.

A *level-2 tree of uniform cofinalities*, or *level-2 tree*, is a function Q such that $\text{dom}(Q)$ is a tree of level-1 trees, $\emptyset \in \text{dom}(Q)$ and for any $q \in \text{dom}(Q)$, $(Q(q \upharpoonright l))_{l \leq \text{lh}(q)}$ is a partial level ≤ 1 tower of discontinuous type. In particular, $Q(\emptyset) = (\emptyset, (0))$.

We denote $Q(q) = (Q_{\text{tree}}(q), Q_{\text{node}}(q))$ and $Q[q] = (Q_{\text{tree}}(q), (Q_{\text{node}}(q \upharpoonright l))_{l \leq \text{lh}(q)})$. So $Q[q]$ is a potential partial level ≤ 1 tower of discontinuous type. Denote $Q\{q\} = \{a \in \omega^{<\omega} : q \frown (a) \in \text{dom}(Q)\}$, which is a level-1 tree.

The *cardinality* of Q is $\text{card}(Q) = \text{card}(\text{dom}(Q))$. $\text{card}(Q)$ could be finite or \aleph_0 .

For Q a level-2 tree, Let

$$\text{dom}^*(Q) = \text{dom}(Q) \cup \{q^\frown(-1) : q \in \text{dom}(Q)\}.$$

Here -1 is a distinguished element which is $<_{BK}$ -smaller than any node in $\omega^{<\omega}$. So $<_{BK} \upharpoonright \text{dom}^*(Q)$ extends $<_{BK} \upharpoonright \text{dom}(Q)$ where $q^\frown(-1)$ comes before any $q^\frown(s) \in \text{dom}(Q)$. If $q \neq \emptyset$, denote $Q\{q, -\} = \{q^\frown(-1)\} \cup \{q^\frown(a) : Q_{\text{tree}}(q^\frown(a)) = Q_{\text{tree}}(q) \wedge a <_{BK} q(\text{lh}(q) - 1)\}$, $Q\{q, +\} = \{q^\frown\} \cup \{q^\frown(a) : Q_{\text{tree}}(q^\frown(a)) = Q_{\text{tree}}(q) \wedge a >_{BK} q(\text{lh}(q) - 1)\}$. For $q \in \text{dom}^*(Q)$, q is of *discontinuous type* if $q \in \text{dom}(Q)$; q is of *continuous type* if $q \in \text{dom}^*(Q) \setminus \text{dom}(Q)$. In particular, $\{\emptyset, (-1)\} \subseteq \text{dom}^*(Q)$. Put $Q[q^\frown(-1)] = (P, (Q_{\text{node}}(q \upharpoonright l))_{l \leq \text{lh}(q)})$, where P is the completion of $Q(q)$. So $Q[q^\frown(-1)]$ is a potential partial level ≤ 1 tower of continuous type.

Definition 3.9. Suppose Q is a level-2 tree. A Q -description is a triple

$$\mathbf{q} = (q, P, \vec{p})$$

such that $q \in \text{dom}^*(Q)$ and $(P, \vec{p}) = Q[q]$. $\text{desc}(Q)$ is the set of Q -descriptions. A Q -description (q, P, \vec{p}) is of (dis-)continuous type iff q is of (dis-)continuous type. The constant Q -description is $(\emptyset, \emptyset, (0))$.

Definition 3.10. Suppose Q is a level ≤ 2 tree. An extended Q -description is either a Q -description or of the form $(2, (q, P, \vec{p}))$ such that $(2, (q^\frown(-1), P, \vec{p}))$ is a Q -description of continuous type. $\text{desc}^*(Q)$ is the set of extended Q -descriptions. $(d, \mathbf{q}) \in \text{desc}^*(Q)$ is regular iff either $(d, \mathbf{q}) \in \text{desc}(Q)$ of discontinuous type or $(d, \mathbf{q}) \notin \text{desc}(Q)$.

If $\mathbf{q} = (q, P, \vec{p}) \in \text{desc}(Q)$ is of discontinuous type, put $\mathbf{q}^\frown(-1) = (q^\frown(-1), P^+, \vec{p})$ where P^+ is the completion of (P, \vec{p}) . If $\vec{\alpha} = (\alpha_p)_{p \in N}$ is a tuple indexed by N , $q \in \text{dom}^*(Q)$, $\text{dom}(Q(q^-)) \subseteq N$ if $q \neq \emptyset$, we put

$$\vec{\alpha} \oplus_Q q = (\alpha_{p_0}, q(0), \dots, \alpha_{p_{\text{lh}(q)-1}}, q(\text{lh}(q) - 1)),$$

where $p_i = Q_{\text{node}}(q \upharpoonright i)$.

The ordinal representation of Q is the set

$$\begin{aligned} \text{rep}(Q) = & \{\vec{\alpha} \oplus_Q q : q \in \text{dom}(Q), \vec{\alpha} \text{ respects } Q_{\text{tree}}(q)\} \\ & \cup \{\vec{\alpha} \oplus_Q q^\frown(-1) : q \in \text{dom}(Q), \vec{\alpha} \text{ respects } Q(q)\}. \end{aligned}$$

$\text{rep}(Q)$ is endowed with the $<_{BK}$ ordering:

$$<^Q = <_{BK} \upharpoonright \text{rep}(Q).$$

Thus, the $<^Q$ -greatest element is $\emptyset = \emptyset \oplus_Q \emptyset$, and the set $\{(\beta, -1) : \beta < \omega_1\}$ is $<^Q$ -cofinal below \emptyset . In general, if $q \in \text{dom}(Q)$ and $\vec{\alpha}$ respects $Q_{\text{tree}}(q)$ and every entry of $\vec{\alpha}$ is additively closed, then $\vec{\alpha} \oplus_Q q$ is the $<^Q$ -sup of $\vec{\alpha} \frown (\beta) \oplus q \frown (-1) \in \text{rep}(Q)$. The fact that (0) is the $<_{BK}$ -maximum node of a nonempty regular level-1 tree implies that if $(q, P) \in \text{desc}(Q)$, $q \neq \emptyset$, $(\alpha_p)_{p \in P}$ respects P , then $\alpha_{(0)}$ is bigger than α_p for any $p \in P \setminus \{(0)\}$. Hence, when Q is finite, $<^Q$ has order type $\omega_1 + 1$. If $B \in \mathbb{L}$ is a subset of ω_1 , we put

$$f \in B^{Q\uparrow}$$

iff $f \in \mathbb{L}$ is an order preserving, continuous function from $\text{rep}(Q)$ to $B \cup \{\omega_1\}$. If $f \in B^{Q\uparrow}$, for each $q \in \text{dom}(Q)$, letting $P_q = Q_{\text{tree}}(q)$, f_q is the function on $[\omega_1]^{P_q\uparrow}$ that sends $\vec{\alpha}$ to $f(\vec{\alpha} \oplus_Q q)$, and

$$[f]^Q = ([f]_q^Q)_{q \in \text{dom}(Q)}$$

where $[f]_q^Q = [f_q]_{\mu^{P_q}}$.

A *level ≤ 2 tree* is a pair $Q = ({}^1Q, {}^2Q)$ such that dQ is a level- d tree for $d \in \{1, 2\}$. Its *cardinality* is $\text{card}(Q) = \sum_d \text{card}({}^dQ)$. We follow the convention that dQ always stands for the level- d component of a level ≤ 2 tree Q . Q is a *level ≤ 2 subtree* of Q' iff dQ is a level- d subtree of ${}^dQ'$ for $d \in \{1, 2\}$. $\text{rep}(Q) = \bigcup_d (\{d\} \times \text{rep}({}^dQ))$. $<^Q = <_{BK} \upharpoonright \text{rep}(Q)$. So $<^Q$ is essentially the concatenation of $<^{{}^1Q}$ and $<^{{}^2Q}$. $\text{dom}(Q) = \bigcup_d (\{d\} \times \text{dom}({}^dQ))$, $\text{dom}^*(Q) = \bigcup_d (\{d\} \times \text{dom}^*({}^dQ))$, where $\text{dom}^*({}^1Q) = \text{dom}({}^1Q) = {}^1Q$. $\text{desc}(Q) = \bigcup_d (\{d\} \times \text{desc}({}^dQ))$ is the set of Q -descriptions. $(d, \mathbf{q}) \in \text{desc}(Q)$ is *of continuous type* iff $d = 2$ and \mathbf{q} is of continuous type; otherwise, (d, \mathbf{q}) is *of discontinuous type*. Q is Π_2^1 -wellfounded iff 1Q is Π_1^1 -wellfounded and 2Q is Π_2^1 -wellfounded. By virtue of the Brouwer-Kleene ordering, the next proposition is a corollary of Theorem 3.4.

Proposition 3.11. *Let Q be a level ≤ 2 tree. Then Q is Π_2^1 -wellfounded iff $<^Q$ is a wellordering on $\text{rep}(Q)$.*

As a corollary, if Q is Π_2^1 -wellfounded, then $\text{o.t.}(<^Q) = \omega_1 + 1$.

If f is a function on $\text{rep}(Q)$, let df be the function on $\text{rep}({}^dQ)$ that sends v to $f(d, v)$. If $B \in \mathbb{L}$ is a subset of ω_1 , we put

$$f \in B^{Q\uparrow}$$

iff $f \in \mathbb{L}$ is an order preserving, continuous function on $\text{rep}(Q)$, and ${}^df \in B^{dQ\uparrow}$ for $d \in \{1, 2\}$. f represents a $\text{card}(Q)$ -tuple of ordinals

$$[f]^Q = ({}^d[f]_q^Q)_{(d, q) \in \text{dom}(Q)}$$

where ${}^d[f]_q^Q = [{}^df]_q^{dQ}$. In particular, we must have ${}^2[f]_\emptyset^Q = \omega_1$. Let

$$[B]^{Q\uparrow} = \{[f]^Q : f \in B^{Q\uparrow}\}.$$

Suppose $(2, \mathbf{q}) = (2, (q, P, \vec{p})) \in \text{desc}^*(Q)$. If $f \in \omega_1^{Q\uparrow}$, ${}^2f_{\mathbf{q}}$ is the function on $[\omega_1]^{P\uparrow}$ defined as follows: ${}^2f_{\mathbf{q}} = {}^2f_q$ if $(2, \mathbf{q}) \in \text{desc}(Q)$; ${}^2f_{\mathbf{q}}(\vec{\alpha}) = {}^2f_q(\vec{\alpha} \upharpoonright {}^2Q_{\text{tree}}(q))$ if $(2, \mathbf{q}) \notin \text{desc}(Q)$. If $\vec{\beta} = ({}^d\beta_q)_{(d,q) \in \text{dom}(Q)} \in [\omega_1]^{Q\uparrow}$, we define ${}^d\beta_{\mathbf{q}}$ for $(d, \mathbf{q}) \in \text{desc}^*(Q)$: if $d = 2$, $\mathbf{q} = (q, P, \vec{p})$, put ${}^d\beta_{\mathbf{q}} = [{}^df_{\mathbf{q}}]_{\mu^P}$ where $\vec{\beta} = [f]^Q$. Clearly, ${}^2\beta_{\mathbf{q}} = {}^2\beta_q$ if $(2, \mathbf{q}) \in \text{desc}(Q)$ of discontinuous type, ${}^2\beta_{\mathbf{q}} = j^{2Q_{\text{tree}}(q), P}({}^2\beta_q)$ if $(2, \mathbf{q}) \notin \text{desc}(Q)$. The next lemma computes the remaining case when $\mathbf{q} \in \text{desc}(Q)$ is of continuous type, justifying that ${}^d\beta_{\mathbf{q}}$ does not depend on the choice of f .

Lemma 3.12. *Suppose Q is a level ≤ 2 tree. Suppose $\vec{\beta} = ({}^d\beta_q)_{(d,q) \in \text{dom}(Q)} \in [\omega_1]^{Q\uparrow}$, $(2, \mathbf{q}) = (2, (q, P, \vec{p})) \in \text{desc}(Q)$ is of continuous type, $P^- = Q_{\text{tree}}(q^-)$, then ${}^2\beta_{\mathbf{q}} = j_{\text{sup}}^{P^-, P}({}^2\beta_{q^-})$.*

Proof. Let $\vec{\beta} = [f]^Q$, $f \in [\omega_1]^{Q\uparrow}$. Let $v = p_{\text{lh}(q)-1}$. So P is the completion of $Q(q^-) = (P^-, v)$.

Suppose $\gamma = [g]_{\mu^{P^-}} < {}^2\beta_{q^-}$, $g \in \mathbb{L}$. So for μ^{P^-} -a.e. $\vec{\alpha}$, $g(\vec{\alpha}) < {}^2f_{q^-}(\vec{\alpha}) = \sup_{\xi < \alpha_{v^-}} {}^2f_q(\vec{\alpha} \frown (\xi))$, where $\vec{\alpha} \frown (\xi)$ is the extension of $\vec{\alpha}$ whose entry indexed by v is ξ . Let $h(\vec{\alpha})$ be the least $\xi < \alpha_{v^-}$ such that $g(\vec{\alpha}) < {}^2f_q(\vec{\alpha} \frown (\xi))$. Then $h \in \mathbb{L}$. By remarkability of level-1 sharps, we get $C \in \mu_{\mathbb{L}}$ such that for any $\vec{\alpha} \in [C]^{P\uparrow}$, $h(\vec{\alpha} \upharpoonright \text{dom}(P^-)) < \alpha_v$. Hence for any $\vec{\alpha} \in [C]^{P\uparrow}$, $g(\vec{\alpha} \upharpoonright \text{dom}(P^-)) < {}^2f_q(\vec{\alpha})$. Hence $j^{P^-, P}(\gamma) < {}^2\beta_q$.

Suppose on the other hand $\gamma = [g]_{\mu^P} < {}^2\beta_{\mathbf{q}}$. Then for μ^P -a.e. $\vec{\alpha}$, $g(\vec{\alpha}) < {}^2f_q(\vec{\alpha}) = \sup_{\xi < \alpha_v} {}^2f_q(\vec{\alpha} \upharpoonright \text{dom}(P^-) \frown (\xi))$. Let $h(\vec{\alpha})$ be the least $\xi < \alpha_v$ such that $g(\vec{\alpha}) < {}^2f_q(\vec{\alpha} \upharpoonright \text{dom}(P^-) \frown (\xi))$. By remarkability, we get $C \in \mu_{\mathbb{L}}$ and $h' \in \mathbb{L}$ such that for any $\vec{\alpha} \in [C]^{P\uparrow}$, $h(\vec{\alpha}) = h'(\vec{\alpha} \upharpoonright \{p : p \prec^P v\})$. Hence, $g(\vec{\alpha}) < {}^2f_q(\alpha \upharpoonright \text{dom}(P^-) \frown h'(\vec{\alpha} \upharpoonright \{p : p \prec^P v\})) = j^{P^-, P}(\eta)$, where $\eta = [\vec{\alpha} \mapsto {}^2f_q(\vec{\alpha} \frown h'(\vec{\alpha} \upharpoonright \{p : p \prec^{P^-} v^-\}))]_{\mu^{P^-}}$. Clearly, $\eta < {}^2\beta_{q^-}$. So $\gamma < j_{\text{sup}}^{P^-, P}({}^2\beta_{q^-})$. \square

For a level ≤ 2 tree, The properties of a tuple $[f]^Q$ for $f \in \omega_1^{Q\uparrow}$ are analyzed in [14, 24]. We restate the key results in the effective context. A tuple $\vec{\beta}$ *respects* Q iff $\vec{\beta} = [f]^Q$ for some $f \in \omega_1^{Q\uparrow}$; $\vec{\beta}$ *weakly respects* Q iff $\beta_\emptyset = \omega_1$ and for any $q \in \text{dom}(Q) \setminus \{\emptyset\}$, $\beta_q < j^{Q_{\text{tree}}(q^-), Q_{\text{tree}}(q)}(\beta_{q^-})$. We will need an Δ_3^1 definition of respectivity and weak respectivity. Weak respectability is clearly Δ_3^1 from its definition. It is essentially shown in [24] that respectability is also Δ_3^1 . We restate the relevant definitions in a more applicable fashion.

The next few lemmas are essentially part of effectivized Kunen's analysis [24] of tuples of ordinals in u_ω . The proofs are rather routine.

Suppose E is a club in ω_1 . For a partial level ≤ 1 tree (P, t) , put $\vec{\alpha} = (\alpha_p)_{p \in P \cup \{t\}} \in [E]^{(P, t)^\uparrow}$ iff $\vec{\alpha}$ respects (P, t) , $(\alpha_p)_{p \in P} \in [E]^{P^\uparrow}$, and $t \neq -1 \rightarrow \alpha_t \in E$. For a level ≤ 2 tree Q , put

$$\begin{aligned} \text{rep}({}^2Q) \restriction E = & \{ \vec{\alpha} \oplus_{{}^2Q} q : q \in \text{dom}({}^2Q), \vec{\alpha} \in [E]^{2Q_{\text{tree}(q)}^\uparrow} \} \\ & \cup \{ \vec{\alpha} \oplus_{{}^2Q} q^\frown(-1) : q \in \text{dom}({}^2Q), \vec{\alpha} \in [E]^{2Q(q)^\uparrow} \}. \end{aligned}$$

Put $\text{rep}(Q) \restriction E = (\{1\} \times \text{rep}({}^1Q)) \cup (\{2\} \times \text{rep}({}^2Q) \restriction E)$. Then $\text{rep}(Q) \restriction E$ is a closed subset of $\text{rep}(Q)$ (in the order topology of $<^Q$).

Lemma 3.13. *Suppose Q is a finite level ≤ 2 tree, $C \in \mu_{\mathbb{L}}$ is a club. Then $\vec{\beta} \in [C]^{Q^\uparrow}$ iff there exist $f \in \omega_1^{Q^\uparrow}$ and $E \in \mu_{\mathbb{L}}$ such that $\vec{\beta} = [f]^Q$ and for any $q \in {}^1Q$, ${}^1f(q)$ is a limit point of C ; for any $q \in \text{dom}({}^2Q)$, for any $\vec{\alpha} \in [E]^{2Q_{\text{tree}(q)}^\uparrow}$, ${}^2f_q(\vec{\alpha})$ is a limit point of C .*

Proof. The nontrivial direction is \Leftarrow . Suppose $f \in \omega_1^{Q^\uparrow}$ and $E \in \mu_{\mathbb{L}}$ are as given. For $q \in \text{dom}({}^2Q) \setminus \{\emptyset\}$, let ${}^2Q(q) = (P_q, p_q)$, and let q^* be the $<_{BK}$ -maximum of ${}^2Q\{q, -\}$.

Claim 3.14. *There is $E' \in \mu_{\mathbb{L}}$ such that $E' \subseteq E$ and for any $q \in \text{dom}({}^2Q) \setminus \{\emptyset\}$, for any $\vec{\alpha} \in [E']^{P_q^\uparrow}$, if $p_q \neq -1$ then $C \cap ({}^2f_{q^*}(\vec{\alpha}), {}^2f_q(\vec{\alpha}))$ has order type $\alpha_{p_q^-}$.*

Proof of Claim 3.14. Otherwise, there is $q \in \text{dom}({}^2Q) \setminus \{\emptyset\}$ such that $p_q \neq -1$ and for μ^{P_q} -a.e. $\vec{\alpha}$, $C \cap ({}^2f_{q^*}(\vec{\alpha}), {}^2f_q(\vec{\alpha}))$ has order type smaller than $\alpha_{p_q^-}$. However, by assumption, $C \cap ({}^2f_{q^*}(\vec{\alpha}), {}^2f_q(\vec{\alpha}))$ is cofinal in ${}^2f_q(\vec{\alpha})$, and ${}^2f_{q^\frown(-1)}$ witnesses that 2f_q has uniform cofinality p_q^- . This leads to a function $h \in \mathbb{L}$ where for μ^{P_q} -a.e. $\vec{\alpha}$, $h(\vec{\alpha})$ is a cofinal sequence in $\alpha_{p_q^-}$ of order type $< \alpha_{p_q^-}$. Hence, $\text{cf}^{\mathbb{L}}(\text{seed}_{p_q^-}^{P_q}) < \text{seed}_{p_q^-}^{P_q}$ by Łoś, which is absurd. \square

Fix E' as in Claim 3.14. We are able to define $f' : \text{rep}(Q) \restriction E' \rightarrow C$ such that $f(1, q) = f'(1, q)$ for $q \in {}^1Q$, $f(2, \vec{\alpha} \oplus_{{}^2Q} q) = f'(2, \vec{\alpha} \oplus_{{}^2Q} q)$ for $q \in \text{dom}({}^2Q) \setminus \{\emptyset\}$, $\vec{\alpha} \in [E']^{P_q^\uparrow}$. Let $\theta : \text{rep}(Q) \rightarrow \text{rep}(Q) \restriction E'$ be an order preserving bijection. Let $E'' \in \mu_{\mathbb{L}}$ where $\eta \in E''$ iff $E' \cap \eta$ has order type η . It is easy to see that $\theta \restriction (\text{rep}(Q) \restriction E'')$ is the identity map. Define $g = f' \circ \theta$. Then $g \in C^{Q^\uparrow}$ and $[g]^Q = [f]^Q$. \square

Lemma 3.15. *Suppose Q is a finite level ≤ 2 tree, ${}^2Q(q) = (P_q, p_q)$ for $q \in \text{dom}(Q)$, $E \in \mu_{\mathbb{L}}$ is a club. Suppose $f : \text{rep}(Q) \restriction E \rightarrow \omega_1 + 1$ satisfies*

1. $f \restriction (\{1\} \times \text{rep}({}^1Q))$ is continuous, order preserving;

2. if $q \in \text{dom}({}^2Q)$, then the potential partial level ≤ 1 tower induced by 2f_q is ${}^2Q[q]$, the approximation sequence of 2f_q is $({}^2f_{q\bar{i}})_{i \leq \text{lh}(q)}$, and the uniform cofinality of 2f_q on $[E]^{P_q\uparrow}$ is witnessed by ${}^2f_{q\bar{(-1)}}$, i.e., if $\vec{\alpha} \in [E]^{P_q\uparrow}$, then ${}^2f_q(\vec{\alpha}) = \sup\{{}^2f_{q\bar{(-1)}}(\vec{\alpha} \smallfrown (\beta)) : \vec{\alpha} \smallfrown (\beta) \in \text{rep}({}^2Q) \upharpoonright E\}$, and the map $\vec{\beta} \mapsto {}^2f_{q\bar{(-1)}}(\vec{\alpha} \smallfrown (\beta))$ is continuous, order preserving;

3. if $a, b \in {}^2Q\{q\}$ and $a <_{BK} b$, then $[f_{q\bar{(-1)}}]_{\mu^{P_{q\bar{(-1)}}(a)}} < [f_{q\bar{(-1)}}]_{\mu^{P_{q\bar{(-1)}}(b)}}$.

Then there is $E' \in \mu_{\mathbb{L}}$ such that $E' \subseteq E$ and $f \upharpoonright (\text{rep}(Q) \upharpoonright E')$ is order preserving.

Proof. We know by assumption that for μ^{P_q} -a.e. $\vec{\alpha}$, $f_q(\vec{\alpha}) = \sup\{f_{q\bar{(-1)}}(\vec{\alpha} \smallfrown (\beta)) : \beta < \alpha_{p_q^-}\}$. Fix for the moment q such that $p_q \neq -1$. For $\vec{\alpha} = (\alpha_p)_{p \in P_q}$, put $\vec{\alpha}^- = (\alpha_p)_{p <_{BK} p_k^-}$. By remarkability of (level-1) sharps, there is a function $h \in \mathbb{L}$ and $E'_q \in \mu_{\mathbb{L}}$ such that for any $\vec{\alpha} \in [E'_q]^{P_q\uparrow}$, $h(\vec{\alpha}^-) < \alpha_{p_q^-}$ and for any $\beta \in \alpha_{p_q^-} \cap E'_q$, for any $a, b \in {}^2Q\{q\}$, $f_{q\bar{(-1)}}(\vec{\alpha} \smallfrown (\beta)) < f_{q\bar{(-1)}}(\vec{\alpha} \smallfrown (h(\vec{\alpha}^-)))$. Let $\eta \in E'_q$ iff for any $\vec{\alpha} \in [E'_q]^{P_q\uparrow}$, if $\forall p <_{BK} p_k^- \alpha_p < \eta$ then $h(\vec{\alpha}^-) < \eta$. Finally, let $E'' = \bigcap \{E'_q : p_q \neq -1\}$. E'' works for the lemma. \square

Lemma 3.16. Suppose that Q is a finite level ≤ 2 tree and $\vec{\beta} = ({}^d\beta_q)_{(d,q) \in \text{dom}(Q)}$ is a tuple of ordinals in u_ω . Then $\vec{\beta}$ respects Q iff all of the following holds:

1. $({}^1\beta_q)_{q \in {}^1Q}$ respects 1Q .
2. For any $q \in \text{dom}({}^2Q)$, the potential partial level ≤ 1 tower induced by ${}^2\beta_q$ is $Q[q]$, and the approximation sequence of ${}^2\beta_q$ is $({}^2\beta_{q\bar{i}})_{i \leq \text{lh}(q)}$.
3. If $a, b \in {}^2Q\{q\}$ and $a <_{BK} b$ then ${}^2\beta_{q\bar{(-1)}}(a) < {}^2\beta_{q\bar{(-1)}}(b)$.

Moreover, if $C \in \mu_{\mathbb{L}}$ is a club, then $\vec{\beta} \in [C]^{Q\uparrow}$ iff $\vec{\beta}$ respects Q and letting C' be the set of limit points of C , then ${}^1\beta_q \in C'$ for $q \in {}^1Q$, ${}^2\beta_q \in j^{2Q_{\text{tree}(q)}}(C')$ for $q \in \text{dom}({}^2Q)$.

Lemma 3.17. The relation “ Q is a finite level ≤ 2 tree $\wedge \vec{\beta}$ respects Q ” is Δ_3^1 .

Lemma 3.18. Suppose Q and Q' are level ≤ 2 trees with the same domain. Suppose $\vec{\beta}$ respects both Q and Q' . Then $Q = Q'$.

If $y \in [\text{dom}(Q)]$, let $Q(y) =_{\text{DEF}} \bigcup_{n < \omega} Q_{\text{tree}}(y \upharpoonright n)$ be an infinite level-1 tree. Q is Π_2^1 -wellfounded iff

1. $\forall q \in \text{dom}(Q) \ Q\{q\}$ is Π_1^1 -wellfounded,

2. $\forall y \in [\text{dom}(Q)]$ $Q(y)$ is not Π_1^1 -wellfounded.

In particular, finite level-2 trees are Π_2^1 -wellfounded. Π_2^1 -wellfoundedness of a level-2 tree is a Π_2^1 property in the real coding the tree.

A level-2 tree Q is called a *subtree* of Q' iff Q is a subfunction of Q' . A *finite level-2 tower* is a (possibly empty) sequence $(Q_i)_{1 \leq i \leq n}$ such that Q_i is a level-2 tree for $1 \leq i \leq n$, $\text{card}(Q_i) = i$ and $i < j \rightarrow Q_i$ is a subtree of Q_j . An *infinite level-2 tower* is a sequence $\vec{Q} = (Q_n)_{1 \leq n < \omega}$ such that for each n , $(Q_i)_{1 \leq i \leq n}$ is a finite level-2 tower. A *level-2 system* is $(Q_s)_{s \in \omega < \omega}$ such that for each s , $(Q_{s \upharpoonright i})_{1 \leq i < \text{lh}(s)}$ is a finite level-2 tower. Associated to a Π_2^1 set A we can assign a level-2 system $(Q_s)_{s \in \omega < \omega}$ so that $x \in A$ iff the level-2 tower $Q_x =_{\text{DEF}} (Q_{x \upharpoonright n})_{n < \omega}$ is Π_2^1 -wellfounded. If A is lightface Π_2^1 , then $(Q_s)_{s \in \omega < \omega}$ can be picked effective.

In our language, the level-2 tree S_2 , originally defined in [14, Section 2], takes the following form.

Definition 3.19. Assume Π_1^1 -determinacy.

1. S_2^- is the tree on $V_\omega \times u_\omega$ such that $(\emptyset, \emptyset) \in S_2^-$ and a nonempty node

$$(\emptyset, \emptyset) \neq (\vec{Q}, \vec{\alpha}) = ((Q_i)_{1 \leq i \leq n}, (\alpha_i)_{1 \leq i \leq n}) \in S_2^-$$

iff \vec{Q} is a finite level-2 tower, and putting $Q_0 = \emptyset$, $q_i \in \text{dom}(Q_{i+1}) \setminus \text{dom}(Q_i)$, $\beta_{q_i} = \alpha_i$, then $(\beta_q)_{q \in \text{dom}(Q_n)}$ respects Q_n .

2. S_2 is the tree on $V_\omega \times u_\omega$ such that $(\emptyset, \emptyset) \in S_2^-$ and a nonempty node

$$(\emptyset, \emptyset) \neq (\vec{Q}, \vec{\alpha}) = ((Q_i)_{1 \leq i \leq n}, (\alpha_i)_{1 \leq i \leq n}) \in S_2^-$$

iff \vec{Q} is a finite level-2 tower, and putting $Q_0 = \emptyset$, $q_i \in \text{dom}(Q_{i+1}) \setminus \text{dom}(Q_i)$, $\beta_{q_i} = \alpha_i$, then $(\beta_q)_{q \in \text{dom}(Q_n)}$ weakly respects Q_n .

By Theorem 3.4,

$$p[S_2^-] = p[S_2] = \{\vec{Q} : \bigcup \vec{Q} \text{ is } \Pi_2^1\text{-wellfounded}\}.$$

The (non-regular) u_ω -scale associated to S_2 is Δ_3^1 (cf. [14]).

4 More on the level-2 analysis

4.1 Homogeneity properties of S_2

By [15, Lemma 14.2], $\mathbb{L}_{\delta_3^1}[T_2]$ is admissibly closed. We shall define a system of $\mathbb{L}_{\delta_3^1}[T_2]$ -measures on finite tuples in u_ω . This system of $\mathbb{L}_{\delta_3^1}[T_2]$ -measures will

witness S_2 being $\mathbb{L}_{\delta_3^1}[T_2]$ -homogeneous. Under AD, these $\mathbb{L}_{\delta_3^1}[T_2]$ -measures are total measures induced from the strong partition property on ω_1 (cf. [14]). These measures enable the Martin-Solovay tree construction of S_3 projecting to the universal Π_3^1 set, to be redefined in Section 4.2. In our situation, we must recast the effective version of the proof of the strong partition property on ω_1 . Only subsets of ω_1 in \mathbb{L} will be colored, and the coloring must be guided by a level-2 tree Q and a subset A of $[\omega_1]^{Q^\uparrow}$ which lies in $\mathbb{L}_{\delta_3^1}[T_2]$.

Definition 4.1. ω_1 has the level-2 strong partition property iff for every finite level ≤ 2 tree Q , for every $A \in \mathbb{L}_{\delta_3^1}[T_2]$, there is a club $C \subseteq \omega_1$, $C \in \mathbb{L}$ such that either $[C]^{Q^\uparrow} \subseteq A$ or $[C]^{Q^\uparrow} \cap A = \emptyset$.

Martin's proof of the strong partition property on ω_1 under AD carries over in a trivial way. For the reader's convenience, we include a proof.

Theorem 4.2 (Martin). Assume Δ_2^1 -determinacy. Then ω_1 has the level-2 strong partition property.

Proof. We imitate the proof in [8, Theorem 28.12], which builds on partially iterable sharps.

For $x \in \mathbb{R}$, A putative x -sharp is a remarkable EM blueprint over x . Suppose x^* is a putative x -sharp. For any ordinal α , $\mathcal{M}_{x^*,\alpha}$ is the EM model built from x^* and indiscernibles of order type α . The wellfounded part of $\mathcal{M}_{x^*,\alpha}$ is transitive. For any limit ordinal $\alpha < \beta$, $\mathcal{M}_{x^*,\alpha}$ is a rank initial segment of $\mathcal{M}_{x^*,\beta}$. Say that x^* is α -wellfounded iff $\alpha \in \text{wfp}(\mathcal{M}_{x^*,\alpha})$. A putative sharp code for an increasing function is $w = \langle \ulcorner \tau \urcorner, x^* \rangle$ such that x^* is a putative x -sharp, τ is a $\{\underline{\in}, \underline{x}\}$ -unary Skolem term for an ordinal and

$$“\forall v, v'((v, v' \in \text{Ord} \wedge v < v') \rightarrow (\tau(v) \in \text{Ord} \wedge \tau(v) < \tau(v')))”$$

is a true formula in x^* . The statement “ $\langle \ulcorner \tau \urcorner, x^* \rangle$ is a putative sharp code for an increasing function, x^* is α -wellfounded, r codes the order type of $\tau^{\mathcal{M}_{x^*,\alpha}}(\alpha)$ ” about $(\langle \ulcorner \tau \urcorner, x^* \rangle, r)$ is Σ_1^1 in the code of α . In addition, when $x^* = x^\#$, $\langle \ulcorner \tau \urcorner, x^* \rangle$ is called a (true) sharp code for an increasing function. The statement “ M is a putative v -sharp for some $v \in \mathbb{R}$, $\alpha \in \text{wfp}(M_\infty)$, r codes the order type of $\tau^{M_\infty}(\alpha)$ ” is a Σ_1^1 statement about (M, r) in the code of α .

To simplify matters, we shall ignore the level-1 component of Q and assume that Q is a finite level-2 tree. Let $A \in \mathbb{L}_{\delta_3^1}[T_2]$. A is Δ_3^1 by Theorem 2.1. Let $B, C \subseteq \mathbb{R}^2$ be Σ_2^1 such that

$$\begin{aligned} w \text{ codes } (w_q)_{q \in \text{dom}(Q)} \in (\text{WO}_\omega)^{\text{dom}(Q)} \wedge (|w_q|)_{q \in \text{dom}(Q)} \in A \\ \leftrightarrow \exists z(w, z) \in B \leftrightarrow \neg \exists z(w, z) \in C. \end{aligned}$$

We define the game

$$H^Q(B)$$

in which I produces $\langle \ulcorner \tau^\top, x^* \rangle$ and II produces $(\langle \ulcorner \sigma^\top, y^* \rangle, w, z)$. An infinite run $(\langle \ulcorner \tau^\top, x^* \rangle, \langle \ulcorner \sigma^\top, y^* \rangle, w, z)$ is won by Player II iff

1. If $\langle \ulcorner \tau^\top, x^* \rangle$ is a putative sharp code for an increasing function, then so is $\langle \ulcorner \sigma^\top, y^* \rangle$. Moreover, for any $\eta < \omega_1$, if

$$x^* \text{ is } \eta\text{-wellfounded} \wedge \tau^{\mathcal{M}_{x^*, \eta}}(\eta) \in \text{wfp}(\mathcal{M}_{x^*, \eta})$$

then

$$y^* \text{ is } \eta\text{-wellfounded} \wedge \sigma^{\mathcal{M}_{y^*, \eta}}(\eta) \in \text{wfp}(\mathcal{M}_{y^*, \eta}).$$

2. If $\langle \ulcorner \tau^\top, x^* \rangle, \langle \ulcorner \sigma^\top, y^* \rangle$ are true sharp codes for increasing functions, $x^* = x^\#$, $y^* = y^\#$, then w codes $(w_q)_{q \in \text{dom}(Q)} \in (\text{WO}_\omega)^{\text{dom}(Q)}$ and for $q \in \text{dom}(Q)$, letting g^q be defined by

$$g^q(\vec{\alpha}) = \sup_{\beta} \left(\begin{array}{l} \tau^{L[x]}(\theta_Q((\vec{\alpha} \frown \beta) \oplus (q \frown (-1)))) \\ \sigma^{L[y]}(\theta_Q((\vec{\alpha} \frown \beta) \oplus (q \frown (-1)))) \end{array} \right),$$

where the sup ranges over β such that $(\vec{\alpha} \frown \beta) \oplus (q \frown (-1)) \in \text{rep}(<^Q)$, θ_Q is an order preserving bijection from $\text{rep}(Q)$ to $\omega_1 + 1$, we have

$$\forall q \in \text{dom}(Q) [g^q]_{\mu_{Q_{\text{tree}}(q)}} = |w_q|.$$

and

$$(w, z) \in B.$$

Lemma 4.3. *If Player II has a winning strategy in $H^Q(B)$, then there is a club $X \subseteq \omega_1$ such that $X \in \mathbb{L}$ and $[X]^{Q^\uparrow} \subseteq A$.*

Proof. Let φ be a winning strategy for Player II in $H^Q(B)$. We define a club $X \subseteq \omega_1$ by the Σ_1^1 -boundedness argument. For $\eta < \omega_1$, let B_η be the set of $r \in \mathbb{R}$ such that there are $\langle \ulcorner \tau^\top, x^* \rangle, \langle \ulcorner \sigma^\top, y^* \rangle, w, z$ and an ordinal $\beta \leq \eta$ such that

1. $\langle \ulcorner \tau^\top, x^* \rangle$ is a putative sharp code for an increasing function,
2. $\langle \ulcorner \sigma^\top, y^* \rangle$ is a putative sharp code for an increasing function,
3. $\langle \ulcorner \tau^\top, x^* \rangle * \varphi = (\langle \ulcorner \sigma^\top, y^* \rangle, w, z)$,
4. $\beta \in \text{wfp}(\mathcal{M}_{x^*, \eta}) \wedge \tau^{M_{x^*, \eta}}(\beta) \in \text{wfp}(\mathcal{M}_{x^*, \eta}) \wedge \tau^{M_{x^*, \eta}}(\beta) \leq \eta$.
5. $\beta \in \text{wfp}(\mathcal{M}_{y^*, \eta}) \wedge \sigma^{M_{y^*, \eta}}(\beta)$ has order type coded in r .

B_η is a Σ_1^1 set in the code of η . Since φ is winning for II, $B_\eta \subseteq WO$. By Σ_1^1 -boundedness, if $X \subseteq \omega_1$ is the club consisting of φ -admissibles and limits of φ -admissibles, then for any $\xi \in X$, for any $\eta < \xi$ and $r \in B_\eta$, $\|r\| < \xi$.

We have to show that $[X]^{Q^\uparrow} \subseteq A$. That is, for any $f \in X^{Q^\uparrow} \cap \mathbb{L}$, $[f]^Q \in A$. Pick such an f . Let $x \in \mathbb{R}$ and τ be such that for any $\vec{\alpha} \oplus q \in \text{rep}(Q)$,

$$f(\vec{\alpha} \oplus q) = \tau^{L[x]}(\theta_Q(\vec{\alpha} \oplus q)).$$

Feed in $\langle \ulcorner \tau^\top, x^\# \rangle$ for Player I in $H^Q(A; n)$. The response according to φ is $\langle \langle \ulcorner \sigma^\top, y^\# \rangle, w, z \rangle * \varphi$. $\langle \ulcorner \sigma^\top, y^\# \rangle$ is a true sharp code for an increasing function. w codes $(w_q)_{q \in \text{dom}(Q)} \in (WO_\omega)^{\text{dom}(Q)}$. Let g^q be as in the definition of $H^Q(B)$. Thus, $[g^q]_{\mu^{Q_{\text{tree}}(q)}} = |w_q|$ and $(w, z) \in B$. Thus, $(|w_q|)_{q \in \text{dom}(Q)} \in A$. To finish the proof, we have to see that

$$[f_q]_{\mu^{Q_{\text{tree}}(q)}} = [g^q]_{\mu^{Q_{\text{tree}}(q)}}$$

for all $q \in \text{dom}(Q)$. It suffices to see that whenever $\vec{\alpha}$ respects $Q(q)$,

$$\sup_{\beta} f((\vec{\alpha} \frown \beta) \oplus (q^\frown(-1))) = \sup_{\beta} \left(\begin{array}{c} f((\vec{\alpha} \frown \beta) \oplus (q^\frown(-1))), \\ \sigma^{L[y]}(\theta_Q((\vec{\alpha} \frown \beta) \oplus (q^\frown(-1)))) \end{array} \right)$$

\leq is evident. To get \geq , by choice of X , for any β which is used in the supremum,

$$\sigma^{L[y]}(\theta_Q((\vec{\alpha} \frown \beta) \oplus (q^\frown(-1)))) < \min(X \setminus (f((\vec{\alpha} \frown \beta) \oplus (q^\frown(-1))) + 1)).$$

The right hand side of the above inequality is $\leq f((\vec{\alpha} \frown \beta + 1) \oplus (q^\frown(-1)))$, as f is $<^Q$ -order preserving into X . \square

Define the game $H^Q(C)$ in the same way. A symmetrical argument gives

Lemma 4.4. *If Player II has a winning strategy in $H^Q(C)$, then there is a club $X \subseteq \omega_1$ such that $X \in \mathbb{L}$ and $[X]^{Q^\uparrow} \cap A = \emptyset$.*

The games $H^Q(B)$ and $H^Q(C)$ are both $\mathfrak{D}(<\omega^2\text{-}\mathbf{\Pi}_1^1)$, hence determined. It remains to show that II must have a winning strategy in either $H^Q(B)$ or $H^Q(C)$. Suppose otherwise and I has a winning strategy φ_B in $H^Q(B)$ and φ_C in $H^Q(C)$. We apply the same boundedness argument as in the proof of Lemma 4.3. Let X be the set of countable (φ_B, φ_C) -admissibles and their limits. Let $f \in [X]^{Q^\uparrow}$. If $[f]^Q \in A$, pick $(w, z) \in B$ with w coding $(w_q)_{q \in \text{dom}(Q)}$ and $(|w_q|)_{q \in \text{dom}(Q)} = [f]^Q$. Then II defeats φ_B by playing $(\langle \sigma, \varphi_B^\# \rangle, w, z)$, where $\sigma^{L[\varphi_B]}(v)$ = the v -th φ_B -admissible ordinal. If $[f]^Q \notin A$, II can defeat φ_C by a symmetrical argument. This is a contradiction. \square

Definition 4.5. Let Q be a finite level ≤ 2 tree. We define

$$A \in \mu^Q$$

iff there is $C \in \mu_{\mathbb{L}}$ such that

$$[C]^{Q\uparrow} \subseteq A.$$

μ^Q is easily verified to be a countably complete filter concentrating on $[\omega_1]^{Q\uparrow}$. In particular, when $\text{card}(Q) = 1$, μ^Q is the principal measure concentrating on $\{(\omega_1)_{(2,\emptyset)}\}$. Noticing the facts that $\text{rep}(Q)$ has order type $\omega_1 + 1$, and that $[f]^Q$ depends only on $\{f(v) : \|v\|_{<Q} \text{ is a limit ordinal}\}$. Theorem 4.2 implies that

$$\mu^Q \text{ is an } \mathbb{L}_{\delta_3^1}[T_2]\text{-measure.}$$

Let $j^Q = j_{\mathbb{L}_{\delta_3^1}[T_2]}^{\mu^Q}$ be the restricted ultrapower map of μ^Q on $\mathbb{L}_{\delta_3^1}[T_2]$. Put $[f]_{\mu^Q} = [f]_{\mathbb{L}_{\delta_3^1}[T_2]}^{\mu^Q}$ for $f \in \mathbb{L}_{\delta_3^1}[T_2]$. Łoś' theorem reads: for any first order formula φ , for any $x \in \mathbb{R}$, for any $f_i \in \mathbb{L}_{\delta_3^1}[T_2]$, with $\text{ran}(f_i) \subseteq L_{\kappa_3^x}[T_2, x]$, $1 \leq i \leq n$,

$$j^Q(L_{\kappa_3^x}[T_2, x]) \models \varphi([f_1]_{\mu^Q}, \dots, [f_n]_{\mu^Q})$$

iff

$$\text{for } \mu^Q\text{-a.e. } \vec{\xi}, L_{\kappa_3^x}[T_2, x] \models \varphi(f_1(\vec{\xi}), \dots, f_n(\vec{\xi})).$$

If Q is a subtree of Q' , both finite, then $\mu^{Q'}$ projects to μ^Q via the map that sends $(\beta_q)_{(d,q) \in \text{dom}(Q')}$ to $(\beta_q)_{(d,q) \in \text{dom}(Q)}$. Let

$$j^{Q,Q'} : \text{Ult}(\mathbb{L}_{\delta_3^1}[T_2], \mu^Q) \rightarrow \text{Ult}(\mathbb{L}_{\delta_3^1}[T_2], \mu^{Q'})$$

be the induced factor map. If $\vec{Q} = (Q_n)_{n < \omega}$ is a level ≤ 2 tower, the associated $\mathbb{L}_{\delta_3^1}[T_2]$ -measure tower $(\mu^{Q_n})_{n < \omega}$ is easily seen close to $\mathbb{L}_{\delta_3^1}[T_2]$.

The homogeneity property of the Martin-Solovay tree on a $\mathbf{\Pi}_2^1$ set (cf. [14]) translates to our context:

Theorem 4.6. Assume Δ_2^1 -determinacy. Let $\vec{Q} = (Q_n)_{n < \omega}$ be an infinite level-2 tower. Let $Q_\omega = \cup_{n < \omega} Q_n$. The following are equivalent.

1. Q_ω is Π_2^1 -wellfounded.
2. $<^{Q_\omega}$ is a wellordering.
3. There is $\vec{\beta} = (\beta_t)_{t \in \text{dom}(Q_\omega)}$ which respects Q_ω .
4. $(\mu^{Q_n})_{n < \omega}$ is $\mathbb{L}_{\delta_3^1}[T_2]$ -countably complete.

5. The direct limit of $(j^{Q_m, Q_n})_{m < n < \omega}$ is wellfounded.

Proof. $1 \Leftrightarrow 2$: By Proposition 3.11.

$2 \Rightarrow 4$: Suppose $<^{Q_\omega}$ is a wellordering. Let $(A_n)_{n < \omega}$ be such that $A_n \in \mu^{Q_n} \cap \mathbb{L}_{\delta_3^1}[T_2]$. Let $x \in \mathbb{R}$ and $C \in L[x]$ be a club in ω_1 such that $[C]^{Q_n \uparrow} \subseteq A_n$ for all n . Let $f : \text{dom}(<^{Q_\omega}) \rightarrow C$ be given by

$$f(\vec{\alpha} \oplus_{Q_\omega} t) = \text{the } \|\vec{\alpha} \oplus_{Q_\omega} t\|_{<^{Q_\omega}}\text{-th element of } C.$$

Then $f \in L[x, Q_\omega]$ and is order preserving. Let $\beta_n = [f \upharpoonright \text{rep}(Q_n)]^{Q_n}$. Then for all n , $(\beta_1, \dots, \beta_n) \in A_n$.

$4 \Rightarrow 3$: This follows from the fact that μ^{Q_n} concentrates on tuples that respect Q_n .

$3 \Rightarrow 1$: If $x \in [\text{dom}(Q_\omega)]$, then $j^{Q_\omega(x \upharpoonright k), Q_\omega(x \upharpoonright l)}(\beta_{x \upharpoonright k}) > \beta_{x \upharpoonright l}$ for all $k < l < \omega$. This means the direct limit of $j^{Q_\omega(x \upharpoonright k), Q_\omega(x \upharpoonright l)}$ is illfounded. Hence $Q_\omega(x)$ is not Π_1^1 -wellfounded by Theorem 3.4.

$4 \Leftrightarrow 5$: By Proposition 2.15. \square

Definition 4.7. Q^0, Q^1, Q^{20}, Q^{21} denote the following typical level ≤ 2 trees of cardinalities at most 2:

- ${}^1Q^0 = \emptyset$, ${}^1Q^1 = \{(0)\}$, $\text{dom}({}^2Q^0) = \text{dom}({}^2Q^1) = \{\emptyset\}$.
- For $d \in \{0, 1\}$, ${}^1Q^{2d} = \emptyset$, $\text{dom}({}^2Q^{2d}) = \{\emptyset, ((0))\}$, ${}^2Q^{2d}((0))$ is of degree d .

μ^{Q^0} is a principle measure. μ^{Q^1} is essentially $\mu_{\mathbb{L}}$. $\mu^{Q^{20}}$ and $\mu^{Q^{21}}$ are essentially refinements of the $\mathbb{L}_{\delta_3^1}[T_2]$ -club filter on u_2 , the former concentrates on ordinals of $\mathbb{L}_{\delta_3^1}[T_2]$ -cofinality ω , the latter of $\mathbb{L}_{\delta_3^1}[T_2]$ -cofinality ω_1 .

4.2 The tree S_3

A *partial level ≤ 2 tree* is a pair $(Q, (d, q, P))$ such that Q is a finite level ≤ 2 tree, and one of the following holds:

1. $(d, q, P) = (0, -1, \emptyset)$, or
2. $d = 1$, $q \notin {}^1Q$, ${}^1Q \cup \{q\}$ is a level-1 tree, $P = \emptyset$, or
3. $d = 2$, $q \notin \text{dom}({}^2Q)$, $\text{dom}({}^2Q) \cup \{q\}$ is tree of level-1 trees, P is the completion of ${}^2Q(q^-)$. (In particular, ${}^2Q(q^-)$ must have degree 1.)

The *degree* of $(Q, (d, q, P))$ is d . We put $\text{dom}(Q, (d, q, P)) = \text{dom}(Q) \cup \{(d, q)\}$. The *cardinality* of $(Q, (d, q, P))$ is $\text{card}(Q, (d, q, P)) = \text{card}(Q) + 1$. The *uniform cofinality* of a partial level ≤ 2 tree $(Q, (d, q, P))$ is

$$\text{ucf}(Q, (d, q, P)),$$

defined as follows.

1. $\text{ucf}(Q, (d, q, P)) = (0, -1)$ if $d = 0$;
2. $\text{ucf}(Q, (d, q, P)) = (1, q^-)$ if $d = 1$, $\text{lh}(q) > 1$;
3. $\text{ucf}(Q, (d, q, P)) = (2, (\emptyset, \emptyset, (0)))$ if $d = 1$, $\text{lh}(q) = 1$;
4. $\text{ucf}(Q, (d, q, P)) = (2, (q', P, \vec{p}))$ if $d = 2$, ${}^2Q[q'] = (P, \vec{p})$, and q' is the $<_{BK}$ -least element of ${}^2Q\{q, +\}$, $q' \neq q^-$;
5. $\text{ucf}(Q, (d, q, P)) = (2, (q^-, P, \vec{p}))$ if $d = 2$, ${}^2Q[q^-] = (P^-, \vec{p})$, and ${}^2Q\{q, +\} = \{q^-\}$.

So $\text{ucf}(Q, (d, q, P))$ is either $(0, -1)$ or a regular extended Q -description. The *cofinality* of $(Q, (d, q, P))$ is

$$\text{cf}(Q, (d, q, P)) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } d = 0, \\ 1 & \text{if } d = 1 \text{ and } q = \min(<^1Q \cup \{q\}), \\ 2 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

A tuple $\vec{\beta} = ({}^e\beta_t)_{(e,t) \in \text{dom}(Q, (d, q, P))}$ *respects* $(Q, (d, q, P))$ iff $\vec{\beta} \upharpoonright \text{dom}(Q)$ respects Q and ${}^d\beta_q < \omega$ if $d = 0$, $\vec{\beta}$ respects a completion of $(Q, (d, q, P))$ otherwise. A partial level ≤ 2 tree of degree 0 has no completion. A *completion* of a partial level ≤ 2 tree $(Q, (d, q, P))$ of degree ≥ 1 is a level ≤ 2 tree Q^* such that $\text{dom}(Q^*) = \text{dom}(Q, (d, q, P))$, ${}^2Q^* \upharpoonright \text{dom}({}^2Q) = {}^2Q$, and either $d = 1$ or $d = 2 \wedge {}^2Q_{\text{tree}}(t) = P$. For a level ≤ 2 tree Q' , $(Q, (d, q, P))$ is a *partial subtree* of Q' iff a completion of $(Q, (d, q, P))$ is a subtree of Q' .

A *partial level ≤ 2 tower of discontinuous type* is a nonempty finite sequence $(Q_i, (d_i, q_i, P_i))_{1 \leq i \leq k}$ such that $\text{card}(Q_1) = 1$, each $(Q_i, (d_i, q_i, P_i))$ is a partial level ≤ 2 tree, and each Q_{i+1} is a completion of $(Q_i, (d_i, q_i, P_i))$. A *partial level ≤ 2 tower of continuous type* is $(Q_i, (d_i, q_i, P_i))_{1 \leq i < k} \frown (Q_*)$ such that either $k = 0 \wedge Q_*$ is the level ≤ 2 tree of cardinality 1 or $(Q_i, (d_i, q_i, P_i))_{1 \leq i < k}$ is a partial level ≤ 2 tower of discontinuous type $\wedge Q_*$ is a completion of $(Q_{k-1}, (d_{k-1}, q_{k-1}, P_{k-1}))$. For notational convenience, the information of a partial level ≤ 2 tower is compressed into a *potential partial level ≤ 2 tower*. A *potential partial level ≤ 2 tower* is $(Q_*, \overrightarrow{(d, q, P)}) = (Q_*, (d_i, q_i, P_i)_{1 \leq i \leq \text{lh}(\vec{q})})$

such that for some level ≤ 2 tower $\vec{Q} = (Q_i)_{1 \leq i \leq k}$, either $Q_* = Q_k \wedge (\vec{Q}, \overrightarrow{(d, q, P)})$ is a partial level ≤ 2 tower of discontinuous type or $(\vec{Q}, \overrightarrow{(d, q, P)}) \frown (Q_*)$ is a partial level ≤ 2 tower of continuous type.

Definition 4.8. A level-3 tree of uniform cofinality, or level-3 tree, is a function

$$R$$

such that $\emptyset \notin \text{dom}(R)$, $\text{dom}(R) \cup \{\emptyset\}$ is tree of level-1 trees and for any $r \in \text{dom}(R)$, $(R(r \restriction l))_{1 \leq l \leq \text{lh}(r)}$ is a partial level ≤ 2 tower of discontinuous type. If $R(r) = (Q_r, (d_r, q_r, P_r))$, we denote $R_{\text{tree}}(r) = Q_r$, $R_{\text{node}}(r) = (d_r, q_r)$, $R[r] = (Q_r, (d_{r \restriction l}, q_{r \restriction l}, P_{r \restriction l})_{1 \leq l \leq \text{lh}(r)})$. $R[r]$ is a potential partial level ≤ 2 tower of discontinuous type. If Q is a completion of $R(r)$, put $R[r, Q] = (Q, (d_{r \restriction l}, q_{r \restriction l}, P_{r \restriction l})_{1 \leq l \leq \text{lh}(r)})$, which is a potential partial level ≤ 2 tower of continuous type. For $r \in \text{dom}(R) \cup \{\emptyset\}$, put $R\{r\} = \{a \in \omega^{<\omega} : r \frown (a) \in \text{dom}(R)\}$, which is a level-1 tree.

The cardinality of R is $\text{card}(R) = \text{card}(\text{dom}(R))$. R is said to be regular iff $((1)) \notin \text{dom}(R)$. In other words, when $R \neq \emptyset$, $((0))$ is the $<_{BK}$ -maximum of $\text{dom}(R)$.

Suppose R is a level-3 tree. Let $\text{dom}^*(R) = \text{dom}(R) \cup \{r \frown (-1) : r \in \text{dom}(R)\}$. For $r \in \text{dom}(R)$, put $R\{r, -\} = \{r \frown (-1)\} \cup \{r \frown (a) : R_{\text{tree}}(r \frown (a)) = R_{\text{tree}}(r), a <_{BK} r(\text{lh}(r) - 1)\}$, $R\{r, -\} = \{r \frown (-1)\} \cup \{r \frown (a) : R_{\text{tree}}(r \frown (a)) = R_{\text{tree}}(r), a >_{BK} r(\text{lh}(r) - 1)\}$,

If $\vec{\beta} = ({}^d\beta_q)_{(d,q) \in N}$ is a tuple indexed by N , $r \in \text{dom}^*(R)$, $\text{lh}(r) = k$, either $k = 1$ or $\text{dom}(R(r^-)) \subseteq N$, we put

$$\vec{\beta} \oplus_R r = (r(0), {}^d\beta_{q_1}, r(1), \dots, {}^d\beta_{q_{k-1}}, r(k-1)),$$

where $(d_i, q_i) = R_{\text{node}}(r \restriction i)$. The ordinal representation of R is the set

$$\begin{aligned} \text{rep}(R) = & \{\vec{\beta} \oplus_R r : r \in \text{dom}(R), \vec{\beta} \text{ respects } R_{\text{tree}}(r)\} \\ & \cup \{\vec{\beta} \oplus_R r \frown (-1) : r \in \text{dom}(R), \vec{\beta} \text{ respects } R(r)\}. \end{aligned}$$

$\text{rep}(R)$ is endowed with the $<_{BK}$ ordering

$$<^R = <_{BK} \restriction \text{rep}(R).$$

R is Π_3^1 -wellfounded iff

1. $\forall r \in \text{dom}(R) \cup \{\emptyset\}$ $R\{r\}$ is Π_1^1 -wellfounded, and
2. $\forall z \in [\text{dom}(R)]$ $R(z) =_{\text{DEF}} \cup_{n < \omega} (R_{\text{tree}}(z \restriction n))_{1 \leq n < \omega}$ is not Π_2^1 -wellfounded.

For level-3 trees R and R' , R is a *subtree* of R' iff R is a subfunction of R' . A *finite level-3 tower* is a sequence $(R_i)_{i \leq n}$ such that $n < \omega$, each R_i is a regular level-2 tree, $\text{card}(R_i) = i + 1$ and $i < j \rightarrow R_i$ is a subtree of R_j . \vec{R} is *regular* iff each R_i is regular. An *infinite level-3 tower* is a sequence $\vec{R} = (R_n)_{n < \omega}$ such that for each n , $(R_i)_{i \leq n}$ is a finite level-3 tower. Π_3^1 -wellfoundedness of a level-3 tower is a Π_3^1 property in the real coding the tower. In particular, every finite level-3 tree is Π_3^1 -wellfounded. Similarly to Proposition 3.11, we have

Proposition 4.9. *Assume Δ_2^1 -determinacy. Suppose R is a level-3 tree. Then R is Π_3^1 -wellfounded iff $<^R$ is a wellordering.*

Associated to a Π_3^1 set A we can assign a level-3 system $(R_s)_{s \in \omega^{<\omega}}$ so that $x \in A$ iff the infinite level-3 tree $R_x =_{\text{DEF}} \cup_{n < \omega} R_{x \upharpoonright n}$ is Π_3^1 -wellfounded. If A is lightface Π_3^1 , then $(R_s)_{s \in \omega^{<\omega}}$ can be picked effective.

Suppose $F \in \mathbb{L}_{\delta_3^1}[T_2]$ is a function on $\text{rep}(R)$, $r \in \text{dom}(R)$. Then F_r is a function on $\omega_1^{R_{\text{tree}(r)} \uparrow}$ that sends $\vec{\beta}$ to $F(\vec{\beta} \oplus_R r)$. F represents a $\text{card}(R)$ -tuple of ordinals

$$[F]^R = ([F]_r^R)_{r \in \text{dom}(R)}$$

where $[F]_r^R = [F_r]_{\mu^{R_{\text{tree}(r)}}}$ for $r \in \text{dom}(R)$. If $B \subseteq \delta_3^1$, put

$$F \in B^{R\uparrow}$$

iff $F \in \mathbb{L}_{\delta_3^1}[T_2]$ and F is an order-preserving continuous function from $\text{rep}(R)$ to B (with respect to $<^R$ and $<$). Let

$$[B]^{R\uparrow} = \{[F]^R : F \in B^{R\uparrow}\}.$$

A tuple of ordinals $\vec{\gamma} = (\gamma_r)_{r \in \text{dom}(R)}$ is said to *respect* R iff $\vec{\gamma} \in [\delta_3^1]^{R\uparrow}$. $\vec{\gamma}$ is said to *weakly respect* R iff for any $t, t' \in \text{dom}(R)$, if t is a proper initial segment of t' , then $j^{R_{\text{tree}(t)}, R_{\text{tree}(t')}}(\gamma_t) > \gamma_{t'}$. By virtue of the order $<^R$, if $\vec{\gamma}$ respects R , then $\vec{\gamma}$ weakly respects R and whenever $R_{\text{tree}(t \smallfrown (p))} = R_{\text{tree}(t \smallfrown (q))}$ and $p < q$, then $\gamma_{t \smallfrown (p)} < \gamma_{t \smallfrown (q)}$.

The trees S_3^- and S_3 are defined in [14]. They both project to the universal Π_3^1 set. In our language, they take the following form.

Definition 4.10. *Assume Δ_2^1 -determinacy.*

1. S_3^- is the tree on $V_\omega \times \delta_3^1$ such that $(\emptyset, \emptyset) \in S_3^-$ and

$$(\vec{R}, \vec{\alpha}) = ((R_i)_{i \leq n}, (\alpha_i)_{i \leq n}) \in S_3^-$$

iff \vec{R} is a finite regular level-3 tower and letting $r_i \in \text{dom}(R_{i+1}) \setminus \text{dom}(R_i)$, $\beta_{r_i} = \alpha_{i+1}$, then $(\beta_r)_{r \in \text{dom}(R_n)}$ respects R_n .

2. S_3 is the tree on $V_\omega \times \delta_3^1$ such that $(\emptyset, \emptyset) \in S_3$ and

$$(\vec{R}, \vec{\alpha}) = ((R_i)_{i \leq n}, (\alpha_i)_{i \leq n}) \in S_3$$

iff \vec{R} is a finite regular level-3 tower and letting $r_i \in \text{dom}(R_{i+1}) \setminus \text{dom}(R_i)$, $\beta_{r_i} = \alpha_{i+1}$, then $(\beta_r)_{r \in \text{dom}(R_n)}$ weakly respects R_n .

By Theorem 4.6,

$$p[S_3^-] = p[S_3] = \{\vec{R} : \vec{R} \text{ is a } \Pi_3^1\text{-wellfounded level-3 tower}\}.$$

The (non-regular) scale associated to S_3 is Π_3^1 . For $\xi < \delta_3^1$, put $(\vec{R}, \vec{\alpha}) \in S_3 \restriction \xi$ iff $(\vec{R}, \vec{\alpha}) \in S_3$ and $(\vec{R}, \vec{\alpha}) \neq (\emptyset, \emptyset) \rightarrow \alpha_0 < \xi$.

Suppose E is a club in ω_1 . For a partial level ≤ 2 tree $(Q, (d, q, P))$, put $\vec{\alpha} = ({}^e\alpha_t)_{(e,t) \in \text{dom}(Q, (d, q, P))} \in [E]^{(Q, (d, q, P))^\uparrow}$ iff $\vec{\alpha}$ respects $(Q, (d, q, P))$, $({}^e\alpha_t)_{(e,t) \in \text{dom}(Q)} \in [E]^{Q^\uparrow}$, and $d = 1 \rightarrow {}^1\alpha_q \in E$, $d = 2 \rightarrow {}^2\alpha_q \in j^P(E)$. For a level-3 tree R , put

$$\begin{aligned} \text{rep}(R) \restriction E = & \{\vec{\beta} \oplus_R r : r \in \text{dom}(R), \vec{\beta} \in [E]^{R_{\text{tree}}(r)^\uparrow}\} \\ & \cup \{\vec{\beta} \oplus_R r \smallfrown (-1) : r \in \text{dom}(R), \vec{\beta} \in [E]^{R(r)^\uparrow}\}. \end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 3.16, $\text{rep}(R) \restriction E$ is a closed subset of $\text{rep}(R)$ (in the order topology of $<^R$). A useful consequence is that the order preserving bijection

$$\theta_R^E : \text{rep}(R) \restriction E \rightarrow \text{rep}(R)$$

is the identity on $\text{rep}(R) \restriction E'$ for a club $E' \subseteq E$.

5 The lightface level-3 sharp

This section defines a real $0^{3\#}$ which is many-one equivalent to $M_2^\#$, under boldface Π_3^1 -determinacy. The assumption of Π_3^1 -determinacy is very likely not optimal.

5.1 Level-3 boundedness

Recall in Corollary 2.10 that the rank of a $\Sigma_3^1(<_{u_\omega}, x)$ wellfounded relation is bounded by κ_3^x . We would like to strengthen this fact by allowing a suitable code for an arbitrary ordinal in δ_3^1 . The strengthening is based on an inner model theoretic characterization of u_ω in $L[T_3, x]$. We say that

δ is an L -Woodin cardinal

iff $L(V_\delta) \models \delta$ is Woodin.

Theorem 5.1 (Woodin, [21, Theorem 5.22]). *Assume Π_3^1 -determinacy. Let $\kappa = u_\omega$. For $x \in \mathbb{R}$, $M_{2,\infty}^-(x) \models \kappa$ is the least L -Woodin cardinal.*

Corollary 5.2 (Level-3 boundedness). *Assume Π_3^1 -determinacy. Suppose $x \in \mathbb{R}$, $\mathcal{N} \in \mathcal{F}_{2,x}$, η is a cardinal and strong cutpoint of \mathcal{N} , $\xi = \pi_{\mathcal{N},\infty}(\eta)$. Suppose g is $\text{Coll}(\omega, \eta)$ -generic over \mathcal{N} , $r \in \mathbb{R} \cap \mathcal{N}[g]$. Let λ be the least L -Woodin cardinal in $M_{2,\infty}^-(x)$ above ξ . Suppose G is a $\Pi_3^1(r, < u_\omega)$ set equipped with a regular $\Pi_3^1(r, < u_\omega)$ norm φ . Suppose A is a $\Sigma_3^1(r, < u_\omega)$ subset of G . Then*

$$\sup\{\varphi(y) : y \in A\} < (\lambda^+)^{M_{2,\infty}(x)}.$$

Proof. Put $x = 0$ for simplicity. Put

$$\mathcal{G}_2^{\mathcal{N},\eta} = \{\mathcal{P} \in \mathcal{F}_2 : \mathcal{P} \text{ is a nondropping iterate of } \mathcal{N} \text{ above } \eta\}.$$

$\mathcal{G}_2^{\mathcal{N},\eta}$ is a subsystem of \mathcal{F}_2 . Let $M_{2,\infty}^{\mathcal{N},\eta,\#}$ be the direct limit of $\mathcal{G}_2^{\mathcal{N},\eta}$. The inclusion map of direct systems induces an embedding between direct limits

$$\pi_x^{\mathcal{N},\eta} : M_{2,\infty}^{\mathcal{N},\eta,\#} \rightarrow M_{2,\infty}^\#.$$

Let $r_g \in \mathbb{R}$ be the real coding $(g, \mathcal{N}|\eta)$. Every mouse $\mathcal{P} \in \mathcal{G}_2^{\mathcal{N},\eta}$ corresponds to an r_g -mouse $\mathcal{P}[g] \in \mathcal{F}_{2,r_g}$ (converted into an r_g -mouse in the obvious way, cf. [22]). So in the direct limit,

$$M_{2,\infty}^{\mathcal{N},\eta,\#}[g] = M_{2,\infty}^\#(r_g).$$

By Corollary 2.10,

$$\sup\{\varphi(y) : y \in A\} < \kappa_3^{r_g},$$

which in turn is smaller than the successor of u_ω in $M_{2,\infty}^\#(r_g)$, as $\{T_2, r_g\} \in M_{2,\infty}^\#(r_g)$. By Theorem 5.1, u_ω is the least L -Woodin cardinal of $M_{2,\infty}^\#(r_g)$, hence the least L -Woodin cardinal of $M_{2,\infty}^{\mathcal{N},\eta,\#}$ above η . By elementarity, $\pi_x^{\mathcal{N},\eta}(u_\omega) = \lambda$. So $\pi_x^{\mathcal{N},\eta}(\kappa_3^{r_g}) < (\lambda^+)^{M_{2,\infty}}$. This finishes the proof. \square

5.2 Representations of ordinals in δ_3^1

We introduce a coding system for ordinals in δ_3^1 which is the higher level analog of WO. The coding system is guided by Theorem 2.17. Identifying u_ω with $(V_\omega \cup u_\omega)^{<\omega}$, we shall assume X is a Δ_3^1 subset of $\mathbb{R} \times (V_\omega \cup u_\omega)^{<\omega}$ so that the map $v \mapsto X_v$ is a surjection from \mathbb{R} onto $\mathcal{P}((V_\omega \cup u_\omega)^{<\omega})$.

For a finite level-3 tree R and a tuple $\vec{\beta} \oplus_R t \in \text{rep}(R)$, put

$$v \in \text{LO}_{\vec{\beta} \oplus_R t}^R$$

iff for each $\vec{\gamma} \oplus_R s \leq^R \vec{\beta} \oplus_R t$,

$$(X_v)_{\vec{\gamma} \oplus_R s} =_{\text{DEF}} \{(\xi, \eta) : (v, \vec{\gamma} \oplus_R s, \xi, \eta) \in X_v\}$$

is a linear ordering on u_ω . Put

$$v \in \text{LO}^R$$

iff $v \in \text{LO}_{\vec{\beta} \oplus_R t}^R$ for all $\vec{\beta} \oplus_R t \in \text{rep}(R)$. The relations “ $v \in \text{LO}_{\vec{\beta} \oplus_R t}^R$ ” and “ $v \in \text{LO}^R$ ” are Δ_3^1 . Put

$$v \in \text{WO}_{\vec{\beta} \oplus_R t}^{R\uparrow}$$

iff for each $\vec{\gamma} \oplus_R s \leq^R \vec{\beta} \oplus_R t$, $(X_v)_{\vec{\gamma} \oplus_R s}$ is a wellordering on u_ω , and the map $\vec{\gamma} \oplus_R s \mapsto \text{o.t.}((X_v)_{\vec{\gamma} \oplus_R s})$ is continuous, order preserving for $\vec{\gamma} \oplus_R s \leq^R \vec{\beta} \oplus_R t$. Put

$$v \in \text{WO}^{R\uparrow}$$

iff $v \in \text{WO}_{\vec{\beta} \oplus_R t}^{R\uparrow}$ for all $\vec{\beta} \oplus_R t \in \text{rep}(R)$. The relations “ $v \in \text{WO}_{\vec{\beta} \oplus_R t}^{R\uparrow}$ ” and “ R is a finite level-3 tree $\wedge v \in \text{WO}^{R\uparrow}$ ” are Π_3^1 . If $(X_v)_{\vec{\beta} \oplus_R t}$ is a wellordering on u_ω , its order type is denoted by $\|v\|_{\vec{\beta} \oplus_R t}$. A member $v \in \text{WO}^{R\uparrow}$ codes a tuple of ordinals $[v]^R$ that respects R :

$$[v]^R = [\vec{\beta} \oplus_R t \mapsto \|v\|_{\vec{\beta} \oplus_R t}]^R.$$

Clearly, if $v \in \text{WO}^{R\uparrow}$, then $[v]^R \in L_{\kappa_3^{v,R}}[T_2, v, R]$ and is Δ_1 -definable in $L_{\kappa_3^{v,R}}[T_2, v, R]$ from $\{T_2, v, R\}$. Put $[v]^R = ([v]_t^R)_{t \in \text{dom}(R)}$. So $[v]_t^R = [\vec{\beta} \mapsto \|v\|_{\vec{\beta} \oplus_R t}^R]_{\mu^{R_{\text{tree}}(t)}}$.

Observe the simple fact that for any finite level-1 tree W , for any $\vec{\alpha} = (\alpha_w)_{w \in W}$ respecting W , there is a Π_1^1 -wellfounded level-1 tree W' extending W such that $\alpha_w = \|(w)\|_{<W'}$ for any $w \in W$. Intuitively, W' “represents” $\vec{\alpha}$ in the sense that $\vec{\alpha}$ extends to a tuple $\vec{\alpha}'$ respecting W' and if $\vec{\beta}$ respects W' , then $\forall w \in W \alpha_w \leq \beta_w$. It is implicitly used in proving that $0^\#$ is the unique wellfounded remarkable EM blueprint. Likewise, its higher level analog will be an ingredient in the level-3 EM blueprint formulation of $0^{3\#}$.

We also need to code ordinals in δ_3^1 by direct limits of iterations of Π_3^1 -iterable mice. Suppose $x \in \mathbb{R}$ and z codes a Π_3^1 -iterable x -mouse \mathcal{P}_z . Then

$$\pi_{\mathcal{P}_z, \infty} : \mathcal{P}_z \rightarrow (\mathcal{P}_z)_\infty$$

is the direct limit map of all the nondropping iterates of \mathcal{P}_z . $o((\mathcal{P}_z)_\infty)$ is the length of a $\Delta_3^1(z)$ -prewellordering, namely the one induced by iterations of \mathcal{P}_z . By Corollary 2.13, $\pi_{\mathcal{P}_z, \infty}$ and $(\mathcal{P}_z)_\infty$ are both in $L_{\kappa_3^{M_1^\#(z)}}[T_2, M_1^\#(z)]$ and Δ_1 -definable over $L_{\kappa_3^{M_1^\#(z)}}[T_2, M_1^\#(z)]$ from $\{T_2, M_1^\#(z)\}$.

5.3 Putative level-3 indiscernibles

The higher level analog of the type of L with n indiscernibles is the type of $M_{2,\infty}^-$ realized by an appropriate $[F]^R$, where $F \in (\delta_3^1)^{R\uparrow}$. Such functions F are coded by subsets of u_ω in $\mathbb{L}_{\delta_3^1}[T_2]$. The coding system is provided by Theorem 2.17.

$\mathcal{L} = \{\subseteq\}$ is the language of set theory. For a level-3 tree R , \mathcal{L}^R is the expansion of \mathcal{L} which consists of additional constant symbols $\underline{c_r}$ for each $r \in \text{dom}(R)$. For a level-3 tree R and a tuple of ordinals $\vec{\gamma} = (\gamma_r)_{r \in \text{dom}(R)}$, the \mathcal{L} -structure $M_{2,\infty}^-$ expands to the \mathcal{L}^R -structure

$$(M_{2,\infty}^-; \vec{\gamma})$$

whose constant $\underline{c_r}$ is interpreted as γ_r .

Definition 5.3. $C \subseteq \delta_3^1$ is said to be firm iff every member of C is additively closed, the set $\{\xi : \xi = o.t.(C \cap \xi)\}$ has order type δ_3^1 and $C \cap \xi \in \mathbb{L}_{\delta_3^1}[T_2]$ for all $\xi < \delta_3^1$.

Definition 5.4. $C \subseteq \delta_3^1$ is called a set of potential level-3 indiscernibles for $M_{2,\infty}^-$ iff for any level-3 tree R , for any $F, G \in C^{R\uparrow} \cap \mathbb{L}_{\delta_3^1}[T_2]$,

$$(M_{2,\infty}^-; [F]^R) \equiv (M_{2,\infty}^-; [G]^R).$$

A firm set of potential level-3 indiscernibles for $M_{2,\infty}^-$ is the higher level analog of a set of order indiscernibles for L . Note that the successor elements of C don't really play a part in computing $[F]^R = ([F_r]_{\mu^{R_{\text{tree}}(r)}})_{r \in \text{dom}(R)}$, as the relevant ultrapowers $\mu^{R_{\text{tree}}(r)}$ concentrate on tuples of limit ordinals, hence the prefix "potential".

Lemma 5.5. Assume Π_3^1 -determinacy. Then there is a firm set of potential level-3 indiscernibles for $M_{2,\infty}^-$.

Proof. Suppose R is a finite level-3 tree. Let φ be an \mathcal{L}^R -sentence. Consider the game $G^{R;\varphi}$ where I produces reals v, x, c and a natural number p , II produces reals v', x', c' and a natural number p' . The payoff is decided according to the following priority list:

1. I and II must take turns to ensure that $v \in \text{WO}^{R\uparrow}$ and $v' \in \text{WO}^{R\uparrow}$. If one of them fails to do so, and $w \in \text{rep}(R)$ is $<^R$ -least for which $v \notin \text{WO}_w^{R\uparrow} \vee v' \notin \text{WO}_w^{R\uparrow}$, then I loses iff $v \notin \text{WO}_w^{R\uparrow}$, and II loses iff $v \in \text{WO}_w^{R\uparrow}$.
2. If 1 is satisfied, put $\vec{\gamma} = (\gamma_r)_{r \in \text{dom}(R)}$, where $\gamma_r = \max([v]_r^R, [v']_r^R)$. I must ensure

- (a) x codes a 2-small premouse \mathcal{P}_x which satisfies “I am closed under the $M_1^\#$ -operator”;
- (b) c codes a strictly increasing, cofinal-in- $o(\mathcal{P}_x)$ sequence of ordinals $(c_n)_{n<\omega}$ relative to x such that each c_n is a cardinal cutpoint of \mathcal{P}_x ;
- (c) $\mathcal{P}_x|_{c_1}$ is a Π_3^1 -iterable mouse;
- (d) p codes a tuple of ordinals $\vec{\alpha} = (\alpha_r)_{r \in \text{dom}(R)}$ in $\mathcal{P}_x|_{c_0}$ relative to x ;
- (e) For each $r \in \text{dom}(R)$, $\pi_{\mathcal{P}_x|_{c_0, \infty}}(\alpha_r) = \gamma_r$;
- (f) $(\mathcal{P}_x; \vec{\alpha}) \models \varphi$.

Otherwise he loses.

- 3. If 1-2 are satisfied, II must ensure 2(a)-(f) with $(x, c, (c_n)_{n<\omega}, p, \vec{\alpha}, \varphi)$ replaced by $(x', c', (c'_n)_{n<\omega}, p', \vec{\alpha}', \neg\varphi)$, otherwise he loses.
- 4. If 1-3 are satisfied, I and II must take turns to ensure for all $2 \leq n < \omega$,
 - (a) $\mathcal{P}_x|_{c_n}$ is a Π_3^1 -iterable mouse and $\mathcal{P}_{x'}|_{c'_{n-1}} <_{DJ} \mathcal{P}_x|_{c_n}$;
 - (b) $\mathcal{P}_{x'}|_{c'_n}$ is a Π_3^1 -iterable mouse and $\mathcal{P}_x|_{c_n} <_{DJ} \mathcal{P}_{x'}|_{c'_n}$.

If one of them fails to do so, and n is least for which (a) or (b) fails at n , then I loses iff (a) fails at n , and II loses iff (a) holds at n .

- 5. It is impossible that both players obey all the rules, due to a successful comparison between \mathcal{P}_x and $\mathcal{P}_{x'}$. The definition of $G^{R; \varphi}$ is finished.

The payoff of $G^{R; \varphi}$ has complexity $(\llbracket \emptyset \rrbracket_R + \omega) - \Pi_3^1$ for both players. The nontrivial part about the complexity is that 2(e) is Δ_3^1 , shown as follows. According to rules 2(a)-(c), $\mathcal{P}_x|_{c_1}$ is Π_3^1 -iterable and closed under the (genuine) $M_1^\#$ -operator, $c_0 < c_1$, and therefore $M_1^\#(\mathcal{P}_x|_{c_0})$ is canonically coded in x . $\pi_{\mathcal{P}_x|_{c_0, \infty}}(\alpha_s)$ is the length of a $\Delta_3^1(\mathcal{P}_x|_{c_0})$ prewellordering, induced by iterations. By Corollary 2.13, $\pi_{\mathcal{P}_x|_{c_0, \infty}}(\alpha_s)$ is Δ_1 -definable over $L_{\kappa_3^x}[T_2, x]$ from $\{T_2, x\}$. $\vec{\gamma}$ is clearly Δ_1 -definable over $L_{\kappa_3^v}[T_2, v]$ from $\{T_2, v\}$. So 2(e) is expressed into a Δ_1 statement over $L_{\kappa_3^{v, x}}[T_2, v, x]$ from $\{T_2, v, x, c\}$, or equivalently, $\Delta_3^1(v, x, c)$ by Theorem 2.1.

Hence $G^{R; \varphi}$ is determined. Suppose for definiteness II has a winning strategy σ in $G^{R; \varphi}$. Let C be the set of L -Woodin cardinal cutpoints of $M_{2, \infty}^-(\sigma)$ and their limits. We show that

$$\forall F \in C^{R^\uparrow} (M_{2, \infty}^-; [F]^R) \models \neg\varphi$$

Suppose towards a contradiction that $F \in C^{R\uparrow}$ but $(M_{2,\infty}^-; [F]^R) \models \varphi$. As δ_3^1 is inaccessible in $M_{2,\infty}^\#$, there is a club $D \in M_{2,\infty}^\#$ in δ_3^1 so that $M_{2,\infty}^- \restriction \lambda \prec M_{2,\infty}^-$ for any $\lambda \in D$. There is thus a continuous, order preserving $G : \omega + 1 \rightarrow C \setminus \sup \text{ran}(F)$ for which $(M_{2,\infty}^- \restriction G(\omega); [F]^R) \models \varphi$. Pick $\mathcal{P} \in \mathcal{F}_2$ and ordinals $(c_n)_{n < \omega}$, $(\alpha_r)_{r \in \text{dom}(R)}$ in \mathcal{P} such that $\pi_{\mathcal{P},\infty}(c_n) = G(n)$ for any $n < \omega$ and $\pi_{\mathcal{P},\infty}(\alpha_r) = [F]_r^R$ for any $r \in \text{dom}(R)$. Thus, $(\mathcal{P} \restriction \sup_{n < \omega} c_n; \vec{\alpha}) \models \varphi$. Let Player I play (v, x, c, p) , where $v \in \text{WO}^{R\uparrow}$, $\|v\|_w^R = F(w)$ for any $w \in \text{rep}(R)$, x codes $\mathcal{P} \restriction \sup_{n < \omega} c_n$, c codes $(c_n)_{n < \omega}$ relative to x , p codes $(\alpha_r)_{r \in \text{dom}(R)}$. The response according to σ is denoted by $(v', x', c', p') = (v, x, c, p) * \sigma$. We shall derive a contraction by showing neither player breaks the rules, using Σ_3^1 -boundedness.

As σ is a winning strategy, Player II is not the first person to break the rules. So $v \in \text{WO}^{R\uparrow}$ implies $v' \in \text{WO}^{R\uparrow}$. For each $w \in \text{rep}(R)$ which is either the $<^R$ -minimum or a $<^R$ -successor, if $\mathcal{N} \in \mathcal{F}_{2,\sigma}$, $\eta \in \mathcal{N}$, $\pi_{\mathcal{N},\infty}(\eta) = F(w)$, g is $\text{Coll}(\omega, \eta)$ -generic over \mathcal{N} , $r_g \in \mathbb{R}$ being the real coding $(g, \mathcal{N} \restriction \eta)$, then (v', x', c', p') belongs to the set

$$A_w = \{(\bar{v}, \bar{x}, \bar{c}, \bar{p}) * \sigma : \bar{v} \in \text{WO}_w^{R\uparrow} \restriction \xi\}$$

which is $\Sigma_3^1(M_1^\#(r_g), <_{u_\omega})$ by Corollary 2.13 and Theorem 2.1. Since σ is a winning strategy, A_w is a subset of

$$B_w = \{(\bar{v}', \bar{x}', \bar{c}', \bar{p}') : \bar{v}' \in \text{WO}_w^{R\uparrow}\}$$

B_w is a $\Pi_3^1(<_{u_\omega})$ set, equipped with the $\Pi_3^1(<_{u_\omega})$ prewellordering $(\bar{v}', \bar{x}', \bar{c}', \bar{p}') \mapsto \|\bar{v}'\|_w^R$. By Corollary 5.2, $\|v'\|_w^R < \min(C \setminus (F(w) + 1))$. By continuity, if w has $<^R$ -limit order type, then $\|v'\|_w^R \leq \|v\|_w^R$. Consequently, for $r \in \text{dom}(R)$, $[v']_r^R \leq [v]_r^R$, so if $\vec{\gamma}$ is defined from v, v' as in Rule 2, then $\gamma_r = [v]_r^R$.

By our choice of F and G , Rule 2 is satisfied. Let $\mathcal{P}_x, (c_n)_{n < \omega}, \vec{\alpha}, \mathcal{P}_{x'}, (c'_n)_{n < \omega}, \vec{\alpha}'$ be defined as in Rules 2 and 3. For each $1 \leq n < \omega$, using the Π_3^1 -prewellordering on codes of Π_3^1 -iterable mice, a similar boundedness argument shows that $\|\mathcal{P}_{x'} \restriction c'_n\|_{<_{DJ}} < \min(C \setminus (G(n) + 1))$, and hence $\mathcal{P}_{x'} \restriction c'_n <_{DJ} \mathcal{P}_x \restriction c_{n+1}$. So Rule 4 is satisfied. This is impossible. \square

Definition 5.6. Assume Π_3^1 -determinacy. Let C be a firm set of potential level-3 indiscernibles for $M_{2,\infty}^-$. Then

$$0^{3\#}$$

is a map sending a finite level-3 tree R to the complete consistent \mathcal{L}^R -theory $0^{3\#}(R)$, where $\ulcorner \varphi \urcorner \in 0^{3\#}(R)$ iff φ is an \mathcal{L}^R -formula and for all $\vec{\gamma} \in [C]^{R\uparrow}$,

$$(M_{2,\infty}^-; \vec{\gamma}) \models \varphi.$$

$0^{3\#}$ is the higher level analog of $0^\#$. Each individual $0^{3\#}(R)$ is the higher level analog of the n -type that is realized in L by n indiscernibles.

The proof of Lemma 5.5 shows

Lemma 5.7. *Assume Π_3^1 -determinacy. For a finite level-3 tree R , $0^{3\#}(R)$ is a $\mathcal{O}(\llbracket \emptyset \rrbracket_R + \omega)$ - Π_3^1 real.*

5.4 The equivalence of $x^{3\#}$ and $M_2^\#(x)$

For the other direction of the reduction, we want to compute $\mathcal{O}(<u_\omega - \Pi_3^1)$ truth using $0^{3\#}$ as an oracle.

Lemma 5.8. *Assume Π_3^1 -determinacy. For a finite level-3 tree R , the universal $\mathcal{O}(\llbracket \emptyset \rrbracket_R - \Pi_3^1)$ real is many-one reducible to $0^{3\#}(R)$, uniformly in R .*

Proof. Let $B \subseteq \llbracket \emptyset \rrbracket_R \times \mathbb{R}$ be Π_3^1 . Let θ be a Σ_1 formula such that

$$(\xi, x) \in B \leftrightarrow L_{\kappa_3^x}[T_2, x] \models \theta(\xi, x).$$

G is the game with output $\text{Diff } B$. We need to decide the winner of G from $0^{3\#}(R)$. B is equipped with the Π_3^1 -norm

$$\psi(\xi, x) = \text{the least } \alpha < \kappa_3^x \text{ such that } L_\alpha[T_2, x] \models \theta(\xi, x).$$

If $E \in \mu_{\mathbb{L}}$ is a club, let $\rho^E : \llbracket \emptyset \rrbracket_R \rightarrow \text{rep}(R) \upharpoonright E$ be the order preserving bijection. For $\vec{\gamma}$ respecting R , let $\theta^I(\vec{\gamma})$ be the following formula:

There exist $H \in (\delta_3^1)^{R\uparrow}$ and a strategy τ for Player I such that $[H]^R = \vec{\gamma}$ and for any club $E \in \mu_{\mathbb{L}}$, if x is an infinite run according to τ , then for any even $\alpha < \llbracket \emptyset \rrbracket_R$, $\forall \beta < \alpha ((\beta, x) \in B \wedge \psi(\beta, x) < H(\rho^E(\beta + 1)))$ implies $(\alpha, x) \in B \wedge \psi(\alpha, x) < H(\rho^E(\alpha + 1))$, and there is $\alpha < \llbracket \emptyset \rrbracket_R$ such that $(\alpha, x) \notin B$.

Let $\theta^{II}(\vec{\gamma})$ be the following formula:

There exist $K \in (\delta_3^1)^{R\uparrow}$ and a strategy σ for Player II such that $[K]^R = \vec{\gamma}$ and for any club $E \in \mu_{\mathbb{L}}$, if x is an infinite run according to σ , then for any odd $\alpha < \llbracket \emptyset \rrbracket_R$, $\forall \beta < \alpha ((\beta, x) \in B \wedge \psi(\beta, x) < K(\rho^E(\beta + 1)))$ implies $(\alpha, x) \in B \wedge \psi(\alpha, x) < K(\rho^E(\alpha + 1))$.

Let C be a firm set of level-3 indiscernibles for $M_{2,\infty}^-$. Suppose firstly Player I has a winning strategy τ in G . Let D be the subset of C consisting of L -Woodin cardinals in $M_{2,\infty}(\sigma)$ and their limits. By Corollary 5.2, if x is a consistent run according to σ , then $(0, x) \in B \wedge \psi(0, x) < \min(D)$,

for any odd $\alpha < \llbracket \emptyset \rrbracket_R$, $(\alpha, x) \in B$ implies $(\alpha + 1, x) \in B \wedge \psi(\alpha + 1, x) < \min(D \setminus (\psi(\alpha, x) + 1))$, and there is $\alpha < \llbracket \emptyset \rrbracket_R$ such that $(\alpha, x) \notin B$. Let $H \in D^{R\uparrow}$. Then (H, τ) witnesses $\theta^I([H]^R)$. Let $\mathcal{P} \in \mathcal{F}_2$ and $\vec{\eta} \in \mathcal{P}$ such that $\pi_{\mathcal{P}, \infty}(\vec{\eta}) = [H]^R$. Let $\xi_{\vec{\eta}}$ be the least successor cardinal cutpoint of \mathcal{P} above $\max(\vec{\eta})$ and let g be $\text{Coll}(\omega, \xi)$ -generic over \mathcal{P} . Let $r_{g, \vec{\eta}}$ be the real coding $(g, \vec{\eta})$. Then $\theta^I([H]^R)$ is equivalent to a $\Sigma_4^1(r_{g, \vec{\eta}})$ statement $\bar{\theta}^I(r_{g, \vec{\eta}})$, hence true in $\mathcal{P}[g]$. Hence,

$$\mathcal{P}^{\text{Coll}(\omega, \xi_{\vec{\eta}})} \models \bar{\theta}^I(\dot{r}_{g, \vec{\eta}})$$

By elementarity,

$$(M_{2, \infty}^-)^{\text{Coll}(\omega, \xi_{\vec{\gamma}})} \models \bar{\theta}^I(\dot{r}_{g, [H]^R}).$$

By Lemma 5.5, for any $\vec{\gamma} \in [C]^{R\uparrow}$,

$$(M_{2, \infty}^-)^{\text{Coll}(\omega, \xi_{\vec{\gamma}})} \models \bar{\theta}^I(\dot{r}_{g, \vec{\gamma}}).$$

By a symmetrical argument, if Player II has a winning strategy in G , then for any $\vec{\gamma} \in [C]^{R\uparrow}$,

$$(M_{2, \infty}^-)^{\text{Coll}(\omega, \xi_{\vec{\gamma}})} \models \bar{\theta}^{II}(\dot{r}_{g, \vec{\gamma}}).$$

Finally, there does not exist $\vec{\gamma}$ such that

$$(M_{2, \infty}^-)^{\text{Coll}(\omega, \xi_{\vec{\gamma}})} \models \bar{\theta}^I(\dot{r}_{g, \vec{\gamma}}) \wedge \bar{\theta}^{II}(\dot{r}_{g, \vec{\gamma}}).$$

Otherwise, by absoluteness, $\theta^I(\vec{\gamma}) \wedge \theta^{II}(\vec{\gamma})$ holds. Let (H, τ) witness $\theta^I(\vec{\gamma})$ and let (K, σ) witness $\theta^{II}(\vec{\gamma})$. Let $E \in \mu_{\mathbb{L}}$ be a club such that $H \restriction (\text{rep}(R) \restriction E) = K \restriction (\text{rep}(R) \restriction E)$. Let x be the infinite run according to both τ and σ . Then inductively we can see that for any $\alpha < \llbracket \emptyset \rrbracket_R$, $(\alpha, x) \in B \wedge \psi(\alpha, x) < H(\rho^E(\alpha + 1))$, but there is $\alpha < \llbracket \emptyset \rrbracket_R$ such that $(\alpha, x) \notin B$, which is impossible.

In conclusion, Player I has a winning strategy in B iff for any $\vec{\gamma} \in [C]^{R\uparrow}$, $(M_{2, \infty}^-)^{\text{Coll}(\omega, \xi_{\vec{\gamma}})} \models \bar{\theta}^I(\dot{r}_{g, \vec{\gamma}})$. \square

For a real x , $x^{3\#}$ is the obvious relativization of $0^{3\#}$. Combining Lemmas 5.7 and 5.8, [27, Theorem 3.1] and Neeman [19, 20], we obtain the equivalence of $x^{3\#}$ and $M_2^\#(x)$.

Theorem 5.9. *Assume Π_3^1 -determinacy. For $x \in \mathbb{R}$, $x^{3\#}$ is many-one equivalent to $M_2^\#(x)$, the many-one reduction being independent of x .*

By Theorem 5.9 and Moschovakis third periodicity, the winner of the game in the proof of Lemma 5.5 has a winning strategy recursive in $0^{3\#}$. Hence, the set of L -Woodin cardinals in $M_{2, \infty}^-(0^{3\#})$ and their limits form a firm set of potential level-3 indiscernibles for $M_{2, \infty}^-$.

Acknowledgements

The breakthrough ideas of this paper were obtained during the AIM workshop on Descriptive inner model theory, held in Palo Alto, and the Conference on Descriptive Inner Model Theory, held in Berkeley, both in June, 2014. The author greatly benefited from conversations with Rachid Atmai and Steve Jackson that took place in these two conferences. The final phase of this paper was completed whilst the author was a visiting fellow at the Isaac Newton Institute for Mathematical Sciences in the programme ‘Mathematical, Foundational and Computational Aspects of the Higher Infinite’ (HIF) in August and September, 2015 funded by NSF Career grant DMS-1352034 and EPSRC grant EP/K032208/1.

References

- [1] Howard S. Becker and Alexander S. Kechris. Sets of ordinals constructible from trees and the third Victoria Delfino problem. In *Axiomatic set theory (Boulder, Colo., 1983)*, volume 31 of *Contemp. Math.*, pages 13–29. Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 1984.
- [2] L. A. Harrington, A. S. Kechris, and A. Louveau. A Glimm-Effros dichotomy for Borel equivalence relations. *J. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 3(4):903–928, 1990.
- [3] Leo Harrington. Analytic determinacy and 0^\sharp . *J. Symbolic Logic*, 43(4):685–693, 1978.
- [4] Greg Hjorth. Variations of the Martin-Solovay tree. *J. Symbolic Logic*, 61(1):40–51, 1996.
- [5] Greg Hjorth. Some applications of coarse inner model theory. *J. Symbolic Logic*, 62(2):337–365, 1997.
- [6] Steve Jackson. Projective ordinals. Introduction to Part IV. In *Wadge degrees and projective ordinals. The Cabal Seminar. Volume II*, volume 37 of *Lect. Notes Log.*, pages 199–269. Association for Symbolic Logic, La Jolla, CA; Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2012.
- [7] Thomas Jech. *Set theory*. Springer Monographs in Mathematics. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2003. The third millennium edition, revised and expanded.

- [8] Akihiro Kanamori. *The higher infinite*. Springer Monographs in Mathematics. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, second edition, 2003. Large cardinals in set theory from their beginnings.
- [9] A. S. Kechris. Countable ordinals and the analytical hierarchy. I. *Pacific J. Math.*, 60(1):223–227, 1975.
- [10] A. S. Kechris and D. A. Martin. On the theory of Π^1_3 sets of reals. *Bull. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 84(1):149–151, 1978.
- [11] A. S. Kechris and D. A. Martin. Infinite games and effective descriptive set theory. In *Analytic Sets (London school 1978)*, pages 403–470. Academic Press, London-New York, 1980.
- [12] A. S. Kechris and D. A. Martin. On the theory of Π^1_3 sets of reals, II. In *Ordinal Definability and Recursion Theory. The Cabal Seminar. Volume III*, volume 43 of *Lect. Notes Log.*, pages 200–219. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2016.
- [13] Alexander S. Kechris. Countable ordinals and the analytical hierarchy. II. *Ann. Math. Logic*, 15(3):193–223 (1979), 1978.
- [14] Alexander S. Kechris. Homogeneous trees and projective scales. In *Wadge degrees and projective ordinals. The Cabal Seminar. Volume II*, volume 37 of *Lect. Notes Log.*, pages 270–303. Association for Symbolic Logic, La Jolla, CA; Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2012.
- [15] Alexander S. Kechris, Donald A. Martin, and Robert M. Solovay. Introduction to Q -theory. In *Ordinal Definability and Recursion Theory. The Cabal Seminar. Volume III*, volume 43 of *Lect. Notes Log.*, pages 126–199. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2016.
- [16] Donald A. Martin. Measurable cardinals and analytic games. *Fund. Math.*, 66:287–291, 1969/1970.
- [17] Benjamin D. Miller. The graph-theoretic approach to descriptive set theory. *Bull. Symbolic Logic*, 18(4):554–575, 2012.
- [18] Yiannis N. Moschovakis. *Descriptive set theory*, volume 155 of *Mathematical Surveys and Monographs*. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, second edition, 2009.
- [19] Itay Neeman. Optimal proofs of determinacy. *Bull. Symbolic Logic*, 1(3):327–339, 1995.

- [20] Itay Neeman. Optimal proofs of determinacy. II. *J. Math. Log.*, 2(2):227–258, 2002.
- [21] Grigor Sargsyan. On the prewellorderings associated with the directed systems of mice. *J. Symbolic Logic*, 78(3):735–763, 2013.
- [22] Ralf Schindler and John Steel. The self-iterability of $L[E]$. *J. Symbolic Logic*, 74(3):751–779, 2009.
- [23] Jack H. Silver. Counting the number of equivalence classes of Borel and coanalytic equivalence relations. *Ann. Math. Logic*, 18(1):1–28, 1980.
- [24] Robert M. Solovay. A Δ_3^1 coding of the subsets of ω_ω . In *Wadge degrees and projective ordinals. The Cabal Seminar. Volume II*, volume 37 of *Lect. Notes Log.*, pages 346–363. Association for Symbolic Logic, La Jolla, CA; Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2012.
- [25] J. R. Steel. Projectively well-ordered inner models. *Ann. Pure Appl. Logic*, 74(1):77–104, 1995.
- [26] John R. Steel. An outline of inner model theory. In *Handbook of set theory. Vols. 1, 2, 3*, pages 1595–1684. Springer, Dordrecht, 2010.
- [27] Yizheng Zhu. The higher sharp I: on $M_1^\#$.