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Abstract

Let \( n \in \omega \). The weak choice principle RC\(_n\) states that for every infinite set \( x \) there is an infinite subset \( y \subseteq x \) with a choice function on \([y]^n := \{z \subseteq y \mid |z| = n\}\). C\(_n\) states that for every infinite family of \( n \)-element sets, there is an infinite subfamily \( G \subseteq F \) with a choice function. LOC\(_n\) and WOC\(_n\) are the same statement but we assume that the family \( F \) is linearly orderable (LOC\(_n\)) or well-orderable (WOC\(_n\)).

In the first part of this paper we will give a full characterization of when the implication RC\(_m\) \( \Rightarrow \) WOC\(_n\) with \( m, n \in \omega \) holds in ZF. We will prove the independence results by using suitable Fraenkel-Mostowski permutation models. In the second part of we will show some generalizations. In particular we will show that RC\(_5\) \( \Rightarrow \) LOC\(_5\) and RC\(_6\) \( \Rightarrow \) C\(_3\), answering two open questions from Halbeisen and Tachtsis in [2]. Furthermore we will show that RC\(_6\) \( \Rightarrow \) C\(_9\) and RC\(_7\) \( \Rightarrow \) LOC\(_7\).

1 Definitions and Introduction

The notation we use is standard and follows that of [3]. Now we list some definitions that shall be used in the sequel:

DEFINITION 1.1. Let \( n \) be a natural number.

1. C\(_n\) states that every infinite family \( F \) of sets of size \( n \) has an infinite subset \( G \subseteq F \) with a choice function.

2. LOC\(_n\) states that every infinite, linearly orderable family \( F \) of sets of size \( n \) has an infinite subset \( G \subseteq F \) with a choice function.

3. WOC\(_n\) states that every infinite, well-orderable family \( F \) of sets of size \( n \) has an infinite subset \( G \subseteq F \) with a choice function.

4. RC\(_n\) states that every infinite set \( X \) has an infinite subset \( Y \subseteq X \) such that \([Y]^n = \{z \subseteq Y \mid |z| = n\}\) has a choice function.

5. Let \( F \) be an infinite family of \( n \)-element sets. A Kinna-Wagner selection function of \( F \) is a function \( f \) with \( \text{dom}(f) = F \) such that for all \( p \in F, \emptyset \neq f(p) \subseteq p \).

6. KW\(_n\) states that every infinite family \( F \) of sets of size \( n \) has an infinite subset \( G \subseteq F \) with a Kinna-Wagner selection function.
7. LOKW\textsuperscript{−}\textsubscript{n} states that every infinite, linearly orderable family \(\mathcal{F}\) of sets of size \(n\) has an infinite subset \(\mathcal{G} \subseteq \mathcal{F}\) with a Kinna-Wagner selection function.

In 1999, Montenegro proved in [3] that \(RC_n \Rightarrow C_n\) for all \(n \in \{2, 3, 4\}\). It is still unknown whether this implication holds for any \(n > 5\). In 2017, Halbeisen and Tachtsis found some interesting results concerning the implications \(RC_m \Rightarrow C_n^{-}\) and \(RC_m \Rightarrow RC_n\) for \(m, n \in \omega \setminus \{0, 1\}\) (see [2]). Among other results they were able to prove the following statements:

\((\alpha)\) If \(m, n \in \omega \setminus \{0, 1\}\) are such that there is a prime \(p\) with \(p \nmid m\) and \(p \mid n\), then

\[
RC_m \not\Rightarrow RC_n \text{ and } RC_m \not\Rightarrow C_n^{-}
\]

in ZF.

\((\beta)\) \(RC_5\) implies none of \(LOC_3^{-}\) and \(LOC_3^{-}\).

\((\gamma)\) For every \(n \in \omega \setminus \{0, 1\}\) we have that \(C_n^{-} \Rightarrow LOC_3^{-} \Rightarrow WOC_3^{-}\) but none of these implications is reversible in ZF.

\((\delta)\) For every \(n \in \omega \setminus \{0, 1\}\) the implication \(RC_{2n} \Rightarrow LOKW_n^{-}\) holds. In particular we have that \(RC_6 \Rightarrow LOC_3^{-}\) in ZF.

In this paper we will give a full characterization of when \(RC_n \Rightarrow WOC_m^{-}\) holds for \(n, m \in \omega \setminus \{0, 1\}\). To be more precise, we will show the following result:

**Theorem 1.2.** Let \(m, n \in \omega \setminus 2\). Then \(RC_m\) implies \(WOC_n^{-}\) if and only if the following condition holds: For all prime numbers \(p_0, \ldots, p_{k-1}, k \in \omega,\) such that there are \(a_0, \ldots, a_{k-1} \in \omega\) with

\[
n = \sum_{i<k} a_ip_i,
\]

we can find \(b_0, \ldots, b_{k-1} \in \omega\) with

\[
m = \sum_{i<k} b_ip_i.
\]

In order to prove the independence result, we use permutation models. See [3] for basics about permutation models and ZFA (ZF with the Axiom of Extensionality modified to allow atoms). With Pincus’ transfer theorems (see [6]), we will be able to transfer the results obtained in ZFA to ZF.

Theorem 1.2 gives us the following three special cases:

1. For all \(n \in \omega\) we have that \(RC_n \Rightarrow WOC_n^{-}\). (See Corollary 6.3)

2. Let \(p\) be a prime number, \(m \in \omega \setminus \{0\}\) and \(n \in \omega \setminus \{0, 1\}\). Then

\[
RC_{p^m} \Rightarrow WOC_n^{-}
\]

if and only if \(n \mid p^m\) or \(p = 2, m = 1\) and \(n = 4\). (See Corollary 7.8)

3. If \(RC_m \not\Rightarrow WOC_n^{-}\), we also have that \(RC_m \not\Rightarrow RC_n^{-}\) and \(RC_m \not\Rightarrow C_n^{-}\) (see Corollary 7.8). This generalizes Halbeisen’s and Tachtsis’ result (\(\alpha)\).

In the second part of this paper, we will give some insights into the question what happens when we weaken the assumption that our family of \(n\)-element sets is well-ordered. We will prove that \(RC_n \Rightarrow LOC_3^{-}\) for both \(n \in \{5, 7\}\) and that \(RC_6 \Rightarrow C_3^{-}\) for both \(n \in \{3, 9\}\).
2 Why $RC_6$ implies $C_3^-$

In this section we will closely follow the proof of $RC_4 \Rightarrow C_4^-$ in [5].

**Proposition 2.1.** $RC_6$ implies $C_3^-$. 

**Proof.** Let $F$ be an infinite family of pairwise disjoint sets of size 3. We apply $RC_6$ to the set $\bigcup F$. This gives us an infinite subset $Y \subseteq \bigcup F$ with a choice function on $\{Y\}^6$. For every $i \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ we define

$G_i := \{u \in F \mid |u \cap Y| = i\}.$

Without loss of generality we can assume that $G := G_3$ is infinite. So there is a choice function

$f : \bigcup G^6 \rightarrow \bigcup G.$

We define a directed graph on $G$ by putting a directed edge from $v$ to $u$ if and only if $f(u \cup v) \in u$. With this graph we do the same construction as in [5]. So there is an infinite subset $H \subseteq G$ which is partitioned into finite sets $(A_n)_{n \in \omega}$ such that for every $n \in \omega$, all elements in $A_n$ have outdegree $n$. Moreover, for all $n < m$ the edges between $A_n$ and $A_m$ all point from $A_n$ to $A_m$ and $|A_n|$ is odd for all $n \in \omega$. We can assume that we are in one of the following two cases:

**Case 1:** There are infinitely many $n \in \omega$ with $3 \nmid |A_n|$.

In this case we follow the proof of the Claim in [5] p. 60 and we are done.

**Case 2:** For all $n \in \omega$ we have that $3 \mid |A_n|$.

Let $p_0 \in H$ and let $n \in \omega$ be the unique natural number with $p_0 \in A_n$. There is an $s \in \omega$ with $|A_n| = 2s + 1$. We want to find the number of elements in $A_n$ that point to $p_0$. There are $\binom{|A_n|}{2}$ edges in $A_n$. Since the number of edges in $A_n$ that point to an element in $A_n$ is the same for every element of $A_n$, we have that the indegree of $p_0$ in $A_n$ is given by

\[
\text{indegree}_{A_n}(p_0) = \frac{1}{|A_n|} \binom{|A_n|}{2} = \frac{1}{2}(|A_n| - 1) = s.
\]

By assumption we have that $3 \mid |A_n| = 2s + 1$. Therefore, $3 \nmid s$. Assume that $p_0 = \{x_0, x_1, x_2\}$. For every $i \leq 2$ we define

$A_n^{x_i} := \{v \in A_n \mid f(v \cup p_0) = x_i\}.$

Since $3 \nmid (|A_n^{x_0}| + |A_n^{x_1}| + |A_n^{x_2}|) = s$, we can choose an element from $p_0$. 

3 Why $RC_6$ implies $C_9^-$

**Lemma 3.1** (Kummer). Let $n, k \in \omega \setminus \{0\}$. The exponent of a prime $p$ in the prime factorization of $\binom{n}{k}$ is equal to the number of $j \in \omega \setminus \{0\}$ such that the fractional part of $\frac{j}{p}$ is greater than the fractional part of $\frac{n}{p^r}$.

**Lemma 3.2.** Let $F$ be an infinite family of pairwise disjoint 4-element sets and let

$f : \bigcup F^6 \rightarrow \bigcup F$

be a choice function. Then there is a function $h$ with $h(p \cup q) \in p \cup q$ for all $p \neq q$ in $F$. 
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Proof. Let \( p \neq q \) be elements of \( \mathcal{F} \). We will show that we can choose exactly one element from \( p \cup q \). There are
\[
\binom{8}{6} = 28
\]
6-element subsets of \( p \cup q \). From each of these subsets we can choose one point with the choice function \( f \).

Let \( A \) be the set of all elements in \( p \cup q \) which are chosen the most times. Note that \( 1 \leq |A| \leq 7 \), because 8 does not divide 28.

- If \( |A| = 1 \) we are done.
- If \( |A| = 2 \), choose \( f((p \cup q) \setminus A) \).
- If \( |A| = 3 \) and \( A \subseteq p \) or \( A \subseteq q \) we are done because we can choose the point in \( p \setminus A \) or in \( q \setminus A \). Otherwise, \( |p \cap A| = 1 \) or \( |q \cap A| = 1 \) and we are also done.
- If \( |A| \in \{5, 6, 7\} \), replace \( A \) by \((p \cup q) \setminus A\). So we are in one of the cases above.
- If \( |A| = 4 \), the set \([(p \cup q) \setminus A]^2\) contains \( \binom{4}{2} = 6 \) elements. For each \( B \in [(p \cup q) \setminus A]^2 \) choose \( f(A \cup B) \).

Let \( C_0 \) and \( C_1 \) be the sets of all elements in \( p \cup q \) which are chosen the most and the least often. Note that either \( C_0 \) or \( C_1 \) does not contain 4 elements. By the cases above we are done.

So there is a choice function
\[
h : \{p \cup q \mid p, q \in \mathcal{F}\} \rightarrow \bigcup \mathcal{F}.
\]

Lemma 3.3. Let \( \{A_n \mid n \in \mathbb{N}\} \) be a countable family of pairwise disjoint non-empty finite sets of pairwise disjoint sets of size 2. Moreover, we assume that \( \mathcal{F} := \bigcup_{n \in \omega} A_n \) is an infinite family of 2-element sets with a choice function \( f : \bigcup \mathcal{F}^6 \rightarrow \bigcup \mathcal{F} \).

Then there is an infinite subfamily \( \mathcal{G} \subseteq \mathcal{F} \) with a choice function.

Proof. We can assume that we are in one of the following four cases:

Case 1: For all \( n \in \omega \) we have that \( 2 \nmid |A_n| \).

Let \( k \in \omega \). Then there are natural numbers \( l_0, l_1 \) and \( l_2 \) such that
\[
|A_{3k}| = 2l_0 + 1, \quad |A_{3k+1}| = 2l_1 + 1 \quad \text{and} \quad |A_{3k+2}| = 2l_2 + 1.
\]

For every \( a \in A_{3k} \cup A_{3k+1} \cup A_{3k+2} \) define
\[
\#a := |\{(a_0, a_1, a_2) \in A_{3k} \times A_{3k+1} \times A_{3k+2} \mid f(a_0 \cup a_1 \cup a_2) \in a\}|.
\]

If \( \#a \) is odd, we can choose an element from \( a \), for example the element in \( a \) we choose more often than the other. Since
\[
2 \nmid \prod_{i \leq 2} (2l_i + 1) \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{a \in A_{3k} \cup A_{3k+1} \cup A_{3k+2}} \#a = \prod_{i \leq 2} (2l_i + 1),
\]
we have that for every \( k \in \omega \) there is at least one \( a \in A_{3k} \cup A_{3k+1} \cup A_{3k+2} \) such that \( \#a \) is odd. So we can find a choice function on the infinite set
\[
\mathcal{G} := \{a \in \mathcal{F} \mid \#a \text{ is odd}\}.
\]
Case 2: For all \( n \in \omega \) we have that \(|A_n| = 2\).
For every \( k \in \omega \) there are two distinct 3-element subsets \( B_0 \) and \( B_1 \) of \( A_{2k} \cup A_{2k+1} \) such that \( A_{2k+1} \subseteq B_0 \) and \( A_{2k+1} \subseteq B_1 \). For every \( a \in A_{2k} \cup A_{2k+1} \) we define
\[
\#a := \left| \left\{ i \in \{0, 1\} \mid f \left( \bigcup B_i \right) \in a \right\} \right|.
\]
Note that if \(#a\) is odd we can choose an element from \( a \). So if there are infinitely many \( a \in \mathcal{F} \) such that \(#a\) is odd, we are done. Otherwise, there is an infinite subset \( I \subseteq \omega \) such that for all \( k \in I \) there is a unique \( a_k \in A_{2k} \cup A_{2k+1} \) with \(#a_k = 2\). Then we are in the first case for the family \( \{\{a_k\} \mid k \in I\} \).

Case 3: For all \( n \in \omega \) we have that \(|A_n| \geq 3 \text{ and } 4 \mid |A_n| \text{ and } 2 \mid |A_n|\).
Let \( n \in \omega \). By Lemma 3.1 \( \left( |A_n| \right)^2 \) is odd. For every \( k \in \omega \) we look at the 4-element subsets of \( A_{2k} \cup A_{2k+1} \) with two elements in \( A_{2k} \) and two elements in \( A_{2k+1} \). Note that the number of such subsets is odd. Let \( h \) be the choice function we found in Lemma 3.2. Then for every \( k \in \omega \) there is at least one \( a \in A_{2k} \cup A_{2k+1} \) such that
\[
\#a := \left| \left\{ \{a_0, a_1\}, \{b_0, b_1\} \in [A_{2k}]^2 \times [A_{2k+1}]^2 \mid h(a_0 \cup a_1 \cup b_0 \cup b_1) \in a \right\} \right|
\]
is odd. So again we found a choice function on the infinite set
\[\mathcal{G} := \{ a \in \mathcal{F} \mid \#a \text{ is odd} \} .\]

Case 4: For all \( n \in \omega \) we have that \(|A_n| \geq 3 \text{ and } 4 \mid |A_n|\).
Let \( n \in \omega \). Then there is a \( k \in \omega \) with \(|A_n| = 4k\). We have that
\[
2|A_n| \uparrow \left( \frac{|A_n|}{3} \right), \tag{1}
\]
since otherwise we would have that
\[\frac{|A_n|(|A_n| - 1)(|A_n| - 2)}{2 \cdot |A_n| \cdot 2 \cdot 3} = \frac{2(4k^2 - 3k) + 1}{2 \cdot 3} \in \omega .\]
But this is not the case since the numerator is not divisible by 2. We define
\[
\#a := |\{ \{a_0, a_1, a_2\} \in [A_n]^3 \mid f(a_0 \cup a_1 \cup a_2) \in a \}| \quad \text{and for all } y \in \bigcup A_n \text{ let}
\]
\[\no(y) := |\{ \{a_0, a_1, a_2\} \in [A_n]^3 \mid f(a_0 \cup a_1 \cup a_2) = y \}| .\]
Note that by (1)
\[|\{ y \in \bigcup A_n \mid \no(y) = \max \{ \no(z) \mid z \in \bigcup A_n \} \}| < 2|A_n| .\]
If there is an \( a = \{a_0, a_1\} \in A_n \) with \( \no(a_0) \neq \no(a_1) \) choose the element with lower no. Otherwise we have that
\[B_n := \{ a \in A_n \mid \#a = \max \{ \#b \mid b \in A_n \} \} \subseteq A_n .\]
Repeat the procedure with \( A_n := B_n \) until either \( 4 \mid |A_n| \) or there is an \( a = \{a_0, a_1\} \in A_n \) with \( \no(a_0) \neq \no(a_1) \).
Note that we have to repeat the procedure at most \(|A_n| \) times. In the end we either found a choice function on an infinite subset of \( \mathcal{F} \) or we reduced Case 4 to one of the other cases.
COROLLARY 3.4. Let $\mathcal{F}$ be an infinite family of pairwise disjoint 4-element sets and let
\[
f : \left[ \bigcup \mathcal{F} \right]^6 \to \bigcup \mathcal{F}
\]
be a choice function. Then there is an infinite subset $\mathcal{G} \subseteq \mathcal{F}$ with a choice function on $\mathcal{G}$.

Proof. Let $h$ be the choice function we found in Lemma 3.2. We can define a complete, directed graph on $\mathcal{F}$ by putting an edge from $p$ to $q$ if and only if $g(p \cup q) \in q$. With this graph we can do the same construction as in [5]. So we can find an infinite subset $\mathcal{G} \subseteq \mathcal{F}$ such that we can choose exactly 1 or 2 elements from each $G \in \mathcal{G}$. So either we found a choice function on an infinite subset of $\mathcal{G}$ or we can find an infinite family of 2-element sets $\mathcal{H}$. Then we apply Lemma 3.3 to $\mathcal{H}$ and we are done.

LEMMA 3.5. Let $\mathcal{F}$ be an infinite family of 10-element sets. Assume that each $F \in \mathcal{F}$ is a disjoint union of five 2-element sets $F_i$, $0 \leq i \leq 4$. Moreover, let
\[
f : \left[ \bigcup \mathcal{F} \right]^6 \to \bigcup \mathcal{F}
\]
be a choice function. Then there is an infinite subset $\mathcal{G} \subseteq \mathcal{F}$ with a Kinna-Wagner selection function.

Proof. For all 4-element sets $A \subseteq \bigcup \mathcal{F}$, we define the degree of $A$ by
\[
deg(A) := |\{ F_i \mid F \in \mathcal{F} \wedge i \leq 4 \wedge f(A \cup F_i) \in F_i \}|.
\]
If there is an $A_0 \in [\bigcup \mathcal{F}]^4$ with infinite degree we are done. Because then the set
\[
\mathcal{G} := \{ F \in \mathcal{F} \mid \exists i \leq 4 \ (f(A_0 \cup F_i) \in F_i) \}
\]
is infinite and from every $G \in \mathcal{G}$ we can choose the set
\[
\{ f(A_0 \cup G_i) \mid i \leq 4 \} \cap G \subseteq G.
\]
So we can assume that each $A \in [\bigcup \mathcal{F}]^4$ has finite degree. Define $\mathcal{F}^2 = \{ F_i \mid i \leq 4 \wedge F \in \mathcal{F} \}$ and for all $F \in \mathcal{F}$ let $F^2 := \{ F_i \mid i \leq 4 \}$.

Case 1: There is an $n \in \omega$ such that for infinitely many $F \in \mathcal{F}$ there are $A, B \in F^2$ with $\deg(A \cup B) = n$. Let $\mathcal{G} := \{ F \in \mathcal{F} \mid \exists A, B \in F^2(\deg(A \cup B) = n) \}$. By assumption this is an infinite set. Choose an $(n + 3)$-element set $\{ X_i \mid i \leq n + 2 \} \subseteq F^2$. For all $G \in \mathcal{G}$ and all $A, B \in G^2$ with $\deg(A \cup B) = n$ put an edge pointing from $A$ to $B$ if and only if
\[
f(A \cup B \cup X_{i_0}) \in B,
\]
where
\[
i_0 := \min\{ i \leq n + 2 \mid f(A \cup B \cup X_i) \notin X_i \}.
\]
So we defined a directed graph with at least one edge in each $G^2$ with $G \in \mathcal{G}$. If for infinitely many $G \in \mathcal{G}$ not all elements of $G^2$ have the same outdegree, we are done. So we either have a cycle on infinitely many $G^2$ or we have a complete graph in which every node has outdegree 2. In the first case we can choose a point in each $A \cup B$, where $A, B \in G^2$ are neighbours. So we can choose 5 elements in each $G \in \mathcal{G}$. In the second case we can choose 5 edges as follows: For each node $A \in G^2$, let $B, C \in G^2$ be the two successors of $A$ in the graph. Choose the edge which connects $B$ and $C$ (see Figure [1]). We can again choose at most 5 elements from $G$.

Case 2: For all $n \in \omega$ there are only finitely many $F \in \mathcal{F}$ such that there are $A, B \in F^2$ with $\deg(A \cup B) = n$. Let $A_{-1} := \emptyset$ and for every $n \in \omega$ define
\[
A_n := \{ A \in \mathcal{F} \mid \exists B \in \mathcal{F}(\deg(A \cup B) = n) \} \setminus A_{n-1}.
\]
Note that these sets are pairwise disjoint families of 2-element sets. So we can apply Lemma 3.3 and we are done.
Figure 1: How to choose the edges

**Proposition 3.6.** $\text{RC}_6$ implies $C_9^−$.

**Proof.** Let $\mathcal{F}$ be an infinite family of pairwise disjoint sets of size 9. Since $\text{RC}_9$ holds, there is an infinite set $Y \subseteq \bigcup \mathcal{F}$ with a choice function

$$f : [Y]^6 \to Y.$$  

For all $0 \leq i \leq 9$ let

$$\mathcal{G}_i := \{F \cap Y \mid F \in \mathcal{F} \land |F \cap Y| = i\}.$$  

There is a $1 \leq i \leq 9 \setminus \{0\}$ such that $\mathcal{G}_i$ is an infinite set.

**Case 1:** $\mathcal{G}_1$ or $\mathcal{G}_8$ is infinite.

In the case $\mathcal{G}_8$ is infinite, we look at the complements.

**Case 2:** $\mathcal{G}_3$ or $\mathcal{G}_6$ is infinite.

Use Proposition 2.1

**Case 3:** $\mathcal{G}_4$ is infinite.

Use Corollary 3.4

**Case 4:** $\mathcal{G}_5$ is infinite.

Apply $\text{RC}_6$ to the complements. Then we are either in one of the preceding cases or the complements are partitioned into two sets of size two. We look at the 10 edges between the first 5 elements and the second two elements and use Lemma 3.5

**Case 5:** $\mathcal{G}_7$ is infinite.

For all $G \in \mathcal{G}_7$ let $\overline{G}$ be the complement of $G$ in the sense that for the $F \in \mathcal{F}$ with $G \subseteq F$ we have that

$$\overline{G} := F \setminus G.$$  

Note that $|\overline{G}| = 2$. Let

$$\mathcal{E} := \{\{x, y\} \mid \exists G \in \mathcal{G}_7(x \in G \text{ and } y \in \overline{G})\}.$$  

Apply $\text{RC}_6$ to $\mathcal{E}$. Without loss of generality we can assume that we find a choice function

$$g : [\mathcal{E}]^6 \to \mathcal{E},$$  
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because otherwise we are in one of the preceding cases. So for every $G \in G_7$ there are 14 edges between $G$ and $\overline{G}$. So there are
\[
\binom{14}{6} = 3 \cdot 7 \cdot 11 \cdot 13
\]
6-element subsets. From each of them $g$ chooses one element. Since $\binom{14}{6}$ is not divisible by 14, we can choose less than 14 edges and we are in one of the preceding cases.

Case 6: $G_9$ is infinite.
With the choice function $f$ we can choose an element from each 6-element subset of a $G \in G_9$. There are $\binom{9}{6}$ subsets of size 6. Since $9 \nmid \binom{9}{6}$ we can reduce this case to one of the cases above.

Case 7: $G_2$ is infinite.
We iteratively apply RC$_6$ to the complements. So we can reduce this case to one of the cases above.

4 Why RC$_5$ implies LOC$_5^-$

In this section we will prove that RC$_5$ implies LOC$_5^-$. The beginning of the proof will be as usual: Let $\mathcal{F}$ be an infinite, linearly orderable family of 5-element sets. We apply RC$_5$ to $\bigcup \mathcal{F}$. This will give us an infinite subfamily $\mathcal{G} \subseteq \mathcal{F}$ such that each $p \in \mathcal{G}$ is partitioned into two parts, one of size 2 and one of size 3. So if we could show that RC$_5$ implies LOC$_2^-$ or LOC$_3^-$, the proof would be finished. However, Halbeisen’s and Tachtsis’ result ($\beta$) shows that this idea will not lead to success. That’s why we will work with the set of all edges between the two parts.

**Theorem 4.1.** We have that RC$_5$ implies LOC$_5^-$.  

**Proof.** Let $\mathcal{F}$ be an infinite, linearly orderable collection of pairwise disjoint sets of size 5. We fix a linear order on $\mathcal{F}$ and apply RC$_5$ on the set $X := \bigcup \mathcal{F}$ to find an infinite subset $Y \subseteq X$ with a choice function $f : [Y]^5 \rightarrow Y$. For every $i \leq 5$ we define

$$
\mathcal{F}_i := \{ p \in \mathcal{F} \mid |p \cap Y| = i \}.
$$

Without loss of generality we can assume that by the $\mathcal{F}_i$, the elements $p$ of an infinite subfamily $\mathcal{G} \subseteq \mathcal{F}$ are partitioned into a set with two elements and a set with three elements, namely $p = \{ a_p, b_p, c_p \} \cup \{ x_p, y_p \}$.

Now we look at the set $Z$ of all non-directed edges between a point in $\{ a_p, b_p, c_p \}$ and one in $\{ x_p, y_p \}$. For every $p \in \mathcal{G}$ let $p^*$ be the set of all edges in $Z$ belonging to $p$ and for each subset $\mathcal{H} \subseteq \mathcal{F}$ we define $\mathcal{H}^* := \{ p^* \mid p \in \mathcal{H} \}$.

**Claim 1:** Assume that there is an infinite subset $\mathcal{H} \subseteq \mathcal{G}$ such that we can choose between 1 and 5 elements from each $p^* \in \mathcal{H}^*$. Then there is a choice function

$$
h : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \bigcup \mathcal{H}.
$$

**Proof of Claim 1.** Let $p \in \mathcal{H}$ and assume that we can choose $k \in \{1, 2, 3, 4, 5 \}$ elements from $p^*$. We look at $p$ as a graph with $k$ edges. If $2 \nmid k$, $x_p$ and $y_p$ do not have the same degree and we can choose the element with lower degree. Otherwise we have that $3 \nmid k$ and we can choose an element from $\{ a_p, b_p, c_p \}$. ☐

Claim 1
Now we apply RC\textsubscript{5} on the set \(Z\). Then there is an infinite subset \(Q \subseteq Z\) with a choice function \(g : [Q]^{5} \to Q\). By Claim 1 we can without loss of generality assume that \(p^{*} \subseteq Q\) for every \(p \in \mathcal{H}\).

We can partition each \(p^{*} \in \mathcal{H}^{*}\) as follows into two sets \(\gamma_{0}^{p}\) and \(\gamma_{1}^{p}\) of size three:

\[
\gamma_{0}^{p} := \{a_{p}, x_{p}\}, \{b_{p}, x_{p}\}, \{c_{p}, x_{p}\}\quad \text{and} \quad \gamma_{1}^{p} := \{a_{p}, y_{p}\}, \{b_{p}, y_{p}\}, \{c_{p}, y_{p}\}.
\]

Analogously we can partition \(p^{*}\) into three sets \(\beta_{0}, \beta_{1}, \beta_{2}\) of size two as follows:

\[
\beta_{0}^{p} := \{a_{p}, x_{p}\}, \{a_{p}, y_{p}\}\quad \beta_{1}^{p} := \{b_{p}, x_{p}\}, \{b_{p}, y_{p}\}\quad \text{and} \quad \beta_{2}^{p} := \{c_{p}, x_{p}\}, \{c_{p}, y_{p}\}.
\]

Figure 2: The partitions of a \(p^{*}\) into \(\gamma_{0}^{p}, \gamma_{1}^{p}\) on the left and into \(\beta_{0}^{p}, \beta_{1}^{p}\) and \(\beta_{2}^{p}\) on the right.

Let 

\[
\mathcal{H}_{3}^{*} := \{\gamma_{i}^{p} \mid i \leq 1 \land p \in \mathcal{H}\}
\]

be the sets of size three appearing in the partition of a \(p^{*} \in \mathcal{H}^{*}\) and let 

\[
\mathcal{H}_{2}^{*} := \{\beta_{i}^{p} \mid i \leq 2 \land p \in \mathcal{H}\}
\]

be the family of sets of size two which appear in the partition of a \(p^{*} \in \mathcal{H}^{*}\). If there is a \(\gamma \in \mathcal{H}_{3}^{*}\) such that for infinitely many \(\beta \in \mathcal{H}_{2}^{*}\)

\[
g(\gamma \cup \beta) \in \beta,
\]

we are done by Claim 1. Otherwise, for every \(\gamma \in \mathcal{H}_{3}^{*}\) there are only finitely many \(\beta \in \mathcal{H}_{2}^{*}\) with (2) and we define

\[
\deg(\gamma) := |\{\beta \in \mathcal{H}_{2}^{*} \mid g(\gamma \cup \beta) \in \beta\}| \in \omega.
\]

We are in one of the following two cases:

\textit{Case 1:} There is an \(n \in \omega\) such that \(\deg(\gamma) = n\) for infinitely many \(\gamma \in \mathcal{H}_{3}^{*}\).

Let \(\mathcal{I}_{3}^{*} := \{\gamma \in \mathcal{H}_{3}^{*} \mid \deg(\gamma) = n\}\). Choose an \((n + 4)\)-element set \(\{\beta_{i} \mid i \leq n + 3\} \subseteq \mathcal{H}_{2}^{*}\). For every \(\gamma \in \mathcal{I}_{3}^{*}\) we define

\[
j(\gamma) := \min\{i \leq n + 3 \mid g(\gamma \cup \beta_{i}) \in \gamma\}.
\]

So from every \(\gamma \in \mathcal{I}_{3}^{*}\) we choose the element

\[
g(\gamma \cup \beta_{j(\gamma)}) \in \gamma
\]

and we are done by Claim 1.
Case 2: For each \( n \in \omega \) there are only finitely many \( \gamma \in \mathcal{H}_3 \) with \( \deg(\gamma) = n \).

For every \( n \in \omega \) we define

\[
A_n := \{ \gamma \in \mathcal{H}_3 \mid \deg(\gamma) = n \} \quad \text{and} \quad B_n := \{ \beta \in \mathcal{H}_2 \mid \exists \gamma \in A_n \exists p^* \in \mathcal{H}^*(\gamma \subseteq p^* \land \beta \subseteq p^*) \}.
\]

If there are infinitely many \( p \in \mathcal{H} \) such that \( \gamma^p_0 \in A_n \) and \( \gamma^p_1 \in A_m \) with \( n \neq m \) we are done by Claim 1 since we can choose three edges from each of these infinitely many \( p \)'s. So we can assume that for every \( p \in \mathcal{H} \) both, \( \gamma^p_0 \) and \( \gamma^p_1 \), have the same degree and we define

\[
C_n := \{ p \in \mathcal{H} \mid \{ \gamma^p_0, \gamma^p_1 \} \subseteq A_n \}
\]

for every \( n \in \omega \). Moreover, let

\[
\text{out}(\beta) := \left\{ \gamma \in \bigcup_{m > n} A_m \mid g(\beta \cup \gamma) \in \gamma \right\}
\]

for every \( n \in \omega \) and every \( \beta \in B_n \). If there is a \( \beta \in \bigcup_{n \in \omega} B_n \) with \( |\text{out}(\beta)| = \infty \) we are done by Claim 1. So assume that \( |\text{out}(\beta)| \in \omega \) for all \( \beta \in \bigcup_{n \in \omega} B_n \).

Claim 2: We can construct an infinite subset \( \mathcal{J} \subseteq \mathcal{H} \) with a partition \( \mathcal{J} = \bigcup_{n \in \omega} J_n \), where each \( J_n \) is finite. Moreover, for all natural numbers \( n > m \), all \( p \in J_n \), all \( q \in J_m \), all \( i \in \{0, 1\} \) and all \( j \in \{0, 1, 2\} \)

\[
g(\gamma_i^p \cup \beta_j^q) \in \beta_j^q.
\]

Proof of Claim 2. For each \( n \in \omega \) let \( R_n \) be the finite set of all \( p \in \bigcup_{m \geq n} C_m \) such that there are a \( q \in C_n \), an \( i \in \{0, 1\} \) and a \( j \in \{0, 1, 2\} \) with

\[
g(\gamma_i^p \cup \beta_j^q) \in \gamma_i^p.
\]

Let \( J_n := C_n \setminus R_n \). \( \dashv \) Claim 2

With the same construction we did in the proof of Claim 2 we can find an infinite subset \( \mathcal{K} \subseteq \mathcal{J} \) with a partition \( \mathcal{K} = \bigcup_{n \in \omega} K_n \), where each \( K_n \) is finite and non-empty. Moreover, we can assume that for all natural numbers \( n > m \), all \( p \in I_n \), all \( q \in I_m \) and all \( j \leq 2 \)

\[
g(\gamma_0^p \cup \beta_j^q) = g(\gamma_0^p \cup \beta_j^q) \in \beta_j^q.
\]

Note: Up to now we nowhere used the assumption that our infinite family \( \mathcal{F} \) of sets of size five is linearly ordered. In the last step we will need this assumption.

For each \( n \in \omega \), let \( p_n \in K_n \) be the smallest element in \( K_n \) with respect to the linear order on \( \mathcal{F} \). Note that such a smallest element exists since each \( K_n \) is finite and non-empty. We define

\[
h^*: \{ p_n^* \mid n \in \omega \} \to \left[ \bigcup_{n \in \omega} p_n^* \right]^3
\]

\[
p_n^* \mapsto \{ g(\gamma_0^{p_n+1} \cup \beta_j^p) \mid j \leq 2 \}.
\]

By Claim 1 we are done. \( \dashv \)
5 Why $\text{RC}_7$ implies $\text{LOC}_7^-$

**Lemma 5.1.** Let $\mathcal{F}$ be a linearly orderable family of pairwise disjoint 6-element sets. We assume that we can partition each $p \in \mathcal{F}$ in a unique way into three 2-element sets $\beta_p^0, \beta_p^1$ and $\beta_p^2$ and in a unique way into two 3-element sets $\gamma_p^0, \gamma_p^1$. Moreover, we require that there is a choice function $f : \left[\bigcup \mathcal{F}\right] \rightarrow \bigcup \mathcal{F}$.

Then there is an infinite subfamily $G \subseteq \mathcal{F}$ with a Kinna-Wagner selection function.

**Proof.** We define $\mathcal{F}_3 := \{\gamma_p^i \mid i \in \{0,1\} \land p \in \mathcal{F}\}$ and $\mathcal{F}_4 := \{\beta_p^i \cup \beta_p^j \mid \{i,j\} \in \mathcal{P}^2 \land p \in \mathcal{F}\}$. For every $\gamma \in \mathcal{F}_3$ let $\deg(\gamma) := |\{\delta \in \mathcal{F}_4 \mid \delta \cap \gamma = \emptyset \land f(\delta \cup \gamma) \in \delta\}|$.

If there is a $\gamma \in \mathcal{F}_3$ with $\deg(\gamma) = \infty$ we are done because we can choose between one and three edges from infinitely many elements of $\mathcal{F}$. The rest of the proof is similar to the proof of Theorem 4.1. \hfill $\square$

**Lemma 5.2.** Let $\mathcal{F}$ be a linearly orderable family of pairwise disjoint 12-element sets. We assume that we can partition each $p \in \mathcal{F}$ in a unique way into three 4-element sets $\delta_0, \delta_1$ and $\delta_2$ and in a unique way into four 3-element sets $\gamma_0, \gamma_1, \gamma_2$ and $\gamma_3$. Moreover, we require that there is a choice function $f : \left[\bigcup \mathcal{F}\right] \rightarrow \bigcup \mathcal{F}$.

Then there is an infinite subset $G \subseteq \mathcal{F}$ with a Kinna-Wagner selection function.

**Proof.** The proof is similar to the proof of Theorem 4.1. \hfill $\square$

**Lemma 5.3.** Let $\mathcal{F}$ be a linearly orderable family of pairwise disjoint 10-element sets. We assume that we can partition each $p \in \mathcal{F}$ in a unique way into two 5-element sets $\epsilon_0$ and $\epsilon_1$ and in a unique way into five 2-element sets $\beta_i$, $i \leq 4$. Moreover, we require that there is a choice function $f : \left[\bigcup \mathcal{F}\right] \rightarrow \bigcup \mathcal{F}$.

Then there is an infinite subset $G \subseteq \mathcal{F}$ with a Kinna-Wagner selection function.

**Proof.** The proof is similar to the proof of Theorem 4.1. \hfill $\square$

**Proposition 5.4.** We have that $\text{RC}_7 \Rightarrow \text{LOC}_7^-$. 

**Proof.** Let $\mathcal{F}$ be a linearly orderable, infinite family of sets of size 7. We apply RC$_7$ on the set $X := \bigcup \mathcal{F}$ to find an infinite subset $Y \subseteq X$ with a choice function $f : [Y]^7 \rightarrow Y$. For every $i \leq 7$ we define $\mathcal{F}_i := \{p \in \mathcal{F} \mid |p \cap Y| = i\}$.

Note that we can without loss of generality assume that $\mathcal{F}_2$ or $\mathcal{F}_3$ has infinite cardinality.

**Case 1:** $\mathcal{F}_3$ has infinite cardinality.

For every $p \in \mathcal{F}_3$ let $p^* := \{\{a,x\} \in [p]^2 \mid a \in p \cap Y \land x \in p \setminus Y\}$. 

and apply $RC_7$ on the set $X^* := \bigcup\{p^* \mid p \in F_3\}$. We get an infinite subset $Y^* \subseteq X^*$ with a choice function $g : [Y^*]^7 \to Y^*$. For every $1 \leq i \leq 12$ define

$$F_i^* := \{p^* \mid p \in F_3 \land |p^* \cap Y^*| = i\}.$$ 

There is an $1 \leq i \leq 12$ such that $|F_i^*| = \infty$. If $i \notin \{6, 12\}$ we can choose an element from each $p$ with $p^* \in F_i^*$ and therefore we are done. If $i = 6$, the only case in which we cannot choose an element from all $p$ with $p^* \in F_6^*$ is the one illustrated in Figure 3:

![Figure 3: Case $i = 6$](image)

But in this case we are done by Lemma 5.1. And if $i = 12$ we are done by Lemma 5.2.

**Case 2:** $F_2$ has infinite cardinality.

For every $1 \leq i \leq 10$ we define $F_i^*$ as in Case 1. The only $i$ for which we cannot choose one element from each $p$ with $p^* \in F_i^*$ or for which we cannot choose three elements from each $p$ with $p^* \in F_i^*$ in order to reduce it to Case 1, is $i = 10$. But in this case we are done by Lemma 5.3.

6 When does $RC_m \Rightarrow WOC_n^-$ hold?

**Lemma 6.1.** Let $m, r, s \in \omega \setminus \{0\}$, let $p_0, \ldots, p_{r-1}$ be pairwise different prime numbers and $n_0, \ldots, n_{s-1} \in \omega \setminus \{0\}$ with

$$\forall i < r \exists j < s \ (p_i \mid n_j).$$

Moreover assume that there are $a_0, \ldots, a_{r-1} \in \omega$ with

$$m = \sum_{i < r} a_ip_i.$$ 

Define $n = \sum_{j \in s} n_j$. Let $F$ be an infinite, well-ordered family of pairwise disjoint $n$-element sets. We assume that each $F \in F$ is partitioned into sets $F_i$, $i < s$, with

$$|F_i| = n_i.$$ 

If $RC_m$ holds, there is an infinite subset $G \subseteq F$ such that for each $G \in G$ we can refine the partition on $G$. 


Proof. For every $F \in \mathcal{F}$ we define

$$E_F := \{ x \in [F]^s \mid |x \cap F_j| = 1 \text{ for all } j < s \}.$$ 

Apply RC$_m$ to the set $\bigcup_{F \in \mathcal{F}} E_F$. Then there is an infinite subset $Y \subseteq \bigcup_{F \in \mathcal{F}} E_F$ with a choice function

$$f : [Y]^m \to Y.$$ 

For all $F \in \mathcal{F}$ let

$$D_F := E_F \cap Y.$$ 

Define $\mathcal{G} := \{ F \in \mathcal{F} \mid D_F \neq \emptyset \}$.

Claim: Let $\mathcal{H} \subseteq \mathcal{G}$ be an infinite subset, and let $l = \sum_{i < r} b_i p_i$ with $b_i \leq a_i$ for all $i < r$. Let $p = p_{i_0} \in \{ p_i \mid i < r \}$ such that $b_{i_0} \neq 0$. For all $H \in \mathcal{H}$ let $\emptyset \neq C_H \subseteq E_H$. For all $H \in \mathcal{H}$ let $\{ C_H^k \mid k < t_H \}$ with $t_H \in \omega \setminus \{ 0 \}$ be a partition of $|C_H|^p$. We assume that there is a choice function

$$h : \left[ \bigcup_{H \in \mathcal{H}} C_H^l \right]^{l+p} \to \bigcup_{H \in \mathcal{H}} C_H$$

with $0 \leq l \leq m - p$. Then there is an infinite subset $I \subseteq \mathcal{H}$ such that

1. there is a choice function

$$i : \left[ \bigcup_{I \in \mathcal{I}} C_I^{l-p} \right] \to \bigcup_{I \in \mathcal{I}} C_I$$

or

2. we can refine the partition $\{ I_i \mid i < s \}$ on each $I \in \mathcal{I}$ or

3. for each $I \in \mathcal{I}$ we can refine the partition $\{ C_I^k \mid k < t_I \}$ on $|C_I|^p$ or

4. for each $I \in \mathcal{I}$ we can choose

$$\emptyset \neq B_I \subsetneq C_I.$$ 

Moreover, Case 1 only occurs when $l - p > p_i$ for an $i < r$.

Proof of the Claim. Assume that there is an infinite subset $\mathcal{I} \subseteq \mathcal{H}$ such that there is a $j_0 < s$ with $n_{j_0} \nmid |C_I|$ for all $I \in \mathcal{I}$. Let $I \in \mathcal{I}$. For all $z \in I$ define

$$\#z := |\{ x \in C_I \mid z \in x \}|.$$ 

Since $\sum_{z \in I_{j_0}} \#z = |C_I|$, it follows that

$$\emptyset \neq \{ z \in I_{j_0} \mid \forall z' \in I_{j_0}(\#z \leq \#z') \} \not\subseteq I_{j_0}.$$ 

Therefore we can refine the partition on each $I \in \mathcal{I}$ and we are done. So we can assume that for all $j < s$ and all $H \in \mathcal{H}$ we have that

$$n_j \mid |C_I|.$$ 

There are three cases:
Case 1: There is a $Z_0 \in \left[ \bigcup_{H \in \mathcal{H}} C_H \right]_I^I$ such that there is an infinite subset $\mathcal{I} \subseteq \mathcal{H}$ with

$$\forall I \in \mathcal{I} \, \forall x \in [C_I]^p \, (h(Z_0 \cup x) \in x).$$

Without loss of generality assume that $Z_0 \cap \bigcup_{I \in \mathcal{I}} C_I = \emptyset$. For every $I \in \mathcal{I}$ and all $z \in C_I$ define

$$\deg_I(z) := |\{x \in [C_I]^p \, | \, h(Z_0 \cup x) = z\}|.$$

Note that $\sum_{z \in C_I} \deg_I(z) = |[C_I]^p| = \left(\frac{|C_I|}{p}\right)$. We have that $p \mid |C_I|$ because $n_j \mid |C_I|$ for all $j < s$. By Lemma 3.1 it follows that $|C_I| \geq \frac{|C_I|}{p}$. For each $I$ choose

$$\emptyset \neq B_I := \{z \in C_I \mid \forall z' \in C_I(\deg_I(z) \leq \deg_I(z'))\} \subseteq C_I.$$

Case 2: There is a $Z_0 \in \left[ \bigcup_{H \in \mathcal{H}} C_H \right]_I^I$ such that there is an infinite subset $\mathcal{I} \subseteq \mathcal{H}$ with

$$\forall I \in \mathcal{I} \, \exists k < t_I \, \forall x, x' \in C_I^k \, (h(Z_0 \cup x) \in Z_0 \land h(Z_0 \cup x') \in x').$$

In this case we can refine the partition on $[C_I]^p$ for each $I \in \mathcal{I}$.

Case 3: There is a $Z_0 \in \left[ \bigcup_{H \in \mathcal{H}} C_H \right]_I^I$ such that there is an infinite subset $\mathcal{I} \subseteq \mathcal{H}$ with

$$\forall I \in \mathcal{I} \, \exists k < t_I \, \forall x \in C_I^k \, (h(Z_0 \cup x) \in Z_0 \land \exists x', x' \in C_I^k \, (h(Z_0 \cup x) \neq h(Z_0 \cup x'))).$$

In this case we can refine the partition on $[C_I]^p$ for each $I \in \mathcal{I}$.

Case 4: For all $Z \in \left[ \bigcup_{H \in \mathcal{H}} C_H \right]_I^I$ there are infinitely many $H \in \mathcal{H}$ such that

$$\exists k < t_H \, \forall x, x' \in C_H^k \, (h(Z \cup x) = h(Z \cup x')) \in Z).$$

(3)

For each $Z \in \left[ \bigcup_{H \in \mathcal{H}} C_H \right]_I^I$ let $H_Z \in \mathcal{H}$ be the smallest element with respect to the well-ordering in $\mathcal{H}$ such that (3) holds. Then let $k_0 < t_{H_Z}$ be smallest possible such that

$$\forall x, x' \in C_H^{k_0} \, (h(Z \cup x) = h(Z \cup x')) \in Z).$$

We define an function $i : \left[ \bigcup_{H \in \mathcal{H}} C_H \right]_I^I \to \bigcup_{H \in \mathcal{H}} C_H$ by stipulating $i(Z) := h(Z \cup x)$, where $x \in C_H^{k_0}$. Note that $i$ is well-defined. So 1. of the Claim is satisfied.

Now we apply the Claim iteratively until we can find an infinite subfamily of $\mathcal{G}$ with a refined partition on each $G \in \mathcal{G}$.

**Proposition 6.2.** Let $m, n \in \omega \setminus \{0, 1\}$ and assume that for all prime numbers $p_0, \ldots, p_{r-1}$, $r \in \omega$, such that there are $a_0, \ldots, a_{r-1} \in \omega$ with

$$n = \sum_{i < r} a_i p_i,$$

we can find $b_0, \ldots, b_{r-1} \in \omega$ with

$$m = \sum_{i < r} b_i p_i.$$

Then we have that

$$RC_m \Rightarrow WOC_n^-.$$
Proof. Let $\mathcal{F}$ be an infinite, well-ordered family of $n$-element sets. Assume that for every $F \in \mathcal{F}$ there is a partition of $F$ into sets $F_0, \ldots, F_{s-1}$, for an $s \in \omega$. If there is an $i < s$ with $|F_i| = 1$, we are done. Otherwise we can apply Lemma 6.1 in order to find an infinite subfamily $\mathcal{G} \subseteq \mathcal{F}$ with a refined partition on each $G \in \mathcal{G}$. We do the same process until there is a part containing exactly one element.

COROLLARY 6.3. For every $n \in \omega$ we have that

$$\text{RC}_n \Rightarrow \text{WOC}_n^{-}. $$

7 When does $\text{RC}_m \not\Rightarrow \text{WOC}_n^{-}$ hold?

In this section we will show that for all $n, m \in \omega \setminus \{0, 1\}$ which do not satisfy the conditions of Proposition 6.2 we have that $\text{RC}_m \not\Rightarrow \text{WOC}_n^{-}$ in ZF. In a first step we will construct suitable Fraenkel-Mostowski permutation models to show that $\text{RC}_m \not\Rightarrow \text{WOC}_n^{-}$ in ZFA. We will then see that both statements, $\text{RC}_m$ and $\text{WOC}_n^{-}$, are injectively boundable. So by [6, Theorem 3A3] the result is transferable into ZF.

Let $p_0$ and $p_1$ be two prime numbers. We start with a ground model $\mathcal{M}_{p_0, p_1}$ of ZFA + AC with a set of atoms

$$\mathcal{A} := \bigcup \{A_i \mid i \in \omega\} \cup \bigcup \{B_j \mid j \in \omega\},$$

where for all $i, j \in \omega$ the sets $A_i$ and $B_j$ are called blocks. These blocks have the following properties:

1. For all $i \in \omega$, $A_i = \{a_{i,k} \mid k < p_0\}$ and $B_i = \{b_{i,k} \mid k < p_1\}$ with $|A_i| = p_0$ and $|B_i| = p_1$.

2. The blocks are pairwise disjoint.

For all $i, j \in \omega$ we define a permutation on $\mathcal{A}$ as follows:

3. For all $i \in \omega$ and all $k < p_0$ let

$$\alpha_i(a_{i,k}) := \begin{cases} a_{i,k+1} & \text{if } k < p_0 - 1 \\ a_{i,0} & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

and $\alpha_i(a) = a$ for all $a \in \mathcal{A} \setminus A_i$. Analogously for all $j \in \omega$ and all $k < p_1$ let

$$\beta_j(b_{j,k}) := \begin{cases} b_{j,k+1} & \text{if } k < p_1 - 1 \\ b_{j,0} & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

and $\beta_j(b) = b$ for all $b \in \mathcal{A} \setminus B_j$.

Now we define an abelian group $G$ of permutations of $\mathcal{A}$ by requiring

$$\phi \in G \iff \phi = \alpha \circ \beta,$$

where

$$\alpha = \prod_{i \in \omega} \alpha_i^{k_i} \text{ with } k_i < p_0 \text{ for each } i \in \omega$$

and

$$\beta = \prod_{j \in \omega} \beta_j^{l_j} \text{ with } l_j < p_1 \text{ for each } j \in \omega.$$
Remark 7.1. We can also work with \( k \) blocks of size \( p_0, \ldots, p_{k-1} \), where \( p_i \) is a prime number for every \( i < k \). The corresponding permutation model is denoted by \( V_{p_0, \ldots, p_{k-1}} \).

Definition 7.2. A set \( E \in \text{fin}(A) \) is closed if and only if for all \( i, j \in \omega \) we have that
\[
A_i \cap E \neq \emptyset \Rightarrow A_i \subseteq E \text{ and } B_j \cap E \neq \emptyset \Rightarrow B_j \subseteq E.
\]

Remark 7.3. Let \( A \) and \( B \) be two blocks in \( \{ A_i \mid i \in \omega \} \cup \{ B_j \mid j \in \omega \} \). We define
\[
A < B : \iff \begin{cases} A = A_i \cap B = B_j & \text{or} \\ A = A_i \cap B = A_j \land i < j & \text{or} \\ A = B_i \cap B = B_j \land i < j. \end{cases}
\]

Moreover, for distinct closed sets \( E = \bigcup \{ F_0, \ldots, F_n \} \in \text{fin}(A) \) and \( E' = \bigcup \{ F'_0, \ldots, F'_m \} \in \text{fin}(A) \) with blocks \( F_0, \ldots, F_n, F'_0, \ldots, F'_m \) let
\[
E < E' : \iff \text{The } <\text{-least block in the symmetric difference } \{ F_0, \ldots, F_n \} \Delta \{ F'_0, \ldots, F'_m \} \text{ belongs to } E.
\]

This defines a well-ordering on the set of all closed supports.

Lemma 7.4. Let \( n \in \omega \setminus \{ 0, 1 \} \) and let \( p_0 \) and \( p_1 \) be two prime numbers such that
\[
n = cp_0 + dp_1 \neq 0
\]
for \( c, d \in \omega \). Then we have that
\[
V_{p_0, p_1} \models \neg \text{WOC}_n.
\]

Proof. Define
\[
\mathcal{F} := \{ A_l \cup A_{l+1} \cup \cdots \cup A_{l+c-1} \cup B_{l+c} \cup \cdots \cup B_{l+c+d-1} \mid l = k(c + d) \text{ for a } k \in \omega \}.
\]

This is an infinite family of \( n \)-element sets. Since the empty set is a support of \( \mathcal{F} \), we have that \( \mathcal{F} \in V_{p_0, p_1} \). Moreover, \( \mathcal{F} \) is well-orderable in \( V_{p_0, p_1} \). Assume by contradiction that there is an infinite subset \( \mathcal{G} \subseteq \mathcal{F} \) with a choice function
\[
g : \mathcal{G} \to \bigcup \mathcal{G}
\]
in \( V_{p_0, p_1} \). Let \( E_g \in \text{fin}(A) \) be a closed support of \( g \). Since \( E_g \) is finite, there is a \( G_0 \in \mathcal{G} \) such that \( G_0 \cap E_g = \emptyset \). Then there is an \( i \in \omega \) with
\[
g(G_0) \in A_i \cup B_i.
\]

Define \( \gamma_i := \alpha_i \circ \beta_i \). We have that
\[
g(\gamma_i(G_0)) = g(G_0) \neq \gamma_i(g(G_0)).
\]

So \( E_g \) is not a support of \( g \) which is a contradiction.

Lemma 7.5. Let \( m \in \omega \setminus \{ 0, 1 \} \) and let \( p_0, p_1 \) be prime numbers such that
\[
m \neq cp_0 + dp_1
\]
for all \( c, d \in \omega \). Then we have that
\[
V_{p_0, p_1} \models \text{RC}_m.
\]
Proof. Let \( x \in \mathcal{V}_{p_0, p_1} \) be an infinite set with closed support \( E_x \in \text{fin}(A) \). If there is an \( E \in \text{fin}(A) \) such that \[ y := \{ z \in x \mid E \text{ is a support of } z \} \] is an infinite set, we are done because \( y \) can be well-ordered in \( \mathcal{V}_{p_0, p_1} \). So assume that for all \( E \in \text{fin}(A) \) there are only finitely many \( z \in x \) with support \( E \). For every closed support \( E \in \text{fin}(A) \) with \( E_x \subseteq E \) define \[ M_E := \{ z \in x \mid E \text{ is the minimal closed support of } z \text{ with } E_x \subseteq E \}. \] The sets \( M_E \) are finite. For all \( z \in M_E \) define \[ |z| := \{ \phi(z) \mid \phi \in \text{fix}_G(E_x) \} \subseteq M_E. \] There are two cases:

**Case 1:** For infinitely many \( M_E \) there is a \( z \in M_E \) with \[ |z| = M_E. \] Let \( y := \bigcup \{ M_E \mid E_x \subseteq E \wedge \exists z \in M_E \{ |z| = M_E \} \} \). The set \( y \) is in \( \mathcal{V}_{p_0, p_1} \) because \( E_x \) is a support of \( y \). Let \( t \subseteq y \) with \( |t| = m \) and let \( E \) be the smallest support such that \( M_E \subseteq y \) and \( |t \cap M_E| \) is not of the form \( k_0 p_0 + k_1 p_1 \) with \( k_0, k_1 \in \omega \). Define \( t_{-1} := t \cap M_E \). Since \( E \setminus E_x \neq \emptyset \) there are blocks \( A_{i_0}, \ldots, A_{i_{n-1}}, B_{j_u}, B_{j_{u+1}}, \ldots, B_{j_{u+v-1}} \) with \[ E \setminus E_x = \bigcup \{ A_{i_0}, A_{i_1}, \ldots, A_{i_{n-1}}, B_{j_u}, B_{j_{u+1}}, \ldots, B_{j_{u+v-1}} \}. \] Define \[ \tilde{G} := \left\{ \prod_{k \in u} \alpha_{i_k}^{\kappa_k} \circ \prod_{l \in v} \beta_{j_{u+l}}^{\lambda_{u+l}} \mid \forall k < u \forall l < v (\kappa_k < p_0 \wedge \lambda_{u+l} < p_1) \right\}. \] Let \( \tilde{\phi} := \rho_{i_0}^{\kappa_0} \circ \cdots \circ \rho_{i_{n-1}}^{\kappa_{n-1}} \circ \beta_{j_u}^{\lambda_u} \circ \cdots \circ \beta_{j_{u+v-1}}^{\lambda_{u+v-1}} \in \tilde{G} \). Define \[ \phi|_r := \kappa_i \text{ if } r < u \text{ and } \phi|_r := \lambda_j \text{ if } u \leq r < u + v. \] The elements in \( \tilde{G} \) can be ordered lexicographically. We call this well-ordering \( \leq_{\tilde{G}} \). For all \( s, s' < t_{-1} \) and all \( r < u + v \) define \[ \text{dist}_r((s, s')) := \phi|_r, \] where \( \phi \) is the \( \leq_{\tilde{G}} \)-smallest element in \( \tilde{G} \) with \( \phi(s) = s' \).

The rest of the proof can be done as in [1, Proposition 6.6]. For the sake of completeness, we will redo it here:

**Claim 1:** For all \( s, s', s'' < t_{-1} \) and all \( r < u + v \) we have that \[ \text{dist}_r((s, s')) +_p \text{dist}_r((s', s'')) = \text{dist}_r((s, s'')), \] where \( p = p_0 \) if \( r < u \) and \( p = p_1 \) if \( u \leq r < u + v \). Moreover, \( +_p \) denotes addition modulo \( p \).

**Proof of Claim 1.** Let \( \phi_0, \phi_1, \phi \in \tilde{G} \) be \( \leq_{\tilde{G}} \)-minimal with \[ \phi_0(s) = s', \phi_1(s') = s'' \text{ and } \phi(s) = s''. \] Assume that \( \phi \neq \phi_1 \circ \phi_0 \). So we have that \( \phi^{-1} \circ \phi_1 \circ \phi_0 \neq \text{id} \) and \[ \phi^{-1} \circ \phi_1 \circ \phi_0(s) = s. \]
Let $l < u + v$ be the largest number such that
\[
\phi^{-1} \circ \phi_1 \circ \phi_0|_l \neq 0.
\]
Without loss of generality we assume that $l < u$. Then let $m \in \omega$ with
\[
(\phi^{-1} \circ \phi_1 \circ \phi_0)^m|_l = 1.
\]
Note that $(\phi^{-1} \circ \phi_1 \circ \phi_0)^m \neq \alpha_{i_1}$ because otherwise we would have that $\alpha_{i_1}(s) = s$ which is a contradiction to the fact that $E$ is the minimal support of $s$ with $E_s \subseteq E$. So there is a $\phi \in \tilde{G} \setminus \{id\}$ with
\[
(\phi^{-1} \circ \phi_1 \circ \phi_0)^m = \varphi \circ \alpha_{i_1} \quad \text{and} \quad \phi \vartriangleleft \alpha_{i_1}.
\]
Then $\varphi \circ \alpha_{i_1}(s) = s \implies \alpha_{i_1}(s) = \varphi^{-1}(s)$. Note that $\varphi^{-1} \vartriangleleft \alpha_{i_1}$. We have that $\phi_0|_l \neq 0$ or $\phi_1|_l \neq 0$ or $\phi|_l \neq 0$.

Without loss of generality we assume that $\phi_0|_l \neq 0$. Then
\[
\phi_0 \circ \alpha_{i_1}^{-1} \circ \varphi^{-1} \vartriangleleft \alpha_{i_1}
\]
and
\[
\phi_0 \circ \alpha_{i_1}^{-1} \circ \varphi^{-1}(s) = \phi_0 \circ \alpha_{i_1}^{-1} \circ \alpha_{i_1}(s) = \phi_0(s) = s'.
\]
This contradicts the minimality of $\phi_0$.

For all $\tilde{t} \subseteq \tilde{t}_1$ and all $s < \tilde{t}$ and all $r < u + v$ define
\[
\chi_r(s, \tilde{t}) := \{\text{dist}_r(\langle s, s' \rangle) \mid s' \in \tilde{t}\}.
\]
These sets have the following properties:

**Claim 2**: For all $\tilde{t} \subseteq \tilde{t}_1$ and all $s, s' < \tilde{t}$ we have that

1. $1 \leq |\chi_r(s, \tilde{t})| \leq p_0$ for all $r < u$ and $1 \leq |\chi_r(s, \tilde{t})| \leq p_1$ for all $u \leq r < u + v$.
2. for all $r < u + v$ there is a $k_r \in \omega$ such that $\chi_r(s, \tilde{t}) = \chi_r(s', \tilde{t}) + p \cdot k_r$, where $p = p_0$ if $r < u$ and $p = p_1$ if $u \leq r < u + v$.
3. $|\chi_r(s, \tilde{t})| = |\chi_r(s', \tilde{t})|$.
4. if $s \neq s'$ there is an $r < u + v$ such that $\chi_r(s, \tilde{t}) \neq \chi_r(s', \tilde{t})$.

*Proof of Claim 2*. 1. Note that $0 < \chi_r(s, \tilde{t})$ since dist$_r(\langle s, s \rangle) = 0$.
2. Set $k_r := \phi|_r$, where $\phi$ is $\preceq$-$\alpha$-minimal with $\phi(s) = s'$ and use Claim 1.
3. This follows from 2.
4. Let $s, s' < \tilde{t}$ and let $\phi$ be $\preceq$-$\alpha$-minimal with $\phi(s) = s'$. If $\chi_r(s, \tilde{t}) = \chi_r(s', \tilde{t})$ for all $r < u + v$ it follows that $\phi|_r = k_r = 0$ for all $r < u + v$. So $\phi = \text{id}$ and therefore $s = s'$.

We define an ordering $\preceq$ on the sets $\chi_r(s, \tilde{t})$ as follows: $\chi_r(s, \tilde{t}) \preceq \chi_r(s', \tilde{t})$ if and only if $\chi_r(s, \tilde{t}) = \chi_r(s', \tilde{t})$ or the smallest integer in the symmetric difference $\chi(s, \tilde{t}) \Delta \chi_r(s', \tilde{t})$ belongs to $\chi_r(s, \tilde{t})$.

For all non-empty sets $\tilde{t} \subseteq \tilde{t}_1$, all $r < u + v$ and all natural numbers $n$ define $\lambda_{r,n}(\tilde{t})$ as follows: Let $\lambda_{r,0}(\tilde{t}) := \emptyset$ and for every $n \in \omega \setminus \{0\}$ let
\[
\lambda_{r,n}(\tilde{t}) := \left\{ s \in \tilde{t} \setminus \bigcup_{i=0}^{n-1} \lambda_{r,i}(\tilde{t}) \mid \forall s' \in \tilde{t} \setminus \bigcup_{i=0}^{n-1} \lambda_{r,i}(\tilde{t}) \left( \chi_r(s, \tilde{t}) \leq \chi_r(s', \tilde{t}) \right) \right\}.
\]
Note that $\bigcup_{n \in \omega} \lambda_{r,n}(\bar{t}) = \bar{t}$ and only finitely many $\lambda_{r,n}(\bar{t})$ are non-empty. Assume that $t_{r-1}$ is defined for an $r < u + v$. Then let

$$t_r := \lambda_{r,n_0}(t_{r-1}),$$

where $n_0 \in \omega$ is the smallest natural number such that $\lambda_{r,n_0}(t_{r-1})$ is not of the form $cp_0 + dp_1$ with $c, d \in \omega$. By Claim 2 $t_{u+v-1}$ is a one-element set. I.e. there is an $s < t$ with $t_{u+v-1} = \{s\}$. So we choose $s$ from $t$. This shows that $RC_m$ holds in $V_{p_0,p_1}$.

**Case 2:** There are infinitely many $M_E$ such that there are $z, z' \in M_E$ with $[z] \cap [z'] = \emptyset$.

Our goal is to reduce this case to Case 1. For every $E \in \text{fin}(A)$ with $E \subseteq E$ define $[M_E] := \{[z] \mid z \in M_E\}$. Furthermore choose a $w_0$ in the ground model $M_{p_0,p_1}$ such that

$$w_0 \setminus \bigcup_{E \in \text{fin}(A); E \subseteq E} [M_E] = \emptyset$$

and for all $E \in \text{fin}(A)$ with $E \subseteq E$ and $M_E \neq \emptyset$ ($|w_0 \cap [M_E]| = 1$).

In other words, $w_0$ picks exactly one element from each non-empty $[M_E]$. Note that $E_x$ is a support of $w_0$. So $w_0 \in V_{p_0,p_1}$. Choose

$$M'_E := M_E \cap w_0.$$ 

This reduces Case 2 to Case 1.

**Proposition 7.6.** Let $m, n \in \omega \setminus \{0, 1\}$ and let $p_0, \ldots, p_{k-1}$ be $k \in \omega$ prime numbers such that

$$m \neq \sum_{i<k} c_i p_i$$

for all $c \in \omega, i < k$, and

$$n = \sum_{i<k} d_i p_i$$

for some $d \in \omega, i \in k$. Then

$$RC_m \not\vDash WOC_n^-$$

in ZF.

**Proof.** As in Lemma 7.4 and Lemma 7.5 we can prove that

$$V_{p_0,\ldots,p_{k-1}} \models RC_m \wedge \neg WOC_n^-. \quad (4)$$

In order to transfer this statement to ZF, we have to show that $RC_n$ and $WOC_n^-$ are injectively boundable for all $n \in \omega$. Then we can use Pincus’ transfer theorem [6, Theorem 3A3]. The terms “boundable” and “injectively boundable” are defined in [5].

For a set $x$ we define the injective cardinality

$$|x|_- := \{\alpha \in \Omega \mid \text{there is an injection from } \alpha \text{ to } x\},$$

where $\Omega$ is the class of all ordinal numbers. Moreover let $\varphi(x)$ denote the property “if $x$ is an infinite set, there is an infinite $y \subseteq x$ with a choice function on $[y]^\omega$”. Note that $\varphi(x)$ is boundable. Since $\varphi(x)$ holds when $|x|_- > \omega$, it follows that

$$RC_n \iff \forall x(|x|_- \leq \omega \Rightarrow \varphi(x)).$$

So $RC_n$ is injectively boundable. Note that $\neg WOC_n^-$ is boundable. So (4) is transferable into ZF. \[ \square \]
Since \( \neg \text{WOC}_n \Rightarrow \neg \text{RC}_n \), Proposition 7.6 gives us:

**Corollary 7.7.** Let \( m, n \in \omega \setminus \{0, 1\} \) and let \( p_0, \ldots, p_{k-1} \) be \( k \in \omega \) prime numbers such that

\[
m \neq \sum_{i<k} c_ip_i
\]

for all \( c_i \in \omega, \ i < k, \) and

\[
n = \sum_{i<k} d_ip_i
\]

for some \( d_i \in \omega, \ i < k. \) Then

\[
\text{RC}_m \not\Rightarrow \text{RC}_n
\]

in ZF.

**Corollary 7.8.** Let \( p \) be a prime number, let \( m \in \omega \setminus \{0\} \) and \( n \in \omega \setminus \{0, 1\} \). Then we have that

\[
\text{RC}_p^m \Rightarrow \text{WOC}_n^-
\]

if and only if \( n \mid p^m \) or \( p = 2, \ m = 1 \) and \( n = 4. \)

**Proof.** If \( n \) is divisible by a prime \( q \neq p \) we have that

\[
\mathcal{V}_q \models \text{RC}_p^m \land \neg \text{WOC}_n^-.
\]

Therefore, \( \text{RC}_p^m \not\Rightarrow \text{WOC}_n^- \) in ZF. So we can assume that \( n = p^k \) for a \( k \in \omega \setminus \{0\} \).

**Case 1:** \( m \geq k \)

Let \( p_0, p_1, \ldots, p_{r-1} \) be \( r \in \omega \) prime numbers such that there are \( a_0, a_1, \ldots, a_{r-1} \in \omega \) with

\[
n = p^k = \sum_{i<r} a_ip_i.
\]

Then

\[
p^m = p^{m-k}p^k = \sum_{i<r} p^{m-k}a_ip_i.
\]

So by Proposition 6.2 we have that

\[
\text{RC}_p^m \Rightarrow \text{WOC}_n^-.
\]

**Case 2:** \( m < k \)

First of all assume that \( p \neq 2. \) By Bertrand’s postulate there is a prime number \( q_0 \) with

\[
p^m < q_0 < 2p^m.
\]

Note that \( p^k - q_0 > p^k - 2p^m \geq p \) and \( q_0 \neq p. \) So there is a prime number \( q_1 \neq p \) with

\[
q_1 \mid (p^k - q_0).
\]

By construction, \( p^k \) can be written as a sum of multiples of \( q_0 \) and \( q_1. \) Since \( q_1 \mid p^m \) and \( p^m < q_0, \) we have that

\[
p^m \neq aq_0 + bq_1.
\]

for all \( a, b \in \omega. \) So by Proposition 7.6 we have that

\[
\text{RC}_p^m \not\Rightarrow \text{WOC}_n^{-p^k}.
\]
Now let $p = 2$ and $k \geq 3$. Then there is a prime number $q_0$ with
\[2^{k-1} - 1 < q_0 < 2^k - 2.\]
It follows that
\[2 < 2^{k-1} < q_0 < 2^k - 2.\]
So $2^k - q_0 > 2$ and with the same argumentation as above we see that
\[\text{RC}_{2^k} \not\Rightarrow \text{WOC}_{2^k}.\]
Now we assume that $p = 2$ and $k = 2$. This is the only remaining case. By Proposition 6.2 we have that
\[\text{RC}_2 \Rightarrow \text{WOC}_{2^2}^- .\]
if $m \neq 1$. 
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