

## REFLECTION RANKS VIA INFINITARY DERIVATIONS

FEDOR PAKHOMOV AND JAMES WALSH

ABSTRACT. By a previous result of the authors there are no infinite sequences of  $\Pi_1^1$ -sound extensions of  $\text{ACA}_0$  such that each of them proves  $\Pi_1^1$ -reflection of the next one. This engenders a well-founded “reflection ranking” of  $\Pi_1^1$ -sound extensions of  $\text{ACA}_0$ . In previous work the authors proved that for any  $\Pi_1^1$ -sound theory  $T$  extending  $\text{ACA}_0^+$ , the reflection rank of  $T$  equals the proof-theoretic ordinal of  $T$ . This provides an alternative characterization of the notion of “proof-theoretic ordinal,” which is among the central concepts in proof theory. The authors proved this equivalence with techniques from the study of iterated reflection principles. In this note we provide a new proof that instead makes use of traditional proof-theoretic techniques, namely, cut-elimination for infinitary derivations.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

It is a well-known empirical phenomenon that natural axiomatic theories are well-ordered by their consistency strength [9]. However, consistency strength does *not* well-order theories *in general*; only the natural systems are well-ordered. This has been called “one of the great mysteries in the foundations of mathematics” [1]. In [5], the authors investigated this phenomenon by studying a related notion of proof-theoretic strength— $\Pi_1^1$ -reflection strength—and proved that  $\Pi_1^1$ -sound extensions of  $\text{ACA}_0$  can be *ranked* according to this metric. To state this result, we recall that  $\text{RFN}_{\Pi_1^1}(T)$  is a sentence expressing the  $\Pi_1^1$ -soundness of  $T$ .

**Theorem 1.1.** *The restriction of  $\prec_{\Pi_1^1} := \{(T, U) \mid U \vdash \text{RFN}_{\Pi_1^1}(T)\}$  to the  $\Pi_1^1$ -sound extensions of  $\text{ACA}_0$  is well-founded.*

Furthermore, the authors proved that—in a large swathe of cases—a theory’s rank in this well-founded reflection ordering coincides with its proof-theoretic ordinal, where the *proof-theoretic ordinal* of a theory  $T$  is the supremum of the  $T$ -provably well-founded primitive recursive linear orders. Interest in proof-theoretic ordinals comes from the work of Gentzen, who, using only finitary methods and transfinite induction along  $\varepsilon_0$ , proved the consistency of PA. By Gödel’s Second Incompleteness Theorem, this implies that PA does not prove the well-foundedness of  $\varepsilon_0$ . Yet PA proves the well-foundedness of ordinals less than  $\varepsilon_0$ , whence  $\varepsilon_0$  is the supremum of the PA-provably well-founded primitive recursive linear orders, i.e., the proof-theoretic ordinal of PA. This engendered one of the largest research programs in

---

Research of Fedor Pakhomov is supported by FWO Senior Postdoctoral Fellowship, project 1283021N.

Thanks to Antonio Montalbán for comments on a draft and to Henry Towsner for helpful correspondence.

proof theory—known as *ordinal analysis*—in which theories’ proof-theoretic ordinals are determined.

To state the main result from [5] connecting reflection ranks and proof-theoretic ordinals, recall that  $\text{ACA}_0^+$  is theory  $\text{ACA}_0 + \forall X (X^{(\omega)} \text{ exists})$ .

**Theorem 1.2.** *For  $\Pi_1^1$ -sound extensions  $T$  of  $\text{ACA}_0^+$ , the  $<_{\Pi_1^1}$  rank of  $T$  equals the proof-theoretic ordinal of  $T$ .*

Accordingly, sufficiently sound theories can be ranked according to their proof-theoretic strength, given the right choice of proof-theoretic strength. Moreover, the ranks in this ordering are proof-theoretically familiar values, namely, the proof-theoretic ordinals.

Theorem 1.2 connects two distinct topics in proof theory: iterated reflection and ordinal analysis. In [5], the focus was on the iterated reflection side; indeed, Theorem 1.2 was derived from a Schmerl-style [7] conservation theorem for iterated reflection principles. That proof was rather complicated and required the extensive use of techniques from the study of iterated reflection. In this note, we present a simpler proof of Theorem 1.2 that uses more traditional and accessible techniques from ordinal analysis, namely, cut-elimination for infinitary derivations. The cut-elimination proof strengthens the connections between these two complementary areas of proof theory. Moreover, it should make the result more accessible to proof-theorists who are familiar with cut-elimination techniques.

Here is our plan for the rest of the paper. In §2 we cover some preliminaries, including our treatment of reflection principles and infinitary derivations. In §3 we provide a proof of Theorem 1.1. In §4 we provide our new proof of Theorem 1.2.

## 2. PRELIMINARIES

In this section we cover some preliminary material and definitions. First we give the definitions of  $\Pi_1^1$ -reflection and its iterations. Next we review the definition of pseudo- $\Pi_1^1$  theories. We then cover our standard treatment of ordinal notations and collect some facts. We then review Schmerl’s technique of reflexive induction, which we use in our proofs. Finally, we introduce a formalization of an infinitary proof system in  $\text{ACA}_0$  and prove, in  $\text{ACA}_0$ , that the well-founded cut-free proofs in the system are  $\Pi_1^1$ -sound.

**2.1. Reflection principles.**  $\text{RFN}_{\Pi_1^1}(T)$  is the schema:

$$\forall \vec{x} \left( \text{Pr}_T(\varphi(\vec{x})) \rightarrow \varphi(\vec{x}) \right) \text{ for } \varphi \in \Pi_1^1.$$

In fact, since the  $\Pi_1^1$  truth-definition is available in  $\text{ACA}_0$ , this schema follows from a single instance of itself in  $\text{ACA}_0$ ; see [5] for discussion. Hence we may regard this schema as a single sentence.

We define the formula  $\text{RFN}_{\Pi_1^1}^\alpha(\text{ACA}_0)$  of  $\alpha$ -iterated uniform  $\Pi_1^1$ -reflection over  $\text{ACA}_0$  via the fixed point lemma with  $\alpha$  as the free variable:

$$\text{ACA}_0 \vdash \text{RFN}_{\Pi_1^1}^\alpha(\text{ACA}_0) \leftrightarrow \forall \beta < \alpha \text{RFN}_{\Pi_1^1}(\text{ACA}_0 + \text{RFN}_{\Pi_1^1}^\beta(\text{ACA}_0))$$

*Remark 2.1.* Note that in our previous paper [5] we worked with a different definition of theories axiomatized by iterated reflection wherein limit stages yielded infinitely axiomatized theories. However, in this paper, we are only interested in finitely axiomatized theories, and  $\text{RFN}_{\Pi_1^1}^\alpha(\text{ACA}_0)$  is a sentence for any fixed limit  $\alpha$ .

**2.2. Pseudo  $\Pi_1^1$  theories.** In this paper we will examine theories in two different languages. The first is the language of first-order arithmetic extended with one additional free set variable  $X$ ; we also call this the *pseudo- $\Pi_1^1$  language*. Formulas from this language are known as *pseudo  $\Pi_1^1$  formulas*. By a pseudo  $\Pi_1^1$  theory we mean a theory axiomatized by pseudo  $\Pi_1^1$  formulas. The second is the language is the language of second-order arithmetic. We consider the pseudo- $\Pi_1^1$  language to be a sublanguage of the language of second-order arithmetic by identifying each pseudo- $\Pi_1^1$  sentence  $F$  with the second-order sentence  $\forall X F$ .

The theory  $\text{PA}(X)$  is the pseudo  $\Pi_1^1$  pendant of  $\text{PA}$ . That is,  $\text{PA}(X)$  contains (i) the axioms of  $\text{PA}$  and (ii) induction axioms for all formulas in the language, including those with free set variables.

The proof theory of  $\text{PA}$  is more thoroughly developed than that of  $\text{ACA}_0$ . Nevertheless,  $\text{ACA}_0$  is conservative over  $\text{PA}$  for pseudo  $\Pi_1^1$  formulas, so it is often possible to work in  $\text{PA}$  and transfer results to  $\text{ACA}_0$ .

It is well-known that  $\text{ACA}_0$  is conservative over  $\text{PA}$  (see, e.g., [8, 3]). In fact, every extension of  $\text{ACA}_0$  by a  $\Pi_1^1$  sentence is conservative over a corresponding extension of  $\text{PA}(X)$  by pseudo  $\Pi_1^1$  formulas. Indeed, this is Lemma 4.10 from [5]:

**Lemma 2.2.** ( $\text{ACA}_0$ ) *Let  $\varphi(X), \psi(X)$  be pseudo  $\Pi_1^1$ . If  $\text{ACA}_0 + \forall X \varphi(X) \vdash \forall X \psi(X)$  then  $\text{PA}(X) + \{\varphi[\theta] : \theta \text{ is pseudo } \Pi_1^1\} \vdash \psi(X)$ .*

**2.3. Ordinal notations.** We will formalize results in  $\text{ACA}_0$  that involve quantification over all ordinal notations. We refer the reader to [5] to see our treatment of ordinal notations.

Before continuing we record two facts:

**Theorem 2.3.** *Provably in  $\text{ACA}_0$ , for any linear order  $\mathcal{X}$ , if  $\mathcal{X}$  is well-ordered then so is  $\omega^\mathcal{X}$ .*

**Theorem 2.4.** *Provably in  $\text{ACA}_0^+$ , for any linear order  $\mathcal{X}$ , if  $\mathcal{X}$  is well-ordered then so is  $\varepsilon_\mathcal{X}$ .*

For a proof of the first see [2]; for a proof of the second see [4]. These theorems are stated quite generally, in terms of arbitrary linear orderings. They straightforwardly apply to ordinal notation systems, given our treatment of ordinal notation systems.

**2.4. Reflexive induction.** We often employ Schmerl's technique of *reflexive induction*. Reflexive induction is a way of simulating large amounts of transfinite induction in weak theories. The technique is facilitated by the following theorem' we include the proof, since it is so short.

**Theorem 2.5** (Schmerl). *Let  $T$  be a recursively axiomatized theory containing EA. Suppose  $T \vdash \forall \alpha \left( \text{Pr}_T(\forall \beta < \alpha \varphi(\beta)) \rightarrow \varphi(\alpha) \right)$ . Then  $T \vdash \forall \alpha \varphi(\alpha)$*

*Proof.* Suppose that  $T \vdash \forall \alpha \left( \text{Pr}_T(\forall \beta < \alpha \varphi(\beta)) \rightarrow \varphi(\alpha) \right)$ . We infer that:

$$T \vdash \forall \alpha \text{Pr}_T(\forall \beta < \alpha \varphi(\beta)) \rightarrow \forall \alpha \varphi(\alpha).$$

Löb's Theorem then yields  $T \vdash \forall \alpha \varphi(\alpha)$ .  $\square$

**2.5. Infinitary proofs.** To prove the main theorem we will have to carry out cut-elimination for large fragments of an infinitary proof system from *within*  $\text{ACA}_0$ . The standard definitions of infinitary proof systems use arithmetical transfinite recursion, which is beyond the scope of  $\text{ACA}_0$ . Nevertheless, proof theorists have developed many methods for arithmetizing infinitary derivations and their cut-elimination proofs. If we use any of these effective alternatives we can guarantee that all of these steps formalizable in  $\text{ACA}_0$  (and much weaker theories).

Thus, we will define, in  $\text{ACA}_0$ , a notion that *mimics* the typical definition of a complete infinitary proof calculus. We fix a linear order  $\langle \mathcal{D}, < \rangle$ . For  $\alpha \in \mathcal{D}$  and  $\rho \in \mathbb{N}$ , we define “ $p : \vdash_\rho^\alpha \Delta$ ”, which informally means that  $p$  encodes a proof of the sequent  $\Delta$ , that the proof has height  $\alpha$ , and that all cuts are on formulas of rank less than or equal to  $\rho$ . Recall that the rank  $rk(\varphi)$  of a formula  $\varphi$  is the number of logical symbols occurring in  $\varphi$ .

Let  $P$  be a (potentially infinite) set of Gödel numbers of sequences of the form  $\langle \alpha, \rho, \Delta \rangle$ , where  $\alpha \in \mathcal{D}$ ,  $\rho \in \mathbb{N}$ , and  $\Delta$  a finite set of pseudo  $\Pi_1^1$  formulas. We think of the sequence  $\langle \alpha, \rho, \Delta \rangle$  as encoding the statement that  $\vdash_\rho^\alpha \Delta$ , so instead of writing “ $\langle \alpha, \rho, \Delta \rangle \in P$ ” we merely write “ $\ulcorner \vdash_\rho^\alpha \Delta \urcorner \in P$ .” In the next definition, we characterize proofs as those sets of sequences satisfying certain coherence conditions. After defining what proofs are, we will say what it is for a proof to be a proof of a set of formulas.

**Definition 2.6.** Let  $diag(\mathbb{N})$  be the atomic diagram of  $\mathbb{N}$  in the signature  $(0, 1, +, \times)$ . We say that a set  $P$  of indices of the form “ $\ulcorner \vdash_\rho^\alpha \Delta \urcorner$ ” is a *proof*, as long as the following conditions are met.

- If “ $\ulcorner \vdash_0^0 \Delta \urcorner \in P$ ”, then either (i)  $\Delta \cap diag(\mathbb{N}) \neq \emptyset$  or (ii) for some  $t$  and  $s$  such that  $t^{\mathbb{N}} = s^{\mathbb{N}}$ ,  $\Delta$  contains both formulas  $s \notin X, t \in X$ .
- If “ $\ulcorner \vdash_\rho^\alpha \Delta, A_1 \wedge A_2 \urcorner \in P$ ”, then “ $\ulcorner \vdash_\rho^{\alpha_i} \Delta, A_i \urcorner \in P$  and  $\alpha_i < \alpha$  for  $i = 1, 2$ ”.
- If “ $\ulcorner \vdash_\rho^\alpha \Delta, A_1 \vee A_2 \urcorner \in P$ ”, then “ $\ulcorner \vdash_\rho^{\alpha_0} \Delta, A_i \urcorner$  for some  $\alpha_0 < \alpha$  and some  $i \in \{1, 2\}$ ”.
- If “ $\ulcorner \vdash_\rho^\alpha \Delta, \forall x A(x) \urcorner \in P$ ”, then, for all  $i \in \mathbb{N}$ , there is an  $\alpha_i < \alpha$  such that “ $\ulcorner \vdash_\rho^{\alpha_i} \Delta, A(i) \urcorner$ ”.
- If “ $\ulcorner \vdash_\rho^\alpha \Delta, \exists x A(x) \urcorner \in P$ ”, then for some  $\alpha_0 < \alpha$  and some  $i \in \mathbb{N}$ , “ $\ulcorner \vdash_\rho^{\alpha_0} \Delta, A(i) \urcorner \in P$ ”.

- If  $\ulcorner \vdash_{\rho}^{\alpha} \Delta \urcorner \in P$  and the previous clauses are not satisfied, then, for some formula  $F$ ,  $\ulcorner \vdash_{\rho}^{\alpha_1} \Delta, F \urcorner \in P$  and  $\ulcorner \vdash_{\rho}^{\alpha_2} \Delta, \neg F \urcorner \in P$  where  $\alpha_i < \alpha$  for  $i \in \{1, 2\}$  and  $rk(F) < \rho$ .

**Definition 2.7.** We say that a proof  $P$  is a proof of a set  $\Delta$  of pseudo  $\Pi_1^1$  formulas if, for some  $\alpha$  and  $\rho$ ,  $\ulcorner \vdash_{\rho}^{\alpha} \Delta \urcorner$  is in  $P$ . We indicate that  $\ulcorner \vdash_{\rho}^{\alpha} \Delta \urcorner \in P$  by writing  $P : \vdash_{\rho}^{\alpha} \Delta$ , i.e., that  $P$  is a proof of  $\Delta$  of height  $\alpha$  and cut-rank  $\rho$ . We write  $\vdash_{\rho}^{\alpha} \Delta$  to mean that there is a  $P$  such that  $P : \vdash_{\rho}^{\alpha} \Delta$ .

We will need one lemma concerning infinitary derivations. Given the standard definition of infinitary proof calculi, one can establish the following lemma easily by transfinite induction. We take more care than is typical, carrying out the proof in  $\text{ACA}_0$  for the formalization of proofs given in Definition 2.6.

**Lemma 2.8.** *For each formula  $\Pi_{<\omega}^0$  formula  $\varphi(X, \vec{x})$ , the theory  $\text{ACA}_0$  proves: If  $\vdash_0^{\alpha} \varphi(X, \vec{p})$ , for some vector of number parameters  $\vec{p}$ , then  $\forall X \varphi(X, \vec{p})$ .*

*Proof.* We reason in  $\text{ACA}_0$ . We assume for a contradiction that  $\forall X \varphi(X, \vec{p})$  is false and that  $\vdash_0^{\alpha} \varphi(X, \vec{p})$ . Since  $\forall X \varphi(X, \vec{p})$  is false, there is some set  $A$  such that  $\varphi(A, \vec{p})$ .

We consider the set  $U$  of all sequents  $\vdash_0^{\beta} \Gamma(X)$  in  $P$  such that  $\Gamma(X)$  consists of numerical variants of subformulas of  $\varphi(X)$  and  $\Gamma(A)$  is false. Note that this is a valid construction in  $\text{ACA}_0$  since  $\varphi(X, \vec{x})$  is fixed and hence the truth of the sequents  $\Gamma(A)$  that could appear in  $U$  could be expressed in  $\text{ACA}_0$ . Notice that  $\vdash_0^{\alpha} \varphi(X, \vec{p})$  is in  $U$  and whenever  $\vdash_0^{\beta} \Gamma(X)$  is in  $U$  there is some  $\vdash_0^{\beta'} \Gamma'(X)$  in  $U$  with  $\beta' < \beta$  (we could always choose  $\vdash_0^{\beta'} \Gamma'(X)$  to be one the premises used to derive  $\vdash_0^{\beta} \Gamma(X)$ ). Thus the set of all  $\beta$  that appear in sequents in  $U$  is a set of denotations of ordinals without a least element.  $\square$

### 3. REFLECTION RANKS

In this section we recapitulate the short proof of Theorem 1.1. The result and proof in this section first appeared in [5]. We examine the ordering  $<_{\Pi_1^1}$  on r.e. extensions of  $\text{ACA}_0$ , where

$$T <_{\Pi_1^1} U \stackrel{\text{def}}{\iff} U \vdash \text{RFN}_{\Pi_1^1}(T).$$

We will show that there are no infinite  $<_{\Pi_1^1}$  descending sequences of  $\Pi_1^1$  sound extensions of  $\text{ACA}_0$ . We recall that, provably in  $\text{ACA}_0$ , a theory  $T$  is  $\Pi_1^1$  sound if and only if  $T$  is consistent with any true  $\Sigma_1^1$  statement.

**Theorem 3.1.** ( $\text{ACA}_0$ ) *The restriction of the order  $<_{\Pi_1^1}$  to  $\Pi_1^1$ -sound r.e. extensions of  $\text{ACA}_0$  is well-founded.*

*Proof.* In order to prove the result in  $\text{ACA}_0$  we show the inconsistency of the theory  $\text{ACA}_0$  plus the following statement DS, which says that there is a descending sequence of  $\Pi_1^1$  sound extensions of  $\text{ACA}_0$  in the  $<_{\Pi_1^1}$  ordering:

$$\text{DS} := \exists E : \langle T_i \mid i \in \mathbb{N} \rangle (\text{RFN}_{\Pi_1^1}(T_0) \wedge \forall x \text{Pr}_{T_x}(\text{RFN}_{\Pi_1^1}(T_{x+1})) \wedge \forall x (T_x \supseteq \text{ACA}_0))$$

Note that  $E: \langle T_i \mid i \in \mathbb{N} \rangle$  is understood to mean that  $E$  is a set encoding a sequence  $\langle T_0, T_1, T_2, \dots \rangle$  of r.e. theories.

If we prove that  $\text{ACA}_0 + \text{DS}$  proves its own consistency, then the inconsistency of  $\text{ACA}_0 + \text{DS}$  follows from Gödel's second incompleteness theorem. We reason in  $\text{ACA}_0 + \text{DS}$  to prove consistency of  $\text{ACA}_0 + \text{DS}$ .

Let  $E: \langle T_i \mid i \in \mathbb{N} \rangle$  be a sequence of theories witnessing the truth of DS. Let us consider the sentence  $F$

$$\exists U: \langle S_i \mid i \in \mathbb{N} \rangle (S_0 = T_1 \wedge \forall x \text{Pr}_{S_x}(\text{RFN}_{\Pi_1^1}(S_{x+1})) \wedge \forall x (S_x \supseteq \text{ACA}_0)).$$

The sentence  $F$  is true since we could take  $\langle T_{i+1} : i \in \mathbb{N} \rangle$  as  $U$ . It is easy to observe that  $F$  is  $\Sigma_1^1$ .

From  $\text{RFN}_{\Pi_1^1}(T_0)$  we get that  $T_0$  is consistent with any true  $\Sigma_1^1$  statement. Thus, we infer that

$$\text{Con}(T_0 + F).$$

Now using the fact that  $\text{Pr}_{T_0}(\text{RFN}_{\Pi_1^1}(T_1))$  and that  $T_0 \supseteq \text{ACA}_0$  we conclude,

$$\text{Con}(\text{ACA}_0 + \text{RFN}_{\Pi_1^1}(T_1) + F).$$

But it is easy to see that  $\text{RFN}_{\Pi_1^1}(T_1) + F$  implies DS in  $\text{ACA}_0$ . In particular, we may take  $\langle T_1, T_2, \dots \rangle$  as our new witness to DS. Thus, we conclude that  $\text{Con}(\text{ACA}_0 + \text{DS})$ .  $\square$

#### 4. THE PROOF OF THE MAIN THEOREM

Theorem 3.1 states that the restriction of  $\prec_{\Pi_1^1} := \{(T, U) \mid U \vdash \text{RFN}_{\Pi_1^1}(T)\}$  to the  $\Pi_1^1$ -sound extensions of  $\text{ACA}_0$  is well-founded. We write  $|T|_{\text{ACA}_0}$  to denote the rank of a theory in this ordering. We call  $|T|_{\text{ACA}_0}$  the *reflection rank* of  $T$ .

In this section we consider the relationship between reflection ranks and *proof-theoretic ordinals*. We write  $|T|_{\text{WO}}$  to denote the proof-theoretic ordinal of a theory  $T$ , i.e., the supremum of the  $T$ -provably well-founded primitive recursive linear orders.

Our main theorem is that for any  $\Pi_1^1$  sound extension  $T$  of  $\text{ACA}_0^+$ ,  $|T|_{\text{ACA}_0} = |T|_{\text{WO}}$ . We will derive the main theorem from the following equivalence: for any ordinal notation  $\alpha$ ,

$$\text{ACA}_0 + \text{RFN}_{\Pi_1^1}^{1+\alpha}(\text{ACA}_0) \equiv \text{ACA}_0 + \text{WO}(\varepsilon_\alpha).$$

We prove each inclusion of this equivalence separately, i.e., we first prove that

$$(\circ) \quad \text{ACA}_0 + \text{RFN}_{\Pi_1^1}^{1+\alpha}(\text{ACA}_0) \vdash \text{WO}(\varepsilon_\alpha),$$

and then prove that

$$(\triangle) \quad \text{ACA}_0 + \text{WO}(\varepsilon_\alpha) \vdash \text{RFN}_{\Pi_1^1}^{1+\alpha}(\text{ACA}_0).$$

We prove both  $(\circ)$  and  $(\triangle)$  by Schmerl's [7] technique of *reflexive induction*; see §2.4. In §4.1 we cover the "easy direction," namely, the proof of  $(\circ)$ . In §4.2 we will collect some basic facts about infinitary derivations from [6] and use them to prove a key lemma. In §4.3 we use the key lemma to prove the "hard direction," namely,  $(\triangle)$ . We then easily derive the main theorem from  $(\circ)$  and  $(\triangle)$ .

**4.1. The easy direction.** In this section we prove  $(\bigcirc)$ . We prove the claim in  $\text{ACA}_0$  by Schmerl's [7] technique of *reflexive induction*; see §2.4.

**Theorem 4.1.**  $\text{ACA}_0 \vdash \forall \alpha (\text{ACA}_0 + \text{RFN}_{\Pi_1^1}^{1+\alpha}(\text{ACA}_0) \text{ proves } \text{WO}(\varepsilon_\alpha))$ .

*Proof.* We let  $A(\alpha)$  denote the claim that  $\text{ACA}_0 + \text{RFN}_{\Pi_1^1}^{1+\alpha}(\text{ACA}_0) \vdash \text{WO}(\varepsilon_\alpha)$ . We want to prove that  $\text{ACA}_0 \vdash \forall \alpha A(\alpha)$ . By reflexive induction it suffices to prove that  $\text{ACA}_0 \vdash \forall \alpha (\text{Pr}_{\text{ACA}_0}(\forall \gamma < \alpha, A(\gamma)) \rightarrow A(\alpha))$ .

**Reason in  $\text{ACA}_0$ .** We suppose the *reflexive induction hypothesis*, which is that  $\text{Pr}_{\text{ACA}_0}(\forall \gamma < \alpha, A(\gamma))$ , i.e.,

$$\text{Pr}_{\text{ACA}_0} \left( \forall \gamma < \alpha (\text{ACA}_0 + \text{RFN}_{\Pi_1^1}^{1+\gamma}(\text{ACA}_0) \text{ proves } \text{WO}(\varepsilon_\gamma)) \right).$$

We need to show that  $A(\alpha)$ , i.e.,  $\text{ACA}_0 + \text{RFN}_{\Pi_1^1}^{1+\alpha}(\text{ACA}_0) \vdash \text{WO}(\varepsilon_\alpha)$ .

To prove the claim we reason as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{ACA}_0 \vdash \forall \gamma < \alpha (\text{ACA}_0 + \text{RFN}_{\Pi_1^1}^{1+\gamma}(\text{ACA}_0) \text{ proves } \text{WO}(\varepsilon_\gamma)) \\ \text{by the reflexive induction hypothesis.} \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{ACA}_0 + \text{RFN}_{\Pi_1^1}^{1+\alpha}(\text{ACA}_0) \vdash \forall \gamma < \alpha (\text{ACA}_0 + \text{RFN}_{\Pi_1^1}^{1+\gamma}(\text{ACA}_0) \text{ proves } \text{WO}(\varepsilon_\gamma)) \\ \text{by the monotonicity of implication.} \end{aligned}$$

$$\text{ACA}_0 + \text{RFN}_{\Pi_1^1}^{1+\alpha}(\text{ACA}_0) \vdash \forall \gamma < \alpha \text{WO}(\varepsilon_\gamma) \text{ since well-foundedness is } \Pi_1^1.$$

If  $\varepsilon_\alpha$  is a limit of  $\varepsilon$  numbers, then the claim clearly follows. Otherwise,  $\varepsilon_\alpha = \varepsilon_{\beta+1}$  for some  $\beta$ , and we continue reasoning as follows.

$$\text{ACA}_0 + \text{RFN}_{\Pi_1^1}^{1+\alpha}(\text{ACA}_0) \vdash \forall \gamma < \alpha, \text{WO}(\varepsilon_\gamma) \text{ as before.}$$

$$\text{ACA}_0 + \text{RFN}_{\Pi_1^1}^{1+\alpha}(\text{ACA}_0) \vdash \text{WO}(\varepsilon_\beta) \text{ since } \beta < \alpha.$$

Then for every  $\delta < \varepsilon_\alpha$ ,  $\text{ACA}_0 + \text{RFN}_{\Pi_1^1}^{1+\alpha}(\text{ACA}_0)$  proves the well-foundedness of  $\delta$  by (the formalized version of) Theorem 2.3.  $\square$

**4.2. Cut-elimination lemmas.** The proof of  $(\triangle)$  requires more work. In particular, we must first prove, within a theory of the form  $\text{ACA}_0 + \text{WO}(\varepsilon_\alpha)$ , the  $\Pi_1^1$ -soundness of  $\text{ACA}_0 + \text{WO}(\varepsilon_\gamma)$  for all  $\gamma < \alpha$ . That is, we must prove the following:

**Theorem 4.2.**  $\text{ACA}_0 + \text{WO}(\varepsilon_\alpha)$  *proves that for every  $\gamma < \alpha$ ,  $\text{ACA}_0 + \text{WO}(\varepsilon_\gamma)$  is  $\Pi_1^1$  sound.*

We do this by carrying out, within  $\text{ACA}_0 + \text{WO}(\varepsilon_\alpha)$ , ordinal analyses of the theories  $\text{ACA}_0 + \text{WO}(\varepsilon_\gamma)$  for all  $\gamma < \alpha$ . The strategy of the proof is this. We consider a proof of a  $\Pi_1^1$  formula  $\varphi$  from the axiom system  $\text{ACA}_0 + \text{WO}(\varepsilon_\gamma)$ . We then embed this proof into a  $\Pi_1^1$  complete infinitary proof calculus for  $\omega$ -logic. We can then infer the truth of  $\varphi$  by cut-elimination for  $\omega$ -logic. Proving cut-elimination for the relevant fragment of  $\omega$ -logic requires transfinite induction along  $\varepsilon_\alpha$ .

However, to extract  $(\Delta)$  from Theorem 4.2, we will need to make sure that Theorem 4.2 is provable in  $\text{ACA}_0$ . This is why we were careful to define infinitary proof systems in such a way that they could be defined and reasoned with in  $\text{ACA}_0$ .

Before continuing, we collect a number of facts concerning cut-elimination for infinitary derivations from Pohlers' [6]. We fix a sufficiently nice ordinal notation system and note that each of the following is provable in  $\text{ACA}_0$ .

**Definition 4.3.** For a pseudo  $\Pi_1^1$  formula  $F$ , the *truth-complexity* of  $F$  is the least ordinal  $\alpha$  such that  $\vdash_0^\alpha F$ . We write  $\text{tc}(F)$  to denote the truth-complexity of  $F$ .

*Remark 4.4.* Note that an alternative definition of truth-complexity is given in [6] and that our definition is stated as a theorem.

**Lemma 4.5** (Equation (34) after Lemma 2.1.2.4 in [6]). *For any axiom  $A$  of PA, the truth-complexity of  $A$  is less than  $\omega + 5$ .*

For an arithmetically definable relation  $<$ , let  $\text{TI}(<, X)$  be the formula:

$$\forall x \in \text{field}(<) \left( \forall y (y < x \rightarrow y \in X) \rightarrow x \in X \right) \rightarrow \forall x \in \text{field}(<) (x \in X)$$

**Theorem 4.6** (Theorem 1.3.10 in [6]). *If  $\text{otyp}(<)$  is a limit ordinal, then the truth-complexity of  $\text{TI}(<, X)$  is no greater than  $\text{otyp}(<) + 2$ .*

Attention to the proof of the Theorem 4.6 reveals that it actually proves a stronger statement. For an arithmetically definable relation  $<$  and formula  $\varphi$ , let  $\text{TI}(<, \varphi)$  be the formula:

$$\forall x \in \text{field}(<) \left( \forall y (y < x \rightarrow \varphi(y)) \rightarrow \varphi(x) \right) \rightarrow \forall x \in \text{field}(<) \varphi(x)$$

**Proposition 4.7.** *For any pseudo  $\Pi_1^1$  formula  $\varphi$ , if  $\text{otyp}(<)$  is a limit ordinal, then the truth-complexity of  $\text{TI}(<, \varphi)$  is no greater than  $\text{otyp}(<) + 2$ .*

We now recall the definition of the symmetric sum of ordinals. This is a standard notion (see, e.g., [6]) but we present the definition for convenience.

**Definition 4.8.** We define the *symmetric sum* of ordinals (in Cantor normal form)  $\alpha := \omega^{\alpha_1} + \dots + \omega^{\alpha_n}$  and  $\beta := \omega^{\beta_1} + \dots + \omega^{\beta_m}$  as follows:

$$\alpha \# \beta := \alpha_{\pi(1)} + \dots + \alpha_{\pi(m)}$$

where  $\pi$  is a permutation of the numbers  $\{1, \dots, m\}$  such that:

$$1 \leq i \leq j \leq m \Rightarrow \alpha_{\pi(i)} \geq \alpha_{\pi(j)}.$$

*Remark 4.9.* Note that  $\alpha \# \beta = \beta \# \alpha$ .

Before stating the final proposition that we need to cite from Pohlers [6], we recall the definition of the rank of a formula:

**Definition 4.10.** The rank  $\text{rk}(\varphi)$  of a formula  $\varphi$  is the number of logical symbols that occur in  $\varphi$ .

**Proposition 4.11** (Lemma 2.1.2.7 in [6]). *If the sequent  $\neg A_1, \dots, \neg A_n, B$  is provable in pure first-order logic, then  $\vdash_r^{\text{tc}(A_1)\#\dots\#\text{tc}(A_n)+n} B$ , where  $r := \max\{\text{rk}(A_1), \dots, \text{rk}(A_n)\}$ .*

**Theorem 4.12** (Theorem 2.1.2.9 in [6]). *If  $\vdash_{\rho+1}^\alpha \Delta$ , then  $\vdash_\rho^{\omega^\alpha} \Delta$ .*

Before presenting the proof of the main lemma for  $(\Delta)$ , we will introduce the following notational convenience: We write  $\text{PA}^\alpha$  to denote the pseudo  $\Pi_1^1$  pendant of  $\text{ACA}_0 + \text{WO}(\alpha)$ , i.e.,

$$\text{PA}^\alpha := \text{PA}(X) + \{\text{TI}(\alpha, \varphi) \mid \varphi \text{ is pseudo } \Pi_1^1\}.$$

**Lemma 4.13.** *Provably in  $\text{ACA}_0$ , for any ordinal notation  $\alpha$ ,*

$$\text{ACA}_0 + \text{WO}(\varepsilon_\alpha) \vdash \forall \gamma < \alpha (\text{RFN}_{\Pi_1^1}(\text{ACA}_0 + \text{WO}(\varepsilon_\gamma))).$$

*Proof.* Recall that  $\Pi_1^1$ -reflection follows from a single instance of itself in  $\text{ACA}_0$ . Hence, it suffices to prove in  $\text{ACA}_0 + \text{WO}(\varepsilon_\alpha)$  that for  $\gamma < \alpha$  and number parameters  $\vec{p}$  we have

$$(1) \quad \text{Pr}_{\text{ACA}_0 + \text{WO}(\varepsilon_\gamma)}(\varphi(\vec{p})) \rightarrow \varphi(\vec{p}),$$

for some fixed  $\Pi_1^1$  formula  $\varphi(\vec{x})$ .

Suppose that  $\text{ACA}_0 + \text{WO}(\varepsilon_\gamma) \vdash \varphi(\vec{p})$  for some  $\gamma < \alpha$ . By Lemma 2.2, we infer that  $\text{PA}^{\varepsilon_\gamma} \vdash \varphi^*(\vec{p})$  for the pseudo  $\Pi_1^1$  version  $\varphi^*(\vec{p})$  of  $\varphi(\vec{p})$ . This is to say that

$$\text{PA} \vdash \neg \text{TI}(\varepsilon_\gamma, \psi_1) \vee \dots \vee \neg \text{TI}(\varepsilon_\gamma, \psi_k) \vee \varphi^*(\vec{p})$$

for some pseudo  $\Pi_1^1$  formulas  $\psi_1, \dots, \psi_k$ . Then there is a proof in pure first-order logic of the sequent

$$\neg A_1, \dots, \neg A_n, \neg \text{TI}(\varepsilon_\gamma, \bigvee_{i \leq k} \psi_i), \varphi^*(\vec{p})$$

for some axioms  $A_1, \dots, A_n$  of  $\text{PA}$ . By Lemma 4.5, for each  $A_i$ , the truth-complexity of  $A_i$  is less than  $\omega + 5$ . By Proposition 4.7, the truth-complexity of  $\text{TI}(\varepsilon_\gamma, \bigvee_{i \leq k} \psi_i)$  is at most  $\varepsilon_\gamma + 2$ . Thus, by Proposition 4.11

$$\vdash_r^{(\varepsilon_\gamma+2)+(\omega+5)+n} \varphi^*(\vec{p})$$

where  $r := \max\{\text{rk}(A_1), \dots, \text{rk}(A_n), \text{rk}(\text{TI}(\varepsilon_\gamma, \bigvee_{i \leq k} \psi_i))\}$ . Then by application of Theorem 4.12, we infer that

$$\vdash_0^{\varepsilon_\gamma+1} \varphi^*(\vec{p}).$$

Lemma 2.8 implies  $\varphi(\vec{p})$ . □

**4.3. The hard direction.** With this lemma on board we are ready for the proof of the theorem. Once again, we use Schmerl's technique of reflexive induction; for an overview of this technique see §2.4.

**Theorem 4.14.**  $\text{ACA}_0 + \text{WO}(\varepsilon_\alpha) \vdash \text{RFN}_{\Pi_1^1}^{1+\alpha}(\text{ACA}_0)$ .

*Proof.* We let  $A(\alpha)$  denote the claim that  $\text{ACA}_0 + \text{WO}(\varepsilon_\alpha) \vdash \text{RFN}_{\Pi_1^1}^{1+\alpha}(\text{ACA}_0)$ . We want to prove that  $\text{ACA}_0 \vdash \forall \alpha A(\alpha)$ . By reflexive induction it suffices to prove that  $\text{ACA}_0 \vdash \forall \alpha (\text{Pr}_{\text{ACA}_0}(\forall \gamma < \alpha, A(\gamma)) \rightarrow A(\alpha))$ .

**Reason in  $\text{ACA}_0$ .** We assume the *reflexive induction hypothesis*, which is that  $\text{Pr}_{\text{ACA}_0}(\forall \gamma < \alpha, A(\gamma))$ , i.e.,

$$\text{Pr}_{\text{ACA}_0} \left( \forall \gamma < \alpha (\text{ACA}_0 + \text{WO}(\varepsilon_\gamma) \text{ proves } \text{RFN}_{\Pi_1^1}^{1+\gamma}(\text{ACA}_0)) \right).$$

We need to show that  $A(\alpha)$ , i.e.,  $\text{ACA}_0 + \text{WO}(\varepsilon_\alpha) \vdash \text{RFN}_{\Pi_1^1}^{1+\alpha}(\text{ACA}_0)$ .

To prove the claim we reason as follows:

$$\text{ACA}_0 \vdash \forall \gamma < \alpha (\text{ACA}_0 + \text{WO}(\varepsilon_\gamma) \text{ proves } \text{RFN}_{\Pi_1^1}^{1+\gamma}(\text{ACA}_0))$$

by the reflexive induction hypothesis.

$$\text{ACA}_0 + \text{WO}(\varepsilon_\alpha) \vdash \forall \gamma < \alpha (\text{ACA}_0 + \text{WO}(\varepsilon_\gamma) \text{ proves } \text{RFN}_{\Pi_1^1}^{1+\gamma}(\text{ACA}_0))$$

by the monotonicity of implication.

$$\text{ACA}_0 + \text{WO}(\varepsilon_\alpha) \vdash \forall \gamma < \alpha (\text{RFN}_{\Pi_1^1}(\text{RFN}_{\Pi_1^1}^{1+\gamma}(\text{ACA}_0))) \text{ by Lemma 4.13.}$$

$$\text{ACA}_0 + \text{WO}(\varepsilon_\alpha) \vdash \text{RFN}_{\Pi_1^1}^{1+\alpha}(\text{ACA}_0) \text{ by definition.}$$

This completes the proof of the theorem.  $\square$

As an immediate consequence of  $(\bigcirc)$  and  $(\Delta)$  we derive the following:

**Theorem 4.15.**  $\text{ACA}_0 + \text{RFN}_{\Pi_1^1}^{1+\alpha}(\text{ACA}_0) \equiv \text{ACA}_0 + \text{WO}(\varepsilon_\alpha)$ .

We now combine Theorem 4.15 with Theorem 2.4 to derive the main theorem of the paper:

**Theorem 4.16.** *For any  $\Pi_1^1$  sound extension  $T$  of  $\text{ACA}_0^+$ ,  $|T|_{\text{ACA}_0} = |T|_{\text{WO}}$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $T$  be a  $\Pi_1^1$  sound extension of  $\text{ACA}_0^+$ . It is immediate from Corollary 4.15 that  $|T|_{\text{ACA}_0} \leq |T|_{\text{WO}}$ . To see that  $|T|_{\text{WO}} \leq |T|_{\text{ACA}_0}$  we reason as follows:

$$\text{ACA}_0^+ \vdash \forall \mathcal{X} (\text{WO}(\mathcal{X}) \rightarrow \text{WO}(\varepsilon_{\mathcal{X}})) \text{ by Theorem 2.4.}$$

$$\text{ACA}_0^+ \vdash \text{WO}(\alpha) \rightarrow \text{WO}(\varepsilon_\alpha) \text{ by instantiation.}$$

$$\text{ACA}_0^+ \vdash \text{WO}(\varepsilon_\alpha) \rightarrow \text{RFN}_{\Pi_1^1}^{1+\alpha}(\text{ACA}_0) \text{ by Corollary 4.15.}$$

$$\text{ACA}_0^+ \vdash \text{WO}(\alpha) \rightarrow \text{RFN}_{\Pi_1^1}^{1+\alpha}(\text{ACA}_0) \text{ from the previous two lines.}$$

Thus, for any  $T$  extending  $\text{ACA}_0^+$ , if  $T \vdash \text{WO}(\alpha)$  then also  $T \vdash \text{RFN}_{\Pi_1^1}^{1+\alpha}(\text{ACA}_0)$ .  $\square$

## REFERENCES

- [1] Sy-David Friedman, Michael Rathjen, and Andreas Weiermann. Slow consistency. *Annals of Pure and Applied Logic*, 164(3):382–393, 2013.
- [2] Jean-Yves Girard. *Proof Theory and Logical Complexity*, volume 1. Humanities Press, 1987.
- [3] Denis R Hirschfeldt. *Slicing the Truth: On the Computable and Reverse Mathematics of Combinatorial Principles*. World Scientific, 2015.

- [4] Alberto Marcone and Antonio Montalbán. The Veblen functions for computability theorists. *Journal of Symbolic Logic*, 76(2):575–602, 2011.
- [5] Fedor Pakhomov and James Walsh. Reflection ranks and ordinal analysis. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1805.02095*, 2018.
- [6] Wolfram Pohlers. Subsystems of set theory and second order number theory. *Handbook of Proof Theory*, 137:209–335, 1998.
- [7] Ulf R Schmerl. A fine structure generated by reflection formulas over primitive recursive arithmetic. In *Studies in Logic and the Foundations of Mathematics*, volume 97, pages 335–350. Elsevier, 1979.
- [8] Stephen G Simpson. *Subsystems of Second Order Arithmetic*, volume 1. Cambridge University Press, 2009.
- [9] James Walsh. On the hierarchy of natural theories. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2106.05794*, 2021.

GHENT UNIVERSITY AND STEKLOV MATHEMATICAL INSTITUTE OF RUSSIAN ACADEMY OF SCIENCES

*Email address:* `fedor.pakhomov@ugent.be`

SAGE SCHOOL OF PHILOSOPHY, CORNELL UNIVERSITY

*Email address:* `jameswalsh@cornell.edu`