

SOME CONSEQUENCES OF TD AND sTD

YINHE PENG, LIUZHEN WU AND LIANG YU

ABSTRACT. Strongly Turing determinacy, or sTD, says that for any set A of reals, if $\forall x \exists y \geq_T x (y \in A)$, then there is a pointed set $P \subseteq A$. We prove the following consequences of Turing determinacy (TD) and sTD:

- (1) ZF + TD implies weakly dependent choice ($wDC_{\mathbb{R}}$).
- (2) ZF + sTD implies that every set of reals is measurable and has Baire property.
- (3) ZF + sTD implies that every uncountable set of reals has a perfect subset.
- (4) ZF + sTD implies that for any set of reals A and any $\epsilon > 0$,
 - (a) there is a closed set $F \subseteq A$ so that $\text{Dim}_H(F) \geq \text{Dim}_H(A) - \epsilon$.
 - (b) there is a closed set $F \subseteq A$ so that $\text{Dim}_P(F) \geq \text{Dim}_P(A) - \epsilon$.

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. **TD and sTD.** Turing reduction \leq_T is a partial order over reals. It naturally induces an equivalence relation \equiv_T . Given a real x , its corresponded Turing degree \mathbf{x} is a set of reals defined as $\{y \mid y \equiv_T x\}$. We say $\mathbf{x} \leq \mathbf{y}$ if $x \leq_T y$. We use \mathcal{D} to denote the set of Turing degrees. An *upper cone* of Turing degrees is the set $\{\mathbf{y} \mid \mathbf{y} \geq \mathbf{x}\}$.

We say that a perfect set P is *pointed* if there is a perfect tree $T \subseteq 2^{<\omega}$ so that $[T] = P$ and for any $x \in P$, $T \leq_T x$, where $[T] = \{x \in 2^\omega \mid \forall n(x \upharpoonright n \in T)\}$.

Definition 1.1.

- *Turing determinacy, or TD, says that for any set A of Turing degrees, either A or $\mathcal{D} \setminus A$ contains an upper cone of Turing degrees.*
- *Strongly Turing determinacy, or sTD, says that for any set A of reals, if $\forall x \exists y \geq_T x (y \in A)$, then there is a pointed set P so that $P \subseteq A$.*

Martin proves the following famous theorem.

Theorem 1.2 (Martin [15]). *Over ZF, Axiom of determinacy, or AD, implies TD.*

Definition 1.3.

- *Countable choice axiom for sets of reals, or $CC_{\mathbb{R}}$, says that for any countable sequence $\{A_n\}_{n \in \omega}$ of nonempty sets of reals, there is a function $f : \omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ so that for every n , $f(n) \in A_n$.*
- *Dependent choice axiom for sets of reals, or $DC_{\mathbb{R}}$, says that for any binary relation R over reals so that $\forall x \exists y R(x, y)$, there is a function $f : \omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ so that for every n , $R(f(n), f(n+1))$.*

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 03D28, 03E05, 03E15, 03E25, 03E60, 28A80, 68Q30.

We thank Denis Hirschfeldt, Ramez Sami, Theodore Slaman, and Hugh Woodin for their helpful discussions. Especially for Slaman's introducing Hausdorff dimension regularity to us. Peng was partially supported by NSF of China No. 11901562 and the Hundred Talents Program of the Chinese Academy of Sciences. Wu was partially supported by NSFC No. 11871464. Yu was partially supported by NSF of China No. 11671196 and 12025103.

Turing determinacy is an important and very useful consequence of AD. First it is a neat statement, which looks more like an axiom than AD. Second, in many situations, TD seems sufficient to be used to prove set theory theorems. The following theorem justifies this phenomenon.

Theorem 1.4 (Woodin). *Assume $ZF + V = L(\mathbb{R}) + DC_{\mathbb{R}}$. AD is equivalent to TD.*

Moreover, as we shall see in this paper, different than AD which often needs a very genius, tricky and case-by-case design of games, TD (and sTD) usually provides a more consistent way to solve problems in set theory.

The first result in this paper concerns the relationship between AD and Axiom of Choice, or AC.

Though AD contradicts to AC, Mycielski proves the following theorem.

Theorem 1.5 (Mycielski [17]). *Over ZF, AD implies $CC_{\mathbb{R}}$.*

The question if AD implies $DC_{\mathbb{R}}$ remains a long time.

Question 1.6 (Solovay). *Over ZF, does AD imply $DC_{\mathbb{R}}$?*

Kechris proves the following result.

Theorem 1.7 (Kechris [11]). *Assume $ZF + V = L(\mathbb{R})$, AD implies $DC_{\mathbb{R}}$.*

It is unknown whether the assumption $V = L(\mathbb{R})$ can be removed. Recently, the following “unconditional” result is proved.

Theorem 1.8 (Peng and Yu [19]). *Over ZF, TD implies $CC_{\mathbb{R}}$.*

We will use $CC_{\mathbb{R}}$ throughout the paper even without mentioning it.

The first result in this paper is a partial solution to Question 1.6. We prove that $ZF + TD$ implies $wDC_{\mathbb{R}}$, a weaker version of $DC_{\mathbb{R}}$ (for the definition of $wDC_{\mathbb{R}}$, see Definition 4.1).

The second result in this paper is about the regularity properties of sets of reals. Though TD seems unlikely as strong as AD, a natural question is whether TD is as “useful” as AD. Sami initiated this project by proving (in [22]) that $ZF + TD$ implies CH, the continuum hypothesis. But it seems a rather difficult (and long standing) question whether $ZF + TD(+DC)$ implies regularity properties for sets of reals. In this paper, we give a partial answer to this question by showing that strongly Turing determinacy, sTD—a stronger version of TD, implies the regularity properties for sets of reals.

A basis for a class \mathcal{C} of linearly ordered sets is a collection $\mathcal{B} \subseteq \mathcal{C}$ such that for each $L_1 \in \mathcal{C}$, there is an $L_2 \in \mathcal{B}$ such that L_2 is isomorphic to a subset of L_1 . Investigating basis for linear ordering is a very active area in set theory today. For example, Moore [16] proves that under proper forcing axioms, PFA, a five-element basis exists. But it seems that basis theorems for linear orderings under AD remains untouched. In this paper, we prove a basis theorem for linear orderings over \mathbb{R} under the assumption $ZF + TD + DC_{\mathbb{R}}$ + “every uncountable set of reals has a perfect subset” by showing that for any linear order \leq_L over \mathbb{R} , there is an order preserving embedding from $(2^\omega, \leq)$ to (\mathbb{R}, \leq_L) . In other words, $\{(2^\omega, \leq)\}$ is a basis for $\{(\mathbb{R}, \leq_L) \mid \leq_L \text{ is a linear ordering over } \mathbb{R}\}$.

The last result in this paper is an application of recursion theory to fractal geometry theory. Besicovitch and Davis prove that for any analytic set, its Hausdorff dimension can be approximated arbitrarily closed by the Hausdorff dimension of its closed subsets. Joyce and Preiss [10] prove a similar result for packing dimension. Recently Slaman proves that both Besicovitch-Davis and Joyce-Preiss theorem fail for some Π_1^1 -set under the assumption $V = L$. However, we prove that both the theorems hold for arbitrary sets of reals over $ZF + sTD$. So the phenomenon can be viewed as a new regularity property for the sets of reals. After we proved the result, Hirschfeldt and Slaman told us that recently Crone, Fishman and Jackson proved the following result under stronger assumption.

Theorem 1.9 (Crone, Fishman and Jackson [3]). *Assume $ZF + AD + DC_{\mathbb{R}}$. For any set A and $\epsilon > 0$, there is a closed set $F \subseteq A$ so that $\text{Dim}_{\text{H}}(F) \geq \text{Dim}_{\text{H}}(A) - \epsilon$.*

Their proof is direct and uses some rather deep results from set theory. However, we believe our proof is much simpler and more elementary.

1.2. Point to set principle. *Relativization* opens a door between recursion theory and other mathematical branches. In recursion theory, for a real x , a relativization to x , roughly speaking, is a way to add prefix x - to every appearance of any notion in the statement. Then if a notion is defined in recursion theory, its relativization is defined *naturally*. And if a theorem in recursion theory is proved, then its relativization also follows *naturally*. For example, every continuous function is a recursive function relative to a real; and a Borel set is a hyperarithmetic set relative to a real. From this point of view, one may apply recursion theory results to analysis.

“Point to set” principle is a more concrete way, by using relativization, to apply recursion theory to other areas of mathematics. Generally speaking, the principle says that a set A having certain property is equivalent to that it contains some special points. Such argument can be dated back to Sacks, who (in [20]) gave a recursion theoretical proof of the classical result that every analytic set is measurable. For one more example, given a relativizable algorithmic randomness notion Γ (such as Martin-Löf-, Schnorr-, etc), we have the following fact.

Fact 1.10. *Assume $ZF + CC_{\mathbb{R}}$. A set $A \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ is null if and only if there is some real x so that there is no $\Gamma(x)$ -random real in A .*

So if we want to prove that A is not null, then it suffices to prove that for any real x , there is a $\Gamma(x)$ -random real in A . One may also replace randomness with genericity and obtain the the corresponded results. In this paper, we apply some quite recent results in recursion theory and algorithmic randomness theory to descriptive set theory and fractal geometry theory. Especially some deep results concerning the lowness properties for various recursion theory notations turned to be crucial to our proof. The so-called “lowness properties” is a kind of property preserving some algorithmic property. For example, a real x is low for Turing jump (or just low) if $x' \equiv_T \emptyset'$; and a real x is called low for Schnorr random (for the definition of Schnorr randomness, see the paragraphs below Theorem 4.2) if every Schnorr random real is Schnorr random relative to x , etc. Ironically, different than the “slowdown”

properties of themselves, these notions will be used to prove some “speedup” results. We expect to see more such applications in the near future.

We organize the paper as follows. In Section 2, we give some terminologies and notions. In section 3, we sketch a recursion theoretical reformulation of the Sami’s proof that $\text{ZF} + \text{TD}$ implies CH . The result will be used in Section 5. In section 4, we prove $\text{wDC}_{\mathbb{R}}$ within $\text{ZF} + \text{TD}$. In section 5, we prove that $\text{ZF} + \text{sTD}$ implies regular properties for sets of reals. In the same section, we also prove a basis theorem for linear orderings over sets of reals within $\text{ZF} + \text{TD} + \text{DC}_{\mathbb{R}} +$ “every uncountable set of reals has a perfect subset”. In section 6, we prove that Besicovitch-Davis theorem holds for any set of reals within $\text{ZF} + \text{sTD}$.

2. TERMINOLOGIES AND NOTIONS

We assume that readers have some knowledge of descriptive set theory and recursion theory. The major references are [21], [2], [18], [6], [9] and [13].

2.1. Set theory. We assume that readers have some knowledge of axiomatic set theory. ZF is Zermelo-Fraenkel axiom system. AD is the axiom of determinacy.

When we say that $T \subseteq 2^{<\omega}$ is a tree, we mean that T is a tree without dead nodes. $[T]$ is the collection of infinite paths through T . Given any $x \in \omega^\omega$ and natural number n , we use $x \upharpoonright n$ to denote an initial segment of x with length n . In other words, $x \upharpoonright n$ is a finite string $\sigma \in \omega^{<\omega}$ of length n so that for any $i < n$, $\sigma(i) = x(i)$.

2.2. Recursion theory. We use \leq_T to denote Turing reduction and \leq_h to denote hyperarithmetic reduction. We use Φ^x denote a Turing machine with oracle x . Sometimes we also say that Φ^x is a recursive functional. We fix an effective enumeration $\{\Phi_e^x\}_{e \in \omega}$ of recursive functionals.

\mathcal{O} is Kleene’s \mathcal{O} . ω_1^{CK} is the least non-recursive ordinal and ω_1^x is the least ordinal not recursive in x .

We say a set A ranges Turing degrees cofinally if for any real x , there is some $y \geq_T x$ in A . We use x' to denote the Turing jump relative to x . More generally, if $\alpha < \omega_1^x$, then $x^{(\alpha)}$ is that α -th Turing jump of x .

The following fact is folklore and a sketched proof can be found in [19]

Lemma 2.1. *Assume ZF . For any Turing degree \mathbf{x} , there are a family Turing degrees $\{\mathbf{y}_r \mid r \in \mathbb{R}\}$ satisfying the following property:*

- (1) *For any $r \in \mathbb{R}$, $\mathbf{x} < \mathbf{y}_r$;*
- (2) *For any $r_0 \neq r_1 \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\mathbf{z} < \mathbf{y}_{r_0}, \mathbf{y}_{r_1}$, we have that $\mathbf{z} \leq \mathbf{x}$;*
- (3) *For any $\mathbf{z} \geq \mathbf{x}''$, the Turing double jump of \mathbf{x} , there is an infinite set $C_{\mathbf{z}} \subset \mathbb{R}$ so that $\mathbf{y}_r'' = \mathbf{z}$ for any $r \in C_{\mathbf{z}}$.*

3. ON SAMI’S THEOREM

Theorem 3.1 (Sami [22]). *$\text{ZF} + \text{TD} + \text{DC}$ proves CH .*

In this section, we sketch a recursion theoretical proof of Theorem 3.1 to show that DC can be removed from the assumption, which was also observed by Sami. I.e. we have the following fact.

Proposition 3.2 (Sami). *ZF + TD proves CH.*

Proof. Given an uncountable set $A \subseteq \mathbb{R}$. By Lemma 2.1, for any real x , there is a real $y >_T x$ so that there is some real $r \in A$ Turing below y'' but not below y . So, by TD, there is some real z_0 so that for any $y \geq_T z_0$, there is some real $r \in A$ Turing below y'' but not below y .

Now it is simple to construct a $\Sigma_1^1(z_0)$ set B^1 so that

- (i) For any $y \leq_h z_0$ and $x \in B$, we have that $y \leq_T x$; and
- (ii) For any $x_0 \neq x_1 \in B$, if $y \leq_h x_0, x_1$, then $y \leq_h z_0$.

Now for any real $x \in B$, we may pick up some real $y_x \in A$ Turing below x'' but not below x . For any $x_0 \neq x_1 \in B$, if $y_{x_0} = y_{x_1}$, then by (ii), $y_{x_0} = y_{x_1} \leq_h z_0$. By (i), we have that $y_{x_0} = y_{x_1} \leq_T x_0$, which is a contradiction.

So $x \mapsto y_x$ is a 1-1 map from B to A . It is known that every uncountable analytic set has a perfect subset and so A has the same power as \mathbb{R} . \square

From the proof of Proposition 3.2, we can see the following fact that we will use it later in the paper.

Lemma 3.3 (Sami [22]). *Assume ZF + TD. For any uncountable set A of reals, there is a perfect set P of reals and a sequence of arithmetical functions ² $\{f_n\}_{n \in \omega}$ from P to \mathbb{R} so that $P \subseteq \bigcup_{n \in \omega} f_n^{-1}(A)$. Moreover, restricted to P , f_n is 1-1 for every n .*

Proof. Fix an effective enumeration of Turing functional $\{\Phi_n\}_{n \in \omega}$. In the proof of Proposition 3.2, let P be a perfect subset of B . Define $f_n : P \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ so that

$$(1) \quad f_n(x) = \begin{cases} \uparrow & (\exists m \Phi_n^{x''}(m) \text{ is not defined}) \vee (\Phi_n^{x''} \leq_T x); \\ \Phi_n^{x''} & \text{Otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Clearly f_n is arithmetical for every n . Since $P \subseteq B$, we have that $P \subseteq \bigcup_{n \in \omega} f_n^{-1}(A)$. Moreover, if $x \in P$ and $f_n(x)$ is defined, then $f_n(x) \leq_T x'' \wedge f_n(x) \not\leq_T x$. Then by the same reason as in the proof of the theorem, f_n must be 1-1 on P . So $\{f_n\}_{n \in \omega}$ is as required. \square

4. WEAKLY DEPENDENT CHOICE

Throughout the section, we work within ZF + TD.

Definition 4.1. *Weakly dependent choice for sets of reals, or $wDC_{\mathbb{R}}$, says that for any binary relation R over \mathbb{R} with the property that the set $\{y \mid R(x, y)\}$ has positive inner measure for any real x , there is a sequence $\{x_n\}_{n \in \omega}$ of reals so that $\forall n R(x_n, x_{n+1})$.*

Theorem 4.2. *ZF + TD implies $wDC_{\mathbb{R}}$*

We remark that if “having positive inner measure” is replaced with having Baire property and non-meager in the definition of $wDC_{\mathbb{R}}$, then the theorem still holds.

¹We sketch a proof of this and leave the details to readers. First note that the set $\{y \mid \forall r \leq_h z_0 (r \leq_T y)\}$ is an uncountable $\Sigma_1^1(z_0)$ -set. Then one may construct a perfect set $P \subseteq B$ so that any two different members from P form a minimal pair over z_0 in the hyperarithmetical degree sense.

²Actually Sami proves that f_n can be continuous. But we only need this weaker version here.

A real r is called *not Schnorr random* if there is a recursive sequences of recursive open set $\{V_n\}_{n \in \omega}$ with $\forall n \mu(V_n) = 2^{-n}$ so that $r \in \bigcap_{n \in \omega} V_n$. Otherwise, r is called *Schnorr random*. It is not difficult to see that there is a Schnorr random $r \leq_T \emptyset'$.

A real x is called *low for Schnorr random* if every Schnorr random real is Schnorr random relative to x . The following theorem, which was proved by Sacks forcing, is due to Terwijn and Zambella.

Theorem 4.3 (Terwijn and Zambella [23]). *For any real $y \geq_T \emptyset''$, there is a real x low for Schnorr random so that $x'' \equiv_T y$.*

Proof. (of Theorem 4.2.)

Fix any binary relation R as stated in $\text{wDC}_{\mathbb{R}}$. To prove $\text{wDC}_{\mathbb{R}}$, we may assume that for any real x , the set $R_x = \{y \mid R(x, y)\}$ is upward closed under Turing reduction. I.e. for any y and z , if $y \leq_T z$ and $y \in R_x$, then $z \in R_x$. To see this, we may define a new relation \tilde{R} so that $\tilde{R}(x, y)$ if and only if for any real $z_0 \leq_T x$, there is some real $z_1 \leq_T y$ so that $R(z_0, z_1)$. Then for any real x , the set $\tilde{R}_x = \{y \mid \tilde{R}(x, y)\}$ is upward closed under Turing reduction and has positive measure, and so co-null. Moreover, if there is a sequence $\{y_n\}_{n \in \omega}$ so that $\forall n \tilde{R}(y_n, y_{n+1})$. Then we build a sequence $\{x_n\}_{n \in \omega}$ so that $\forall n R(x_n, x_{n+1})$ as follows.

First let $x_0 = y_0$. By the definition of \tilde{R} , we may pick up the least m_1 so that $\Phi_{m_1}^{y_1}$ is defined and $R(x_0, \Phi_{m_1}^{y_1})$. Let $x_1 = \Phi_{m_1}^{y_1}$. Generally, if x_n is defined, then $x_n \leq_T y_n$. So by the definition of \tilde{R} , we may pick up the least index m_{n+1} so that $\Phi_{m_{n+1}}^{y_{n+1}}$ is defined and $R(x_n, \Phi_{m_{n+1}}^{y_{n+1}})$. Set $x_{n+1} = \Phi_{m_{n+1}}^{y_{n+1}}$. Then we have that $\forall n R(x_n, x_{n+1})$.


Now fix any real z , by the assumption on R and Fact 1.10, there is a real $z_0 \geq_T z'$ so that for any $y \leq_T z'$ and z_0 -Schnorr random r , $R(y, r)$. Also by relativizing Theorem 4.3 to z , there is a real $x >_T z$ low for z -Schnorr random so that $x'' \geq_T z_0$. So for any $y \leq_T z'$ and x'' -Schnorr random r , $R(y, r)$. Also note that there is a z -Schnorr random, and so x -Schnorr random, real $r \leq_T z'$. Since $x'' \geq_T z'$, there is some index of Turing functional e so that $\Phi_e^{x''} = z'$. For any number $e \in \omega$, define the set

$$A_e = \{x \mid \exists r (r \text{ is } x\text{-Schnorr random} \wedge r \leq_T \Phi_e^{x''}) \\ \wedge \forall r_0 \leq_T \Phi_e^{x''} \forall r_1 (r_1 \text{ is } x''\text{-Schnorr random} \rightarrow R(r_0, r_1))\}.$$

Then by the discussion above, $\bigcup_{e \in \omega} A_e$ ranges Turing degrees cofinally. So there must be some e_0 so that A_{e_0} ranges Turing degrees cofinally. By TD, there is some x_0 so that for any $y \geq_T x_0$, there is some $y_0 \equiv_T y$ in A_{e_0} . We may assume that $x_0 \in A_{e_0}$. Recursively in $x_0^{(\omega)}$, we first find a sequence of reals

$$\{y_n \in A_{e_0} \mid n < \omega \wedge y_n \equiv_T x_0^{(2n)}\}.$$

Then find a sequence of reals $\{r_n\}_{n \in \omega}$ so that for any n , $r_n \leq_T \Phi_{e_0}^{y_n''}$ is $y_n \equiv_T x_0^{(2n)}$ -Schnorr random. Note for any n , $r_n \leq_T \Phi_{e_0}^{y_n''}$ and r_{n+1} is $x_0^{(2n+2)} \equiv_T y_n''$ -Schnorr random (see the figure below). So by the definition of A_{e_0} , $R(r_n, r_{n+1})$. □

FIGURE 1. $R(r_n, r_{n+1})$

5. REGULARITY PROPERTIES OF SETS OF REALS

In this section, we prove some regularity properties for sets of reals under $\text{ZF} + \text{sTD} (+\text{DC}_{\mathbb{R}})$. Woodin already considered sTD long time ago. All the results in this section must have been known to him.

Theorem 5.1 (Woodin). (1) $\text{ZF} + \text{sTD}$ implies that every set is measurable and has Baire property.
(2) $\text{ZF} + \text{sTD}$ implies that every uncountable set of reals has a perfect subset.

5.1. The proof of part (1). We only prove that every set is measurable and leave the second part to readers.

It suffices to prove that for any set A , if every measurable subset of A is null, then A must be null. Now suppose that, for a contradiction, every measurable subset of A is null but A is not null. Then, by Fact 1.10 with Schnorr randomness, for any real z , there is an z -Schnorr random real z_0 in A . By Theorem 4.3 relative to z , there is a real x low for z -Schnorr random and $x'' \geq_T z_0$.

Now for any $e \in \omega$, let

$$B_e = \{x \mid \Phi_e^{x''} \in A \text{ is an } x\text{-Schnorr random real}\}.$$

By the proof above, we have that $\bigcup_{e \in \omega} B_e$ ranges Turing degrees cofinally. Then there is some e_0 so that B_{e_0} ranges Turing degrees cofinally. By sTD, there is a pointed subset $P \subseteq B_{e_0}$.

Let

$$C = \{r \mid \exists x \in P (\Phi_{e_0}^{x''} = r)\}.$$

C is an analytic set and so measurable. Since P is a pointed set, by the definition of B_{e_0} and Fact 1.10 with Schnorr randomness, C is not null. This is absurd.

5.2. The proof of part (2). We first prove the following lemma.

Lemma 5.2. Assume $\text{ZF} + \text{sTD}$. For any perfect set P of reals and any partition $P = \bigcup_{n < \omega} B_n$, there exists n such that B_n has a perfect subset.

Proof. Clearly we may assume that $P = 2^\omega$ via a homeomorphism. Then for some n , B_n ranges Turing degrees cofinally. By sTD, B_n contains a perfect subset. \square

Proof. (of part (2) of Theorem 5.1). Suppose that A is uncountable. By Lemma 3.3, we may fix perfect set P and a sequence of functions $\{f_n\}_{n \in \omega}$ as in the Lemma. Then by Lemma 5.2, we can choose a perfect $Q \subset f_n^{-1}[A]$ for some n . Now $f_n[Q]$

is an uncountable analytic subset of A . So $f_n[Q]$ and hence A contains a perfect subset. \square

Here we mention another approach, within $\text{ZF} + \text{TD} + \text{DC}_{\mathbb{R}}$, to get a perfect subset due to Sami. A set A of reals is called *Bernstein* if neither A nor $\mathbb{R} \setminus A$ has a perfect subset. Notice that the nonexistence of a Bernstein set implies that for every perfect set P and its subset $A \subseteq P$, either A or $P \setminus A$ has a perfect subset. Sami observed the following relationship between the existence of a Bernstein set and perfect subset property.

Lemma 5.3 (Sami). *Assume $\text{ZF} + \text{TD} + \text{DC}_{\mathbb{R}}$. If there is no Bernstein set, then every uncountable set of reals has a perfect subset.*

Proof. Suppose that A is uncountable. By Lemma 3.3, we may fix a perfect set P and a sequence of functions $\{f_n\}_{n \in \omega}$ as in the Lemma.

Let $T^0 \subseteq 2^{<\omega}$ be a perfect tree so that $[T^0] = P$.

Case (1). There is some $\sigma \in T^0$ and some perfect tree $T_\sigma^0 \subseteq [\sigma] \cap T^0$ so that f_0 is defined on every member in $[T_\sigma^0]$ and $f_0([T_\sigma^0]) \subseteq A$. Fix such σ and T_σ^0 . Then $f_0([T_\sigma^0]) \subseteq A$ is an uncountable analytic set. Thus A must have a perfect subset. We are done.

Case (2). Otherwise. Then by the assumption, for any σ with $[\sigma] \cap [T^0] \neq \emptyset$, there is a perfect tree $[T_\sigma^0] \subseteq [\sigma] \cap [T^0]$ so that for any $x \in [T_\sigma^0]$, either $f_0(x)$ is not defined or $f_0(x) \notin A$. Fix some $\sigma_0 \in T^0$ so that $[\sigma_0] \cap [T^0] \neq \emptyset$ and $[\sigma_1] \cap [T^0] \neq \emptyset$. Let $T_{\sigma_0}^0$ and $T_{\sigma_1}^0$ be as corresponded perfect tree as above. Set

$$T^1 = \{\tau \in T^0 \mid \tau \prec \sigma \vee \tau \succeq \sigma_0 \vee \tau \succeq \sigma_1\} \subseteq T^0.$$

Then for any $x \in [T^1]$, either $f_0(x)$ is not defined or $f_0(x) \notin A$.

Process the construction by induction on n . Either we stop at Case (1) of some n , then we find a perfect subset of A . Or else, the construction goes through all of n 's. Then by a usual fusion argument, we may find a perfect tree S so that $[S] \subseteq P$ so that for any $x \in [S]$ and any n , either $f_n(x)$ is not defined or $f_n(x) \notin A$. This contradicts to the fact that $[P] \subseteq \bigcup_{n \in \omega} f_n^{-1}(A)$.

Thus we must stop at Case (1) of some n and so A must have a perfect subset. \square

sTD implies every set is measurable and so there is no Bernstein set. Thus $\text{ZF} + \text{sTD} + \text{DC}_{\mathbb{R}}$ implies every uncountable set of reals has a perfect subset.

5.3. An application of regular properties to linear orderings over \mathbb{R} .

Lemma 5.4. *Assume $\text{ZF} + \text{CC}_{\mathbb{R}} +$ “every sets of reals is measurable”. For any linear order \leq_L over \mathbb{R} , and $A \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ be any non-null set. The collection of the reals $x \in A$ so that either $\{y \in A \mid y \leq_L x\}$ or $\{y \in A \mid x \leq_L y\}$ is null is null.*

Proof. Given a linear order \leq_L over \mathbb{R} , Let $A \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ be any non-null set. Fix a non-null set $B \subseteq A$. By Fubini's theorem, the set $\{(x, y) \mid x \leq_L y \wedge x \in B \wedge y \in B\}$ is measurable and has positive measure. Let

$$L^B = \{x \in B \mid \{y \in A \mid y \leq_L x\} \text{ is null}\}$$

be a subset of B . Then by Fubini's theorem again, the set $B \setminus L^B$ is not null. So the set

$$L^A = \{x \in A \mid \{y \in A \mid y \leq_L x\} \text{ is null}\}$$

is a null subset of A .

By the same method, the set

$$R^A = \{x \in A \mid \{y \in A \mid x \leq_L y\} \text{ is null}\}$$

is also a null subset of A . □

Finally we have the following basis theorem for linear orderings over \mathbb{R} under $\text{ZF} + \text{sTD}$.

Theorem 5.5. *Assume $\text{ZF} + \text{DC}_{\mathbb{R}} +$ “every sets of reals is measurable”. For any linear order \leq_L over \mathbb{R} , there is an order preserving embedding from $(2^\omega, \leq)$ to (\mathbb{R}, \leq_L) .*

Proof. First we set $P_\emptyset = [0, 1]$.

By Lemma 5.4, there is a real $x \in P_\emptyset$ so that both the sets $\{y \in A \mid y \leq_L x\}$ and $\{y \in A \mid x \leq_L y\}$ have positive measure. So both of them have disjoint perfect subsets P_0 and P_1 with positive measure respectively. Moreover, we may require that for any $i \in \{0, 1\}$ and $y, z \in P_i$, $|y - z| \leq 2^{-1}$.

Now by an induction, it is not difficult to construct a sequence $\{P_\sigma\}_{\sigma \in 2^\omega}$ of perfect sets so that

- If $\sigma \succ \tau$, then $P_\sigma \subset P_\tau$ has positive measure;
- If σ and τ are incompatible, then $P_\sigma \cap P_\tau = \emptyset$;
- If σ is in the left of τ , then $\forall x \in P_\sigma \forall y \in P_\tau (x \leq_L y)$;
- For any σ and $x, y \in P_\sigma$, $|x - y| \leq 2^{-|\sigma|}$.

Define $f : 2^\omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ so that $f(x)$ is the unique real in $\bigcap_n P_{x \upharpoonright n}$. Then f is an order preserving embedding from $(2^\omega, \leq)$ to (\mathbb{R}, \leq_L) . □

One may wonder what happens to Lemma 5.4 under $\text{ZF} + \text{TD}$. Since it is unknown whether $\text{ZF} + \text{TD}$ implies that every set of reals is measurable, we have to use a more involved argument.

Definition 5.6. *A linear order (L, \leq_L) is locally countable if for any $l \in L$, the set $\{x \leq_L l \mid x \in L\}$ is countable.*

A typical locally countable order is (ω_1, \leq) .

For any set A of reals which are closed under Turing equivalence relation, a real x is a *minimal upper bound* of A if

- every member of A is recursive in x ; and
- there is no real $y <_T x$ so that every member of A is recursive in y .

By a classical theorem in recursion theory (see Theorem 4.11 in [13]), for any countable set of reals A , there is always a minimal upper bound.

Lemma 5.7. *Assume $\text{ZF} + \text{TD}$. There is no uncountable set $A \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ with a locally countable linear order over A .*

Proof. By Proposition 3.2, it suffices to prove that there is no locally countable linear order on \mathbb{R} .

Suppose not. Let (\mathbb{R}, \leq_L) be a locally countable order. For any real x , let I_x be the Turing downward closure of the set $\{z \mid z \leq_L x\}$. I.e.

$$I_x = \{s \mid \exists z \leq_L x (s \leq_T z)\}.$$

Obviously $x \leq_L y$ implies $I_x \subseteq I_y$.

Note for any real z , there is a real x so that $z \in I_x$. So there is a real $z_0 \geq_T z$ such that z_0 is a minimal upper bound of I_x . By TD, there is a real z_1 so that every real $z_2 \geq_T z_1$ is a minimal upper bound over I_x for some x .

For any real z , let

$$M_z = \{x \mid z \text{ is a minimal upper bound of } I_x\}$$

and

$$N_z = \bigcup_{x \in M_z} I_x.$$

Note that M_{z_2} is nonempty for every $z_2 \geq_T z_1$. We have the following fact:

- For any $z_2, z_3 \geq_T z_1$, either $N_{z_3} \subseteq N_{z_2}$ or $N_{z_2} \subseteq N_{z_3}$. Suppose that $N_{z_3} \not\subseteq N_{z_2}$. Then there must be some $x_3 \in M_{z_3}$ so that for any $x_2 \in M_{z_2}$, $x_3 \not\leq_L x_2$. In other words, $x_2 \leq_L x_3$ for any $x_2 \in M_{z_2}$. So $N_{z_2} \subseteq N_{z_3}$.

Now fix a pair of minimal covers $z_2 \not\equiv_T z_3$ of z_1 (i.e. for $i \in \{2, 3\}$, $z_i >_T z_1$ but there is no real y strictly between z_1 and z_i in the Turing reduction order sense. For the existence of such a pair, see Lemma 2.1). By the fact above, WLOG, we may assume $N_{z_2} \subseteq N_{z_3}$ and fix some $x \in M_{z_2}$. Then every real in $I_x \subseteq N_{z_2} \subseteq N_{z_3}$ is recursive in both z_2 and z_3 . So every real in I_x is recursive in z_1 . Contradicts to the fact that z_2 is a minimal upper bound of I_x and $z_1 <_T z_2$. \square

Corollary 5.8. *Assume ZF + TD. For any uncountable set $A \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ and linear order \leq_L over A , there are uncountably many reals $x \in A$ so that both $\{y \in A \mid y \leq_L x\}$ and $\{y \in A \mid x \leq_L y\}$ are uncountable.*

Proof. Given a linear order \leq_L over \mathbb{R} . Let

$$L = \{x \in A \mid \{y \in A \mid y \leq_L x\} \text{ is countable}\}$$

and

$$R = \{x \in A \mid \{y \in A \mid x \leq_L y\} \text{ is countable}\}.$$

By Lemma 5.7, both L and R are countable. So there must uncountably many reals $x \in A$ so that both $\{y \mid y \leq_L x\}$ and $\{y \mid x \leq_L y\}$ are uncountable. \square

Now we may obtain the following result.

Theorem 5.9. *Assume ZF + TD + DC $_{\mathbb{R}}$. The following are equivalent.*

- (1) *Every uncountable set of reals has a perfect subset.*
- (2) *For any linear order \leq_L over \mathbb{R} , there is an order preserving embedding from $(2^\omega, \leq)$ to (\mathbb{R}, \leq_L) .*

Proof. (1) \Rightarrow (2). The argument of Theorem 5.5 works here. Just replace “set with positive measure” by “uncountable set”.

(2) \Rightarrow (1). Fix an uncountable set of reals A . By Proposition 3.2, $|A| = |\mathbb{R}|$. So (A, \leq) is order isomorphic to (\mathbb{R}, \leq_L) for some \leq_L . By (2), there is an order preserving map from $(2^\omega, \leq)$ to (\mathbb{R}, \leq_L) and hence (A, \leq) .

Fix $\pi : 2^\omega \rightarrow A$ that preserves order and so is monotonic. Then π is continuous on all but countably many points. In particular, π is continuous (and injective) on a perfect subset P . So $\pi[P]$ is a perfect subset of A . \square

6. REGULAR PROPERTY FOR DIMENSION THEORY

For the notions and terminologies in fractal geometry, we follow the book [7].

Given a non-empty $U \subseteq \mathbb{R}$, the *diameter* of U is

$$\text{diam}(U) = |U| = \sup\{|x - y| : x, y \in U\}.$$

Given any set $E \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ and $d \geq 0$, let

$$\mathcal{H}^d(E) = \liminf_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \left\{ \sum_{i < \omega} |U_i|^d : \{U_i\} \text{ is an open cover of } E \wedge \forall i |U_i| < \delta \right\},$$

$$\mathcal{P}_0^d(E) = \limsup_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \left\{ \sum_{i < \omega} |B_i|^d : \{B_i\} \text{ is a collection of disjoint balls of radii at most } \delta \text{ with centres in } E \right\}.$$

and

$$\mathcal{P}^d(E) = \inf \left\{ \sum_{i < \omega} \mathcal{P}_0^d(E_i) \mid E \subseteq \bigcup_{i < \omega} E_i \right\}.$$

Definition 6.1. *Given any set E ,*

(1) *the Hausdorff dimension of E , or $\text{Dim}_H(E)$, is*

$$\inf\{d \mid \mathcal{H}^d(E) = 0\};$$

(2) *the Packing dimension of E , or $\text{Dim}_P(E)$, is*

$$\inf\{d \mid \mathcal{P}^d(E) = 0\}.$$

By the same reason as in Lebesgue measure, it can be proved with $\text{ZF} + \text{CC}_{\mathbb{R}}$ that for any Borel set B and $\epsilon > 0$, there is a closed set $F \subseteq B$ so that $\text{Dim}_H(F) > \text{Dim}_H(B) - \epsilon$.

Theorem 6.2 (Besicovitch [1] and Davis [5]). *For any analytic set A and $\epsilon > 0$, there is a closed set $F \subseteq A$ so that $\text{Dim}_H(F) \geq \text{Dim}_H(A) - \epsilon$.*

Theorem 6.3 (Joyce and Preiss [10]). *For any analytic set A and $\epsilon > 0$, there is a closed set $F \subseteq A$ so that $\text{Dim}_P(F) \geq \text{Dim}_P(A) - \epsilon$.*

However Slaman proves that both Theorems 6.2 and 6.3 may fail even for some Π_1^1 set under certain assumptions.

Theorem 6.4 (Slaman). *Suppose that the set of constructible reals is not null, then there is a Π_1^1 set C with $\text{Dim}_H(C) = 1$ but for any Borel $F \subset C$, $\text{Dim}_P(F) = 0$.*

We prove that both Theorems 6.2 and 6.3 remain true for any set of reals under $ZF + sTD$.

Theorem 6.5. $ZF + sTD$ implies that for any set of reals A and any $\epsilon > 0$,

- (1) there is a closed set $F \subseteq A$ so that $\text{Dim}_H(F) \geq \text{Dim}_H(A) - \epsilon$.
- (2) there is a closed set $F \subseteq A$ so that $\text{Dim}_P(F) \geq \text{Dim}_P(A) - \epsilon$.

To show the theorem, we use the ‘‘point-to-set’’ method.

Some more facts from algorithmic randomness theory are needed. Let K denote the prefix free Kolmogorov complexity. We use K^x to denote the prefix free Kolmogorov complexity with oracle, which is a real, x . The following ‘‘point to set’’ style theorem is to Lutz and Lutz.

Theorem 6.6 (Lutz and Lutz [14]).³ For any set $A \subseteq \mathbb{R}$,

$$\text{Dim}_H(A) = \inf_{x \in \mathbb{R}} \sup_{y \in A} \underline{\lim}_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{K^x(y \upharpoonright n)}{n}$$

and

$$\text{Dim}_P(A) = \inf_{x \in \mathbb{R}} \sup_{y \in A} \overline{\lim}_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{K^x(y \upharpoonright n)}{n}.$$

The following lowness property is crucial to our proof.

Theorem 6.7 (Herbert [8]; Lempp, Miller, Ng, Turetsky, Weber [12]). • There is a perfect tree $T \subseteq 2^{<\omega}$ recursive in \emptyset' so that for any real $x \in [T]$,

$$\forall y \in \mathbb{R} (\underline{\lim}_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{K(y \upharpoonright n)}{n} = \underline{\lim}_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{K^x(y \upharpoonright n)}{n}).$$

- There is a perfect tree $T \subseteq 2^{<\omega}$ recursive in \emptyset' so that for any real $x \in [T]$,

$$\forall y \in \mathbb{R} (\overline{\lim}_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{K(y \upharpoonright n)}{n} = \overline{\lim}_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{K^x(y \upharpoonright n)}{n}).$$

Now we are ready to prove our major theorem of this section.

Proof. (of Theorem 6.5)

(1). Suppose that $A \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ with $\text{Dim}_H(A) > 0$. Fix any $\epsilon > 0$. By Theorem 6.6, for any real z , there is some real $x \in A$ so that

$$\underline{\lim}_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{K^z(x \upharpoonright n)}{n} > \text{Dim}_H(A) - \frac{\epsilon}{2}.$$

By Theorem 6.7 relative to z , there is a real $y >_T z$ so that

$$\underline{\lim}_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{K^y(x \upharpoonright n)}{n} = \underline{\lim}_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{K^z(x \upharpoonright n)}{n} > \text{Dim}_H(A) - \frac{\epsilon}{2} \wedge y' >_T x.$$

So there must be some e_0 so that the set

$$B_{e_0} = \{y \mid \Phi_{e_0}^{y'} \in A \wedge \underline{\lim}_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{K^y(\Phi_{e_0}^{y'} \upharpoonright n)}{n} > \text{Dim}_H(A) - \frac{\epsilon}{2}\}$$

ranges Turing degrees cofinally. By sTD , there is a pointed set $P \subseteq B_{e_0}$.

³A similar form was also discovered by Cutler. See Theorem 1.4 in [4].

Then the set

$$C = \{x \mid \exists y \in P(\Phi_{e_0}^{y'} = x)\}$$

is an analytic subset of A . By Theorem 6.6,

$$\text{Dim}_H(C) > \text{Dim}_H(A) - \frac{\epsilon}{2}.$$

By Theorem 6.2, C has a closed subset F so that

$$\text{Dim}_H(F) > \text{Dim}_H(C) - \frac{\epsilon}{2}.$$

Thus

$$\text{Dim}_H(F) > \text{Dim}_H(A) - \epsilon.$$

(2). Same proof as (1) except replacing Hausdorff dimension with packing dimension. We leave the details to readers. \square

To continue our study, we need the following folklore technique lemma of which we sketch a proof for the completeness.

Lemma 6.8 (Folklore). *Suppose $\text{ZF} + \text{sTD}$. If $f : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \text{Ord}$ is a degree invariant (i.e. $x \equiv_T y \implies f(x) = f(y)$) map so that $f(x) < \omega_1^x$, then there is an ordinal α so that $f(x) = \alpha$ over an upper cone of Turing degrees.*

Proof. Fix such a map f . Since there are countably many recursive functionals, by sTD, there is some recursive functional Φ so that Φ^x codes a linear order for every real x ; and a pointed set P so that $f(x) \cong \Phi^x$ for any $x \in P$. Let T be a tree representing P so that $\forall x \in P(T \leq_T x)$. Then the set

$$\{\Phi^x \mid x \in P\}$$

is a $\Sigma_1^1(T)$ set and so Φ^x represents an ordinal smaller than ω_1^T for any $x \in P$ by Σ_1^1 -boundedness relative to T (see [2]). By sTD again, there must be some $\alpha < \omega_1^T$ and a pointed set $Q \subseteq P$ so that $f(x) = \alpha$ for any $x \in Q$. This finishes the proof. \square

Crone, Fishman and Jackson also proved the following result.

Theorem 6.9 (Crone, Fishman and Jackson [3]). *Assume $\text{ZF} + \text{AD} + \text{DC}$. If $A = \bigcup_{\alpha < \kappa} A_\alpha$ for some ordinal κ , then $\text{Dim}_H(A) = \sup\{\text{Dim}_H(A_\alpha) \mid \alpha < \kappa\}$.*

We may provide an “elementary” proof of the following weaker result under $\text{ZF} + \text{sTD}$.

Theorem 6.10. *Assume $\text{ZF} + \text{sTD}$. If $A = \bigcup_{\alpha < \omega_1} A_\alpha$, then*

$$\text{Dim}_H(A) = \sup\{\text{Dim}_H(A_\alpha) \mid \alpha < \omega_1\} \text{ and } \text{Dim}_P(A) = \sup\{\text{Dim}_P(A_\alpha) \mid \alpha < \omega_1\}.$$

Proof. For any real x , let $r = \text{Dim}_H(A)$ and

$$\gamma_x = \min\left\{\gamma \mid \sup_{y \in \bigcup_{\alpha < \gamma} A_\alpha} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{K^x(y \upharpoonright n)}{n} \geq r\right\}.$$

By Theorem 6.6, γ_x is defined for every real x .

For any real z , by Theorem 6.7 and the assumption, there is a real $x >_T z$ so that $\gamma_x = \gamma_z$ but $\omega_1^{x'} > \gamma_z$. So

$$\gamma_x = \gamma_z < \omega_1^{x'} = \omega_1^x.$$

In other words, $x \mapsto \gamma_x$ is a degree invariant function so that $\gamma_x < \omega_1^x$ over an upper cone of Turing degrees. Then by Lemma 6.8, $x \mapsto \gamma_x$ is a constant, say η , over an upper cone. Then, by the countability of η , for any $m \in \omega$, there must be some $\alpha_m < \eta$ so that the set $\{x \mid \sup_{y \in A_{\alpha_m}} \underline{\lim}_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{K^x(y|n)}{n} \geq r - \frac{1}{m}\}$ ranges Turing degrees cofinally. Then by Theorem 6.6, $\text{Dim}_H(A_{\alpha_m}) \geq r - \frac{1}{m}$. So

$$\text{Dim}_H(A) = \sup\{\text{Dim}_H(A_\alpha) \mid \alpha < \eta\} = \sup\{\text{Dim}_H(A_\alpha) \mid \alpha < \omega_1\}.$$

We leave the proof of the second part to readers. \square

We remark that the conclusion of Theorem 6.10 can also be proved within ZFC + MA_{\aleph_1} . Further more, ω_1 can be replaced with any cardinal $\kappa < 2^{\aleph_0}$.

REFERENCES

- [1] A. S. Besicovitch. On existence of subsets of finite measure of sets of infinite measure. *Nederl. Akad. Wetensch. Proc. Ser. A.* **55** = *Indagationes Math.*, 14:339–344, 1952. 6.2
- [2] Chi Tat Chong and Liang Yu. *Recursion theory*, volume 8 of *De Gruyter Series in Logic and its Applications*. De Gruyter, Berlin, 2015. Computational aspects of definability, With an interview with Gerald E. Sacks. 2, 6
- [3] Logan Crone, Lior Fishman, and Stephen Jackson. Hausdorff dimension regularity properties and games, 2020. 1.9, 6.9
- [4] Colleen D. Cutler. Strong and weak duality principles for fractal dimension in Euclidean space. *Math. Proc. Cambridge Philos. Soc.*, 118(3):393–410, 1995. 3
- [5] R. O. Davies. Subsets of finite measure in analytic sets. *Nederl. Akad. Wetensch. Proc. Ser. A.* **55** = *Indagationes Math.*, 14:488–489, 1952. 6.2
- [6] Rodney G. Downey and Denis R. Hirschfeldt. *Algorithmic randomness and complexity*. Theory and Applications of Computability. Springer, New York, 2010. 2
- [7] Kenneth Falconer. *Fractal geometry*. John Wiley & Sons, Ltd., Chichester, third edition, 2014. Mathematical foundations and applications. 6
- [8] Ian Herbert. A perfect set of reals with finite self-information. *J. Symbolic Logic*, 78(4):1229–1246, 2013. 6.7
- [9] Thomas Jech. *Set Theory*. Springer Monographs in Mathematics. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2003. 2
- [10] H. Joyce and D. Preiss. On the existence of subsets of finite positive packing measure. *Mathematika*, 42(1):15–24, 1995. 1.1, 6.3
- [11] Alexander S. Kechris. The axiom of determinacy implies dependent choices in $L(\mathbf{R})$. *J. Symbolic Logic*, 49(1):161–173, 1984. 1.7
- [12] Steffen Lemp, Joseph S. Miller, Keng Meng Ng, Daniel D. Turetsky, and Rebecca Weber. Lowness for effective Hausdorff dimension. *J. Math. Log.*, 14(2):1450011, 22, 2014. 6.7
- [13] Manuel Lerman. *Degrees of unsolvability*. Perspectives in Mathematical Logic. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1983. Local and global theory. 2, 5.3
- [14] Jack H. Lutz and Neil Lutz. Algorithmic information, plane Kakeya sets, and conditional dimension. *ACM Trans. Comput. Theory*, 10(2):Art. 7, 22, 2018. 6.6
- [15] Donald A. Martin. The axiom of determinateness and reduction principles in the analytical hierarchy. *Bull. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 74:687–689, 1968. 1.2
- [16] Justin Tatch Moore. A five element basis for the uncountable linear orders. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 163(2):669–688, 2006. 1.1
- [17] Jan Mycielski. On the axiom of determinateness. *Fund. Math.*, 53:205–224, 1963/64. 1.5
- [18] André Nies. *Computability and randomness*, volume 51 of *Oxford Logic Guides*. Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2009. 2
- [19] Yinhe Peng and Liang Yu. TD implies CCR. *Advances in Mathematics*, 384:107755, 2021. 1.8, 2.2

- [20] Gerald E. Sacks. Measure-theoretic uniformity in recursion theory and set theory. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 142:381–420, 1969. [1.2](#)
- [21] Gerald E. Sacks. *Higher recursion theory*. Perspectives in Mathematical Logic. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1990. [2](#)
- [22] Ramez L. Sami. Turing determinacy and the continuum hypothesis. *Arch. Math. Logic*, 28(3):149–154, 1989. [1.1](#), [3.1](#), [3.3](#)
- [23] Sebastiaan A. Terwijn and Domenico Zambella. Computational randomness and lowness. *J. Symbolic Logic*, 66(3):1199–1205, 2001. [4.3](#)

INSTITUTE OF MATHEMATICS, CHINESE ACADEMY OF SCIENCES, EAST ZHONG GUAN CUN ROAD NO. 55, BEIJING 100190, CHINA

Email address: pengyinhe@amss.ac.cn

HLM, ACADEMY OF MATHEMATICS AND SYSTEMS SCIENCE, CHINESE ACADEMY OF SCIENCES, EAST ZHONG GUAN CUN ROAD NO. 55, BEIJING 100190, CHINA

Email address: lzwu@math.ac.cn

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, NANJING UNIVERSITY, JIANGSU PROVINCE 210093, P. R. OF CHINA

Email address: yuliang.nju@gmail.com.