

Growth and irreducibility in path-incompressible trees*

George Barmpalias¹ and Wei Wang²

¹*State Key Lab of Computer Science, Inst. of Software, Chinese Acad. of Sciences, Beijing, China*

²*Inst. of Logic & Cognition and Dept. of Philosophy, Sun Yat-Sen University, Guangzhou, China*

July 1, 2022

Abstract. We study effective randomness-preserving transformations of path-incompressible trees. There exists a path-incompressible tree with infinitely many paths, which does not compute any perfect pathwise-random tree. Sparse perfect path-incompressible trees can be effectively densified, almost surely. We characterize the density of branching that pathwise-random trees can have.

Contents

1	Introduction	1
2	Perfect versus non-perfect path-incompressible trees	4
3	Perfect path-incompressible trees	10
4	Conclusion and discussion	15

1 Introduction

Algorithmic randomness can appear in different forms: infinite binary sequences (*reals*), arrays, trees, and structures in general. It is often essential to effectively transform one form into another, without sacrificing algorithmic complexity: transforming a real which is random with respect to a Bernoulli distribution, into a random real with respect to the uniform distribution goes back to von Neumann (1951), and general cases, including non-computable distributions, have been explored (Bienvenu and Monin, 2012).

We study the hardness of effectively transforming trees of random or incompressible paths with respect to dimensionality features: branching and accumulation paths. We use σ, τ, ρ, η

*Supported by NSFC grant No. 11971501 and partially motivated by participating in the virtual program of the Institute for Mathematical Sciences, National University of Singapore, 2021.

for binary strings and x, y, z for reals. Let $K(\sigma)$ denote the prefix-free Kolmogorov complexity of σ : the length of the shortest self-delimiting (prefix-free) program generating σ .

Definition 1.1. The (randomness) *deficiency* of σ is $|\sigma| - K(\sigma)$. The *deficiency* of a set of strings is the supremum of the deficiencies of its members. The deficiency of x is the deficiency of the set of its prefixes. A set of *incompressible strings* is a set of finite deficiency.

A real is *random*¹ if it has finite deficiency. We say that a set T of strings is a *tree* if it is downward-closed with respect to the prefix relation \leq . A *path through T* is a real with all its prefixes in T . A tree is *perfect* if it has no isolated paths and

- *proper* if it has infinitely many paths; *positive* if its paths have positive measure
- *path-incompressible* if it has finite deficiency, as a set of strings
- *pathwise-random* if all of its paths are random.²

Pathwise-random trees are not always path-incompressible. Hirschfeldt et al. (2021) and, independently, Barmpalias and Wang (2021) showed that every pathwise-random tree computes a path-incompressible tree.

Our purpose is to determine when randomness can be effectively manipulated with respect to topological or density characteristics (length distribution, accumulation points etc.)

To this end one may ask:³ can every

- (a) path-incompressible tree compute a proper/perfect path-incompressible tree?
- (b) proper path-incompressible tree compute a perfect path-incompressible tree?
- (c) perfect path-incompressible tree compute a positive path-incompressible tree?

Such questions were originally motivated by the study of compactness principles in fragments of second-order arithmetic: Hirschfeldt et al. (2021) showed that a sufficiently random real does not compute any perfect pathwise-random tree and Barmpalias and Wang (2021) showed that an incomplete random real does not compute any proper path-incompressible tree. These answer (a), since a single path can be viewed as a tree; similar statements hold for trees with finitely many paths. Bienvenu and Porter (2016), in their study of *logical-depth*⁴ answered (a) for *computably-perfect trees*.⁵

Question (c) was answered in the negative by Barmpalias and Wang (2021): there exists a perfect path-incompressible tree which cannot enumerate any positive pathwise-random tree.

¹equivalent to the notion of Martin-Löf (1966).

²It is possible that T is pathwise-random and $[T]$ has infinite deficiency, so T is not path-incompressible.

³The same can be asked for pathwise-random trees, but they are often equivalent.

⁴due to Bennett (1988), measuring the hardness of producing objects by randomized algorithms.

⁵Trees with an unbounded computable lower bound on the number of branchings along each path.

1.1 Our main results

In §2 we give a negative answer to question (b):

Theorem 1.2. *There exists a proper path-incompressible tree which does not compute any perfect pathwise-random tree.*⁶

In §3 we consider the density of branching in path-incompressible trees and in particular:

can a path-incompressible tree with sparse branching be effectively
transformed into a path-incompressible tree with sparse branching? (1)

We give a positive answer to (1). Given increasing $\ell = (\ell_n)$, a tree T is ℓ -perfect if for all but finitely many n , each $\sigma \in T$ of length ℓ_n has at least two extensions in T , of length ℓ_{n+1} .

Theorem 1.3 (Informal). *Any sparse computably perfect path-incompressible tree can be effectively transformed into an n^2 -perfect path-incompressible tree, almost surely.*

The precise formulation is given §3, but two aspects are clear: the probabilistic success of the transformation, and the bound on the density of the branching achieved. The first is likely necessary, and is formulated as a question in §4. On the other hand, we show that the branching-density limitation is necessary, by the following characterization:

Theorem 1.4. *If (ℓ_n) is computable and increasing the following are equivalent:*

- (i) \exists an ℓ -perfect pathwise-random tree
- (ii) \exists an ℓ -perfect path-incompressible tree
- (iii) $\sum_n 2^{-(\ell_{n+1}-\ell_n)} < \infty$.

The investigations in the present work, represented by question (a)-(c) and (1), may be viewed as tree-analogues of problems of randomness extraction such as effectively increasing the Hausdorff dimension of a real (Miller, 2011), except that the increase now is on the structural density of the tree, without loss in the algorithmic complexity of the paths.

1.2 Methodology, background and notation

The challenge in studying reducibilities between path-incompressible trees is the lack of a simple representation of the associated tree-maps. It is very convenient to define a tree-map in terms of a canonical family of hitting-sets, as demonstrated in §3.2. Diagonalizing against a tree-map which is given in this way essentially amounts to a hypergraph covering problem. However it is not obvious that any tree-map can be assumed to have this form. In §2.1 we establish such a representation, which opens the way to proving our main result, and promises to facilitate solution of additional problems in this area. The intuition comes from the theory

⁶This tree is *computably-growing*: $|T \cap 2^n| = \lceil n \log n \rceil$, where 2^n is the set of n -bit strings.

random closed sets in terms of Poisson point processes, where probability of a set of trees is measured in terms of the measure of its hitting-sets.

Strings are ordered first by length and then lexicographically. Let the n -bit prefix of z be $z \upharpoonright_n$ and $[T]$ be the paths through T . Let 2^ω denote the (set of) *reals*, $2^{<\omega}$ the binary strings, and 2^n denote the n -bit strings. Given trees T, T' we say that T is a *subtree of T'* if $T \subseteq T'$, and say that T is *pruned* if each $\sigma \in T$ has at least one extension in T .

The full binary tree represents the Cantor space, with topology generated by the sets

$$\llbracket \sigma \rrbracket := \{z \in 2^\omega : \sigma < z\} \quad \text{and} \quad \llbracket V \rrbracket = \cup_{\sigma \in V} \llbracket \sigma \rrbracket \quad \text{for } V \subseteq 2^{<\omega}$$

and the uniform measure given by $\mu(\sigma) := \mu(\llbracket \sigma \rrbracket) = 2^{-|\sigma|}$ and $\mu(V) := \mu(\llbracket V \rrbracket)$. A Martin-Löf test is a uniformly c.e. sequence of prefix-free sets $V_i \subseteq 2^{<\omega}$ such that $\mu(V_i) < 2^{-i}$. Following [Martin-Löf \(1966\)](#), we say that x is random if $x \notin \cap_i \llbracket V_i \rrbracket$ for all such tests (V_i) .

Randomness can equivalently be defined in terms of incompressibility, via Kolmogorov complexity. A prefix-free machine is a Turing machine whose domain is a prefix-free set of strings. The *prefix-free Kolmogorov complexity of σ* with respect to prefix-free machine M , denoted by $K_M(\sigma)$, is the length of the shortest input ρ such that $M(\rho)$ converges and outputs σ . There are optimal prefix-free machines M , such that $\sigma \mapsto K_M(\sigma)$ is minimal up to a constant, with respect to all prefix-free machines. We fix an optimal prefix-free machine and let $K(\sigma)$ denote the corresponding prefix-free complexity of σ . Given integer $c \geq 0$, we say that σ is *c -incompressible* if the length of the shortest program that can produce it, also known its prefix-free Kolmogorov complexity $K(\sigma)$, is not smaller than their length $|\sigma|$ by more than c bits: $K(\sigma) \geq |\sigma| - c$. Schnorr showed that a real is Martin-Löf random if and only if there is a finite upper bound on the randomness deficiency of its initial segments.

2 Perfect versus non-perfect path-incompressible trees

We prove [Theorem 1.2](#): there exists a path-incompressible tree with infinitely many paths which does not compute any perfect pathwise-random tree. Fix a positive Π_1^0 tree P such that $[P]$ consists entirely of randoms: the following arguments are given in terms of this P .

Lemma 2.1. *Suppose that W is a tree of incompressible strings and $V_i \subseteq 2^{<\omega}$ are uniformly c.e. and prefix-free such that $\mu(V_i) < 2^{-i}$. Then $W \cap V_i = \emptyset$ for all sufficiently large i .*

Proof. By the assumption on (V_i) , there exists c such that $\forall i \forall \sigma \in V_i : K(\sigma) < |\sigma| - i + c$. If $W \cap V_i \neq \emptyset$ for infinitely many i , then W would contain nodes σ of arbitrarily large deficiency $|\sigma| - K(\sigma)$. Then by compactness, it would contain an infinite path with prefixes of arbitrarily large deficiency, hence a non-random path, contradicting the hypothesis about W . \square

We define the class \mathcal{T} of trees where we will force the tree of [Theorem 1.2](#).

Definition 2.2. Let $\ell_n = n^2 + 4$ and let \mathcal{T} be the class of *rank-1* (ℓ_n)-*leveled trees*: the pruned trees T which have a unique accumulation point z , and such that for each n there exist exactly two extensions of $z \upharpoonright_{\ell_n}$ in $2^{\ell_{n+1}}$, while no splits occur on $\sigma \in T$ with $\sigma \not\prec z$.

For each tree P' let $\mathcal{T}(P')$ be the set of $T \in \mathcal{T}$ with $[T] \subseteq [P']$. By the choice of (ℓ_n) we have $\mathcal{T}(P) \neq \emptyset$. We say that a tree has *depth* k if it has a subtree which is isomorphic to $2^{\leq k}$ and k is the largest number with this property. Let \mathcal{T}^* be the set of prefixes of the $T \in \mathcal{T}$, which we may identify with a subset of some 2^{ℓ_n} of size n , whose downward \leq -closure has depth 1.

For each $F \in \mathcal{T}^*$ and $\mathcal{F} \subseteq \mathcal{T}^*$, let

$$\llbracket F \rrbracket = \{T \in \mathcal{T} : F < T\}, \quad \llbracket \mathcal{F} \rrbracket = \bigcup_{F \in \mathcal{F}} \llbracket F \rrbracket.$$

Let $\mathcal{T}^*(P)$ be the set of P -extendible members of \mathcal{T}^* .

2.1 Hitting families

The required tree in our theorem will be a member of $\mathcal{T}(P)$.

Definition 2.3. We say that $H \subseteq 2^{<\omega}$ is a *hitting-set* for $\mathcal{F} \subseteq \mathcal{T}^*$ if no $F \in \mathcal{F}$ has an extension $T \in \mathcal{T}$ with $[T] \subseteq 2^\omega - \llbracket H \rrbracket$. The *hitting-cost* of \mathcal{F} is

$$c(\mathcal{F}) = \inf\{\mu(H) : H \text{ is a hitting-set for } \mathcal{F}\}.$$

Given $n, V \subseteq 2^{<\omega}$, define the *n-reduct* of V by $V \upharpoonright_n := \{\sigma \in 2^n : \llbracket \sigma \rrbracket \subseteq \llbracket V \rrbracket\}$.

Then $\mathcal{F} \subseteq \mathcal{F}' \Rightarrow c(\mathcal{F}) \subseteq c(\mathcal{F}')$ and $c(\mathcal{F}) = \sup_s c(\mathcal{F}(s)) = \lim_s c(\mathcal{F}(s)) \leq 1$, when $(\mathcal{F}(s))$ is an enumeration of \mathcal{F} .

Lemma 2.4 (Reduct). *Suppose $U \subseteq V \subseteq 2^{<\omega}$, $m \leq n$, and \mathcal{F} is a family of subtrees of $2^{\leq n}$.*

- (i) *If V is a hitting-set for \mathcal{F} , then $V \upharpoonright_n$ is also a hitting-set for \mathcal{F} .*
- (ii) $\llbracket U \upharpoonright_m \rrbracket \subseteq \llbracket V \upharpoonright_n \rrbracket \subseteq \llbracket V \rrbracket$.

Proof. Since V is a hitting-set for \mathcal{F} , each $F \in \mathcal{F}$ has a leaf ρ with $\llbracket \rho \rrbracket \subseteq \llbracket V \rrbracket$. So, $\llbracket \sigma \rrbracket \subseteq \llbracket V \rrbracket$ for each $\sigma \in 2^n$ extending ρ . Thus, each σ as above is in $V \upharpoonright_n$ by definition. This shows that $\llbracket \rho \rrbracket \subseteq \llbracket V \upharpoonright_n \rrbracket$ and $V \upharpoonright_n$ is also a hitting-set for \mathcal{F} . Clause (ii) is straightforward. \square

Barmpalias and Wang (2021) showed:

Lemma 2.5 (Regularity). *Given $\mathcal{F} \subseteq \mathcal{T}^*$, $\epsilon > 0$, there exists a finite $H \subseteq 2^{<\omega}$ with $\mu(H) < c(\mathcal{F}) + \epsilon$ which is a hitting-set for \mathcal{F} .*

A computable enumeration of \mathcal{F} effectively gives a left-c.e. approximation to $c(\mathcal{F})$.

Definition 2.6. Given $\mathcal{F}_\sigma \subseteq \mathcal{T}^*$ with $\llbracket \mathcal{F}_{\sigma*0} \rrbracket \cup \llbracket \mathcal{F}_{\sigma*1} \rrbracket = \llbracket \mathcal{F}_\sigma \rrbracket$, we say (\mathcal{F}_σ) is a *canonical tree-family*. We say that $(H_\sigma), H_\sigma \subseteq 2^{<\omega}$ is an *f-canonical hitting-family* for (\mathcal{F}_σ) if

- H_σ is a hitting-set for \mathcal{F}_σ and $\mu(H_\sigma) \leq f(\sigma)$
- $\sigma < \tau \Rightarrow \llbracket H_\tau \rrbracket \subseteq \llbracket H_\sigma \rrbracket$.

Lemma 2.7. *Each a canonical tree-family $\mathcal{F} = (\mathcal{F}_\sigma)$ with cost $\sigma \mapsto 2^{c-|\sigma|}$ has an f-canonical hitting-family with $f(\sigma) := 2^{c+1-|\sigma|}$.*

Proof. For each σ, n , let $\mathcal{F}_{\sigma,n} = \{F \in \mathcal{F}_\sigma : F \subseteq 2^{\leq n}\}$. We define $(H_{\sigma,n}^n)$ for $\sigma \in 2^{<\omega}, m \leq n$ as follows. By the regularity Lemma 2.5 and the cost assumption:

- if $\sigma \in 2^n$, let $H_{\sigma,n}^n$ be a hitting-set for $\mathcal{F}_{\sigma,n}$, such that $H_{\sigma,n}^n \subseteq 2^n$ and $\mu(H_{\sigma,n}^n) \leq f(\sigma)$.
- inductively for $\rho \in 2^{<n}$, let $H_{\rho,n}^n = H_{\rho*0,n}^n \cup H_{\rho*1,n}^n$.

As $\llbracket \mathcal{F}_\rho \rrbracket = \llbracket \mathcal{F}_{\rho*0} \rrbracket \cup \llbracket \mathcal{F}_{\rho*1} \rrbracket$, $H_{\rho,n}^n$ is a hitting-set for $\mathcal{F}_{\rho,n}$ by induction, and

$$\mu(H_{\rho,n}^n) \leq \mu(H_{\rho*0,n}^n) + \mu(H_{\rho*1,n}^n) \leq f(\rho * 0) + f(\rho * 1) = f(\rho).$$

For $m < n, \rho \in 2^{\leq n}$, let $H_{\rho,m}^n = H_{\rho,n}^n \upharpoonright_m$, which is a hitting-set for $\mathcal{F}_{\rho,m}$ by the Reduct Lemma 2.4. As $\llbracket H_{\rho,m}^n \rrbracket \subseteq \llbracket H_{\rho,n}^n \rrbracket$, $\mu(H_{\rho,m}^n) \leq f(\rho)$ too.

Since $H_{\sigma,m}^n \subseteq 2^m$, there exist infinite $X_{i+1} \subseteq X_i \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ such that each pair σ, m corresponds to some i such that $H_{\sigma,m}^n$ is constant (denoted by $H_{\sigma,m}$) for $n \in X_i$. Let X be the diagonal intersection of the sets X_i , namely the i -th element of X is the i -th element of X_i . Then for each pair σ and m , $H_{\sigma,m} = H_{\sigma,m}^n$ for all but finitely many $n \in X$. So each $H_{\sigma,m}$ is a hitting-set for $\mathcal{F}_{\sigma,m}$. If $m < n$ and $s \in X$ is sufficiently large:

$$\llbracket H_{\sigma,m} \rrbracket = \llbracket H_{\sigma,m}^s \rrbracket = \llbracket H_{\sigma,s}^s \upharpoonright_m \rrbracket \subseteq \llbracket H_{\sigma,s}^s \upharpoonright_n \rrbracket = \llbracket H_{\sigma,n}^s \rrbracket = \llbracket H_{\sigma,n} \rrbracket.$$

Thus, $H_\sigma := \bigcup_m H_{\sigma,m}$ is a hitting-set for \mathcal{F}_σ , and $\mu(H_\sigma) \leq f(\sigma)$.

For each $\sigma < \tau$ and each m , pick a sufficiently large $n \in X$, then

$$\llbracket H_{\sigma,m} \rrbracket = \llbracket H_{\sigma,m}^n \rrbracket = \llbracket H_{\sigma,n}^n \upharpoonright_m \rrbracket \supseteq \llbracket H_{\tau,n}^n \upharpoonright_m \rrbracket = \llbracket H_{\tau,m}^n \rrbracket = \llbracket H_{\tau,m} \rrbracket.$$

It follows that $\llbracket H_\sigma \rrbracket \supseteq \llbracket H_\tau \rrbracket$. □

2.2 Outline of the forcing dichotomy

A canonical hitting-family (H_σ) defines a functional Φ_H , mapping trees to trees: $\Phi_H(T)$ is the tree containing the σ such that T has a path in H_σ . Suppose Φ maps trees to trees, and

$$\Phi^{-1}(\sigma) = \{T \in \mathcal{T} : \sigma \in \Phi(T)\}$$

is a canonical tree-family with a corresponding canonical hitting-family (H_σ) . Then $\Phi(T)$ is a subtree of $\Phi_H(T)$.

Let D_c be a closed set of reals x with *at most c many hits*: the class of x such that:

$$\text{for each } n \text{ there are at most } c \text{ many } n\text{-bit strings } \sigma \text{ such that } x \in \llbracket H_\sigma \rrbracket. \quad (2)$$

The claim then, is that Φ_H cannot map a subtree of D_c with one accumulation point, to a tree with more than one accumulation point, such as a perfect tree. Indeed, inside some neighborhood ρ around the accumulation point of T and for each n , only a fixed number of $H_{\rho'}$, $\rho \leq \rho', \rho' \in 2^n$ will include the accumulation point. The remaining points of T are finitely many, and each of them, by (2), will have finitely many hits. But this means that if there is another accumulation point in the image tree, some paths of the T must spread to many other hitting-sets, which contradicts the finiteness condition (2) of the reals in D_c .⁷

We have shown that if we can find a nonempty closed D_c satisfying (2), Φ_H cannot map a rank-1 tree to a perfect tree, and since $\Phi(T)$ is a subtree of $\Phi_H(T)$, neither can Φ . The final step is to ensure the existence of D_c , when it is not possible to force $\Phi(T) \not\subseteq P$. In this case, we show in Lemma 2.9 that the inverse images $\Phi^{-1}(\sigma)$ have small cost $< 2^{c-|\sigma|}$, so by Lemma 2.7 the family $(\Phi^{-1}(\sigma))$ has a small-cost canonical hitting-family: $\mu(H_\sigma) < 2^{-|\sigma|}$. As a consequence, very few reals belong to large numbers of incompatible H_σ (meaning, for incompatible σ), and by the regularity of the Lebesgue measure we can obtain the required closed D_c satisfying (2), hence forcing divergence.

An implicit assumption in the above argument was that we can use Lemma 2.7 to the tree-family $\mathcal{F}_\sigma := \Phi^{-1}(\sigma)$, hence that (\mathcal{F}_σ) is canonical. For the latter we need the assumption that Φ is total. Fortunately, if Φ is not total it will be easy to force partiality by restricting to a suitable Π_1^0 subclass of \mathcal{T} .

2.3 Forcing the tree

Given a Π_1^0 class $Q \subseteq \mathcal{T}$, $S \subseteq 2^\omega$, a computable descending approximation (Q_s) to Q , let

$$Q^* := \{F \in \mathcal{T}^* : \exists T \in Q, F < T\} \quad \text{and} \quad Q(S) := \{T \in Q : [T] \subseteq S\}.$$

All Turing functionals Φ here are assumed to accept an oracle T from \mathcal{T} or \mathcal{T}^* and the output of $\Phi(T; k)$, if defined, is a finite tree of depth k . We let $\Phi(T) \uparrow$ denote that Φ is not total on T . In most of our analysis we deal with a fixed given Φ , so it is convenient to let (Φ_s) denote its effective enumeration. In the final step of the argument, we will use a list (Φ_e) of functionals where e denotes the index of Φ_e , and similarly use a descending sequence (Q_e) of Π_1^0 subsets of \mathcal{T} , where e will denote the index of Q_e .

Given a Π_1^0 class $Q \subseteq \mathcal{T}$, by compactness, Q^* is a Π_1^0 subset of \mathcal{T}^* ; let

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi^{-1}(\sigma, Q) &:= \{F \in Q^* : \Phi(F; |\sigma|) \downarrow \wedge \sigma \in \Phi(F; |\sigma|)\} \\ \Phi_s^{-1}(\sigma, Q) &:= \{F \in Q_s^* : \Phi_s(F; |\sigma|) \downarrow \wedge \sigma \in \Phi_s(F; |\sigma|)\}. \end{aligned}$$

where (Q_s^*) denotes a computable descending approximation to Q^* .

⁷This argument is formalized in the proof of Lemma 2.10.

Definition 2.8. We say that a Π_1^0 class $Q \subseteq \mathcal{T}$ is

- $Q \subseteq \mathcal{T}$ is ϵ -robust if for each $D \subseteq 2^{<\omega}$, $\mu(D) < \epsilon$ we have $Q(2^\omega - \llbracket D \rrbracket) \neq \emptyset$.
- $Q \subseteq \mathcal{T}$ is robust if it is ϵ -robust for some $\epsilon > 0$.

In the terminology of §2.1, Q is robust if it has positive hitting-cost.

Lemma 2.9. Given a Π_1^0 class $Q \subseteq \mathcal{T}$, Φ , suppose we cannot diagonalize inside Q :

$$\forall k \forall F \in Q^* (\Phi(F; k) \downarrow \Rightarrow \Phi(F; k) \subseteq P).$$

Then $\exists c \forall \sigma \in P : c(\Phi^{-1}(\sigma, Q)) < 2^{c-|\sigma|}$.

Proof. According to the hypothesis,

$$\sigma \notin P \Rightarrow \Phi^{-1}(\sigma, Q) = \emptyset. \quad (3)$$

For each n enumerate $V_n \subseteq 2^{<\omega}$ by the following loop, starting with $s_0 = 0$:

- search for $s_1 > s_0$, $\sigma \in P_{s_1}$, $|\sigma| > n$ with $c(\Phi_{s_1}^{-1}(\sigma, Q_{s_0})) > 2^{n-|\sigma|}$
- enumerate σ into V_n and wait for $s_2 > s_1$ such that $\Phi_{s_1}^{-1}(\sigma, Q_{s_2}) = \emptyset$
- set $s_0 := s_2$ and go to (a).

The σ enumerated in (b) is chosen to be the least in $\sigma \in P_{s_1}$ with the stated property.

At each iteration (s_0, s_1, s_2, σ) , $\mu(P'_{s_0} - P'_{s_2}) > 2^{n-|\sigma|} \geq 2^n \cdot \mu(V_n(s_2) - V_n(s_0))$.

Considering a possible last incomplete iteration (where s_2 is never found) and the condition $|\sigma| > n$, we get $\mu(V_n) < 2^{-n} + 2^{-n-1}$. By Lemma 2.1, for each sufficiently large n , $P \cap V_n = \emptyset$.

Fix such a sufficiently large n . It remains to show that

$$\forall \sigma \in P : c(\Phi^{-1}(\sigma, Q)) < 2^{n-|\sigma|}. \quad (4)$$

By $P \cap V_n = \emptyset$ and (3), the enumeration of V_n will never get permanently stuck at (b). We may conclude that (4) holds: otherwise, clause (a) of the definition of V_n would enumerate some $\sigma \in P$ into V_n , contradicting $V_n \cap P = \emptyset$. \square

We give an intuitive outline of the the proof of Lemma 2.10.

By the hypothesis and Lemma 2.9 there exists c such that $\forall \sigma$, $c(\Phi^{-1}(\sigma, Q)) < 2^{c-|\sigma|}$. Assuming that Φ is total and letting $2^c > 1/\epsilon$, $f(\sigma) := 2^{1+c-|\sigma|}$, Lemma 2.7 says that tree-family $(\Phi^{-1}(\sigma, Q))$ has an f -canonical hitting-family (H_σ) . Since $\mu(H_\sigma) < 2^{c-|\sigma|}$, the measure or reals that belong to $\llbracket H_\sigma \rrbracket$ for an anti-chain of $> 2^{2c}$ many σ is $< 2^{-c}$. By regularity and the robustness of Q , by restricting Q to a large clopen set of paths, we obtain a Π_1^0 robust $Q' \subseteq Q$ such that each path through any tree in Q' belongs to $\llbracket H_\sigma \rrbracket$ for at most 2^{2c} many incomparable σ . This is then used to show that a tree with a single accumulation point cannot be Φ -mapped to a tree with more than one accumulation points, such as a perfect tree.

Lemma 2.10. *Given total Φ and robust Π_1^0 nonempty $Q \subseteq \mathcal{T}$ such that*

$$\forall k \forall F \in Q^* \left(\Phi(F; k) \downarrow \Rightarrow \Phi(F; k) \subseteq P \right),$$

there exists a robust Π_1^0 nonempty $Q' \subseteq Q$ such that $\forall T \in Q', \Phi(T) \uparrow$.

Proof. Suppose that Q is ϵ -robust. By the hypothesis and Lemma 2.9:

$$\exists c \forall \sigma \in P \left(c > -\log \epsilon \wedge c(\Phi^{-1}(\sigma, Q)) < 2^{c-|\sigma|} \right). \quad (5)$$

Fix c , let $f(\sigma) := 2^{1+c-|\sigma|}$ and note that $\mathcal{F}_\sigma := \Phi^{-1}(\sigma, Q)$ is an $f/2$ -canonical tree-family. By Lemma 2.7 consider an f -canonical hitting-family (H_σ) for (\mathcal{F}_σ) . For each k :

$$\sum_{\sigma \in 2^k} \mu(H_\sigma) < 2^c \Rightarrow \mu(\{x : |\{\sigma \in 2^k : x \in \llbracket H_\sigma \rrbracket\}| \geq 2^{2c+2}\}) < 2^{-c-1}$$

so for $g_k(x) := |\{\sigma \in 2^k : x \in \llbracket H_\sigma \rrbracket\}|$, $S_k := \{x \in P : g_k(x) > 2^{2c+2}\}$ we have $g_{k+1}(x) \geq g_k(x)$, $S_k \subseteq S_{k+1}$, $\mu(S_k) \leq 2^{-c-2}$ and for $\mu(S) = \lim_k \mu(S_k) < 2^{-c-1}$ where:

$$g(x) := \sup_k |\{\sigma \in 2^k : x \in \llbracket H_\sigma \rrbracket\}| \quad \text{and} \quad S := \{x \in P : g(x) > 2^{2c+2}\}.$$

By regularity there exists finite $E \subseteq 2^{<\omega}$ with $\llbracket E \rrbracket \supset S$, $\mu(E) < 2^{-c-1} < \epsilon/2$.

Let $Q' := Q(2^\omega - \llbracket E \rrbracket)$. Since Q is ϵ -robust, we have $Q' \neq \emptyset$ and

$$\forall T \in Q' \forall x \in [T], g(x) < 2^{2c+2}.$$

It remains to show that $\forall T \in Q', \Phi(T) \uparrow$. For a contradiction suppose $T \in Q', \Phi(T) \downarrow = T'$. Let x be the unique accumulation point of T . Since $x \notin \llbracket E \rrbracket$, $g(x) < \infty$ and since T' is perfect, there exists $\tau < x$ and $[T']$ -extendible ρ such that $\llbracket \tau \rrbracket \cap \llbracket H_\rho \rrbracket = \emptyset$.

Since x is the unique accumulation point of T , only finitely many paths of T belong to $\llbracket H_\rho \rrbracket$:

$$\sup_n |\{\sigma > \rho : \sigma \in 2^n \wedge \llbracket H_\sigma \rrbracket \cap [T] \neq \emptyset\}| < \infty.$$

But T' is perfect above ρ , so there are infinite antichains of $[T']$ -extendible nodes $\sigma > \rho$ such that $\llbracket H_\sigma \rrbracket \cap [T] = \emptyset$, so for each such σ we must have $\llbracket H_\sigma \rrbracket \cap [T] \neq \emptyset$: contradiction. \square

Lemma 2.11. *If $Q \subseteq \mathcal{T}(P)$ is Π_1^0 and nonempty, it is also robust.*

Proof. We prove the contrapositive: assuming that Q is not robust, we show that it is empty. Let (Q_s) be an effective descending approximation to Q . Since Q is not robust, it has zero hitting-cost. Since Q is Π_1^0 , there exist uniformly computable finite $V_i \subseteq 2^{<\omega}$ such that $\mu(V_i) < 2^{-i}$ and V_i is a hitting-set for Q . By Lemma 2.1, there exists i such that $\llbracket V_i \rrbracket \cap P = \emptyset$. Since V_i is a hitting set for Q and $Q \subseteq \mathcal{T}(P)$, it follows that Q is empty. \square

We now obtain the actual forcing lemma:

Lemma 2.12. *Given robust Π_1^0 nonempty $Q \subseteq \mathcal{T}(P)$, there exists robust Π_1^0 nonempty $Q' \subseteq Q$ such that*

$$\left(\forall T \in Q', \Phi(T) \uparrow \right) \vee \left(\forall T \in Q', \Phi(T) \not\subseteq P \right).$$

Proof. Let $\mathcal{D}_k := \{T \in Q : \Phi(T; k) \uparrow\}$ and note that this is a Π_1^0 subclass of $\mathcal{T}(P)$. If Φ is total, the claim follows by Lemma 2.10. Otherwise there exists k such that $\mathcal{D}_k \neq \emptyset$, so by Lemma 2.11 the conclusion holds for $Q' := \mathcal{D}_k$. \square

We conclude the construction of a tree $T \in \mathcal{T}(P)$ which does not compute any perfect pathwise-random tree, hence Theorem 1.2. Every pathwise-random tree computes a path-incompressible tree⁸ so it suffices to construct $T \in \mathcal{T}(P)$ which does not compute any perfect subtree of P . Let (Φ_e) be an effective enumeration of all functionals Φ such that $\Phi(T; k)$, if defined, is a tree of depth k . If $T \in \mathcal{T}$ computes a perfect tree T' , then there exists e such that $\Phi_e(T) = T'$. We force with robust Π_1^0 classes $Q_i \subseteq \mathcal{T}(P)$.

By Lemma 2.12 we choose robust Π_1^0 classes (Q_e) such that $Q_0 := \mathcal{T}(P)$, $Q_{e+1} \subseteq Q_e$ and

$$\left(\forall T \in Q_{e+1}, \Phi_e(T) \uparrow \right) \vee \left(\forall T \in Q_{e+1}, \Phi_e(T) \not\subseteq P \right)$$

for each e . By compactness, the intersection of all Q_i defines $T \in \mathcal{T}(P)$ which does not compute any perfect tree T' with $[T'] \subseteq [P]$.

3 Perfect path-incompressible trees

We examine the density of branching in path-incompressible trees, and the possibility of effectively increasing it, after a briefly review of known facts about randoms.

Given a prefix-free $V \subseteq 2^{<\omega}$ and k , define V^k inductively by $V^1 := V$ and $V^{k+1} := V^k * V$.

Lemma 3.1. *Given prefix-free c.e. $V \subseteq 2^{<\omega}$, $k > 0$ and computable increasing (t_n) :*

- (i) *if V contains a prefix of each nonrandom, so does V^k . (Kučera, 1985)*
- (ii) *$\exists c \forall n : K(x \upharpoonright_{t_n}) > t_n - c$, then x is random. In fact, there exists d such that*

$$\forall c (\forall n : K(x \upharpoonright_{t_n}) > t_n - c) \Rightarrow \forall n : K(x \upharpoonright_n) > n - c - d$$

for all x , where d only depends on (t_i) . (Nies et al., 2005)

The density of branching can be formalized in terms of a computable (ℓ_n) as follows.

Definition 3.2. Given computable increasing $\ell = (\ell_n)$, tree T , $z \in [T]$ we say that

⁸by Barmpalias and Wang (2021, Corollary 1.12) and, independently, Hirschfeldt et al. (2021).

- T is ℓ -perfect if for almost all n , each $\sigma \in T \cap 2^{\ell_n}$ has ≥ 2 extensions in $T \cap 2^{\ell_{n+1}}$
- z is (ℓ, T) -branching if for almost all n , each $z \upharpoonright_{\ell_n}$ has ≥ 2 extensions in $T \cap 2^{\ell_{n+1}}$.

where *almost all* n means all but finitely many n .

We use the following assembly of items by [Barmpalias and Lewis-Pye \(2020\)](#):

Lemma 3.3. *Let $\ell = (\ell_i)$ be computable and increasing, and P be positive Π_1^0 tree with $[P]$ consisting entirely of randoms.*

- (i) *If $\sum_i 2^{-(\ell_{i+1}-\ell_i)} = \infty$ then every (ℓ, P) -branching z is incomplete; also there are arbitrarily large n and $\sigma \in 2^{\ell_n} \cap P$ which have exactly one extension in $2^{\ell_{n+1}} \cap P$.*
- (ii) *If $\sum_i 2^{-(\ell_{i+1}-\ell_i)} < \infty$, there exists ℓ -perfect tree $T \subseteq P$ and injection $z \mapsto f(z) \in [T]$ such that $z \leq_T f(z)$.*

Proof. The first part of (i) is by [Barmpalias and Lewis-Pye \(2020, Lemma 2.8\)](#), taking into account that a random is difference-random iff it does not compute $\mathbf{0}'$. The second part of (i) is by [Barmpalias and Lewis-Pye \(2020, Lemma 2.4 & Corollary 2.9\)](#). Clause (ii) due to [Barmpalias and Lewis-Pye \(2020, Lemma 2.2\)](#). \square

3.1 Density of branching in path-incompressible trees

We characterize the density of branching that a perfect pathwise-random tree can have:

Theorem 3.4. *Given computable increasing $\ell = (\ell_n)$, the following are equivalent:*

- (a) \exists an ℓ -perfect pathwise-random tree
- (b) \exists an ℓ -perfect path-incompressible tree
- (c) $\sum_n 2^{-(\ell_{n+1}-\ell_n)} < \infty$.

Proof. Every pathwise-random tree computes a path-incompressible tree⁹ so (a) \rightarrow (b). Implication (b) \rightarrow (a) is trivial, while (c) \rightarrow (b) follows from (ii) of [Lemma 3.3](#).

For \neg (c) \rightarrow \neg (b), let \mathcal{F}_ℓ be the class of trees T such that each $\sigma \in T \cap 2^{\ell_n}$ has exactly two extensions in $T \cap 2^{\ell_{n+1}}$. Let $\mathcal{F}_\ell(P)$ be the restriction of \mathcal{F}_ℓ to trees T with $T \subseteq P$. Then

- (I) $Q := \{\sigma : \exists T \in \mathcal{F}_\ell(P), \sigma \in T\}$ is a Π_1^0 subtree of P , by compactness.
- (II) each $\sigma \in Q \cap 2^{\ell_n}$ has at least two extensions in $Q \cap 2^{\ell_{n+1}}$.

If $\mathcal{F}_\ell(P) \neq \emptyset$ then Q is infinite; so for \neg (c) \rightarrow \neg (b) it remains to show that Q is finite. Assuming otherwise, by \neg (c) and the second clause of [Lemma 3.3\(i\)](#), there exists n and $\sigma \in Q \cap 2^{\ell_n}$ which has at most one extension in $2^{\ell_{n+1}} \cap Q$. But this contradicts (II) above. Since \neg (c) is

⁹by [Barmpalias and Wang \(2021, Corollary 1.12\)](#) and, independently, [Hirschfeldt et al. \(2021\)](#).

invariant under finite variations of (ℓ_n) and the choice P of a nonempty Π_1^0 tree of randoms, this contradiction concludes the proof of $\neg(c) \rightarrow \neg(b)$. \square

Next, we consider the branching density along a path in a path-incompressible Π_1^0 tree P . It is known that Turing-hard members of P have low density in P , hence sparse branching.

Definition 3.5. Given $Q \subseteq 2^\omega$, the *density of z in Q* is given by

$$\rho(Q | z) := \liminf_n \mu(Q | \llbracket z \upharpoonright_n \rrbracket) = \liminf_n 2^n \cdot \mu(Q \cap \llbracket z \upharpoonright_n \rrbracket).$$

A real is a *positive-density point* if it has positive-density in every Π_1^0 tree that it belongs to.

Bienvenu et al. (2014) showed that a random z is a positive-density point iff $z \not\geq_T \emptyset'$. Positive-density random reals are not necessarily *density-1 reals* (density tends to 1) and the complete characterization of density-1 reals is an open problem. However a positive-density random real can have arbitrarily high density, in an appropriately chosen Π_1^0 tree P :

Lemma 3.6. *If z is a positive-density random real and $\epsilon > 0$, there exists Π_1^0 pruned tree P such that $[P]$ only contains randoms, $z \in P$ and the P -density of z is $> 1 - \epsilon$.*

Proof. Since z is random, there exists a Π_1^0 pruned tree P_0 such that $[P_0]$ only contains randoms and $z \in P_0$. Since z is a positive-density real, there exists $\delta > 0$ such that the P_0 -density of z is $> \delta$. Let $V_0 \subseteq 2^{<\omega}$ be a prefix-free c.e. set such that $[P_0] = 2^\omega - \llbracket V_0 \rrbracket$, so for each $\tau < z$, $\mu_\tau(V_0) < 1 - \delta$.

Let k be such that $(1 - \delta)^k < \epsilon$ and let $V := (V_0)^k$, so for each $\tau \in P_0$, $\mu_\tau(V) \leq (\mu_\tau(V_0))^k < \epsilon$. By Lemma 3.1 (i), V is c.e. and contains a prefix of every non-random real. Let P be the pruned Π_1^0 tree such that $[P] = 2^\omega - \llbracket V \rrbracket$. Then $P \supseteq P_0$, $z \in P$, and P contains only random reals. Then $\mu_\tau(P) > 1 - (1 - \mu_\tau(P_0))^k$ so

$$\tau < z \Rightarrow \mu_\tau(P) > 1 - (1 - \mu_\tau(P_0))^k > 1 - (1 - \delta)^k > 1 - \epsilon$$

which show that the density of z in P is $> 1 - \epsilon$. \square

We now show a gap theorem: an incomplete random real can be everywhere branching inside some path-incompressible Π_1^0 tree P , but the branching density of a Turing-hard random real in such P is precisely and considerably more sparse.

Theorem 3.7. *Given computable increasing $\ell = (\ell_n)$, the following are equivalent:*

- (a) \forall path-incompressible Π_1^0 tree P , $\exists (\ell, P)$ -branching $z \geq_T \emptyset'$
- (b) $\exists \Pi_1^0$ path-incompressible tree P and (ℓ, P) -branching $z \geq_T \emptyset'$
- (c) $\sum_n 2^{-(\ell_{n+1} - \ell_n)} < \infty$.

If $z \not\geq_T \emptyset'$ is random, $\ell_n = n$, \exists path-incompressible Π_1^0 tree P such that z is (ℓ, P) -branching.

Proof. By Lemma 3.3 (ii) we get (c)→(a) while (a)→(b) is trivial. By Lemma 3.3 (i) we get (b)→(c). For the last clause note that if z has density $> 1/2$ in P , it is (ℓ, P) -branching for $\ell_n = n$. Hence the last clause follows from the characterization of incomplete reals as positive-density points by Bienvenu et al. (2014), and Lemma 3.6. \square

3.2 Increasing the density of branching

We are interested in effectively transforming a perfect path-incompressible tree into one with more dense branching, without significant loss in the deficiency. To this end, we give a positive answer on certain conditions.

Let (ℓ_n) increasing and computable, and let \mathcal{T}_ℓ be the pruned trees such that each $\sigma \in T \cap 2^{\ell_n}$ has one or two extensions in $T \cap 2^{\ell_{n+1}}$. The uniform measure ν on \mathcal{T}_ℓ is induced by

$$\nu([T \upharpoonright_{\ell_n}]) = \frac{1}{|\mathcal{T}_{\ell_n}|} \text{ for } T \in \mathcal{T}_\ell, \text{ where } \mathcal{T}_{\ell_n} := \{T \upharpoonright_{\ell_n} : T \in \mathcal{T}_\ell\}$$

where $T \upharpoonright_{\ell_n} := T \cap 2^{\leq \ell_n}$ and $[T \upharpoonright_{\ell_n}]$ denotes the set of trees in \mathcal{T}_ℓ that have $T \upharpoonright_{\ell_n}$ as a prefix.

Theorem 1.3 is a special case of the following, for $m_n = n^2$.

Theorem 3.8. *Let $\ell = (\ell_n)$, $m = (m_n)$ be computable and increasing such that*

$$\ell_{n+1} - \ell_n \geq m_{n+1} - m_n \text{ and } \sum_n 2^{-(m_{n+1} - m_n)} < \infty.$$

There exists truth-table map $\Phi : \mathcal{T}_\ell \rightarrow \mathcal{T}_m$ such that for $T \in \mathcal{T}_\ell$:

- *if T is path-incompressible, so is $\Phi(T)$*
- *with ν -probability 1, T is ℓ -perfect and $\Phi(T)$ is m -perfect.*

Toward the proof, we need to be specific regarding the deficiency of the trees, so consider Π_1^0 pruned tree containing the c -incompressible reals:

$$P_c = \{\sigma \mid \forall \rho \leq \sigma, K(\rho) \geq |\rho| - c\} \text{ and } \mathcal{T}_\ell(P_c) := \{T \in \mathcal{T}_\ell : [T] \subseteq [P_c]\}.$$

For Theorem 3.8 it suffices to define a truth-table $\Phi : \mathcal{T}_\ell \rightarrow \mathcal{T}_m$ such that for $T \in \mathcal{T}_\ell$:

- (a) if T is path-incompressible, so is $\Phi(T)$: $\exists d \forall c \Phi(\mathcal{T}_\ell(P_c)) \subseteq \mathcal{T}_m(P_{c+d})$
- (b) with ν -probability 1, T is ℓ -perfect and $\Phi(T)$ is m -perfect

The required map Φ will be defined by means of a family of sets of strings.

Definition 3.9. Given increasing $m = (m_i)$, $\ell = (\ell_i)$, we say that $H := (H_\sigma)$ is a (m, ℓ) -family if for each n and $\sigma \in 2^{m_n}$, $\tau \in 2^{m_{n+1}}$:

$$(\sigma < \tau \Rightarrow \llbracket H_\tau \rrbracket \subseteq \llbracket H_\sigma \rrbracket) \wedge H_\sigma \subseteq 2^{\ell_n} \wedge \mu(H_\sigma) \leq 2^{-|\sigma|}$$

Given a (m, ℓ) -family H define the (H, m, ℓ) -map: $\Phi(T; n) = \{\sigma \in 2^{m_n} : T \cap H_\sigma \neq \emptyset\}$.

If $\sigma \mapsto H_\sigma$ is computable, Φ defines a truth-table map from \mathcal{T}_ℓ to \mathcal{T}_m .

It remains to define a computable (m, ℓ) -family $H := (H_\sigma)$ such that conditions (a), (b) above hold for the corresponding truth-table map Φ .

Construction. Let $H_\lambda = \{\lambda\}$ and inductively assume that $H_\sigma, \sigma \in 2^{m_i}, i < n$ have been defined. For each $\sigma \in 2^{m_{n-1}}, \rho \in 2^{m_n - m_{n-1}}$ let

$$H_{\sigma * \rho} := \bigcup_{\tau \in H_\sigma} \{\tau' \in 2^{\ell_n} : \tau * \rho < \tau'\}.$$

so $\mu(H_{\sigma * \rho}) = \mu(H_\sigma) \cdot 2^{-|\rho|}$, $\mu(H_\sigma) = 2^{-|\sigma|}$. Let Φ be the (H, m, ℓ) -map, so

$$\sigma \in \Phi(T) \iff H_\sigma \cap T \neq \emptyset.$$

Let Φ be the truth-table functional induced by (H_σ) .

Verification. Toward (a), consider a prefix-free machine M such that

$$\forall n, c \forall \sigma \in 2^{m_n} : (K(\sigma) \leq |\sigma| - c \implies \forall \tau \in H_\sigma : K_M(\tau) \leq |\tau| - c).$$

Since $\mu(H_\sigma) = 2^{-|\sigma|}$, the weight of M is bounded by 1. Let d be such that $K \leq K_M + d$ so

$$K(\sigma) \leq |\sigma| - c - d \implies \forall \tau \in H_\sigma : K(\tau) \leq |\tau| - c$$

for each n, c and $\sigma \in 2^{m_n}$. Hence for all τ :

$$(\tau \in T \cap 2^{\ell_n} \wedge K(\tau) > |\tau| - c) \implies \forall \sigma \in \Phi(T) \cap 2^{m_n}, K(\sigma) > |\sigma| - c - d.$$

Since $(m_n), (\ell_n)$ are increasing and computable, by Lemma 3.1 (ii) this proves (a).

For (b), we first show that the ν -probability of T containing an isolated path is 0. The probability that $\sigma \in T \cap 2^{\ell_n}$ does not branch at the next level, is the probability that two independent trials with replacement pick the same extension, which is $2^{-(\ell_{n+1} - \ell_n)}$. Since $|T \cap 2^{\ell_n}| \leq 2^n$, the probability that this occurs for some $\tau \in T \cap 2^{\ell_n}$ is $\leq 2^{n - (\ell_{n+1} - \ell_n)}$. By the hypothesis

$$\sum_n 2^{-(\ell_{n+1} - \ell_n - n)} < \infty$$

so by the first Borel-Cantelli lemma, with probability 1 the tree T is ℓ -perfect.

For (b), it remains to show that the ν -probability of $\Phi(T)$ containing an isolated path is 0. If $\sigma \in \Phi(T) \cap 2^{m_n}$ does not branch at the next level, the corresponding $\tau \in H_\sigma \cap T$ gets both of its two extensions from the same $H_{\sigma * \rho}, \rho \in 2^{m_{n+1} - m_n}$. The probability of this event E_τ is $2^{-(m_{n+1} - m_n)}$ and, since $|T \cap 2^{\ell_n}| \leq 2^n$, the probability that E_τ occurs for some $\tau \in T \cap 2^{\ell_n}$ is $\leq 2^{n - (m_{n+1} - m_n)}$. By the hypothesis there exists b such that

$$\sum_n 2^{-(m_{n+1} - m_n - n)} < b$$

so the probability that the above event occurs in more than 2^c many levels of T is $\leq b \cdot 2^{-c}$. By the first Borel-Cantelli lemma, with probability 1, $\Phi(T)$ is m -perfect. This completes the verification of (b) and the proof of Theorem 3.8.

4 Conclusion and discussion

We studied the extend to which the branching in a path-incompressible tree can be effectively altered, without significant deficiency increase. There exists a path-incompressible tree with infinitely many paths, which does not compute any perfect pathwise-random tree. Our contribution is also methodological: our proof depended on a formulation as a covering problem in hypergraphs, which was made possible in §2.1 by establishing that tree-maps can generally be assumed to be generated by canonical hitting-families. Our framework promises further applications to reducibility problems between trees, which are ubiquitous in the study of compactness in fragments of second-order arithmetic (Hirschfeldt et al., 2021; Barmpalias and Wang, 2021; Chong et al., 2019; Greenberg et al., 2021).

The limits of effective densification of perfect path-incompressible trees were explored in §3, and in this context the following type of question seems appropriate: given computable increasing $\ell = (\ell_n)$, $m = (m_n)$ with $\ell_n \gg m_n \gg n^2$, is there an ℓ -perfect path-incompressible tree which does not compute any m -perfect path-incompressible tree.

References

- G. Barmpalias and A. Lewis-Pye. Limits of the Kučera-Gács coding method. In *Structure and Randomness in Computability and Set Theory (edited with Douglas Cenzer, Chris Porter and Jindrich Zapletal)*, pages 87–109. World Scientific Press, 2020.
- G. Barmpalias and W. Wang. Pathwise-random trees and models of second-order arithmetic, 2021. Arxiv:2104.12066.
- C. H. Bennett. Logical depth and physical complexity. In R. Herken, editor, *The universal Turing machine, a half century survey*, pages 227–257. Oxford U.P., 1988.
- L. Bienvenu and B. Monin. Von Neumann’s Biased Coin Revisited. In *Proceedings of the 27th Annual IEEE/ACM Symposium on Logic in Computer Science, LICS ’12*, pages 145–154, Washington, DC, USA, 2012. IEEE Computer Society. ISBN 978-0-7695-4769-5.
- L. Bienvenu and C. P. Porter. Deep Π_1^0 classes. *Bull. Symb. Log.*, 22(2):249–286, 2016.
- L. Bienvenu, R. Hölzl, J. S. Miller, and A. Nies. Denjoy, Demuth, and density. *J. Math. Logic*, 14, 2014.
- C. Chong, W. Li, W. Wang, and Y. Yang. On the computability of perfect subsets of sets with positive measure. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 147:4021–4028, 2019.
- N. Greenberg, J. S. Miller, and A. Nies. Highness properties close to PA completeness. *Isr. J. Math.*, 244:419–465, 2021. Arxiv:1912.03016.
- D. R. Hirschfeldt, C. G. Jockusch, and P. E. Schupp. Coarse computability, the density metric, Hausdorff distances between Turing degrees, perfect trees, and reverse mathematics. Arxiv:2106.13118, 2021.

- A. Kučera. Measure, Π_1^0 -classes and complete extensions of PA. In *Recursion theory week (Oberwolfach, 1984)*, volume 1141 of *Lect. Notes Math.*, pages 245–259. Springer, Berlin, 1985.
- P. Martin-Löf. The definition of random sequences. *Information and Control*, 9:602–619, 1966.
- J. S. Miller. Extracting information is hard: A Turing degree of non-integral effective Hausdorff dimension. *Advances in Mathematics*, 226:373–384, 2011.
- A. Nies, F. Stephan, and S. A. Terwijn. Randomness, relativization and Turing degrees. *J. Symb. Log.*, 70(2):515–535, 2005.
- J. von Neumann. Various techniques used in connection with random digits. In A. S. Householder, G. E. Forsythe, and H. H. Germond, editors, *Monte Carlo Method*, volume 12 of *National Bureau of Standards Applied Mathematics Series*, chapter 13, pages 36–38. US Government Printing Office, Washington, DC, 1951.