

BENIGN APPROXIMATIONS AND NON-SPEEDABILITY

(DRAFT; MARCH 22, 2023)

RUPERT HÖLZL AND PHILIP JANICKI

University of the Bundeswehr Munich

ABSTRACT. A left-computable number x is called *regainingly approximable* if there is a computable increasing sequence $(x_n)_n$ of rational numbers converging to x such that $x - x_n < 2^{-n}$ for infinitely many $n \in \mathbb{N}$; and it is called *nearly computable* if there is such an $(x_n)_n$ such that for every computable increasing function $s: \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ the sequence $(x_{s(n+1)} - x_{s(n)})_n$ converges computably to 0. In this article we study the relationship between both concepts by constructing on the one hand a non-computable number that is both regainingly approximable and nearly computable, and on the other hand a left-computable number that is nearly computable but not regainingly approximable; it then easily follows that the two notions are incomparable with non-trivial intersection. With this relationship clarified, we then hold the keys to answering an open question of Merkle and Titov: they studied *speedable* numbers, that is, left-computable numbers whose approximations can be sped up in a certain sense, and asked whether, among the left-computable numbers, being Martin-Löf random is equivalent to being non-speedable. As we show that the concepts of speedable and regainingly approximable numbers are equivalent within the nearly computable numbers, our second construction provides a negative answer.

1. INTRODUCTION

Let $(x_n)_n$ be a sequence of real numbers. We say that $(x_n)_n$ is *increasing* if we have $x_n < x_{n+1}$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. If we have $x_n \leq x_{n+1}$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we say that $(x_n)_n$ is *non-decreasing*. Analogously we define a *decreasing* and a *non-increasing* sequence. A real number is called *left-computable* if there exists a computable non-decreasing (or, equivalently, increasing) sequence of rational numbers converging to it. The left-computable numbers play an important role in computable analysis and in the theory of algorithmic randomness.

A real number x is called *computable* if there exists a computable sequence $(x_n)_n$ of rational numbers satisfying $|x - x_n| < 2^{-n}$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. It is easy to see that every computable number is left-computable, but the converse is not true. It is also easy to see that a real number x is computable if and only if there exists a computable non-decreasing sequence $(x_n)_n$ of rational numbers with $x - x_n < 2^{-n}$

E-mail address: r@hoelzl.fr, philip.janicki@unibw.de.

for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. However, if we only require that the condition $x - x_n < 2^{-n}$ be satisfied for infinitely many $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we obtain a different subset of the left-computable numbers introduced by Hertling, Hölzl, and Janicki [5].

Definition 1 (Hertling, Hölzl, Janicki [5]). *A real number x is called regainingly approximable if there exists a computable non-decreasing sequence of rational numbers $(x_n)_n$ converging to x with $x - x_n < 2^{-n}$ for infinitely many $n \in \mathbb{N}$.*

Obviously every computable number is regainingly approximable, but the converse is not true [5]. Thus, with respect to inclusion, the regainingly approximable numbers are properly lodged between the computable and the left-computable numbers.

For $A \subseteq \mathbb{N}$, we define a real number in the interval $[0, 1]$ via $x_A := \sum_{n \in A} 2^{-(n+1)}$. Then clearly A is computable if and only if x_A is computable. If A is only assumed to be computably enumerable, then x_A is a left-computable number; the converse is not true as pointed out by Jockusch (see Soare [9]). We say that a real number $x \in [0, 1]$ is *strongly left-computable* if there exists a computably enumerable set $A \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ with $x_A = x$.

Definition 2. *Let $(x_n)_n$ be a convergent sequence and $x := \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} x_n$.*

- (1) *A function $f: \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ is called a modulus of convergence of $(x_n)_n$ if for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and for all $m \geq f(n)$ we have $|x - x_m| < 2^{-n}$.*
- (2) *We say that a modulus of convergence $g: \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ of $(x_n)_n$ is optimal if for every modulus of convergence $f: \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ of $(x_n)_n$ and for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ we have $f(n) \geq g(n)$.*
- (3) *We say that the sequence $(x_n)_n$ converges computably to x if it has a computable modulus of convergence.*

It is clear that for every convergent sequence there exists a unique optimal modulus of convergence g , but that this g need in general not be computable even if the sequence converges computably. It can be shown that a real number is computable if and only if there exists a computable sequence of rational numbers converging computably to it. In a detailed study, Hertling and Janicki [6] used the concept of computable convergence to define another interesting subset of the real numbers.

Definition 3 (Hertling, Janicki [6]).

- (1) *A sequence $(x_n)_n$ is called nearly computably convergent if it converges and, for every computable increasing function $s: \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$, the sequence $(x_{s(n+1)} - x_{s(n)})_n$ converges computably to 0.*
- (2) *A real number is called nearly computable if there exists a computable sequence of rational numbers which converges nearly computably to it.*

Naturally, every computable number is nearly computable, but the converse is not true by a theorem of Downey and LaForte [4, Theorem 3] combined with results of Stephan and Wu [10, Theorem 5] and Hertling and Janicki [6, Proposition 7.2].




FIGURE 1. An overview of the three different notions of benign approximability studied in this article, and of numbers witnessing their separations: x_1 and x_2 are constructed in Theorem 37 and Theorem 9, respectively. Proposition 36 establishes the existence of x_3 , and Corollary 56 that of x_4 .

In this article we are interested in the relationship between the set of left-computable nearly computable numbers and that of regainingly approximable numbers; as every computable number is both nearly computable and regainingly approximable, we are only interested in non-computable numbers. The article consists of five sections. After discussing some preliminaries in the second section, we use the third section to construct an example of a regainingly approximable number that is nearly computable but not computable. In the fourth section we give an example of a left-computable number that is nearly computable but not regainingly approximable. Both examples are built using infinite injury priority constructions. Finally, in the fifth section, we discuss the relationship of our results to an open problem stated by Merkle and Titov [7]; they investigated when and to what extent computable approximations to left-computable numbers can be accelerated.

Definition 4 (Merkle, Titov [7]). *A left-computable number x is called speedable if there exists a constant $\rho \in]0, 1[$ and a computable increasing sequence of rational numbers $(x_n)_n$ converging to x such that there are infinitely many $n \in \mathbb{N}$ with $\frac{x-x_{n+1}}{x-x_n} \leq \rho$.*

Among other results, they gave a direct proof that speedable numbers are not Martin-Löf random¹ and asked whether the inverse implication holds as well; that is, whether a left-computable number is speedable if and only if it is not Martin-Löf

¹This was also implicitly shown by Barmpalias and Lewis-Pye [1, Theorem 1.7]. For general background on Martin-Löf random numbers, refer to Downey and Hirschfeldt [2] or Nies [8].

random. Previous attempts to answer this question failed because so far speedability appears to be a notion that seems hard to work with in effective constructions. But as it turns out, regaining approximability is the key to approaching the problem. Namely, we prove that the concepts of speedable and regainingly approximable numbers are equivalent within the nearly computable numbers; thus, together with the construction of the fourth section, we obtain a negative answer to the open question, our final main result. Figure 1 provides an overview of the relationship of the different classes of numbers studied in this article.

2. PRELIMINARIES

Let $\Sigma := \{0, 1\}$ be the binary alphabet, let Σ^* be the set of all (finite) binary words, and let $\Sigma^{\mathbb{N}}$ be the set of all (infinite) sequences over Σ . Write $\Gamma := \Sigma^* \cup \Sigma^{\mathbb{N}}$. For any $\sigma \in \Sigma^*$ and $\tau \in \Gamma$, we say that σ is a *prefix* of τ (written $\sigma \sqsubseteq \tau$) if there exists an $\rho \in \Gamma$ with $\sigma\rho = \tau$. Obviously, the empty word λ is a prefix of every other word. If $\sigma \sqsubseteq \tau$ and $\sigma \neq \tau$ hold, we write $\sigma \sqsubset \tau$ and say that σ is a *proper prefix* of τ . Restricted to Σ^* , the prefix relation \sqsubseteq is a partial order.

In addition, we introduce the following strict order: For any $\sigma, \tau \in \Gamma$ we say that σ is *lexicographically smaller* than τ (written $\sigma <_L \tau$) if there exists a $\rho \in \Sigma^*$ with $\rho 0 \sqsubseteq \sigma$ and $\rho 1 \sqsubseteq \tau$. Note that this relation is a strict total order only if it is restricted to $\Sigma^{\mathbb{N}}$. We explicitly point out that according to this definition two distinct elements are incomparable if and only if one is a proper prefix of the other. For every $\sigma \in \Sigma^*$, we denote with $|\sigma|$ the length of σ . Finally, we define the function $\nu: \Sigma^* \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$, where $\nu(\sigma)$ is σ 's position in the length-lexicographic order of all strings in Σ^* .

Definition 5. Let $(\mathcal{T}[t])_t$ be a sequence in Σ^* . We recursively define the sequence $\mathcal{T} \in \Sigma^{\mathbb{N}}$, called the *true path* of $(\mathcal{T}[t])_t$, as follows:

$$\mathcal{T}(0) := \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } 0 \sqsubseteq \mathcal{T}[t] \text{ for infinitely many } t \in \mathbb{N} \\ 1 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

$$\mathcal{T}(e+1) := \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } \mathcal{T}(0) \dots \mathcal{T}(e)0 \sqsubseteq \mathcal{T}[t] \text{ for infinitely many } t \in \mathbb{N} \\ 1 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

Note that the true path is also defined when the sequence $(|\mathcal{T}[t]|)_t$ is bounded.

Fact 6. Let $(\mathcal{T}[t])_t$ be a sequence in Σ^* and let \mathcal{T} be its true path. Then the following statements hold:

- (1) For all $\sigma \in \Sigma^*$ with $\sigma <_L \mathcal{T}$, there exist only finitely many $t \in \mathbb{N}$ with $\sigma \sqsubseteq \mathcal{T}[t]$.
- (2) If the sequence $(|\mathcal{T}[t]|)_t$ is bounded from above, then $L := \limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} |\mathcal{T}[t]|$ is a natural number and we have $\mathcal{T}(e) = 1$ for all $e \geq L$.
- (3) If the sequence $(|\mathcal{T}[t]|)_t$ is unbounded, then for all $\sigma \sqsubset \mathcal{T}$ there exist infinitely many $t \in \mathbb{N}$ with $\sigma \sqsubseteq \mathcal{T}[t]$. \square

Finally, we fix some standard enumeration $(\varphi_e)_e$ of all computable partial functions from \mathbb{N} to \mathbb{N} . As usual, the notation $\varphi_e(n)[t]\downarrow$ denotes that the e -th Turing machine, which computes φ_e , stops after at most t steps on input n . In this article we will use a uniform modification of this enumeration by enforcing the implication $\varphi_e(n)[t]\downarrow \Rightarrow \varphi_e(n) \leq t$ for all $e, n, t \in \mathbb{N}$. Note that this modification does not change the property of being a standard enumeration.

Definition 7. Let $\ell: \mathbb{N}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$, defined for all $(e, t) \in \mathbb{N}^2$ via

$$\ell(e)[t] := \max(\{l \leq t \mid \forall k < l: \varphi_e(k)[t]\downarrow < \varphi_e(k+1)[t]\downarrow\} \cup \{-1\}),$$

be the length function for increasing functions.

Clearly, for all $e \in \mathbb{N}$, the sequence $(\ell(e)[t])_t$ is non-decreasing, and it tends to infinity if and only if φ_e is total and increasing.

3. NON-TRIVIAL INTERSECTION

In this section we will prove the first main result of the article. It is easy to see that every computable number is both nearly computable and regainingly approximable; we will show that the converse is not true. The following easy characterization of the computable numbers among the left-computable numbers will be useful in the construction.

Fact 8. *The following statements are equivalent for a left-computable number x :*

- (1) x is computable.
- (2) For every computable non-decreasing sequence of rational numbers $(x_n)_n$ there exists a computable increasing function $s: \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ with $x - x_{s(n)} < 2^{-n}$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. □

Theorem 9. *There exists a regainingly approximable number which is nearly computable, but not computable.*

We will prove this theorem by constructing a computable non-decreasing sequence of rational numbers $(x_t)_t$ which converges nearly computably. Let x denote its limit. To ensure that x is not computable, it is enough to ensure that there exists no computable subsequence of $(x_t)_t$ satisfying Fact 8 (2). To this end, we define the following infinite list of negative requirements, for $e \in \mathbb{N}$:

$$\mathcal{N}_e: \varphi_e \text{ total and increasing} \Rightarrow (\exists m \in \mathbb{N}) x - x_{\varphi_e(m)} \geq 2^{-m}$$

On top of that, we need to ensure that the sequence $(x_t)_t$ converges nearly computably. By definition this is the case if for every computable increasing function $s: \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ the sequence $(x_{s(t+1)} - x_{s(t)})_t$ converges computably to zero. To achieve this, we define the following infinite list of positive requirements, for $e \in \mathbb{N}$:

$$\mathcal{P}_e: \varphi_e \text{ total and increasing} \Rightarrow (x_{\varphi_e(t+1)} - x_{\varphi_e(t)})_t \text{ converges computably to } 0.$$

At first sight, the two types of requirements seem to be in conflict with each other: On the one hand, the approximation of x will have to try to satisfy negative

requirements by performing possibly large jumps; and this can become necessary during very late stages of the construction. On the other hand, it will have to try to satisfy positive requirements by committing at certain moments during the construction that it will never again make jumps larger than certain sizes. We need to carefully balance out these necessities.

Our approach is inspired by the work of Downey and LaForte [4]. Namely, we work with an infinite injury priority construction on an infinite binary tree of strategies $\sigma \in \Sigma^*$. Such a strategy with $e := |\sigma|$ will be responsible for satisfying both requirements \mathcal{N}_e and \mathcal{P}_e . We define the *parameters* of a strategy as the following four functions from $\Sigma^* \times \mathbb{N}$ to \mathbb{N} , defined for every $\sigma \in \Sigma^*$ and every $t \in \mathbb{N}$:

- A *counter* $c(\sigma)[t]$
- A *restraint* $r(\sigma)[t]$
- A *satisfaction flag* $s(\sigma)[t]$
- A *witness* $w(\sigma)[t]$

Throughout the construction, we will ensure that the witness and the restraint are non-decreasing in t . While the witness and the satisfaction flag of a strategy are responsible for handling the corresponding negative requirement, the restraint is relevant for fulfilling the positive one. The counter is a mediator between positive requirements with high priority and negative requirements with lower priority when a conflict occurs. If a strategy of low priority would like to make a large jump in order to fulfill a negative requirement, but can only make smaller jumps due to some restraint imposed by a strategy of higher priority, then with the help of the counter the large jump is divided into several smaller jumps that are then scheduled for later execution. The counter keeps track of how many of these small jumps still have to be made before the original large jump is completed. Once that is the case, the corresponding negative requirement is satisfied. While executing these smaller jumps one by one, even stricter restraints might get imposed due to even higher priority strategies. In that case, we need to split them again into even smaller jumps, etc.

More precisely, when negative requirements become threatened, we want to react by making a jump to defeat the threat. If there is no restraint in place that prevents us from doing so, we immediately make the jump. Otherwise, if such restraints are in place, we choose the next higher priority strategy having created such a restraint, and make it responsible for executing the many small jumps needed. This will then happen starting from the next stage. In other words, jumps that cannot be executed immediately will be handed upwards in the chain of command to be handled there.

For the positive requirements, ideally, we would like to not make any jumps at all. Of course this is impossible due to the negative requirements. In fact, it is during the handling of positive requirements that we execute the many small jumps that were scheduled due to the negative requirements. Depending on the situation we

may either execute a jump right away or pass it upwards in the chain of command where it will get executed by being split into a large number of even smaller jumps. Finally, we still need to ensure that the constructed number is regainingly approximable. Whenever a desired jump from a negative requirement is completed at some stage $t \in \mathbb{N}$, we then take care that lower priority strategies can from now on only make jumps whose sum is at most 2^{-t} , by raising the values of their witnesses. After these introductory remarks, we are now ready to formally prove the theorem.

Proof. We use a special pairing function $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle : \Sigma^* \times \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ defined by

$$\langle \sigma, n \rangle := P(\nu(\sigma), n)$$

for all $\sigma \in \Sigma^*$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$, where $P: \mathbb{N}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ is Cantor's pairing function defined by $P(m, n) := \frac{1}{2}(m+n)(m+n+1) + n$ for all $m, n \in \mathbb{N}$. It is easy to see that $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ is a computable bijection. We will recursively define a computable non-decreasing sequence of rational numbers $(x_t)_t$ starting with $x_0 := 0$. At the same time, we will also recursively define four functions $c, r, s, w: \Sigma^* \times \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ starting with

$$\begin{aligned} c(\sigma)[0] &:= 0, \\ r(\sigma)[0] &:= 0, \\ s(\sigma)[0] &:= 0, \\ w(\sigma)[0] &:= \nu(\sigma), \end{aligned}$$

for all $\sigma \in \Sigma^*$.

The construction proceeds in stages. At the end of each stage $t \in \mathbb{N}$, we will fix a finite binary string $\mathcal{T}[t]$; we will say that stage t *settles on* $\mathcal{T}[t]$. To define this string during stage t we proceed in at most $t+1$ substages, in each of which we will decide on one additional bit of $\mathcal{T}[t]$.

More precisely, in every stage t , we will begin in substage 0 by *applying* strategy λ ; and for every substage $e < t$, if σ with $|\sigma| = e$ is the strategy applied in it, then we may explicitly choose to *apply* $\sigma 0$ or $\sigma 1$ in the following substage $e+1$. Alternatively, in every substage, we may also decide that we do not need another substage, thereby ending stage t and going to stage $t+1$ directly. At the end of each stage, we choose the last applied strategy as the string $\mathcal{T}[t]$ that stage t settles on.

We define some terminology:

- At some stages t of the construction, we will need to *initialize* strategies $\tau \in \Sigma^*$. By this we mean that we set

$$\begin{aligned} c(\tau)[t+1] &:= 0, \\ s(\tau)[t+1] &:= 0, \\ w(\tau)[t+1] &:= \nu(\tau) + t + 2. \end{aligned}$$

Note that this influences how the construction will proceed in the *subsequent* stage $t+1$.

- We say that a strategy $\sigma \in \Sigma^*$ is *threatened at stage t* if the conditions
 - $s(\sigma)[t] = 0$,
 - $\ell(e)[t] \geq w(\sigma)[t]$ where $e := |\sigma|$,
 - $x_t - x_{\varphi_e(\ell(e)[t])} < 2^{-w(\sigma)[t]}$
 are satisfied. As described above, to defeat this threat, we would like to react by making some large jump.
- We say that a strategy $\sigma \in \Sigma^*$ is *expansionary at stage t* if the conditions
 - $s(\sigma)[t] = 1$,
 - $\ell(e)[t] \geq 0$ where $e := |\sigma|$,
 - $x_t - x_{\varphi_e(\ell(e)[t])} < 2^{-r(\sigma)[t]}$
 are satisfied. By the first condition, a σ can only be expansionary if it was already threatened since its last initialization. Then the third condition means that φ_e has made some further progress towards looking like a total, increasing function. Due to how we chose the positive requirements, this has repercussions on the sizes of jumps we may still make in the future.

We complete the description of the construction by saying what it means for $\sigma \in \Sigma^*$ to be *applied* in a substage of stage t :

- (1) Let $e := |\sigma|$. If we have $e = t$, then this is the last substage, we set

$$x_{t+1} := x_t,$$

we initialize all strategies $\tau \in \Sigma^*$ with $\sigma <_L \tau$, and terminate stage t . Otherwise we continue with (2).

- (2) *Negative requirement:* If σ is not threatened at stage t , jump to (3).

Otherwise we would like to react to the threat by making a jump. First check if there exists a $\gamma \in \Sigma^*$ with $\gamma 0 \sqsubseteq \sigma$ and $r(\gamma)[t+1] \geq w(\sigma)[t]$.

If there is no such string, then no higher priority restraint prevents us from making the jump we want to make, and we simply set

$$x_{t+1} := x_t + 2^{-w(\sigma)[t]}.$$

If γ exists on the other hand, then choose the longest such γ , and set

$$c(\gamma)[t+1] := \langle \sigma, 2^{r(\gamma)[t+1]-w(\sigma)[t]} \rangle,$$

$$x_{t+1} := x_t.$$

This means that we cannot make the desired jump right away, but that we have scheduled a large number of small jumps to be made in future stages when strategy γ gets applied.

In either case, this will be the last substage of this stage. We set

$$s(\sigma)[t+1] := 1$$

to document that this negative requirement has been handled, initialize all strategies $\tau \in \Sigma^*$ with $\sigma <_L \tau$ or $\sigma \sqsubset \tau$, and terminate stage t .

- (3) *Positive requirement:* If σ is not expansionary at stage t , continue with the next substage $e + 1$ applying $\sigma 1$. The “1” means that we currently have no reason to believe that φ_e is a total and increasing function, and that it thus need not be considered when we are trying to ensure the near computability of x .

Otherwise, if σ is expansionary at stage t , we check if $c(\sigma)[t] = 0$. If this is the case, then we set

$$r(\sigma)[t + 1] := r(\sigma)[t] + 1$$

and continue with the next substage $e + 1$ applying $\sigma 0$. The “0” means that we consider φ_e a viable candidate for being a total and increasing function, and that in response we have made our restraint on future jump sizes stricter.

Otherwise, if σ is expansionary at stage t but $c(\sigma)[t] > 0$, then we need to delay our reaction as we still have “homework” to do first. Namely, we need to execute a list of jumps previously scheduled in an earlier stage.

Formally, in this case, there exist a strategy $\alpha \in \Sigma^*$ and a number $k \in \mathbb{N}$ with $c(\sigma)[t] = \langle \alpha, k + 1 \rangle$. Check if there exists a $\gamma \in \Sigma^*$ with $\gamma 0 \sqsubseteq \sigma$. If there is no such string, then we set

$$x_{t+1} := x_t + 2^{-r(\sigma)[t]},$$

meaning that we have successfully executed one of the scheduled jumps.

If γ exists on the other hand, choose the longest such γ . We claim that in this case we necessarily have $r(\gamma)[t + 1] \geq r(\sigma)[t]$, see Fact 13 for a justification. Thus we can set

$$\begin{aligned} c(\gamma)[t + 1] &:= \langle \alpha, 2^{r(\gamma)[t+1]-r(\sigma)[t]} \rangle, \\ x_{t+1} &:= x_t. \end{aligned}$$

This means that instead of executing the scheduled jump right away, we hand it further up in the chain of command, splitting it even further in the process. Note that the label “ α ” in the counter, which documents which threat originally made this jump necessary, is maintained in this process.

In either case, this will be the last substage of this stage. We document the fact that one of the scheduled jumps has been taken care of (either by executing it or by delegating it upwards) by setting

$$c(\sigma)[t + 1] := \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } k = 0, \\ \langle \alpha, k \rangle & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

initialize all strategies $\tau \in \Sigma^*$ with $\alpha <_L \tau$ or $\alpha \sqsubset \tau$, and terminate stage t .

If some of the parameters $c(\sigma)[t + 1]$, $r(\sigma)[t + 1]$, $s(\sigma)[t + 1]$, or $w(\sigma)[t + 1]$ have not been explicitly set to some new value during stage t , then we set them to preserve their last respective values $c(\sigma)[t]$, $r(\sigma)[t]$, $s(\sigma)[t]$, or $w(\sigma)[t]$.

We proceed with the verification. Write $J := \{t \in \mathbb{N} : x_{t+1} > x_t\}$ for the set of stages at which non-zero jumps are made during the construction.

First note that in this construction, whenever a strategy σ is applied at some stage t , then at least all strategies that are lexicographically larger than σ will be initialized at the end of stage t . Furthermore, by construction, whenever a strategy σ is initialized, all of its extensions are initialized as well. The following three facts are immediate from the definitions; we omit the proofs.

Fact 10. *If σ is applied and threatened at stage t , then stage t settles on σ ; similarly, if σ is applied and expansionary at stage t , then stage t settles on some extension of σ .* \square

Fact 11. *For all $\sigma, \tau \in \Sigma^*$ and all $t \in \mathbb{N}$ we have*

- $r(\sigma)[t] \leq t$,
- $r(\sigma)[t] \leq r(\sigma)[t+1]$,
- $w(\sigma)[t] \leq w(\sigma)[t+1]$,
- $\sigma \sqsubseteq \tau : w(\sigma)[t] \leq w(\tau)[t]$.

\square

Fact 12. *Let $t \in \mathbb{N}$ be a stage when σ is applied. Then, for all $\gamma \in \Sigma^*$ with $\gamma 0 \sqsubseteq \sigma$, we have $c(\gamma)[t] = 0$.* \square

We establish the claim that was used during the construction.

Fact 13. *For every stage t and $\gamma 0 \sqsubseteq \sigma$, we have $r(\gamma)[t+1] \geq r(\sigma)[t]$.*

Proof. If for some $t' \leq t$ we have $r(\sigma)[t'+1] > r(\sigma)[t']$, then in particular σ must have been applied during stage t' . But then $\gamma 0$ was also applied at stage t' since $\gamma 0 \sqsubseteq \sigma$. This implies $r(\gamma)[t'+1] > r(\gamma)[t']$ by construction. Thus, by induction,

$$r(\gamma)[t+1] \geq r(\sigma)[t+1] \geq r(\sigma)[t].$$

\square

Next, we establish the following two helpful lemmata.

Lemma 14. *Let $m, t_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\sigma \in \Sigma^*$ with $w(\sigma)[t_0] = m$. There exists at most one stage $t_1 \geq t_0$ with $w(\sigma)[t_1] = m$ at which σ is applied and threatened.*

Proof. Let $t_1 \geq t_0$ be a stage at which σ is applied and threatened. By construction we have $s(\sigma)[t_1] = 0$ and $s(\sigma)[t_1+1] = 1$. Thus, from now on, σ is never threatened again, unless it is initialized at some stage $t_2 > t_1$. But then, by construction, $w(\sigma)[t_2] > w(\sigma)[t_1] = m$. The claim then follows from the fact that $(w(\sigma)[t])_t$ is non-decreasing. \square

Lemma 15. *Let $\sigma \in \Sigma^*$. The following two properties are equivalent:*

- (1) *The strategy σ is applied and expansionary at infinitely many stages.*
- (2) *Infinitely many stages settle on some extension of $\sigma 0$.*

Proof. “(1) \Rightarrow (2)”: Suppose that there are infinitely many stages at which σ is applied and expansionary. Let $t_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ be an arbitrary such stage. We claim that there must be a stage $t^* \geq t_0$ where $\sigma 0$ is applied. If $c(\sigma)[t_0] = 0$, then $t^* = t_0$ by construction. Otherwise fix $\alpha \in \Sigma^*$ and $k \geq 1$ with $c(\sigma)[t_0] = \langle \alpha, k \rangle$. Then let $t_1, \dots, t_k \in \mathbb{N}$ denote the k consecutive stages where σ is applied and expansionary that immediately follow t_0 ; we claim that we can find t^* among them. Namely, if between t_0 and t_k an initialization of σ occurs at some stage \hat{t} , then let t^* be the smallest element of $\{t_0, \dots, t_k\}$ that is greater than \hat{t} . Otherwise, if no such initialization occurs, then we must have $c(\sigma)[t_k] = 0$ by construction, and $t^* = t_k$. “(2) \Rightarrow (1)”: Suppose that infinitely many stages settle on some extension of $\sigma 0$. By construction σ must be applied and expansionary at these stages. \square

The following proposition shows that for every $l \in \mathbb{N}$ there exists a strategy of length l which is applied infinitely often but only initialized finitely often. Intuitively speaking, this ensures that for each requirement there is a stable strategy which is applied in infinitely many stages in which it can take care of satisfying the negative and positive requirements.

Proposition 16. *For every $l \in \mathbb{N}$, there exists a binary string $\sigma_l \in \Sigma^l$ satisfying the following conditions:*

- (1) *There exist infinitely stages in which σ_l is applied.*
- (2) *There exist only finitely many stages in which σ_l is initialized.*

In particular, the map $t \mapsto |\mathcal{T}[t]|$ is unbounded, and if we let \mathcal{T} denote the true path of $(\mathcal{T}[t])_t$ then conditions (1) and (2) hold for every $\sigma \sqsubset \mathcal{T}$.

Proof. We proceed by induction. The claim trivially holds for $l = 0$ since λ is applied in every stage but never initialized. Assume that for some fixed $l \in \mathbb{N}$ there exists a strategy $\sigma_l \in \Sigma^l$ satisfying both conditions.

Let $t_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ be the first stage after the last initialization of σ_l ; in particular, no proper prefix of σ_l may be applied and threatened at t_0 or later by construction. If there exists a stage $t_1 \geq t_0$ at which σ_l is applied and threatened it must be unique; this is because after such a stage we would have $s(\sigma_l)[t_1 + 1] = 1$, and since σ_l is never initialized again this means that σ_l can never be threatened again after t_1 . If t_1 exists then let $t_2 > t_1$ be the next stage at which σ_l is applied; otherwise let t_2 be the next stage after t_0 at which σ_l is applied. We show that $\sigma_l 0$ cannot be initialized anymore after t_2 by excluding the two possible causes:

- $\sigma_l 0$ is initialized when some γ is applied and threatened at stage $t \geq t_2$: By construction, γ would have to be such that $\gamma \sqsubset \sigma_l 0$ or such that $\gamma <_L \sigma_l 0$. The case $\gamma = \sigma_l$ is excluded by the choice of t_2 , and all other choices of γ would lead to an initialization of σ_l after $t_2 \geq t_0$ as well, contradiction.
- $\sigma_l 0$ is initialized when some γ is applied and expansionary at stage $t \geq t_2$: We cannot have $\gamma <_L \sigma_l 0$ as that would again lead to an initialization of σ_l at stage t as well. Thus by construction we must have $\gamma 0 \sqsubseteq \sigma_l$. However, by

Fact 12 we must have $c(\gamma)[t_2] = 0$ for every such γ . As no α with $\alpha <_L \sigma_l$ or $\alpha \sqsubseteq \sigma_l$ can ever be applied and threatened again after t_2 , we cannot have $c(\gamma)[t] = \langle \alpha, k \rangle$ for any such α and any $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Thus, by construction, $\sigma_l 0$ cannot be initialized due to any strategy that is applied and expansionary after t_2 .

It follows that $\sigma_l 0$ is not initialized anymore after stage t_2 . Thus, in case there are infinitely many stages at which $\sigma_l 0$ is applied, we may choose $\sigma_{l+1} := \sigma_l 0$.

For the other case, assume that there are only finitely many stages at which $\sigma_l 0$ is applied. Then by the arguments above and by Lemma 15 there is a stage $t_3 \geq t_2$ after which $\sigma_l 0$ is never applied again and σ_l is never again threatened or expansionary. Then after t_3 , in each of the (by assumption) infinitely many stages where σ_l is applied, $\sigma_l 1$ is applied next. Let $t_4 > t_3$ be the next stage at which σ_l is applied; we again exclude the possible causes for initializing $\sigma_l 1$ after t_4 :

- $\sigma_l 1$ is initialized when some γ is applied and threatened at stage $t \geq t_4$: By construction, γ would have to be such that $\gamma \sqsubset \sigma_l 1$ or such that $\gamma <_L \sigma_l 1$. The case $\gamma = \sigma_l$ is excluded by the choice of t_2 , the case $\gamma \sqsupseteq \sigma_l 0$ is excluded by the choice of t_3 , and all other choices of γ would lead to an initialization of σ_l after $t_4 \geq t_0$, contradiction.
- $\sigma_l 1$ is initialized when some γ is applied and expansionary at stage $t \geq t_4$: As before we only need to consider γ with $\gamma 0 \sqsubseteq \sigma_l$ and we must have $c(\gamma)[t_4] = 0$ for all of them. As no α with $\alpha <_L \sigma_l$ or $\alpha \sqsubseteq \sigma_l$ or $\sigma_l 0 \sqsubseteq \alpha$ can ever be applied and threatened again after t_4 by the previous arguments, we cannot have $c(\gamma)[t] = \langle \alpha, k \rangle$ for any such α and any $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Thus, by construction, $\sigma_l 1$ cannot be initialized due to any strategy that is applied and expansionary after t_4 .

Thus, in this case, $\sigma_l 1$ is not initialized again after t_4 , and we choose $\sigma_{l+1} := \sigma_l 1$.

It trivially follows that $t \mapsto |\mathcal{T}[t]|$ is unbounded. To establish the final claim, for every $l \in \mathbb{N}$, let σ_l be the lexicographically smallest string in Σ^l satisfying (1) and (2). We claim $\sigma_l \sqsubset \mathcal{T}$ for all $l \in \mathbb{N}$. Suppose otherwise; then, by definition of \mathcal{T} , for some $l \in \mathbb{N}$ there exists a $\tau \in \Sigma^l$ with $\tau <_L \sigma_l$ and satisfying (1). But then, by construction, every stage in which τ is applied ends with an initialization of σ_l , which contradicts (2). \square

During the construction, both positive and negative requirements may trigger jumps. However, intuitively speaking, all jumps can be traced back to original threats to negative requirements. This intuition is captured in the following definition and facts, which are easy to verify from the construction.

Definition 17. Define $u: J \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ as follows: For $t \in J$, let $\sigma \in \Sigma^*$ be the strategy on which t settles.

- (1) If σ is applied and threatened at t and there is no $\gamma \in \Sigma^*$ for which $\gamma 0 \sqsubseteq \sigma$ and $w(\sigma)[t] \geq r(\gamma)[t+1]$ hold, then let $u(t) := t$.

- (2) If σ is expansionary at t with $c(\sigma)[t] > 0$ and there is no $\gamma \in \Sigma^*$ with $\gamma 0 \sqsubseteq \sigma$, then there exists a strategy $\alpha \in \Sigma^*$ and a number $k \in \mathbb{N}$ with $c(\sigma)[t] = \langle \alpha, k + 1 \rangle$. Then let $u(t)$ be the latest stage $t' < t$ at which α was applied and threatened.

Informally speaking, u maps the stage where a jump is made back to the stage where the threat at its origin occurred. Note that, by construction, for every $t \in J$ one of the two cases above must hold.

Fact 18. For each $t' \in \mathbb{N}$ there exist only finitely many $t \in J$ with $u(t) = t'$. \square

With the function u defined, we can establish a series of lemmata bounding the total sums of jumps made during the construction.

Lemma 19. Let $t_1 \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\sigma \in \Sigma^*$ be such that σ is applied, not threatened, and expansionary at t_1 with $c(\sigma)[t_1] > 0$. Let $\alpha \in \Sigma^*$ be the strategy and $k \in \mathbb{N}$ be the number with $c(\sigma)[t_1] = \langle \alpha, k + 1 \rangle$. Let t' be the last stage before t_1 at which α was applied and threatened. Let $t_2 > t_1$ be the next stage at which σ is applied. Suppose that σ is not initialized between t_1 and t_2 . Let $I := \{t \in J \mid t_1 \leq t < t_2 \wedge u(t) = t'\}$. Then we have

$$\sum_{t \in I} (x_{t+1} - x_t) = 2^{-r(\sigma)[t_1]}.$$

Note that a strategy σ can by definition not be threatened and expansionary at the same stage, so that the condition “not threatened” seems superfluous. However, we state and prove the lemma in this form as this will later allow us to reuse the lemma unmodified in the proof of Theorem 37.

Proof. We show the statement by induction over the number of zeros in σ . If σ does not contain any zero, then I contains only one element and we have

$$\sum_{t \in I} (x_{t+1} - x_t) = x_{t_1+1} - x_{t_1} = 2^{-r(\sigma)[t_1]}.$$

Otherwise let $\gamma \in \Sigma^*$ be the longest string with $\gamma 0 \sqsubseteq \sigma$ with

$$c(\gamma)[t_1 + 1] = \langle \alpha, 2^{r(\gamma)[t_1+1] - r(\sigma)[t_1]} \rangle.$$

By construction, this is a counter indicating how many stages at which γ is applied, not threatened and expansionary have to occur before σ can be applied again; by construction we have $r(\gamma)[t] = r(\gamma)[t_1 + 1]$ for all $t \in I$. As γ has one zero less than σ , we can assume inductively that the statement already holds for γ ; furthermore note that γ cannot be initialized between t_1 and t_2 by assumption and construction. Thus,

$$\sum_{t \in I} (x_{t+1} - x_t) = 2^{r(\gamma)[t_1+1] - r(\sigma)[t_1]} \cdot 2^{-r(\gamma)[t_1+1]} = 2^{-r(\sigma)[t_1]}. \quad \square$$

Fact 20. Under the same assumptions as in Lemma 19, except allowing initializations of σ between t_1 and t_2 , we still have $\sum_{t \in I} (x_{t+1} - x_t) \leq 2^{-r(\sigma)[t_1]}$.

To see this, note that the arguments used in the proof of Lemma 19 still give the same upper bound, but that initializations might prevent jumps that were scheduled from being executed by resetting counters to zero.

Lemma 21. *Let $t_1 \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\sigma \in \Sigma^*$ be such that σ is applied and threatened in t_1 . Let $t_2 > t_1$ and $I := \{t \in J \mid t_1 \leq t < t_2 \text{ and } u(t) = t_1\}$. If t_2 is the next stage at which σ is applied and σ has not been initialized between t_1 and t_2 , then we have $\sum_{t \in I} (x_{t+1} - x_t) = 2^{-w(\sigma)[t_1]}$.*

Proof. If there is no longest $\gamma \in \Sigma^*$ with $\gamma 0 \sqsubseteq \sigma$ and $r(\gamma)[t_1 + 1] \geq w(\sigma)[t_1]$, then I contains only one element and we have

$$\sum_{t \in I} (x_{t+1} - x_t) = x_{t_1+1} - x_{t_1} = 2^{-w(\sigma)[t_1]}.$$

Otherwise we have $c(\gamma)[t_1 + 1] = \langle \sigma, 2^{r(\gamma)[t_1+1]-w(\sigma)[t_1]} \rangle$. By construction, this is a counter indicating how many stages at which γ is applied, not threatened, and expansionary have to occur before σ can be applied again. Noting that $r(\gamma)[t_1 + 1] = r(\gamma)[t]$ for all $t \in I$ by construction and applying Lemma 19, we obtain

$$\sum_{t \in I} (x_{t+1} - x_t) = 2^{r(\gamma)[t_1+1]-w(\sigma)[t_1]} \cdot 2^{-r(\gamma)[t_1+1]} = 2^{-w(\sigma)[t_1]}. \quad \square$$

Fact 22. *Under the same assumptions as in Lemma 21, except allowing $t_2 > t_1$ to be arbitrary and allowing initializations of σ between t_1 and t_2 , we still have $\sum_{t \in I} (x_{t+1} - x_t) \leq 2^{-w(\sigma)[t_1]}$.*

Note that in this instance we can allow arbitrary $t_2 > t_1$ because if an initialization occurs, and σ is applied and threatened again afterwards, then the stages at which the jumps resulting from that threat are executed cannot be in I by definition.

Corollary 23. *Let $t_1, t_2 \in \mathbb{N}$ with $t_1 < t_2$ and let $I := \{t \in J \mid t_1 \leq t < t_2\}$. Then,*

$$\sum_{t \in I} (x_{t+1} - x_t) \leq \sum_{t' \in u(I)} 2^{-w(\mathcal{T}[t'])[t']}. \quad \square$$

Lemma 24. *Let $I \subseteq J$, let $\sigma \in \Sigma^*$ and let $t_0 \leq \min u(I)$. Then we have*

$$\sum_{t' \in u(I): \mathcal{T}[t'] = \sigma} 2^{-w(\sigma)[t']} \leq 2^{-w(\sigma)[t_0]+1}.$$

Proof. First note that by definition of u all the numbers t' that appear in the sum on the left-hand side are stages where σ is applied and threatened. But, according to Lemma 14, between two such stages, σ must be initialized, which by construction increases the value of σ 's witness by at least 2. Thus,

$$\sum_{t' \in u(I): \mathcal{T}[t'] = \sigma} 2^{-w(\sigma)[t']} \leq \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} 2^{-(w(\sigma)[t_0]+2k)} \leq 2^{-w(\sigma)[t_0]+1}. \quad \square$$

From these facts it follows that we indeed construct a left-computable number.

Proposition 25. *The sequence $(x_t)_t$ is computable, non-decreasing, and bounded from above. Thus, its limit $x := \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} x_t$ is a left-computable number.*

Proof. It is clear that $(x_t)_t$ is computable and non-decreasing. We show that it converges by showing that $\sum_{t=0}^{\infty} (x_{t+1} - x_t)$ converges. To see this, we apply Corollary 23 with $t_1 = 0$ and $t_2 \rightarrow \infty$ as well as Lemma 24 to obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
 \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} (x_{t+1} - x_t) &= \sum_{t \in J} (x_{t+1} - x_t) \\
 &\leq \sum_{t' \in u(J)} 2^{-w(\mathcal{T}[t'])[t']} \\
 &= \sum_{\sigma \in \Sigma^*} \sum_{t' \in u(J): \mathcal{T}[t'] = \sigma} 2^{-w(\sigma)[t']} \\
 &\leq \sum_{\sigma \in \Sigma^*} 2^{-w(\sigma)[0]+1} \\
 &= \sum_{\sigma \in \Sigma^*} 2^{-\nu(\sigma)+1} \\
 &< \infty. \quad \square
 \end{aligned}$$

We proceed with some observations that will be helpful later to establish that all requirements are met by the construction. The next lemma establishes that all jumps scheduled for a strategy on the true path will eventually be executed if we assume that we are already past this strategy's last initialization.

Lemma 26. *Let $\sigma \sqsubset \mathcal{T}$ and $e := |\sigma|$. Let $t_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ be the earliest stage after which σ is no longer initialized. Let $t_1 \geq t_0$ be a stage at which σ is applied and threatened, and let $t_2 > t_1$ be another stage at which σ is applied. Then we have*

- (1) $x_{t_2} - x_{t_1} \geq 2^{-w(\sigma)[t_1]}$,
- (2) $x_{t_2} - x_{\varphi_e(\ell(e)[t_1])} \geq 2^{-w(\sigma)[t_1]}$.

Proof.

- (1) This follows immediately from Lemma 21.
- (2) By the conventions laid out on page 5 and since $(x_t)_t$ is non-decreasing, we have $t_1 \geq \varphi_e(\ell(e)[t_1])$, thus $x_{t_1} \geq x_{\varphi_e(\ell(e)[t_1])}$, and the claim follows immediately from (1). \square

Lemma 27. *Let $e \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\sigma \sqsubset \mathcal{T}$ with $|\sigma| = e$. Let $t_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ be the earliest stage after which σ is not initialized anymore. Suppose that φ_e is total and increasing.*

- (1) *There exists a uniquely determined stage $t' \geq t_0$ at which σ is applied and threatened.*
- (2) *There exist infinitely many stages at which σ is applied and expansionary.*

Proof.

- (1) Since σ is not initialized after t_0 , we have $w(\sigma)[t] = w(\sigma)[t_0]$ for all $t \geq t_0$. Since $s(\sigma)[t_0] = 0$, there must be an earliest stage $t' \geq t_0$ at which σ is applied and threatened. By construction, we have $s(\sigma)[t' + 1] = 1$. Since σ is not initialized after t' , we have that σ cannot be threatened again.
- (2) Let t' be as in (1), and let t_1 be an arbitrary number with $t_1 \geq t'$. We claim that there is a stage $t_2 \geq t_1$ satisfying the properties
 - $s(\sigma)[t_2] = 1$,
 - $\ell(e)[t_2] \geq 0$,
 - $x_{t_2} - x_{\varphi_e(\ell(e)[t_2])} < 2^{-r(\sigma)[t_1]}$.

The first property clearly holds for any stage later than t' . The second property must hold for t_2 large enough since the assumption that φ_e is total and increasing implies that $(\ell(e)[t])_t$ tends to infinity. The third condition follows from the same argument together with the fact that $(x_t)_t$ converges.

Finally note that σ was by choice of t_2 not expansionary at any stage between t_1 and t_2 . By construction this implies that $r(\sigma)[t_1] = r(\sigma)[t_2]$, and thus all conditions for being expansionary are fulfilled by σ at stage t_2 . \square

We are ready to show that all negative requirements are satisfied.

Proposition 28. \mathcal{N}_e is satisfied for all $e \in \mathbb{N}$.

Proof. Let $e \in \mathbb{N}$. Suppose that φ_e is total and increasing. Let $\sigma \sqsubset \mathcal{T}$ with $|\sigma| = e$, let $t_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ be the earliest stage after which σ is not initialized anymore and let $t_1 \geq t_0$ be the stage at which σ is applied and threatened; this stage exists due to Lemma 27. Then we have $\ell(e)[t_1] \geq w(\sigma)[t_1]$ in particular. Let $t_2 > t_1$ be the next stage at which σ is applied. If we write $m := w(\sigma)[t_1]$, then, using Lemma 26,

$$x - x_{\varphi_e(m)} = x - x_{\varphi_e(w(\sigma)[t_1])} \geq x_{t_2} - x_{\varphi_e(\ell(e)[t_1])} \geq 2^{-w(\sigma)[t_1]} = 2^{-m}.$$

Thus, there exists a number $m \in \mathbb{N}$ with $x - x_{\varphi_e(m)} \geq 2^{-m}$, and \mathcal{N}_e is satisfied. \square

Corollary 29. The number x is not computable. \square

The following lemma is the main tool for proving that $(x_t)_t$ converges nearly computably.

Lemma 30. Let $\sigma \sqsubset \mathcal{T}$ and $t_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ be the earliest stage after which σ is no longer initialized and after which there are no more stages at which σ is applied and threatened. Let $t_1, t_2 \in \mathbb{N}$ with $t_0 \leq t_1 < t_2$ be two consecutive stages at which σ is applied and expansionary. Then we have

$$x_{t_2} - x_{t_1} \leq 2^{-r(\sigma)[t_1]+1}.$$

Proof. In order to understand what jumps may be made in stages t_1 up to strictly before stage t_2 , we distinguish between obligations to make jumps that may already

stand at the moment when we enter stage t_1 , and new obligations to make jumps that are created between stages t_1 and t_2 .

First, to quantify jumps due to potential standing obligations, note that in substages 0 up to $|\sigma| - 1$ of stage t_1 , no jumps are made by construction. Thus, let us consider what jumps may still be scheduled for execution when we are in substage $|\sigma|$ of stage t_1 . Consider the following facts:

- (1) No strategy $\tau <_L \sigma$ will be applied again after stage t_1 , as otherwise this would lead to initialization of σ , which contradicts our assumptions. Thus, if any jumps are still scheduled for any such τ (that is, if $c(\tau)[t_1] > 0$), we need not take them into account.
- (2) For strategies $\tau \in \Sigma^*$ with $\tau 0 \sqsubseteq \sigma$ we must have $c(\tau)[t_1] = 0$ due to Fact 12. Furthermore, none of these strategies can be applied and threatened anymore from t_1 onward, as otherwise that would lead to initialization of σ , again a contradiction.
- (3) While for strategies $\tau \in \Sigma^*$ with $\tau 1 \sqsubseteq \sigma$ we might have $c(\tau)[t_1] > 0$, none of these scheduled jumps will ever be executed from t_1 onwards. This is because in this case there needs to exist some $\alpha \sqsupseteq \tau 0$ and some $k \in \mathbb{N}$ with $c(\tau)[t_1] = \langle \alpha, k \rangle$. When such a jump would be executed, then since $\alpha <_L \sigma$ that would again lead to an initialization of σ , contradiction. Thus, as before, we need not take such τ 's into account.
- (4) No τ with $\sigma 0 <_L \tau$ can be applied at stage t_1 by construction. While such τ 's may be applied during stages $t_1 < t < t_2$, note that we set $c(\tau)[t_1 + 1] = 0$ for all of them when they are initialized at the end of stage t_1 .
- (5) For a strategy τ with $\sigma 0 \sqsubseteq \tau$ we may indeed have $c(\tau)[t_1] > 0$.
- (6) Similarly, it might be the case that $c(\sigma)[t_1] > 0$.

Thus, any jumps made in stages t_1 up to $t_2 - 1$ are either caused by some strategy as in (5) or (6), or must be due to *new* threats to strategies of type (4) that occur strictly between substage $|\sigma|$ of stage t_1 and stage t_2 . We establish upper bounds for all of these cases:

- Concerning strategies of type (5), by construction, if we make any jump at all while applying them, then these can only occur immediately at stage t_1 in substage $|\tau|$. We claim that such a jump can not occur due to τ being applied and expansionary at t_1 with $c(\tau)[t_1] > 0$. This is because such a jump would not be made at t_1 , but would by construction instead be split and scheduled for later execution by some strategy ρ with $\sigma 0 \sqsubseteq \rho 0 \sqsubseteq \tau$, and this strategy ρ will not be applied before stage t_2 by construction. Thus, the only reason to make a jump in this case is if τ is applied and threatened at t_1 . Then, by construction the jump made would be of size

$$2^{-w(\tau)[t_1]} < 2^{-r(\sigma)[t_1 + 1]} \leq 2^{-r(\sigma)[t_1]}.$$

- Concerning (6), in this case, by construction, we would like to make a jump of size $2^{-r(\sigma)[t_1]}$. The jump may be made immediately, or split and

scheduled for later execution by some strategies that are prefixes of σ ; but in either case the total sum of all jumps resulting from this is bounded by $2^{-r(\sigma)[t_1]}$ by Lemma 19.

- Finally, we consider new threats to strategies τ of type (4) that occur strictly between substage $|\sigma|$ of stage t_1 and stage t_2 . Since these τ 's were all initialized at stage t_1 , we have $w(\tau)[t_1 + 1] = \nu(\tau) + t_1 + 2$ for each of them. Thus, applying Lemma 24 to each such τ and then summing over all of them, the total sum of all jumps made or scheduled when such τ 's are applied in stages between t_1 and t_2 can be at most 2^{-t_1} , which by Fact 11 is at most $2^{-r(\sigma)[t_1]}$.

By construction, cases (5) and (6) exclude each other, completing the proof. \square

After these preparations, we can show that all positive requirements are satisfied.

Proposition 31. \mathcal{P}_e is satisfied for all $e \in \mathbb{N}$.

Proof. Let $e \in \mathbb{N}$. Suppose that φ_e is total and increasing. Let $\sigma \sqsubset \mathcal{T}$ with $|\sigma| = e$. Let $t_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ be the earliest stage after which σ is not initialized anymore. According to Lemma 27 there exist infinitely many stages at which σ is applied and expansionary. Now, using Lemma 15, we can infer that there exist infinitely many stages at which σ_0 is applied. Thus, by construction, the sequence $(r(\sigma)[t])_t$ tends to infinity. For every $n \in \mathbb{N}$, write

$$t(n) := \min \left\{ t \geq t_0 : \begin{array}{l} r(\sigma)[t] \geq n + 2 \text{ and } \sigma \text{ is applied} \\ \text{and expansionary at stage } t \end{array} \right\}.$$

and then define a function $v: \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ via $v(n) = \ell(e)[t(n)]$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Clearly, t and v are computable.

We claim that v is a modulus of convergence of the sequence $(x_{\varphi_e(t+1)} - x_{\varphi_e(t)})_t$. To see this, let $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $i \geq v(n)$. Let $t_2 > t_1 \geq t(n)$ be the two consecutive stages at which σ is applied and expansionary with $\ell(e)[t_1] \leq i$ and $\ell(e)[t_2] \geq i + 1$. Applying Lemma 30 and the assumption that σ is expansionary at t_1 , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} x_{\varphi_e(i+1)} - x_{\varphi_e(i)} &\leq x_{\varphi_e(\ell(e)[t_2])} - x_{\varphi_e(\ell(e)[t_1])} \\ &= \underbrace{(x_{\varphi_e(\ell(e)[t_2])} - x_{t_2})}_{\leq 0} + (x_{t_2} - x_{t_1}) + (x_{t_1} - x_{\varphi_e(\ell(e)[t_1])}) \\ &\leq 2^{-r(\sigma)[t_1]+1} + 2^{-r(\sigma)[t_1]} \\ &\leq 2^{-r(\sigma)[t(n)]+1} + 2^{-r(\sigma)[t(n)]} \\ &< 2^{-n}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus $(x_{\varphi_e(t+1)} - x_{\varphi_e(t)})_t$ converges computably to zero, and \mathcal{P}_e is satisfied. \square

Corollary 32. The number x is nearly computable. \square

It remains to show that x is regainingly approximable.

Definition 33. Let $\sigma \sqsubset \mathcal{T}$ be such that $\varphi_{|\sigma|}$ is total and increasing. Let $t_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ be the earliest stage after which σ is not initialized anymore and let $t' \geq t_0$ be the stage at which σ is applied and threatened. Then we call $t_\sigma := \max\{t \in J \mid u(t) = t'\}$ the cut-off stage for σ .

As $\{t \in J \mid u(t) = t'\}$ is non-empty and finite, t_σ is well-defined with $t_\sigma \geq t'$.

Lemma 34. Let $\sigma \sqsubset \mathcal{T}$ be such that $\varphi_{|\sigma|}$ is total and increasing. Let $t_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ be the earliest stage after which σ is not initialized anymore. Let $t_1 \geq t_0$ be the stage at which σ is applied and threatened and let $t_\sigma \geq t_1$ be the cut-off stage for σ . Then the following statements hold:

- (1) All strategies $\tau \in \Sigma^*$ with $\sigma \sqsubset \tau$ or $\sigma <_L \tau$ are initialized at t_σ .
- (2) For all $\tau \in \Sigma^*$ we have $c(\tau)[t_\sigma + 1] > 0 \Rightarrow \tau 0 <_L \sigma$.
- (3) For all $\tau \in \Sigma^*$ with $\tau 0 <_L \sigma$ there are no more stages after t_σ at which τ is applied and expansionary.
- (4) If some strategy τ is applied and threatened at some stage after t_σ , we must have $\sigma \sqsubset \tau$ or $\sigma <_L \tau$.
- (5) We have $x - x_{t_\sigma+1} \leq 2^{-(t_\sigma+1)}$.

Intuitively speaking, items (1)–(4) show that the cut-off stage for a σ has the special property that all previously scheduled jumps have either been executed at this stage or have been aborted due to initialization. The only possible exception are jumps scheduled for strategies that are lexicographically smaller than σ ; however, those strategies will never be applied again in any case. Since there exist infinitely many strategies along the true path with the properties required in Definition 33 there exist infinitely many cut-off stages. Then item (5) implies that x is regainingly approximable.

Corollary 35. The number x is regainingly approximable. □

We finish with the proof of Lemma 34, completing the proof of the existence of a nearly computable regainingly approximable number that is not computable.

Proof of Lemma 34.

- (1) If we have $t_\sigma = t_1$, then the desired jump at t_1 is made immediately. By construction, all strategies $\tau \in \Sigma^*$ with $\sigma \sqsubset \tau$ or $\sigma <_L \tau$ are initialized at stage t_σ . Otherwise, we have $t_\sigma > t_1$ and the desired jump at t_1 is split and scheduled. Remember that then, by construction, the last of these split jumps will ultimately be executed by the shortest $\rho \in \Sigma^*$ with $\rho 0 \sqsubseteq \sigma$ at stage t_σ . In other more formal words, ρ must be applied and expansionary at t_σ with $c(\rho)[t_\sigma] = \langle \sigma, 1 \rangle$. Then again, by construction, all strategies $\tau \in \Sigma^*$ with $\sigma \sqsubset \tau$ or $\sigma <_L \tau$ are initialized at stage t_σ .
- (2) Let $\tau \in \Sigma^*$; we distinguish three cases:

- Assume $\sigma <_L \tau 0$. This is equivalent to $\sigma <_L \tau$. Due to (1), τ is initialized at t_σ , so we have $c(\sigma)[t_\sigma + 1] = 0$.
- Assume $\sigma \sqsubset \tau 0$. This is equivalent to $\sigma \sqsubseteq \tau$. If $\sigma \sqsubset \tau$, then, due to (1), τ is initialized at t_σ , so we have $c(\sigma)[t_\sigma + 1] = 0$. Otherwise, we have $\sigma = \tau$. By choice of t_0 we have $c(\sigma)[t_0 + 1] = 0$. We claim that, from stage $t_0 + 1$ onward up to stage t_σ , strategy $\sigma 0$ is never applied; from this it follows in particular that for all stages t with $t_0 < t \leq t_\sigma + 1$ we have $c(\sigma)[t] = 0$, and we are done. To see that the claim is true, note that
 - in stages $t_0 + 1$ up to $t_1 - 1$, by definition, σ cannot be expansionary, thus $\sigma 0$ cannot be applied by construction;
 - in stage t_1 , by assumption, σ is applied and threatened, thus $\sigma 0$ cannot be applied by construction;
 - if we are in the case where $t_\sigma > t_1$ then, by construction, in stages $t_1 + 1$ up to stage t_σ we have that σ and thus in particular $\sigma 0$ are never applied.
- Assume $\tau 0 \sqsubseteq \sigma$. By Fact 12, we must have $c(\tau)[t_1] = 0$. If $t_\sigma = t_1$, then σ is applied and threatened at t_σ and the jump resulting from this threat is executed immediately; thus τ 's counter remains unchanged and so $c(\tau)[t_\sigma + 1] = c(\tau)[t_1] = 0$. So assume $t_\sigma > t_1$, meaning that the jump resulting from the threat against σ at stage t_1 is split and scheduled for later execution. If there is a stage t_2 with $t_1 \leq t_2 \leq t_\sigma$ at which $c(\tau)[t_2] = \langle \sigma, k \rangle$ for some $k \in \mathbb{N}$ (meaning that τ plays a part in executing the split jumps for σ), then by construction there must also be a latest stage t_3 with $t_2 \leq t_3 \leq t_\sigma$ where $c(\tau)[t_3] = \langle \sigma, 1 \rangle$ and $c(\tau)[t_3 + 1] = 0$ (after which τ has done its part for σ). By construction, between $t_3 + 1$ and t_σ no extensions of $\tau 0$ can be applied (because all remaining stages from $t_3 + 1$ until t_σ , if any, are used by strict prefixes of τ to execute the split jumps that were delegated upwards by τ), and therefore we have

$$c(\tau)[t_\sigma + 1] = c(\tau)[t_3 + 1] = 0.$$

If, on the other hand, there is no stage t_2 as above, then τ was “skipped over” by σ in the sense that when σ was threatened at stage t_1 , there existed a prefix ψ with $\psi 0 \sqsubseteq \tau 0 \sqsubseteq \sigma$ and some $k \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $c(\psi)[t_1 + 1]$ was set to $\langle \sigma, k \rangle$ directly (meaning that τ plays *no* part in executing the split jumps for σ). In this case, none of $\tau 0$'s extensions can ever be applied in stages t_1 up to t_σ . Thus they can never set τ 's counter to any non-zero value, and we have $c(\tau)[t_\sigma + 1] = c(\tau)[t_1] = 0$.

In summary, the implication $c(\tau)[t_\sigma + 1] > 0 \Rightarrow \tau 0 <_L \sigma$ holds.

- (3) Let $\tau \in \Sigma^*$ with $\tau 0 <_L \sigma$. We claim that if there were a stage $t > t_\sigma$ at which τ is applied and expansionary then σ would be initialized at t , and

since $t > t_0$ this contradicts the assumptions. To see this, note that there are two possible behaviours at stage t when τ is applied and expansionary:

- If $\tau 0$ is applied in the next substage of stage t , then that stage must settle on some extension ρ of $\tau 0$. Thus, $\rho <_L \sigma$, and σ is initialized at the end of stage t ;
 - if, on the other hand, we have $c(\tau)[t] = \langle \alpha, k \rangle$ for some $\alpha \sqsupseteq \tau 0$ and some $k \in \mathbb{N}$, then stage t ends with the initialization of every strategy to the right of α , and this includes σ .
- (4) Since σ is not initialized after t_σ , no $\tau <_L \sigma$ can be applied and no $\tau \sqsubset \sigma$ can be applied and threatened after t_σ . Due to $t_\sigma \geq t_1$, σ is not applied and threatened after t_σ either. Thus, if some strategy τ is applied and threatened at some stage after t_σ , we must have $\sigma \sqsubset \tau$ or $\sigma <_L \tau$.
- (5) Define $R := \{\tau \in \Sigma^* \mid \sigma \sqsubset \tau \text{ or } \sigma <_L \tau\}$. According to (2), (3) and (4), all jumps that are made after stage t_σ must be due to fresh threats to strategies $\tau \in R$ when they are applied; that is, formally speaking, if we write $I := \{t \in J \mid t \geq t_\sigma + 1\}$ then we have $t_\sigma + 1 \leq \min u(I)$.

By (1), all $\tau \in R$ are initialized at t_σ , thus $w(\tau)[t_\sigma + 1] = \nu(\tau) + t_\sigma + 2$. As $\lambda \notin R$, we have $\nu(\tau) \geq 1$ for all $\tau \in R$. Thus, using Corollary 23 with $t_1 = t_\sigma + 1$ and $t_2 \rightarrow \infty$ as well as Lemma 24, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
 x - x_{t_\sigma+1} &= \sum_{t \in I} (x_{t+1} - x_t) \\
 &\leq \sum_{t' \in u(I)} 2^{-w(\mathcal{T}[t'])[t']} \\
 &= \sum_{\tau \in R} \sum_{t' \in u(I): \tau = \mathcal{T}[t']} 2^{-w(\tau)[t']} \\
 &\leq \sum_{\tau \in R} 2^{-w(\tau)[t_\sigma+1]+1} \\
 &= \sum_{\tau \in R} 2^{-(\nu(\tau)+t_\sigma+1)} \\
 &\leq 2^{-(t_\sigma+1)}. \quad \square
 \end{aligned}$$

4. INCOMPARABILITY

In this section we prove that the regainingly approximable and the nearly computable numbers are incomparable within the left-computable numbers. One of the separations is provided by the following proposition.

Proposition 36. *There exists a regainingly approximable number which is not nearly computable.*

Proof. A result of Downey, Hirschfeldt, and LaForte [3, Theorem 2.15] implies that every strongly left-computable number that is nearly computable is, in fact,

computable. But Hertling, Hölzl, and Janicki [5] established the existence of regainingly approximable numbers that are strongly left-computable without being computable. Such a number can therefore not be nearly computable. \square

The other separation is the second main result of this article.

Theorem 37. *There exists a left-computable number which is nearly computable but not regainingly approximable.*

While the proof of Theorem 37 will be structurally similar to that of Theorem 9, there are important differences that, while seemingly subtle, vastly impact the dynamics of the construction. In these introductory explanations we will thus focus on the differences between both constructions, but will then proceed with the construction and verification in full detail. We again prove the theorem by constructing a computable non-decreasing sequence of rational numbers $(x_t)_t$ which converges nearly computably to some x . To guarantee that x is not regainingly approximable, we can use the following characterization.

Lemma 38 (Hertling, Hölzl, Janicki [5]). *The following statements are equivalent for a left-computable number x :*

- (1) x is regainingly approximable.
- (2) For every computable non-decreasing sequence of rational numbers $(x_n)_n$ converging to x there exists a computable increasing function $s: \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ with $x - x_{s(n)} < 2^{-n}$ for infinitely many $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

It is thus sufficient to ensure that for the sequence $(x_t)_t$ that we are constructing there is no computable function s as in the second item. Therefore, for every $e \in \mathbb{N}$, we define the following negative requirement:

$$\mathcal{N}_e: \varphi_e \text{ total and increasing} \Rightarrow (\exists m \in \mathbb{N}) (\forall n \geq m) x - x_{\varphi_e(n)} \geq 2^{-n}$$

Notice how the quantifiers differ from those in the negative requirements used to prove Theorem 9; here, a negative requirement can be threatened infinitely often, which will need to be reflected in the details of the construction below.

To ensure that x is nearly computable, we use the same positive requirements as before; namely, for every $e \in \mathbb{N}$:

$$\mathcal{P}_e: \varphi_e \text{ total and increasing} \Rightarrow (x_{\varphi_e(t+1)} - x_{\varphi_e(t)})_t \text{ converges computably to } 0$$

As in the last proof, the two types of requirements seemingly contradict each other. We will again resolve this apparent conflict by splitting large jumps into small jumps that will be scheduled and delayed for later execution.

We point out that, despite the more demanding negative requirements used here, the proof of this theorem is somewhat easier than that of Theorem 9. This is because in that proof, unlike here, in order to establish regaining approximability, much effort had to be devoted to ensuring the existence of the special cut-off stages.

We again work with an infinite injury priority construction on an infinite binary tree of strategies $\sigma \in \Sigma^*$ that each are responsible for satisfying both requirements $\mathcal{N}_{|\sigma|}$ and $\mathcal{P}_{|\sigma|}$, and define the *parameters* of such a strategy as the following four functions from $\Sigma^* \times \mathbb{N}$ to \mathbb{N} , defined for every $\sigma \in \Sigma^*$ and every $t \in \mathbb{N}$:

- a *counter* $c(\sigma)[t]$
- a *pause flag* $p(\sigma)[t]$
- a *restraint* $r(\sigma)[t]$
- a *witness* $w(\sigma)[t]$

As before, by construction, w and r will be non-decreasing in t for each σ . In the construction, some negative requirements will require attention infinitely often. The pause flag will be used to prevent high priority negative requirements from precluding other requirements from ever receiving attention.

After these informal remarks, we proceed with the full proof of the theorem.

Proof of Theorem 37. We recursively define a computable non-decreasing sequence of rational numbers $(x_t)_t$ starting with $x_0 := 0$. At the same time, we also recursively define four functions $c, p, r, w: \Sigma^* \times \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ starting with

$$\begin{aligned} c(\sigma)[0] &:= 0, \\ p(\sigma)[0] &:= 0, \\ r(\sigma)[0] &:= 0, \\ w(\sigma)[0] &:= \nu(\sigma), \end{aligned}$$

for all $\sigma \in \Sigma^*$. As in the proof of Theorem 9, the construction proceeds in stages consisting of at most $t + 1$ substages. At the end of each stage $t \in \mathbb{N}$, we will fix a finite binary string $\mathcal{T}[t]$ and say that stage t *settles on* $\mathcal{T}[t]$. Again, this string is determined in the substages as follows: In the first substage of each stage we *apply* strategy λ ; and in each substage when some σ is applied, we can choose whether we want to *apply* $\sigma 0$ or $\sigma 1$ in the following substage or whether we want to let the current stage end right after the current substage. The strategy applied in the last substage of a stage is then the string that that stages settles on.

We define the same terms as before, but with the different conditions needed here:

- *Initializing* a strategy $\tau \in \Sigma^*$ at a stages t means setting

$$\begin{aligned} c(\tau)[t + 1] &:= 0, \\ w(\tau)[t + 1] &:= \nu(\tau) + t + 2. \end{aligned}$$

- We say that a strategy $\sigma \in \Sigma^*$ is *threatened at stage t* if the conditions
 - $p(\sigma)[t] = 0$,
 - $\ell(e)[t] \geq w(\sigma)[t]$,
 - $x_t - x_{\varphi_e(\ell(e)[t])} < 2^{-w(\sigma)[t]}$

are satisfied. As before, to defeat this threat, we would like to react by making some large jump.

- We say that a strategy $\sigma \in \Sigma^*$ is *expansionary at stage t* if the conditions
 - $\ell(e)[t] \geq 0$ where $e := |\sigma|$,
 - $x_t - x_{\varphi_e(\ell(e)[t])} < 2^{-r(\sigma)[t]}$
 are satisfied. As before this means that φ_e has made some progress towards looking like a total, increasing function.

We complete the description of the construction by giving the details of what we do in a substage of stage t when a strategy $\sigma \in \Sigma^*$ is applied; note the significantly different initialization behaviour compared with the proof of Theorem 9:

- (1) Let $e := |\sigma|$. If we have $e = t$, then this is the last substage, we set

$$x_{t+1} := x_t,$$

we initialize all strategies $\tau \in \Sigma^*$ with $\sigma <_L \tau$, and terminate stage t . Otherwise we continue with (2).

- (2) *Negative requirement:* If σ is not threatened at stage t , set

$$p(\sigma)[t+1] := 0,$$

meaning in particular that if strategy σ was paused before, it is now unpaused again. Then jump directly to (3).

Otherwise, that is if σ is threatened at stage t , check if there is a $\gamma \in \Sigma^*$ with $\gamma 0 \sqsubseteq \sigma$ and $r(\gamma)[t+1] \geq w(\sigma)[t]$. If not, then let

$$x_{t+1} := x_t + 2^{-w(\sigma)[t]}.$$

If yes, then choose the longest such γ and set

$$c(\gamma)[t+1] := \langle \sigma, 2^{r(\gamma)[t+1]-w(\sigma)[t]} \rangle,$$

$$x_{t+1} := x_t.$$

In either case, this will be the last substage of this stage. We pause strategy σ by setting

$$p(\sigma)[t+1] := 1;$$

this prevents σ from being threatened in the next stage and thus gives other, lower priority strategies a chance to act. We also set

$$w(\sigma)[t+1] := w(\sigma)[t] + 1$$

which, unlike in the proof of Theorem 9, is necessary due to the infinitary nature of the negative requirements. We then initialize all strategies $\tau \in \Sigma^*$ with $\sigma <_L \tau$, and terminate stage t .

- (3) *Positive requirement:* If σ is not expansionary at stage t , continue with the next substage $e + 1$ applying $\sigma 1$. As before, this means that we currently have no reason to believe that φ_e is a total and increasing function.

Otherwise, if σ is expansionary at stage t , we check if $c(\sigma)[t] = 0$. If this is the case, then we set

$$r(\sigma)[t+1] := r(\sigma)[t] + 1$$

and continue with the next substage $e + 1$ applying $\sigma 0$. As before, the “0” documents that we have made our restraint on future jump sizes stricter because we currently consider φ_e a viable candidate for being a total and increasing function.

Otherwise there exist a strategy $\alpha \in \Sigma^*$ and a number $k \in \mathbb{N}$ with $c(\sigma)[t] = \langle \alpha, k + 1 \rangle$, meaning that we still have scheduled jumps to execute. Thus check if there exists a $\gamma \in \Sigma^*$ with $\gamma 0 \sqsubseteq \sigma$. If not, then set

$$x_{t+1} := x_t + 2^{-r(\sigma)[t]}.$$

If yes, choose the longest such γ . The argument used to prove Fact 13 works exactly in the same way for the present construction; thus we have $r(\gamma)[t + 1] \geq r(\sigma)[t]$ and we can set

$$\begin{aligned} c(\gamma)[t + 1] &:= \langle \alpha, 2^{r(\gamma)[t+1]-r(\sigma)[t]} \rangle, \\ x_{t+1} &:= x_t. \end{aligned}$$

In either case, this will be the last substage of this stage. As one of the scheduled jumps has been taken care of, we can decrement the corresponding counter by setting

$$c(\sigma)[t + 1] := \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } k = 0, \\ \langle \alpha, k \rangle & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Then we initialize all strategies $\tau \in \Sigma^*$ with $\sigma 0 <_L \tau$, and terminate stage t .

If some of the parameters $c(\sigma)[t + 1]$, $p(\sigma)[t + 1]$, $r(\sigma)[t + 1]$, or $w(\sigma)[t + 1]$ have not been explicitly set to some new value during stage t , then we set them to preserve their last respective values $c(\sigma)[t]$, $p(\sigma)[t]$, $r(\sigma)[t]$, or $w(\sigma)[t]$.

We proceed with the verification. The following properties of the restraint and the witness functions follow directly from their definitions; we omit the proofs.

Fact 39. *For all $\sigma, \tau \in \Sigma^*$ and all $t \in \mathbb{N}$ we have*

- $r(\sigma)[t] \leq t$,
- $r(\sigma)[t] \leq r(\sigma)[t + 1]$,
- $w(\sigma)[t] \leq w(\sigma)[t + 1]$. □

It is easy to verify that Fact 10 and Fact 12 carry over to this construction with literally the same proofs. The next two statements hold because the pause function is not affected by initializations.

Fact 40. *Let $t_1 < t_2$ be two consecutive stages at which some strategy $\sigma \in \Sigma^*$ is applied. Then $p(\sigma)[t_1] = 0$ or $p(\sigma)[t_2] = 0$.* □

Fact 41. *Let $t_1 < t_2$ be two consecutive stages at which some strategy $\sigma \in \Sigma^*$ is applied. Assume that σ is threatened at t_1 . Then σ is not threatened at t_2 .*

Proof. Since σ is threatened at t_1 , by construction we have both $p(\sigma)[t_1] = 0$ and $p(\sigma)[t_1 + 1] = 1$. Then, by construction, we still have $p(\sigma_l)[t_2] = 1$, and thus σ cannot be threatened at t_2 . \square

The proof of Lemma 15 has to be modified as follows to reflect the different dynamics of the present construction.

Lemma 42. *Let $\sigma \in \Sigma^*$. The following two properties are equivalent:*

- (1) *The strategy σ is applied and expansionary at infinitely many stages.*
- (2) *The strategy σ is applied, not threatened, and expansionary at infinitely many stages.*
- (3) *Infinitely many stages settle on some extension of $\sigma 0$.*

Proof. “(1) \Rightarrow (2)”: Let t_1 be any stage at which σ is applied and expansionary. We claim there is a stage $t_2 \geq t_1$ at which σ is applied, not threatened, and expansionary. If σ is not threatened at t_1 we can let $t_2 := t_1$. Otherwise let t_2 be the next stage at which σ is applied. In this case, to see that t_2 is as needed, note that by construction and by the definition of an expansionary stage, σ is still expansionary at t_2 . But by Fact 41, σ cannot be threatened at t_2 .

“(2) \Rightarrow (3)”: Suppose that there are infinitely many stages at which σ is applied, not threatened, and expansionary. Let $t_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ be an arbitrary such stage. We claim that there must be a stage $t^* \geq t_0$ where $\sigma 0$ is applied. If $c(\sigma)[t_0] = 0$, then $t^* = t_0$ by construction. Otherwise fix $\alpha \in \Sigma^*$ and $k \geq 1$ with $c(\sigma)[t_0] = \langle \alpha, k \rangle$. Then let $t_1, \dots, t_k \in \mathbb{N}$ denote the k consecutive stages where σ is applied, not threatened, and expansionary that immediately follow t_0 ; we claim that we can find t^* among them. Namely, if between t_0 and t_k an initialization of σ occurs at some stage \hat{t} , then let t^* be the smallest element of $\{t_0, \dots, t_k\}$ that is greater than \hat{t} . Otherwise, if no such initialization occurs, then we must have $c(\sigma)[t_k] = 0$ by construction, and $t^* = t_k$.

“(3) \Rightarrow (1)”: Suppose that infinitely many stages settle on some extension of $\sigma 0$. By construction σ must be applied and expansionary at these stages. \square

Define J and u as in the proof of Theorem 9. We continue by noting that Fact 18, Lemma 19, Fact 20, Lemma 21, Fact 22, and Corollary 23 again carry over to this construction with literally the same proofs. The proof of Lemma 24 needs to be modified as follows, because here we use different rules for increasing witnesses.

Lemma 43. *Let $I \subseteq J$, let $\sigma \in \Sigma^*$ and let $t_0 \leq \min u(I)$. Then we have*

$$\sum_{t' \in u(I): \mathcal{T}[t'] = \sigma} 2^{-w(\sigma)[t']} \leq 2^{-w(\sigma)[t_0] + 1}.$$

Proof. By definition of u , all the numbers t' that appear in the sum on the left-hand side are stages where σ is applied and threatened. By construction, between

two such stages, the value of σ 's witness grows by at least 1. Thus,

$$\sum_{t' \in u(I): \mathcal{T}[t'] = \sigma} 2^{-w(\sigma)[t']} \leq \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} 2^{-(w(\sigma)[t_0] + k)} \leq 2^{-w(\sigma)[t_0] + 1}. \quad \square$$

Using these tools, we can prove the following statement.

Proposition 44. *The sequence $(x_t)_t$ is computable, non-decreasing, and bounded from above. Thus, its limit $x := \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} x_t$ is a left-computable number.*

Proof. The proof is literally the same as that of Proposition 25, except with Lemma 43 in place of Lemma 24. \square

The following is analogous to Proposition 16, but allows for an easier proof.

Proposition 45. *For every $l \in \mathbb{N}$, there exists a binary string $\sigma_l \in \Sigma^l$ satisfying the following conditions:*

- (1) *There exist infinitely stages in which σ_l is applied.*
- (2) *There exist only finitely many stages in which σ_l is initialized.*

In particular, the map $t \mapsto |\mathcal{T}[t]|$ is unbounded, and if we let \mathcal{T} denote the true path of $(\mathcal{T}[t])_t$ then conditions (1) and (2) hold for every $\sigma \sqsubset \mathcal{T}$.

Proof. We proceed by induction. The claim trivially holds for $l = 0$ since λ is applied in every stage but never initialized. Assume that for some fixed $l \in \mathbb{N}$ there exists a strategy $\sigma_l \in \Sigma^l$ satisfying both conditions. Let $t_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ be the earliest stage after which σ_l is no longer initialized. There are two cases:

- *$\sigma_l 0$ is applied infinitely often:* We claim $\sigma_l 0$ is never initialized after t_0 ; this is because by construction any initialization of $\sigma_l 0$ would have to occur in a stage where some $\gamma <_L \sigma_l 0$ is applied; this would also initialize σ_l , contradiction. Thus we can choose $\sigma_{l+1} := \sigma_l 0$.
- *$\sigma_l 0$ is applied only finitely often:* Due to Lemma 42 in this case there is a stage $t_1 \geq t_0$ after which σ_l is never again applied and expansionary. Then, by construction, $\sigma_l 1$ is never again initialized after t_1 . We also claim that for every $t_2 \geq t_1$ at which σ_l is applied there exists a stage $t_3 \geq t_2$ at which $\sigma_l 1$ is applied. If σ_l is not threatened at t_2 then by construction $\sigma_l 1$ is applied at t_2 , and we are done. Otherwise, if σ_l is threatened at t_2 , then by Fact 41 we have that σ_l cannot be threatened at the next stage $t_3 > t_2$ where σ_l is applied. Thus $\sigma_l 1$ is applied at t_3 . Consequently, we can choose $\sigma_{l+1} := \sigma_l 1$.

The second part of the proposition is proven in literally the same way as in the proof of Proposition 16. \square

The following lemma demonstrates that the dynamics that result from the way the construction was set up work as intended.

Lemma 46. *Let e be such that φ_e is total and increasing and let $\sigma \sqsubset \mathcal{T}$ with $|\sigma| = e$. Then the following statements hold:*

- (1) *There exist infinitely many stages at which σ is applied and threatened, and in particular, $(w(\sigma)[t])_t$ tends to infinity. Furthermore, if t_0 is a stage after which σ is never again initialized, then for $m := w(\sigma)[t_0]$ we have that every $k \geq m$ is an element of $(w(\sigma)[t])_t$.*
- (2) *There exist infinitely many stages at which σ is applied and expansionary. In particular, $(r(\sigma)[t])_t$ tends to infinity.*

Proof.

- (1) By Proposition 45, σ is applied infinitely often and there is a stage t_0 after which σ is not initialized anymore. Then, for $t > t_0$ we can only have $w(\sigma)[t+1] > w(\sigma)[t]$ if σ is applied and threatened at t . Recall that the assumption that φ_e is total and increasing is equivalent to the statement that $(\ell(e)[t])_t$ tends to infinity. Thus, by the definition of a threatened stage, by the fact that $(x_t)_t$ converges, and using Fact 40, for every $t_1 > t_0$ there exists a $t_2 \geq t_1$ at which σ is applied and threatened and such that $w(\sigma)[t_1+1] = w(\sigma)[t_1] + 1$. This is enough to establish all three claims.
- (2) Let $t_1 \in \mathbb{N}$ be arbitrary. By (1), there are infinitely many stages at which σ is applied and threatened. Thus, by Fact 41, there must also be infinitely many stages, where σ is applied and not threatened. Therefore, and since $(x_t)_t$ converges, there is a smallest $t_2 \geq t_1$ such that for all $t \geq t_2$ we have $x_t - x_{\varphi_e(\ell(e)[t])} < 2^{-r(\sigma)[t_1]}$ and at which σ is applied, not threatened, and by definition expansionary. Thus, since t_1 was arbitrary, there are infinitely many stages at which σ is applied and expansionary. Then by Lemma 42, σ is applied at infinitely many stages, and by construction, $(r(\sigma)[t])_t$ tends to infinity. \square

Noting that Lemma 26 also holds for this construction with literally the same proof as before, we are ready to prove that all negative requirements are satisfied.

Proposition 47. \mathcal{N}_e is satisfied for all $e \in \mathbb{N}$.

Proof. Let e be such that φ_e is total and increasing, and let $\sigma \sqsubset \mathcal{T}$ with $|\sigma| = e$. Let $t_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ be the earliest stage after which σ is not initialized anymore. Let m be as in Lemma 46 (1), and let $n \geq m$ be arbitrary. Then there exists a uniquely determined stage $t_1 \geq t_0$ at which σ is applied and threatened and such that $w(\sigma)[t_1] = n$. Let $t_2 > t_1$ be the next stage at which σ is applied. Then

$$x - x_{\varphi_e(n)} = x - x_{\varphi_e(w(\sigma)[t_1])} \geq x_{t_2} - x_{\varphi_e(\ell(e)[t_1])} \geq 2^{-w(\sigma)[t_1]} = 2^{-n};$$

here, the first inequality uses the fact that $\ell(e)[t_1] \geq w(\sigma)[t_1]$ by definition of a threatened stage, and the second inequality uses Lemma 26.

In summary, there exists a number $m \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for all $n \geq m$ we have $x - x_{\varphi_e(n)} \geq 2^{-n}$. Therefore, \mathcal{N}_e is satisfied. \square

Corollary 48. *The number x is not regainingly approximable.* \square

It remains to prove that x is nearly computable. Write

$$S := \{e \in \mathbb{N} \mid \varphi_e \text{ is total and increasing}\}.$$

The following lemma is analogous to Lemma 30; however, the infinitary nature of the negative requirements and the different initialization strategy used in this construction are reflected in the higher complexity of its statement and proof.

Lemma 49. *Let $\sigma \sqsubset \mathcal{T}$ and $t_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ be the earliest stage after which σ is no longer initialized and after which there are no more stages at which any $\tau \sqsubseteq \sigma$ with $|\tau| \notin S$ is applied and threatened. Let $t_1, t_2 \in \mathbb{N}$ with $t_0 \leq t_1 < t_2$ be two consecutive stages at which σ is applied and expansionary. Then we have*

$$x_{t_2} - x_{t_1} \leq 2^{-r(\sigma)[t_1]+1} + \sum_{\substack{\tau \sqsubseteq \sigma, \\ |\tau| \in S}} 2^{-w(\tau)[t_1]+1}.$$

As in the proof of Lemma 30, we need to analyze all possible causes for jumps being made between stages t_1 and t_2 . Again there are essentially two such causes: we may still have jumps scheduled from before stage t_1 that await execution, and new threats may arise after t_1 leading to further jumps. The most important difference to Lemma 30 is however that here initial segments τ of σ with $|\tau| \in S$ may also get threatened — possibly multiple times — leading to additional jumps that need to be accounted for by the sum in the statement of the lemma.

Proof. We again distinguish between obligations to make jumps that may already stand at the moment when we enter stage t_1 , and new obligations to make jumps that are created between stages t_1 and t_2 . First, to quantify jumps due to potential standing obligations, note that in substages 0 up to $|\sigma| - 1$ of stage t_1 , no jumps are made by construction. Now consider the following facts:

- (1) No strategy $\tau <_L \sigma$ will be applied again after stage t_1 , as otherwise this would lead to initialization of σ , which contradicts our assumptions. Thus, if any jumps are still scheduled for any such τ (that is, if $c(\tau)[t_1] > 0$), we need not take them into account.
- (2) For strategies $\tau \in \Sigma^*$ with $\tau 0 \sqsubseteq \sigma$ and $|\tau| \notin S$ we must have $c(\tau)[t_1] = 0$ due to Fact 12. Furthermore, τ will never be applied and threatened between stages t_1 and t_2 by our assumptions. Thus we need not consider these strategies in the remainder of the proof.
- (3) For strategies $\tau \in \Sigma^*$ with $\tau 0 \sqsubseteq \sigma$ and $|\tau| \in S$ we must have $c(\tau)[t_1] = 0$, as well. However, such a τ may get threatened between stages t_1 and t_2 which might lead to jumps that we need to take into account.
- (4) While for strategies $\tau \in \Sigma^*$ with $\tau 1 \sqsubseteq \sigma$ we might have $c(\tau)[t_1] > 0$, none of these scheduled jumps will ever be executed from t_1 onwards. This is because such a jump could only be executed during a stage at which τ is

applied and expansionary. This would by construction lead to the initialization of all ρ with $\tau 0 <_L \rho$, which in particular include σ ; contradiction. Thus, as before, we need not take such τ 's into account.

- (5) No strategy τ with $\sigma 0 <_L \tau$ can be applied at stage t_1 by construction. While such τ 's may be applied during some stage $t_1 < t < t_2$, note that we set $c(\tau)[t_1 + 1] = 0$ for all of them when they are initialized at the end of stage t_1 .
- (6) For a strategy τ with $\sigma 0 \sqsubseteq \tau$ we may indeed have $c(\tau)[t_1] > 0$.
- (7) Similarly, it might be the case that $c(\sigma)[t_1] > 0$.

Thus, any jumps made in stages t_1 up to $t_2 - 1$ are either caused by some strategy as in (6) or (7), or must be due to *new* threats to strategies of type (3) or (5) that occur strictly between substage $|\sigma|$ of stage t_1 and stage t_2 . We establish upper bounds for all of these cases:

- Concerning strategies of type (6), by construction, if we make any jump at all while applying them, then these can only occur immediately at stage t_1 in substage $|\tau|$. We claim that such a jump can not occur due to τ being applied and expansionary at t_1 with $c(\tau)[t_1] > 0$. This is because such a jump would not be made at t_1 , but would by construction instead be split and scheduled for later execution by some strategy ρ with $\sigma 0 \sqsubseteq \rho 0 \sqsubseteq \tau$, and this strategy ρ will not be applied before stage t_2 by construction. Thus, the only reason to make a jump in this case is if τ is applied and threatened at t_1 . Then, by construction the jump made would be of size

$$2^{-w(\tau)[t_1]} < 2^{-r(\sigma)[t_1+1]} \leq 2^{-r(\sigma)[t_1]}.$$

- Concerning (7), in this case, by construction, we would like to make a jump of size $2^{-r(\sigma)[t_1]}$. The jump may be made immediately, or split and scheduled for later execution by some strategies that are prefixes of σ ; but in either case the total sum of all jumps resulting from this is bounded by $2^{-r(\sigma)[t_1]}$ by Lemma 19.
- Consider new threats to strategies τ of type (5) that occur strictly between substage $|\sigma|$ of stage t_1 and stage t_2 . Since these τ 's were all initialized at stage t_1 , we have $w(\tau)[t_1 + 1] = \nu(\tau) + t_1 + 2$ for each of them. Thus, applying Lemma 43 to each such τ and then summing over all of them, the total sum of all jumps made or scheduled when such τ 's are applied in stages between t_1 and t_2 can be at most 2^{-t_1} , which by Fact 11 is at most $2^{-r(\sigma)[t_1]}$.
- Finally, consider new threats to strategies τ of type (3) that occur at some stage t strictly between substage $|\sigma|$ of stage t_1 and stage t_2 . By Fact 22 each such threat can only contribute jumps totaling at most $2^{-w(\tau)[t]}$. And, by construction, whenever this occurs, we set $w(\tau)[t + 1] = w(\tau)[t] + 1$. Thus, even if the same τ is threatened multiple times between t_1 and t_2 , the total sum of all jumps associated with these threats sums to at most $2^{-w(\tau)[t_1+1]}$.

By construction, cases (6) and (7) exclude each other, thus the jumps caused by cases (5)–(7) combined contribute at most $2^{-r(\sigma)[t_1]+1}$. Together with the maximally possible contribution of all τ 's of type (3) we obtain

$$x_{t_2} - x_{t_1} \leq 2^{-r(\sigma)[t_1]+1} + \sum_{\substack{\tau \sqsubseteq \sigma, \\ |\tau| \in S}} 2^{-w(\tau)[t_1]+1}. \quad \square$$

After these preparations, we can show that all positive requirements are satisfied.

Proposition 50. \mathcal{P}_e is satisfied for all $e \in \mathbb{N}$.

Proof. Let $e \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\sigma \sqsubset \mathcal{T}$ with $|\sigma| = e$. Suppose that φ_e is total and increasing. Then, by Lemma 46 (2), $(r(\sigma)[t])_t$ tends to infinity. Let $t_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ be the earliest stage after which σ is no longer initialized and such that, for all $\tau \sqsubseteq \sigma$ with $|\tau| \notin S$, there are no more stages at which τ is applied and threatened. For $n \in \mathbb{N}$, write

$$t(n) := \min \left\{ t \geq t_0 : \begin{array}{l} r(\sigma)[t] \geq n+3 \text{ and } \sum_{\tau \sqsubseteq \sigma, |\tau| \in S} 2^{-w(\tau)[t]+1} \leq 2^{-(n+1)} \\ \text{and } \sigma \text{ is applied and expansionary at stage } t \end{array} \right\}.$$

Note that for each $\tau \sqsubseteq \sigma$ with $|\tau| \in S$ we have that $(w(\tau)[t])_t$ tends to infinity by Lemma 46 (1), and thus $t(n)$ is defined for every n . Thus, we can define a function $v: \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ via $v(n) = \ell(e)[t(n)]$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Clearly, t and v are computable.

We claim that v is a modulus of convergence of the sequence $(x_{\varphi_e(t+1)} - x_{\varphi_e(t)})_t$. To see this, let $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $i \geq v(n)$. Let $t_2 > t_1 \geq t(n)$ be the two consecutive stages at which σ is applied and expansionary with $\ell(e)[t_1] \leq i$ and $\ell(e)[t_2] \geq i+1$. Applying Lemma 49 and the assumption that σ is expansionary at t_1 , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} x_{\varphi_e(i+1)} - x_{\varphi_e(i)} &\leq x_{\varphi_e(\ell(e)[t_2])} - x_{\varphi_e(\ell(e)[t_1])} \\ &= \underbrace{(x_{\varphi_e(\ell(e)[t_2])} - x_{t_2})}_{\leq 0} + (x_{t_2} - x_{t_1}) + (x_{t_1} - x_{\varphi_e(\ell(e)[t_1])}) \\ &\leq \left(2^{-r(\sigma)[t_1]+1} + \sum_{\substack{\tau \sqsubseteq \sigma, \\ |\tau| \in S}} 2^{-w(\tau)[t_1]+1} \right) + 2^{-r(\sigma)[t_1]} \\ &\leq 2^{-r(\sigma)[t(n)]+1} + 2^{-(n+1)} + 2^{-r(\sigma)[t(n)]} \\ &< 2^{-r(\sigma)[t(n)]+2} + 2^{-(n+1)} \\ &\leq 2^{-n}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus $(x_{\varphi_e(t+1)} - x_{\varphi_e(t)})_t$ converges computably to zero, and \mathcal{P}_e is satisfied. \square

Corollary 51. *The number x is nearly computable.* \square

This completes the proof of the existence of a left-computable, nearly computable number that is not regainingly approximable.

5. NON-SPEEDABLE NON-RANDOMS

In this final section we prove our third main result by showing that there exists a left-computable number that is neither speedable nor Martin-Löf random; thereby giving a negative answer to the question of Merkle and Titov [7] whether among the left-computable numbers the Martin-Löf randoms are characterized by being non-speedable. The understanding of the relationship between near computability and regaining approximability that we gained in the last section will be instrumental for this. We begin by establishing a more convenient characterization of speedability.

Lemma 52. *A left-computable number is speedable if and only if there exists a constant $\rho \in]0, 1[$ and a computable increasing sequence $(x_n)_n$ of rational numbers converging to x such that there are infinitely many $n \in \mathbb{N}$ with $\frac{x_{n+1}-x_n}{x-x_n} \geq \rho$.*

Proof. Suppose that x is speedable, that is, by definition, there exists a constant $\rho' \in]0, 1[$ and a computable increasing sequence $(x_n)_n$ converging to x with $\frac{x-x_{n+1}}{x-x_n} \leq \rho'$ for infinitely many $n \in \mathbb{N}$. If we let $\rho := 1 - \rho'$, this is equivalent to $\frac{x_{n+1}-x_n}{x-x_n} = 1 - \frac{x-x_{n+1}}{x-x_n} \geq \rho$ for infinitely many $n \in \mathbb{N}$. \square

Thus, a left-computable number x is non-speedable if and only if for every computable increasing sequence of rational numbers $(x_n)_n$ converging to x the sequence $\left(\frac{x_{n+1}-x_n}{x-x_n}\right)_n$ converges to zero. Before we use this characterization we first examine the relationship between speedable and regainingly approximable numbers.

Proposition 53. *Every regainingly approximable number is speedable.*

Proof. Let x be regainingly approximable. Then, by definition, there exists a computable non-decreasing sequence of rational numbers $(x_n)_n$ converging to x with $x - x_n < 2^{-n}$ for infinitely many $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Define the sequence $(y_n)_n$ by $y_n := x_n - 2^{-n}$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. This sequence is computable, increasing and also converges to x . Then, for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$ with $x - x_n < 2^{-n}$, we have

$$\frac{y_{n+1} - y_n}{x - y_n} = \frac{(x_{n+1} - x_n) + 2^{-(n+1)}}{(x - x_n) + 2^{-n}} > \frac{2^{-(n+1)}}{2^{-n} + 2^{-n}} = \frac{1}{4}. \quad \square$$

The converse is not true as the two following known results imply.

Proposition 54 (Merkle, Titov [7]). *Every strongly left-computable number is speedable.*

Theorem 55 (Hertling, Hölzl, Janicki [5]). *There exists a strongly left-computable number that is not regainingly approximable.*

Corollary 56. *There exists a speedable number that is not regainingly approximable.* \square

Thus, in general, the regainingly approximable numbers are a proper subset of the speedable numbers. However, as we will show next, the two notions become

equivalent once we restrict ourselves to nearly computable numbers. The proof of this is not straightforward and needs some preparation. Let us first recall a convenient characterization of the left-computable, nearly computable numbers.

Proposition 57 (Hertling, Janicki [6]). *The following statements are equivalent for a left-computable number x :*

- (1) x is nearly computable.
- (2) For every computable non-decreasing sequence of rational numbers $(x_n)_n$ converging to x , the sequence $(x_{n+1} - x_n)_n$ converges computably to zero.

As this characterization employs the concept of computable convergence, it will be helpful to have a way of expressing regaining approximability in a similar vein.

Proposition 58. *Let x be a left-computable number. Let $(x_n)_n$ be a computable non-decreasing sequence of rational numbers converging to x and let $g: \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ be its optimal modulus of convergence. Then the following statements are equivalent:*

- (1) x is regainingly approximable.
- (2) There exists a computable function $f: \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ such that $f(n) \geq g(n)$ for infinitely many $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

Proof. “(1) \Rightarrow (2)”: Suppose that x is regainingly approximable. Due to Proposition 38, there is a computable increasing function $f: \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ with $x - x_{f(n)} < 2^{-n}$ for infinitely many $n \in \mathbb{N}$. By definition of an optimal modulus of convergence we must have $f(n) \geq g(n)$ for these n .

“(2) \Rightarrow (1)”: Suppose that there exists a computable function $f: \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ with $f(n) \geq g(n)$ for infinitely many $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and assume w.l.o.g. that f is increasing. Then for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$ with $f(n) \geq g(n)$ we have $x - x_{f(n)} \leq x - x_{g(n)} < 2^{-n}$. \square

As usual we say for functions $f, g: \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ that f *dominates* g if $f(n) \geq g(n)$ for almost all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Now recall that in Theorem 37 we have shown that there are left-computable numbers x that are nearly computable but not regainingly approximable. Then, informally speaking, Proposition 58 states that every computable non-decreasing sequence of rational numbers $(x_n)_n$ converging to such an x must converge very slowly in the sense that its optimal modulus of convergence dominates every computable function. In contrast to this, since x is nearly computable, for every such $(x_n)_n$, the sequence $(x_{n+1} - x_n)_n$ converges computably to zero, thus its optimal modulus of convergence is dominated by a computable function.

Putting these observations together suggests that, for every x as in Theorem 37 and any computable increasing sequence of rational numbers $(x_n)_n$ converging to x , the sequence $\left(\frac{x_{n+1} - x_n}{x - x_n}\right)_n$ ought to converge to zero, due to its numerator converging much faster than its denominator. The following lemma confirms this intuition.

Lemma 59. *Let $(a_n)_n$ be a sequence and $(b_n)_n$ be a decreasing sequence, both converging to zero. Let $f: \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ be a non-decreasing and unbounded function*

that is a modulus of convergence of $(a_n)_n$, and let $g: \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ be the optimal modulus of convergence of $(b_n)_n$. Suppose that for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$ there exists an $m \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for all $n \geq m$ the inequality $f(n+k) < g(n)$ holds. Then

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left(\frac{a_n}{b_n} \right)_n = 0.$$

Proof. Let $\varepsilon > 0$. Fix a $k \in \mathbb{N}$ with $2^{-k} < \frac{\varepsilon}{2}$ and an $m \in \mathbb{N}$ such that the inequality $f(n+k) < g(n)$ is satisfied for all $n \geq m$. Choose $l := f(m+k)$, and let $i \geq l$. Since f is non-decreasing and unbounded, there exists a number $n \in \mathbb{N}$ with $f(n+k) \leq i \leq f(n+1+k)$. Then, since f is a modulus of convergence of $(a_n)_n$, we have $|a_i| < 2^{-(n+k)}$. Furthermore $i < g(n+1)$, and as $(b_n)_n$ is a decreasing sequence converging to zero and g its optimal modulus of convergence, we also have $b_i \geq 2^{-(n+1)}$. Putting everything together we obtain

$$\left| \frac{a_i}{b_i} \right| = \frac{|a_i|}{b_i} < \frac{2^{-(n+k)}}{2^{-(n+1)}} = 2 \cdot 2^{-k} < 2 \cdot \frac{\varepsilon}{2} = \varepsilon.$$

Thus, $\left(\frac{a_n}{b_n} \right)_n$ converges to zero. \square

After this preparation we are ready to prove our final theorem.

Theorem 60. *Let x be a left-computable number that is nearly computable but not regainingly approximable. Then x is not speedable.*

Proof. Let $(x_n)_n$ be a computable increasing sequence of rational numbers converging to x . Then the sequence $(x_{n+1} - x_n)_n$ converges to zero and, as x is nearly computable, has a computable modulus of convergence $f: \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$. Since x is not regainingly approximable it is in particular non-computable, and thus f must be unbounded; w.l.o.g. we also assume it to be non-decreasing. Let $g: \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ be the optimal modulus of convergence of $(x_n)_n$. Since x is not regainingly approximable there is no computable function $h: \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ with $h(n) \geq g(n)$ for infinitely many $n \in \mathbb{N}$, due to Proposition 58. In particular, for every constant $k \in \mathbb{N}$ there exists a number $m \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for all $n \geq m$ the inequality $f(n+k) < g(n)$ holds. Note that $(x - x_n)_n$ is a decreasing sequence that converges to zero and g is its optimal modulus of convergence. Thus, the premises of Lemma 59 are satisfied, and $\left(\frac{x_{n+1} - x_n}{x - x_n} \right)_n$ converges to zero. Then, by Lemma 52, x is not speedable. \square

Putting together Proposition 53 and Theorem 60, we obtain the following corollary.

Corollary 61. *Let x be a left-computable number that is nearly computable. Then the following statements are equivalent:*

- (1) x is regainingly approximable.
- (2) x is speedable. \square

Together with Theorem 37 we obtain the next corollary.

Corollary 62. *There exists a left-computable number which is nearly computable but not speedable.* \square

Stephan and Wu [10] showed that a left-computable number which is nearly computable cannot be Martin-Löf random. Together with Corollary 62 this implies our final main result, a negative answer to the question of Merkle and Titov [7].

Corollary 63. *There exists a left-computable number which is not speedable and not Martin-Löf random.* \square

6. ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors would like to thank Ivan Titov for helpful discussions.

REFERENCES

- [1] G. Barmpalias and A. Lewis-Pye. Differences of halting probabilities. *Journal of Computer and System Sciences*, 89:349–360, 2017.
- [2] R. Downey and D. Hirschfeldt. *Algorithmic Randomness and Complexity*. Springer, 2010.
- [3] R. Downey, D. Hirschfeldt, and G. LaForte. Randomness and reducibility. In J. Sgall, A. Pultr, and P. Kolman, editors, *Proceedings of the 26th International Symposium on Mathematical Foundations of Computer Science*, Lecture Notes in Computer Science 2136, pages 316–327. Springer, 2001.
- [4] R. Downey and G. LaForte. Presentations of computably enumerable reals. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 284(2):539–555, 2002.
- [5] P. Hertling, R. Hölzl, and P. Janicki. Regainingly approximable numbers and sets, 2023. Available at <https://arxiv.org/abs/2301.03285>.
- [6] P. Hertling and P. Janicki. Nearly computable real numbers, 2023. Available at <https://arxiv.org/abs/2301.08124>.
- [7] W. Merkle and I. Titov. Speedable left-c.e. numbers. In H. Fernau, editor, *Proceedings of the 15th International Computer Science Symposium in Russia*, Lecture Notes in Computer Science 12159, pages 303–313. Springer, 2020.
- [8] A. Nies. *Computability and Randomness*. Oxford University Press, 2009.
- [9] R. Soare. Cohesive sets and recursively enumerable Dedekind cuts. *Pacific Journal of Mathematics*, 31:215–231, 1969.
- [10] F. Stephan and G. Wu. Presentations of K-trivial reals and Kolmogorov complexity. In B. Cooper, B. Löwe, and L. Torenvliet, editors, *Proceedings of the 1st International Conference on Computability in Europe*, Lecture Notes in Computer Science 3526, pages 461–469. Springer, 2005.