Immunity and Non-Cupping for Closed Sets

Douglas Cenzer[1], Takayuki Kihara[2],
Rebecca Weber[3], Guohua Wu[4,*]

[1] Department of Mathematics, University of Florida, P.O. Box 118105, Gainesville, FL 32611, United States of America

[2] Mathematical Institute, Tohoku University, 6-3, Aramaki Aoba, Aoba-ku, Sendai, Miyagi, Japan

[3] Department of Mathematics, Dartmouth College, Hanover, NH 03755,United States of America

[4] School of Physical and Mathematical Sciences, Nanyang Technological University, Singapore 639798

E-mail: `cenzer@math.ufl.edu`, `sa7m10@math.tohoku.ac.jp`, `rweber@math.dartmouth.edu`, `guohua@ntu.edu.sg`

Abstract

We extend the notion of immunity to closed sets and to Π^0_1 classes in particular in two ways: *immunity* meaning the corresponding tree has no infinite computable subset, and *tree-immunity* meaning it has no infinite computable sub*tree*. We separate these notions from each other and that of being *special*, and show separating classes for computably inseparable c.e. sets are immune and perfect thin classes are tree-immune. We define the notion of *prompt immunity* and construct a positive-measure promptly immune Π^0_1 class. We show that no immune-free Π^0_1 class P *cups* to the Medvedev complete class DNC of diagonally noncomputable sets, where P cups to Q in the Medvedev degrees of Π^0_1 classes if there is a class R such that the product $P \otimes R \equiv_{\mathrm{M}} Q$. We characterize the interaction between (tree-)immunity and Medvedev meet and join, showing the (tree-)immune degrees form prime ideals in the Medvedev lattice. We show that every random closed set is immune and not small, and every small special class is immune.

2000 Mathematics Subject Classification. **03D45**. 03D25 03D30 03D32.
Keywords. Computability, Π^0_1 Classes.

1 Introduction

The notion of a simple c.e. set and the corresponding complementary notion of an immune co-c.e. set are fundamental to the study of c.e. sets and

*This research was partially supported by NSF grants DMS-0554841 and DMS-0652372. Weber was partially supported by NSF grant DMS-0652326 and Wu was partially supported by NTU grant RG58/06 MS21100023.

Tbilisi Mathematical Journal 2 (2009), pp. 77–94.
Tbilisi Centre for Mathematical Sciences & College Publications.

Received by the editors: 28 September 2009; 25 November 2009.
Accepted for publication: 24 December 2009.

degrees. Together with variations and related notions such as *effectively immune*, *promptly simple*, *hyperimmune* and so forth, they permeate the classic text of R. I. Soare [21] and its updated version.

Many of the results on c.e. sets and degrees have found counterparts in the study of effectively closed sets (Π^0_1 classes). See the surveys [12, 11] for examples. In particular, hyperhyperimmune co-c.e. sets correspond to thin Π^0_1 classes [7, 10, 14] and hyperimmune co-c.e. sets correspond to several different notions including *smallness* studied by Binns [3, 4].

In this paper we consider the notion of immune sets as applied to Π^0_1 classes and closed sets in general. We work in $2^{\mathbb{N}}$ with the topology generated by basic clopen sets called *intervals*. For any $\sigma \in \{0,1\}^*$ the interval $I(\sigma)$ is $\{X : \sigma \prec X\}$, where $\prec$ means initial segment. Notation is standard; we note that λ denotes the empty string, $\sigma \upharpoonright n$ is the initial segment of σ of length n, and if $T \subseteq \{0,1\}^*$ is a tree (i.e., it is closed under initial segment), $[T] \subseteq 2^{\mathbb{N}}$ denotes the set of infinite paths through T. A node $\sigma \in T$ is a *leaf* of T if $\sigma^\frown i \notin T$ for any i. For any set $P \subseteq 2^{\mathbb{N}}$, we may define the tree $T_P = \{\sigma \in \{0,1\}^* : I(\sigma) \cap P \neq \varnothing\}$; the closed sets $P \subseteq 2^{\mathbb{N}}$ are exactly those for which $P = [T_P]$. A Π^0_1 class is a closed set for which some computable tree $T \supseteq T_P$ has $[T] = P$; in this case T_P is a Π^0_1 set. For any tree T, let $\mathrm{Ext}(T)$ be the set of nodes of T which have an infinite extension in $[T]$, so if $P = [T]$, $\mathrm{Ext}(T) = T_P$.

A partial computable functional $\Phi : 2^{\mathbb{N}} \to 2^{\mathbb{N}}$ is given by a computable representation $\varphi : \{0,1\}^* \to \{0,1\}^*$ such that $\sigma \prec \tau$ implies $\varphi(\sigma) \preceq \varphi(\tau)$; $\Phi(X)$ is defined when $\bigcup_n \varphi(X \upharpoonright n)$ is infinite, and in that case they are equal. Similar representations hold for functions on $\mathbb{N}^{\mathbb{N}}$.

An infinite set $C \subseteq \omega$ is called *immune* if it does not include any infinite c.e. subset, or equivalently if it has no infinite computable subset. A c.e. set which is the complement of an immune set is *simple*.

Definition 1.1. Let P be a closed subset of $2^{\mathbb{N}}$.

1. P is *immune* if T_P is immune.
2. P is *tree-immune* if T_P has no infinite computable subtree.

It is easy to see that an immune closed set must be tree-immune, and both must be *special*; i.e., have no computable paths. In § 2 we separate all three notions. We also show that the class of separating sets $S(A, B)$ for any pair of computably inseparable sets A and B is immune and that any perfect thin Π^0_1 class is tree-immune. We define the notion of *prompt immunity* and construct an example of a Π^0_1 class of positive measure which is promptly immune.

In § 3, we consider connections between immunity and Binns' notion of *smallness* [3]. We show that every special hyperimmune Π^0_1 class is tree-immune and that every small special Π^0_1 class is immune. In § 4, we consider connections with the Medvedev degrees of difficulty [16, 19]. We show that for closed sets P and Q, the meet $P \oplus Q$ is (tree-)immune if and only if both P and Q are (tree-)immune, whereas the join $P \otimes Q$ is (tree-)immune if and only if at least one of P and Q are (tree-)immune. We show that for any Π^0_1 class P with no computable element, there is a non-immune Π^0_1 class Q with no computable element which is Medvedev reducible to P. In § 5, we show that no immune-free degree cups to any generalized separating class (in the sense of Cenzer and Hinman [9]), and hence every immune-free Medvedev degree is non-cuppable.

In § 6, we show that any random closed set (in the sense of [1]) is immune. We also show that any random closed set is not small.

2 Immunity for Π^0_1 classes

We begin with two useful characterizations of immunity.

Lemma 2.1. A closed set P is immune if and only if T_P has no infinite c.e. subtree.

Proof. Certainly if T_P has an infinite c.e. subtree, then it has an infinite computable subset. For the converse, let $S \subseteq T_P$ be an infinite computable subset and define the tree T by

$$\sigma \in T \iff (\exists \tau \in S)\sigma \preceq \tau.$$

Then T is an infinite c.e. subtree of T_P. Q.E.D.

Theorem 2.3 shows we cannot ensure that every infinite c.e. tree has an infinite computable subtree.

Lemma 2.2. P is not immune if and only if there is a computable sequence $\{\sigma_n : n \in \omega\}$ such that $\sigma_n \in T_P \cap \{0,1\}^n$ for each n.

Proof. The reverse implication is immediate. Now suppose that C is an infinite computable subset of T_P and enumerate C as $\{\tau_0, \tau_1, \dots\}$. Observe that C must have arbitrarily long elements and define σ_n to be $\tau_i \restriction n$, where i is the least such that $|\tau_i| \geq n$. Q.E.D.

It is clear any immune class is tree-immune, and any tree-immune class is special. The following results show that neither implication reverses.

Theorem 2.3. There exists a tree-immune Π^0_1 class P that is not immune.

Proof. Let S_e be the eth computable tree, with characteristic function $\varphi_e : \{0,1\}^* \to \{0,1\}$. We shall say that S_e has height $\geq m$ at stage s if $\varphi_{e,s}(\sigma)$ is defined for all $\sigma \in \{0,1\}^m$ and S_e has at least one node of length m.

We shall build a sequence of nested computable trees T_s such that $T_P = \bigcap_s T_s$ and a prefix-free infinite c.e. set A such that $A_s = \{\sigma_0, \ldots, \sigma_s\} \subseteq \mathrm{Ext}(T_s)$ and $|\sigma_s| > s$. We have the following requirements:

$$N_e : |S_e| = \infty \;\Rightarrow\; S_e \not\subseteq T_P.$$

Each N_e has an associated $m_s(e)$, the minimum height of S_e required before we act for N_e. For all e, $m_0(e) = 2e + 1$.

To meet a single requirement N_0 we wait until the stage s when S_0 attains height ≥ 1 $(= m_0(0))$. Then we choose the leftmost τ in $S_0 \cap \{0,1\}$, let $m_s(0) = 1 + \max\{|\sigma_i| : i < s\}$, and choose all σ_t, $t \geq s$, to be incompatible with τ. Then at stage $t > s$ when S_0 reaches height $\geq m_s(0)$, we choose $\tau' \in S_e \cap \{0,1\}^{m_s(0)}$ extending τ and let T_{t+1} be the result of removing from T_t all extensions of τ'. If S_e has no extensions of τ of length $m_s(0)$, then if $\tau = 1$, or $\tau = 0$ but $1 \notin S_e$, we abandon N_0, as S_e is finite. Otherwise we reset τ to 1 and $m_t(0) = 1 + \max\{|\sigma_i| : i < t\}$ and wait again, avoiding the cone above the new τ (and no longer avoiding the old) in future σ_i choices.

The same module holds for all other requirements; we maintain a set R of bases of cones that must be avoided by A. Each $m_s(e)$ changes its value at most 2^{2e+1} times, and the values it takes on are sufficiently large that standard measure arguments show we always have room to choose new σ_i nodes and maintain their extendibility.

Stage 0**.** For all e, we let $m_0(e) = 2e+1$; $A_0 = R_0 = \varnothing$; $T_0 = \{0,1\}^*$.

Stage $s > 0$**.**

Step 1. For each $e \leq s$ such that S_e has height $\geq 2e+1$ newly at stage s, set $m_s(e) = 2e + 1 + \max\{|\sigma_i| : i < s\}$ and set τ_e to the leftmost string in $S_e \cap \{0,1\}^{e+1}$. Enumerate all such τ_e into R_s.

Step 2. For each $e \leq s$ such that $m_{s-1}(e) > 2e+1$, S_e has height $m_{s-1}(e)$ newly at s, and $S_e \cap \{0,1\}^{m_{s-1}(e)} \subseteq T_{s-1}$, if there exists a string $\tau \succ \tau_e$ in $S_e \cap \{0,1\}^{m_{s-1}(e)}$ remove the leftmost such from T_s. If there does not exist such a τ, remove τ_e from R_s. If τ_e is the rightmost string in $S_s \cap \{0,1\}^{2e+1}$, do nothing. Otherwise choose the leftmost of the strings to the right of τ_e, label it the new τ_e, put this new τ_e into R_s, and set $m_s(e) = 2e + 1 + \max\{|\sigma_i| : i < s\}$.

Step 3. For any e not treated above, let $m_s(e) = m_{s-1}(e)$; let T_s be T_{s-1} minus the strings removed in the previous step (if any) and all their extensions.

Step 4. Finally, let Q be the part of T_s uncovered by A and R, i.e.,

$$Q = T_s - \{\tau^\frown\rho : \tau \in A_{s-1} \cup R_s, \rho \in \{0,1\}^*\}.$$

Note that since we only remove strings from T that are within the intervals of permanent members of R, we would get the same Q if we replaced T_s

with $\{0,1\}^*$. Choose the leftmost $\sigma \in Q$ of length at least $s+2$ and let it be $\sigma_s \in A_s$.

To verify the construction works, first note every σ_i has an extension by a straightforward measure argument: we remove at most one node τ on behalf of each S_e, and for any i such that $\tau \succeq \sigma_i$, we ensure $\mu(I(\tau)) \leq 2^{-2e-1-|\sigma_i|}$. The sum of the measure removed from any $I(\sigma_i)$ is hence bounded by $\frac{2}{3}\mu([\sigma_i])$.

Another measure argument shows there is always enough room in Q to choose a new string in A without covering all of T_s. Since each S_e has at most one node in R at a time, the measure of Q at stage s is at least

$$x = 1 - \sum_{e=0}^{s} 2^{-2e-1} - \sum_{i=1}^{s-1} 2^{-i-2},$$

which we need to be greater than (at most) 2^{-s-2}. It is easily checked that $x - 2^{-s-2}$ is

$$\frac{1}{12} + \frac{1}{3 \cdot 2^{2s+1}} + \frac{1}{2^{s+2}},$$

which is clearly positive.

Since it is clear that the requirements are met, P is a Π^0_1 class, and $A \subset T_P$ is computable, the proof is complete. Q.E.D.

Theorem 2.4. There is a special Π^0_1 class that is not tree-immune.

Proof. This is a corollary of Theorem 4.8; any Q^* where Q is special is also special but not tree-immune. Q.E.D.

The next results show many Π^0_1 classes of interest are immune. Recall $S(A,B)$ denotes the class of separating sets for A and B (all C such that $A \subseteq C$ and $B \cap C = \varnothing$); it is a closed set, and when A and B are c.e. it is a Π^0_1 class.

Proposition 2.5. If A and B are computably inseparable, then $S(A,B)$ is immune.

Proof. Suppose that $W \subset T_{S(A,B)}$ is an infinite c.e. set, enumerated without repetition as $\sigma_0, \sigma_1, \ldots$. Note that for any $\sigma \in W$ and any $n < |\sigma|$, $n \in A$ implies that $\sigma(n) = 1$ and $n \in B$ implies that $\sigma(n) = 0$. Since W must have elements of arbitrary length, we may computably define $i(n)$ to be the least i such that $|\sigma_i| > n$, and let $X(n) = \sigma_{i(n)}(n)$ to compute a separating set for A and B. Q.E.D.

The notion of a *thin* Π^0_1 class corresponds to that of a hyperhyperimmune set and has been studied extensively by many researchers in articles including [7, 10, 14]. A Π^0_1 class P is thin if for any Π^0_1 class $Q \subset P$, there is a clopen set U such that $Q = P \cap U$. This is equivalent to saying that the family of Π^0_1 subsets of P is complemented, that is, for any Π^0_1 class $Q \subset P$, $P \setminus Q$ is also a Π^0_1 class. Since any hyperhyperimmune set is also immune, the following result is natural.

Proposition 2.6. If P is a perfect thin Π^0_1 class, then P is tree-immune.

Proof. Let P be perfect thin (and therefore having no computable member) and suppose that some infinite computable tree $W \subseteq T_P$. Let L be the set of *leaves* of W, that is

$$L = \{\sigma \in W : \sigma^\frown 0 \notin W \ \&\ \sigma^\frown 1 \notin W\}.$$

Then the elements of L are pairwise incomparable and, since P has no computable elements, L is infinite. To see this, note that if L were finite, then $\mathrm{Ext}(W)$ would be computable and thus W would have a computable element (in particular the leftmost path), which would also belong to P. That is, suppose that L were finite and let m be the maximum length of a node in L, then, for any σ,

$$\sigma \in \mathrm{Ext}(W) \iff (\exists \tau \in W \cap \{0,1\}^{m+1})\sigma \prec \tau.$$

Note that for each $\sigma \in L$, $\sigma \in T_P$. Now we can partition P into the subsets

$$P_0 = \{X \in P : (\forall n) X\lceil n \notin L\} \text{ and}$$

$$P_1 = \{X \in P : (\exists n) X\lceil n \in L\}.$$

Note that P_0 is a Π^0_1 class and therefore, since P is thin, P_1 is also a Π^0_1 class.

Let $L = \{\sigma_0, \sigma_1, \dots\}$ and observe that the closed set P_1 is covered by the family $\{I(\sigma_i) : i \in \omega\}$. It follows by compactness that $P_1 \subseteq I(\sigma_0) \cup \cdots \cup I(\sigma_k)$ for some finite k. But this contradicts the fact that every $\sigma_i \in T_P$ and that the σ_is are pairwise incomparable. Q.E.D.

A c.e. set A is called *promptly simple* if for some enumeration $\{A_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ of A there is a computable function π such that for any infinite c.e. set $W_e \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ there are n, s with $n \in W_{e,s+1} - W_{e,s}$ and $n \in A_{\pi(s)}$.

For P a Π^0_1 class, let T be a computable tree giving P. For each s, let T_s be the collection of nodes of T which have length-s extensions in T. Let $\{\sigma_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}} = \{\lambda, 0, 1, 00, 01, 10 \dots\}$ denote the length-lexicographical ordering of the elements of $\{0,1\}^*$. We say that P is *promptly immune* if there is a computable function π such that for any infinite c.e. set W, there exist n, s such that

$$n \in W_{s+1} - W_s \ \ \&\ \ \sigma_n \notin T_{\pi(s)}.$$

There exist Π^0_1 classes with positive measure which have no computable elements. The next result is an improvement on this.

Theorem 2.7. There exists a Π^0_1 class P of positive measure which is promptly immune.

Proof. We define the Π^0_1 class $P = [T]$ in stages T_s and let $T = \bigcap_s T_s$. The class P will be promptly immune via the function $\pi(s) = s + 1$. For each e, we shall wait for some n such that $|\sigma_n| > 2e$ to come into W_e at stage $s + 1$ and then remove σ_n from T_{s+1} by removing σ_n and all extensions (if any) from T. Initially $T_0 = \{0, 1\}^*$. After stage s, we shall have satisfied some of the requirements. At stage $s + 1$, we look for the least $e \leq s$ which has not yet been satisfied and such that some suitable $n \in W_{e,s+1} - W_{e,s}$. We meet this requirement by setting $T_{s+1} = T_s - \{\tau : \sigma_n \preceq \tau\}$. Note that this action removes from $[T]$ a set of measure $\leq 2^{-2e-1}$, so that the total measure removed is less than or equal to $\sum_e 2^{-2e-1} = \frac{2}{3}$. It follows that $T_s \neq \varnothing$ for any s and therefore $P = [T]$ is not empty, and in fact has measure at least $\frac{1}{3}$. Q.E.D.

3 Smallness and Hyperimmunity

In this section, we compare immunity with other "smallness" notions for Π^0_1 classes. Some definitions are needed.

There is a one-to-one correspondence between the set of natural numbers and the set of finite subsets of natural numbers, given as follows. For any $n > 0$, let n be uniquely expressed in binary form as $n = \sum_{j=1}^{k} 2^{e_j}$ for some finite sequence $e_1 < e_2 < \cdots < e_k$; the finite set $\{e_1, \ldots, e_k\}$ is denoted by D_n and n is its *canonical index*. We set $D_0 = \varnothing$. For any computable function f, the sequence $D_{f(n)}$ is called a *strong array*; it is called *disjoint* if the sets $D_{f(n)}$ are pairwise disjoint.

A set $C \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ is called *hyperimmune* if there is no disjoint strong array $\langle D_{f(n)} \rangle$ such that, for all n, $D_{f(n)} \cap C \neq \varnothing$. A well-known theorem by Kuznecov, Medvedev, and Uspenski [21, V.2.3] states that $C = \{c_0 < c_1 < \ldots\}$ is hyperimmune if and only if there is no infinite computable function g such that $g(n) > c_n$ for all n.

A finite string $\sigma \in \{0, 1\}^n$ has Gödel number $\sum_{i=0}^{n} \sigma(i) 2^i$. If F is a finite set of (Gödel numbers of) strings, then $F^* = \bigcup\{I(\sigma) : \sigma \in F\}$. Binns [4] called a sequence $\langle D_{f(n)} \rangle$ of finite sets of (Gödel numbers of) strings a *disjoint strong array* if the sets $D^*_{f(n)}$ are pairwise disjoint.

Definition 3.1.
1. (Binns [3]). A closed set P is *small* if there is no computable function g such that, for all n, we have $\mathrm{card}(\{0, 1\}^{g(n)} \cap T_P) > n$.
2. (Binns [4]). A closed set P is *hyperimmune* if there is no disjoint strong array $\langle D_{f(n)} \rangle$ such that $P \cap D^*_{f(n)} \neq \varnothing$ for all n.

Binns [4] showed that the class DNC_2 of diagonally non-computable functions is not small, and in fact not hyperimmune. By Proposition 2.5, this gives an example of an immune class of measure 0 which is not small. It is also easy to see that a class of positive measure cannot be small, so the immune class of Theorem 2.7 is also not small.

For any tree $T \subseteq \{0,1\}^*$, we say that σ is a *branching node* of T if both $\sigma^\frown 0$ and $\sigma^\frown 1$ are in T; let $\mathrm{Br}(T)$ denote the set of branching nodes of T.

Theorem 3.2 (Binns [3]). A Π^0_1 class P is small if and only if $\mathrm{Br}(T_P)$ is hyperimmune.

Theorem 3.3 (Binns [4]). Every small Π^0_1 class is hyperimmune.

The converse to Theorem 3.3 does not hold. It is not clear whether every special hyperimmune Π^0_1 class must be immune, because the nodes witnessing immunity need not be incomparable. However, we have the following result.

Theorem 3.4. Every special hyperimmune Π^0_1 class is tree-immune.

Proof. Assume P is not tree-immune, and let $T \subseteq T_P$ be a computable tree. Since P is special, T has an infinite, computable set $L = \{\sigma_0, \sigma_1, \dots\}$ of leaves. Then we may define a disjoint strong array

$$D_{f(n)} = \{\sigma_n\}.$$

Hence P is not hyperimmune. Q.E.D.

Cenzer, Weber, and Wu [13] asked whether every small special Π^0_1 class is immune. We can now answer this question.

Theorem 3.5. Every small special Π^0_1 class is immune.

Proof. Suppose that P is special and small but not immune, and let $T \subseteq T_P$ be an infinite c.e. subtree.

Claim 3.6. The set $\mathrm{Br}(T)$ is infinite.

Proof. Suppose by way of contradiction that $\mathrm{Br}(T)$ is finite and let s be the maximum length of any $\sigma \in \mathrm{Br}(T)$. It follows that any node in T of length $\geq s$ must extend one of the finite set of nodes of length s. Since T is infinite, there must be a single node $\tau \in T$ which has infinitely many extensions in T. Since there is no branching above τ, all of those extensions are comparable, so that there is a unique infinite path X in T through τ. Since T is c.e., we may compute the path X as follows. Given i, enumerate the elements of T until we find a string σ with $|\sigma| \geq i$ which is comparable with τ and then $X(i) = \sigma(i)$. This violates the assumption that P is special. Q.E.D. (Claim 3.6)

Now Br(T) is itself a c.e. set, since we can enumerate $\sigma \in \mathrm{Br}(T)$ once σ, $\sigma^\frown 0$, and $\sigma^\frown 1$ have all been enumerated into T. Hence Br(T) has an infinite, increasing computable subset and is certainly not hyperimmune. It follows that the larger set $\mathrm{Br}(T_P)$ is also not hyperimmune, so by Theorem 3.2, P is not small. Q.E.D.

4 Degrees of Difficulty

Π^0_1 classes are often viewed as collections of solutions to some mathematical problem. Muchnik and Medvedev reducibility, defined for closed subsets of $2^{\mathbb{N}}$ and indeed $\mathbb{N}^{\mathbb{N}}$ in general, order classes based on this viewpoint. The class A is *Muchnik* (a.k.a. *weakly*) *reducible* to the class B ($A \leq_{\mathrm{w}} B$) if for every $X \in B$ there is $Y \in A$ such that $Y \leq_{\mathrm{T}} X$ [17]. The class A is *Medvedev* (a.k.a. *strongly*) *reducible* to B ($A \leq_{\mathrm{s}} B$) if there is a single Turing reduction procedure which, when given any element of B as an oracle, computes an element of A; it is exactly the uniformization of Muchnik reduction [16]. These reductions have been studied extensively by Binns (e.g., [2]), Cenzer and Hinman [8, 9] and Simpson (e.g., [20]) and have connections to randomness [18]. We shall need the result from [8] that any partial computable $\Phi : P \to Q$ for two Π^0_1 classes P and Q may be extended to a total computable functional. The Medvedev *degrees* are equivalence classes under $P \equiv_s Q$, defined as ($P \leq_{\mathrm{s}} Q$) & ($Q \leq_{\mathrm{s}} P$), and similarly for the Muchnik degrees. Let $\mathcal{P}_{\mathrm{s}}$ denote the partial ordering of the Medvedev degrees of Π^0_1 classes.

Proposition 4.1. If P is not (tree-)immune and Q is Medvedev reducible to P then Q is also not (tree-)immune.

Proof. Let P be a Π^0_1 class which is not tree-immune, and $V \subseteq T_P$ an infinite computable tree. Let Φ witness $Q \leq_{\mathrm{s}} P$ and set $S = \Phi(V)$; note that S is a tree. By the definition of partial computable functional and the fact that Φ must be defined on all of P, $S \subseteq T_Q$ and S is infinite. It remains to show S is computable.

To determine whether $\tau \in S$, compute $\varphi(\sigma)$ for all $\sigma \in 2^{<\omega}$ in lexicographical order until $|\varphi(\sigma)| \geq |\tau|$ for all $\sigma \in P$ of some length n. Then $\tau \in S$ if and only if $\tau \preceq \varphi(\sigma)$ for some $\sigma \in V \cap \{0,1\}^n$.

If P is not immune, then there is an infinite c.e. tree $V \subseteq T_P$ and the argument above shows that $\Phi(V)$ is an infinite c.e. subtree of T_Q, so that Q is also not immune. Q.E.D.

Let us say that a Medvedev degree $\mathbf{d} \in \mathcal{P}_{\mathrm{s}}$ is *(tree-)immune* if there is some class $P \in \mathbf{d}$ which is (tree-)immune and otherwise $\mathbf{d}$ is *(tree-)immune-free.*

Corollary 4.2. 1. If $\mathbf{d} \in \mathcal{P}_s$ contains a non-(tree-)immune Π^0_1 class, then $\mathbf{d}$ is (tree-)immune-free.

2. If $\mathbf{d} \in \mathcal{P}_s$ contains a (tree-)immune Π^0_1 class, then every member of $\mathbf{d}$ is (tree-)immune.

For $X, Y \in 2^{\mathbb{N}}$, the join $X \oplus Y = Z$ is given by $Z(2n) = X(n)$ and $Z(2n+1) = Y(n)$. Similarly, for finite sequences σ and τ of equal length, we may define $\sigma \oplus \tau = \rho$, where $\rho(2n) = \sigma(n)$ and $\rho(2n+1) = \tau(n)$.

The quotient structure of the Π^0_1 classes under either Muchnik or Medvedev equivalence is a lattice, and both have the same join and meet operators. The join of P and Q is given by

$$P \otimes Q = \{X \oplus Y : X \in P, Y \in Q\}.$$

If $P = [S]$ and $Q = [T]$, then $P \otimes Q = [S \otimes T]$, where

$$S \otimes T = \{\sigma \oplus \tau, (\sigma \oplus \tau)i : \sigma \in S, \tau \in T, |\sigma| = |\tau|, i \in \{0,1\}\};$$

since all finite joins are of even length, we branch at odd levels. The meet of P and Q is given by

$$P \oplus Q = \{0^\frown X : X \in P\} \cup \{1^\frown Y : Y \in Q\}.$$

If $P = [S]$ and $Q = [T]$, then $P \oplus Q = [S \oplus T]$, where

$$S \oplus T = \{0^\frown \sigma : \sigma \in S\} \cup \{1^\frown \tau : \tau \in T\}.$$

Binns [4] showed that $P \oplus Q$ and $P \otimes Q$ are small if and only if both P and Q are small. The results for immunity are not quite the same.

Theorem 4.3. For any closed sets P and Q, $P \oplus Q$ is (tree-)immune if and only if both P and Q are (tree-)immune.

Proof. Suppose first that P is not immune and let $C \subseteq T_P$ be an infinite computable set. Then $\{0^\frown \sigma : \sigma \in C\}$ is a computable subset of $T_{P \oplus Q}$. Supposing P is not tree-immune, let $V \subseteq T_P$ be an infinite computable tree. Then $\{\lambda\} \cup \{0^\frown \sigma : \sigma \in V\}$ is an infinite computable subtree of $T_{P \oplus Q}$. The arguments when Q is not (tree-)immune are, of course, symmetric.

Next suppose that $P \oplus Q$ is not immune and let $C \subseteq T_{P \oplus Q}$ be an infinite computable set. Let $C_i = \{\sigma : i^\frown \sigma \in C\}$ for $i = 0, 1$. Then $C_0 \subseteq T_P$, $C_1 \subseteq T_Q$ and both sets are computable. Clearly either C_0 is infinite or C_1 is infinite, which implies that either P is not immune or Q is not immune. A similar argument applies if $P \oplus Q$ is not tree-immune, where $V \subseteq T_{P \oplus Q}$ is an infinite computable tree and the corresponding $V_0 \subseteq T_P$ and $V_1 \subseteq T_Q$ are computable trees. Q.E.D.

Theorem 4.4. For any closed sets P and Q, $P \otimes Q$ is (tree-)immune if and only if at least one of P and Q is (tree-)immune.

Proof. Suppose first that $P \otimes Q$ is not tree-immune and let $V \subseteq T_{P\otimes Q}$ be an infinite computable tree. Let

$$V_P = \{\sigma : (\exists \tau \in \{0,1\}^{|\sigma|})(\sigma \oplus \tau \in V)\}$$

and similarly

$$V_Q = \{\tau : (\exists \sigma \in \{0,1\}^{|\tau|})(\sigma \oplus \tau \in V)\}.$$

Then V_P is an infinite computable subtree of T_P and V_Q is an infinite computable subtree of T_Q, so that neither P nor Q is tree-immune. A similar argument applies if $P \otimes Q$ is not immune, where V, V_P and V_Q are now infinite c.e. trees.

Next suppose that both P and Q are not tree-immune and let $V_P \subseteq T_P$ and $V_Q \subseteq Q$ be infinite computable trees. Then $V_P \otimes V_Q$ is an infinite computable subtree of $T_P \otimes T_Q = T_{P\oplus Q}$. A similar argument applies if P are Q are both not immune, where V_P, V_Q and $V_P \otimes V_Q$ are all infinite c.e. trees. Q.E.D.

Corollary 4.5. The immune-free degrees and the tree-immune-free degrees each form a prime ideal in the lattice $\mathcal{P}_{\mathrm{s}}$.

Corollary 4.6. The tree-immune-free Medvedev degrees form a proper subideal of the immune-free Medvedev degrees.

Proof. Let $\mathbf{d}$ be the Medvedev degree of the tree-immune, non-immune Π^0_1 class P constructed in Theorem 2.3. Then by Corollary 4.2, $\mathbf{d}$ is tree-immune but immune-free. Q.E.D.

We now turn to questions of density. Let 0_s denote the least Medvedev degree, which consists of all Π^0_1 classes that have a computable member. Binns has shown there is a nonsmall class of every nonzero Medvedev degree. We have the following bounding result for nonimmune classes.

Theorem 4.7. For any nonzero Π^0_1 class P, there is a Π^0_1 class Q with $0_s <_s Q \leq_{\mathrm{s}} P$ which is not tree-immune, and hence not immune.

Proof. Let R be the Π^0_1 class of Theorem 2.4 which is nonzero and not tree-immune. It follows from Theorem 4.3 that $P \oplus R$ is not tree-immune, but it is also special and certainly $P \oplus R \leq_{\mathrm{s}} P$. Q.E.D.

Theorem 4.8. For every Π^0_1 class Q, there exists a Π^0_1 class $Q^* \leq_{\mathrm{s}} Q$ such that Q^* has tree-immune-free Medvedev degree, and Q^* is Muchnik equivalent to Q. Furthermore, if Q is immune, then $Q^* <_s Q$.

Proof. The case that Q is not special is obvious. Let Q be a special Π^0_1 class, and let T be a computable tree such that $[T] = Q$. We note that the set L of all leaves of T is computable. We set

$$T^* = T \cup \{\sigma^\frown\tau : \sigma \in L \;\&\; \tau \in T\}.$$

and let $Q^* = [T^*]$, so that

$$Q^* = Q \cup \{\sigma^\frown X : \sigma \in L \;\&\; X \in Q\}.$$

Then Q^* is a Π^0_1 class and $Q \subseteq Q^*$, so $Q^* \leq_{\mathrm{s}} Q$. T is a computable subtree of T_{Q^*}, so that Q^* is not tree-immune, and hence by Corollary 4.2, Q^* has tree-immune-free degree. At the same time, every member of Q^* is Turing equivalent to a member of Q, so that Q^* is Muchnik equivalent to Q.

If Q is immune, it follows from Proposition 4.1 that we may not have $Q \leq_{\mathrm{s}} Q^*$, since Q^* is not immune. Q.E.D.

Lemma 4.9 (Essentially by Simpson [19])**.** There exists a Medvedev complete set Q and a computable function q such that, for any e, the eth Π^0_1 class P_e is Medvedev reducible to Q via a computable functional $\Phi_{q(e)}$.

Remark 4.10. Every Medvedev complete set has this property.

Lemma 4.11. Let $P \leq_{\mathrm{s}} Q$ be special Π^0_1 classes, S and T computable trees with $[S] = P$ and $[T] = Q$, and L_S and L_T the computable sets of all leaves of S and T, respectively. Then there is a computable functional Φ^* such that $\Phi^*(Q) \subseteq P$ and $\Phi^*(L_T) \subseteq L_S$.

Proof. Since P is special, any $\sigma \in S$ has an extension in L_S. Assume $P \leq_{\mathrm{s}} Q$ via the computable functional Φ and let φ be a representing function for Φ. We construct the desired functional Φ^* with representing function φ^*.

First suppose $\tau \in 2^{<\omega}$ has no initial segment which is a leaf of T. If $\varphi(\tau) \in S$, then we let $\varphi^*(\tau) = \varphi(\tau)$. If $\varphi(\tau) \notin S$, then we let σ be the longest initial segment of $\varphi(\tau)$ which belongs to S, so that $\sigma \in L_S$, and let $\varphi^*(\tau) = \sigma$. Note that if $X \in Q$, it follows that $\varphi^*(X{\upharpoonright}n) = \varphi(X{\upharpoonright}n)$, so that $\Phi^*(Q) \subseteq P$ as desired.

Next suppose that $\tau \succeq \sigma$ for some leaf σ of T. If $\varphi(\sigma) \notin S$, then as above let $\varphi^*(\sigma)$ be the longest initial segment of $\varphi(\sigma)$ which belongs to S. If $\varphi(\sigma) \in S$, let $\varphi^*(\sigma)$ be the shortest and leftmost leaf of S which extends $\varphi(\sigma)$. Then let $\varphi^*(\tau) = \varphi^*(\sigma)^\frown 0^{|\tau|-|\sigma|}$. It follows that φ^* maps L_T into L_S.

It is easy to check that φ^* is monotonic and defines a computable functional Φ^*. Q.E.D.

Theorem 4.12. There is a greatest tree-immune-free Medvedev degree.

Proof. Let Q be a Medvedev complete set, T a computable tree such that $Q = [T]$ and Q^* as defined in Theorem 4.8. Fix any non-tree-immune Π^0_1 class P and let $V \subseteq T_P$ be an infinite computable tree. We may assume that P has no computable path. By the Medvedev completeness of Q and Lemma 4.11, $[V] \leq_{\mathrm{s}} Q$ via some computable functional Φ with representing function φ such that φ maps L_T into L_V.

Let f be a computable function such that $P_{f(\sigma)} = P \cap I(\sigma)$ for all $\sigma \in L_V$, and observe that since $V \subseteq T_P$, $P_{f(\sigma)}$ is a nonempty subset of P.

We now construct a computable functional $\Psi : Q^* \to P$. Let $X \in Q^*$. We define the partial output $\psi(X{\restriction}n)$ as follows. As long as $\varphi(X{\restriction}n) \in V$, simply let $\psi(X{\restriction}n) = \varphi(X{\restriction}n)$. If $\varphi(X{\restriction}n) \in V$, but $\varphi(X{\restriction}n+1) \notin V$, then there exists $\sigma \in L_V$ with $\varphi(X{\restriction}n) \preceq \sigma \prec \varphi(X{\restriction}n+1)$. Furthermore, since $\Phi : Q \to [V]$ and $\varphi(X{\restriction}n+1) \notin V$, it follows that $X \notin Q$. In this case, it follows by the assumption from Lemma 4.11 that $X{\restriction}n+1 \in L_V$. To see this, let k be the least such that $X{\restriction}k \in L_V$. Then $\varphi(X{\restriction}k) = \sigma$ by the assumption from Lemma 4.11 and the monotonicity of φ. Also $k \leq n$ since $\varphi(X{\restriction}n+1) \notin V$ and hence $\varphi(X{\restriction}n) = \sigma$ as well.

Now define $\Psi(X) = \Phi_{q(f(\sigma))}(X)$, where q is the function from Lemma 4.9. Since we know $\sigma \prec \Phi_{q(f(\sigma))}(X)$, we can let $\psi(X{\restriction}n+r) = \sigma \cup \varphi_{q(f(\sigma))}(X{\restriction}n+r)$, that is, $\psi(X{\restriction}n+r) = \sigma$ if $\varphi_{q(f(\sigma))}(X{\restriction}n+r) \preceq \sigma$ and otherwise $\psi(X{\restriction}n+r) = \varphi_{q(f(\sigma))}(X{\restriction}n+r)$. Q.E.D.

Corollary 4.13. The c-immune-free Medvedev degrees forms a principal prime ideal in $\mathcal{P}_{\mathrm{s}}$.

5 Non-Cupping

Cenzer-Weber-Wu [13] suggested the problem of determining the cuppable Π^0_1 classes in $\mathcal{P}_{\mathrm{s}}$. Here we say that an incomplete Π^0_1 class P is *cuppable* if there exists an incomplete Π^0_1 class Q such that $P \otimes Q$ is Medvedev complete. In general, P *cups* to $R >_s P$ if there exists $Q <_s R$ such that $P \otimes Q \equiv_s R$. The first result in this direction is the following.

Theorem 5.1 (Simpson [19])**.** Any Π^0_1 class that cups to a separating class must have measure 0.

Hence, the positive measure Medvedev degrees `POS` form a subideal of Medvedev non-cupping degrees `NCup`, and, by Theorem 2.7, a non-cuppable promptly immune Π^0_1 class exists. However, we shall observe a further relationship between immunity and non-cuppability.

Recall for disjoint sets A, B, $S(A,B)$ is the class of all separating sets $C \supseteq A$, $C \cap B = \varnothing$. In particular, $\mathrm{DNC}_2 = S(A_0, A_1)$ where $A_i = \{e : \varphi_e(e) = i\}$. A *generalized separating class* is the product $\prod_n F_n$ where $\{F_n\}_{n\in\omega}$ is a computable sequence of finite subsets of $\mathbb{N}$. For $S(A,B)$ the set $F_n = \{0\}$ if $n \in B$, $\{1\}$ if $n \in A$ and $\{0,1\}$ if $n \notin A \cup B$. Generalized separating classes were studied by Cenzer and Hinman [9]. It is important to note that any generalized separating class P is *computably bounded* and hence is computably homeomorphic to a Π^0_1 class $Q \subseteq \{0,1\}^\omega$ (cf. [6, Lemma 1.3]). Hence the Medvedev degrees of the generalized separating classes are included in the Medvedev degrees of subsets of Cantor space.

Theorem 5.2. No immune-free degree cups to any generalized separating class.

Proof. Let P be an non-immune Π^0_1 class and $V \subseteq T_P$ an infinite computable set, with fixed enumeration $\{\sigma_i\}_{i\in\omega}$. Let $S = \prod_n F_n$ be a generalized separating class for a sequence $\{F_n\}_{n\in\omega}$ of finite sets. Suppose that for some Q, $S \leq P \otimes Q$ via a computable functional Φ. We shall write an input $X \oplus Y$ to Φ as the ordered pair X, Y.

We construct a computable functional Ψ witnessing $S \leq_{\mathrm{s}} Q$. Given $Y \in Q$, define $Z = \Psi(Y)$ as follows. For each n, let $Z(n) = \Phi(\sigma_i, Y)(n)$, where i is the least such that $\Phi(\sigma_i, Y)(n)$ is defined. We know that such i exists since, by compactness, there is some m such that $|\varphi(\sigma,\tau)| > n$ for all $\sigma \in T_P$, $\tau \in T_Q$ with length $\geq m$.

It remains to confirm that $Z = \Psi(Y) \in S$; that is, $Z(n) \in F_n$ for all n. Given n and $\sigma_i \in V$ such that $Z(n) = \Phi(\sigma_i, Y)(n)$, we can find $X \in P$ such that $\sigma_i \prec X$ (since $\sigma_i \in T_P$). It follows that $\Phi(X,Y) \in S$ and hence $\Phi(\sigma_i, Y)(n) = \Phi(X,Y)(n) \in F_n$. Q.E.D.

Corollary 5.3. Every immune-free Medvedev degree is Medvedev non-cuppable.

Proof. The class of 2-valued diagonally noncomputable functions, DNC_2, is a Medvedev complete generalized separating class, and hence no immune-free degree can cup to it. Q.E.D.

We get new subideals $\overline{\mathtt{IM}}$ and $\overline{\mathtt{TIM}}$ of Medvedev non-cuppable degrees `NCup`, which consist of immune-free and tree-immune-free degrees, respectively. However, immunity does not necessarily give a cupping property. Actually, as seen before, a positive measure promptly immune degree in Cenzer-Weber-Wu [13] is an example of a non-cuppable immune degree.

Corollary 5.4. A Muchnik complete Medvedev non-cuppable degree exists.

Proof. By Theorem 4.12, $\max \overline{\mathtt{TIM}}$ exists and it is clearly Muchnik complete since it is degree-isomorphic to any Medvedev complete class. Moreover, it is non-cuppable by Corollary 5.3. Q.E.D.

Theorem 5.5. For $\mathbf{c} = \max \overline{\mathtt{TIM}}$, a measure 0 immune non-cuppable degree $> \mathbf{c}$ exists.

Proof. Let $\mathbf{d}$ be a positive measure, promptly immune Medvedev degree. Then $\mathbf{d} \not\leq \mathbf{c}$ holds since tree-immune-free degrees are downward closed. We claim $\mathbf{a} = \mathbf{c} \cup \mathbf{d}$ is the desired degree. This follows from the results that immune degrees and non-cuppable degrees form ideals, positive measure-free degrees form a filter, and $\mathbf{d}$ has positive measure-free degree by its Muchnik completeness (cf. [19]). Q.E.D.

Corollary 5.6. The immune-free Medvedev degrees $\overline{\mathtt{IM}}$ and the tree-immune-free Medvedev degrees $\overline{\mathtt{TIM}}$ form proper subideals of the noncuppable Medvedev degrees $\mathtt{NCup}$.

6 Immunity and randomness

Finally we consider the immunity of random closed sets. A closed set P may be coded as an element of $3^{\mathbb{N}}$; P is called random if that sequence is Martin-Löf random (for background on randomness, cf. [15]). The code of P is defined from T_P; the nodes of T_P are considered in order by length and then lexicographically, and each one is represented in the code by 0, 1, or 2 according to whether the node has only the left child, only the right child, or both children, respectively. Randomness for closed sets is defined and explored in [1, 5], where it is shown among other results that no Π^0_1 class is random, and that no random closed set contains an f-c.e. path for any computable f bounded by a polynomial. The following theorem does not follow immediately but is not surprising.

Theorem 6.1. If P is a random closed set, then P is immune.

Proof. Fix a computable sequence $C = (\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \dots)$ such that $|\sigma_n| = n$ for each n. For $n > 0$, let $S_n = \{Q : (\forall i \leq n)\ \sigma_i \in T_Q\}$. Then S_n is a clopen set in the space of closed sets and the sequence $\{S_n : n \in \omega\}$ is uniformly c.e. It is clear that $C \subseteq T_P$ if and only if $P \in S_n$ for all n. Now consider the Lebesgue measure $\mu(S_n)$. Certainly $\mu(S_1) = 2/3$. Given $\mu_n = \mu(S_n)$ and σ_{n+1}, let $i \leq n$ be the largest such that $\sigma_i \prec \sigma_{n+1}$. Then $\mu_{n+1} = (\frac{2}{3})^{n+1-i}\mu_n \leq \frac{2}{3}\mu_n$. Hence $\mu(S_n) \leq (\frac{2}{3})^n$ for each n. It follows that $\{S_{2n} : n \in \omega\}$ is a Martin-Löf test and hence no random closed set can belong to every S_n. Hence if P is random, C is not a subset of T_P. Since this holds for every such C, it follows that random closed sets are immune. Q.E.D.

Since a random ternary sequence must contain $\frac{1}{3}$ 2s in the limit, intuitively the tree it codes must branch too much to be small. This is a straightforward consequence of the following, which is drawn from [1, Lemma 4.5].

Lemma 6.2. Let Q be a random closed set. Then there exist a constant $C \in \mathbb{N}$ and $k \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for all $m > k$,

$$C\left(\frac{4}{3}\right)^m\left(1 - m^{-\frac{1}{4}}\right) \ < \ \mathrm{card}(T_Q \cap \{0,1\}^m) \ < \ C\left(\frac{4}{3}\right)^m\left(1 + m^{-\frac{1}{4}}\right).$$

Corollary 6.3. If Q is a random closed set, Q is not small.

Proof. For C, k as in Lemma 6.2, define the function $g(n)$ as

$$g(n) = \max\left\{k+1, \min\left\{m : n < C\left(\frac{4}{3}\right)^m\left(1 - m^{-\frac{1}{4}}\right)\right\}\right\}.$$

It is clear that g is computable, and by Lemma 6.2, for all n the number of branches at level $g(n)$ will be at least n. Q.E.D.

References

[1] G. Barmpalias, P. Brodhead, D. Cenzer, S. Dashti, and R. Weber. Algorithmic randomness of closed sets. *Journal of Logic and Computation*, 17(6):1041–1062, 2007.

[2] S. Binns. A splitting theorem for the Medvedev and Muchnik lattices. *Mathematical Logic Quarterly*, 49(4):327–335, 2003.

[3] S. Binns. Small Π^0_1 classes. *Archive for Mathematical Logic*, 45(4):393–410, 2006.

[4] S. Binns. Hyperimmunity in $2^{\mathbb{N}}$. *Notre Dame Journal of Formal Logic*, 48(2):293–316, 2007.

[5] P. Brodhead, D. Cenzer, and S. Dashti. Random closed sets. In A. Beckmann, U. Berger, B. Löwe, and J. V. Tucker, editors, *Logical Approaches to Computational Barriers, Second Conference on Computability in Europe, CiE 2006, Swansea, UK, July 2006, Proceedings*, volume 3988 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 55–64. Springer, 2006.

[6] D. Cenzer. Π^0_1 classes in computability theory. In E. R. Griffor, editor, *Handbook of computability theory*, volume 140 of *Studies in Logic and the Foundations of Mathematics*, pages 37–85. North-Holland Publishing Co., Amsterdam, 1999.

[7] D. Cenzer, R. Downey, C. Jockusch, and R. A. Shore. Countable thin Π^0_1 classes. *Annals of Pure and Applied Logic*, 59(2):79–139, 1993.

[8] D. Cenzer and P. G. Hinman. Density of the Medvedev lattice of Π^0_1 classes. *Archive for Mathematical Logic*, 42(6):583–600, 2003.

[9] D. Cenzer and P. G. Hinman. Degrees of difficulty of generalized r.e. separating classes. *Archive for Mathematical Logic*, 46(7-8):629–647, 2008.

[10] D. Cenzer and A. Nies. Initial segments of the lattice of Π^0_1 classes. *The Journal of Symbolic Logic*, 66(4):1749–1765, 2001.

[11] D. Cenzer and J. Remmel. *Effectively Closed Sets*. Lecture Notes in Logic. Association for Symbolic Logic, in preparation.

[12] D. Cenzer and J. B. Remmel. Π^0_1 classes in mathematics. In Y. L. Ershov, S. S. Goncharov, A. Nerode, J. B. Remmel, and V. W. Marek, editors, *Handbook of recursive mathematics, Vol. 2, Recursive algebra, analysis and combinatorics*, volume 139 of *Studies in Logic and the Foundations of Mathematics*, pages 623–821. North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1998.

[13] D. Cenzer, R. Weber, and G. Wu. Immunity of closed sets. In K. Ambos-Spies, B. Löwe, and W. Merkle, editors, *Mathematical Theory and Computational Practice. Fifth Conference on Computability in Europe, CiE 2009, Heidelberg, Germany, July 2009, Proceedings*, volume 5635 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 109–117. Springer, 2009.

[14] P. Cholak, R. Coles, R. Downey, and E. Herrmann. Automorphisms of the lattice of Π^0_1 classes: perfect thin classes and anc degrees. *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society*, 353(12):4899–4924, 2001.

[15] R. Downey and D. Hirschfeldt. *Algorithmic Randomness and Complexity*. Theory and Applications of Computability. Springer, in press.

[16] Y. T. Medvedev. Degrees of difficulty of the mass problem. *Doklady Akademii Nauk SSSR*, 104:501–504, 1955.

[17] A. A. Mučnik. On strong and weak reducibility of algorithmic problems. *Sibirskiĭ Matematičeskiĭ Žurnal*, 4:1328–1341, 1963.

[18] S. G. Simpson. Mass problems and randomness. *Bulletin of Symbolic Logic*, 11(1):1–27, 2005.

[19] S. G. Simpson. Π^0_1 sets and models of WKL_0. In S. G. Simpson, editor, *Reverse mathematics 2001*, volume 21 of *Lecture Notes in Logic*, pages 352–378. Association for Symbolic Logic, La Jolla, CA, 2005.

[20] S. G. Simpson. An extension of the recursively enumerable Turing degrees. *Journal of the London Mathematical Society*, 75(2):287–297, 2007.

[21] R. I. Soare. *Recursively enumerable sets and degrees.* Perspectives in Mathematical Logic. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1987.