Jumps of Σ^0_2-high e-degrees and properly Σ^0_2 e-degrees

Richard Shore[*] Andrea Sorbi[†]

Abstract

We show that the Σ^0_2 high e-degrees coincide with the high e-degrees. We also show that not every properly Σ^0_2 e-degree is high.

1 Introduction

Enumeration reducibility is the notion of relative enumerability of sets: a set A is *enumeration reducible* (or simply *e-reducible*) to a set B, in symbols, $A \leq_e B$, if there is an effective procedure for enumerating A given *any* enumeration of B. Formally, we define $A \leq_e B$ if there is some computably enumerable set Φ (called in this context an *enumeration operator* or simply an *e-operator*) such that

$$A = \{x : (\exists \text{ finite } D)[\langle x, D\rangle \in \Phi \,\&\, D \subseteq B]\}$$

(throughout the paper we identify finite sets with their canonical indices). We denote by $\equiv_e$ the equivalence relation generated by the preordering relation $\leq_e$ and $\deg_e(A)$ denotes the equivalence class (or the *e-degree*) of A. The partially ordered structure of the e-degrees is denoted by $\mathfrak{D}_e$; its partial ordering is denoted by $\leq$. $\mathfrak{D}_e$ is, in fact, an upper semilattice with least element $\mathbf{0}_e$.

One of the most interesting features of the e-degrees is that they extend the structure $\mathfrak{D}_T$ of the Turing degrees ([Med55] and [Rog67]). Indeed if we define $\iota : \mathfrak{D}_T \to \mathfrak{D}_e$ by $\iota(\deg_T(A)) = \deg_e(\chi_A)$ (where $\deg_T(A)$ is the Turing degree of the set A and χ_A denotes the characteristic function of A) then ι

[*]Department of Mathematics, Cornell University, Ithaca NY 14853, USA. The frist authro was partially supported by NSF Grant DMS-9503503 and a CNR visiting professorship at the University of Turin.

[†]Department of Mathematics, University of Siena, Italy. The second author was partially supported by the HC&M research network *Complexity, Logic and Recursion Theory* (*COLORET*), contract no. ERBCHRXCT930415; MURST 60%, and CNR-GNSAGA. During the preparation of part of this paper the second author was visiting at the University of Wisconsin, Madison.

is the desired embedding. (In fact, it preserves joins and least element.) The verification that ι is well defined relies on the following lemma:

Lemma 1.1 *For every total function f and g, we have*

$$f \leq_T g \Leftrightarrow f \leq_e g.$$

Proof. See e.g. [Rog67, p. 153]. $\square$

One can define (see below) a jump operation $'$ on the e-degrees, and therefore introduce the notions of a *low* e-degree (i.e. an element of the class $\mathbf{L}_1 = \{\mathbf{a} \leq \mathbf{0}'_e : \mathbf{a}' = \mathbf{0}'_e\}$); and that of a *high* e-degree (i.e. an element of $\mathbf{H}_1 = \{\mathbf{a} \leq \mathbf{0}'_e : \mathbf{a}' = \mathbf{0}''_e\}$). Moreover, since ι preserves jump, we have that low Turing degrees are mapped to low e-degrees and high Turing degrees are mapped to high e-degrees.

A nice, useful characterization of the class $\mathbf{L}_1$ of the low e-degrees is given in [MC85]: $\mathbf{a} \in \mathbf{L}_1$ if and only if $\mathbf{a}$ contains a set A such that, for every $B \leq_e A$, $B \in \Delta^0_2$. Thus $\mathbf{a}$ and all the e-degrees below $\mathbf{a}$ consist entirely of Δ^0_2 sets. In this paper, we characterize the class $\mathbf{H}_1$ of high e-degrees by a result analogous to the one characterizing the high Turing degrees as those containing a set with an approximation whose associated computation function dominates every total recursive function (Theorem 2.1). The relevant definitions of a Σ^0_2 approximation and a computation function are given below. The e-degrees of sets with such approximations are known as the Σ^0_2-high e-degrees (Definition 1.7). This characterization answers Question 7.3 of [Coo90].

Since the e-degrees below $\mathbf{0}'_e$ are exactly the e-degrees consisting of Σ^0_2 sets, in view of the above cited characterization of the low e-degrees, a natural question to ask is where an e-degree $\mathbf{a} \leq \mathbf{0}'_e$ which contains no Δ^0_2 set (such an e-degree is called a *properly* Σ^0_2 e-degree) lies in the low/high hierarchy. A natural conjecture might be that the properly Σ^0_2 e-degrees are all in $\mathbf{H}_1$. Cooper and Copestake ([CC88]) show that there exist properly Σ^0_2 e-degrees that are Σ^0_2-high, and thus lie in $\mathbf{H}_1$ by Theorem 2.1. However, in Theorem 3.1 we show that the properly Σ^0_2 e-degrees are not contained in $\mathbf{H}_1$.

Our notations and terminology are mostly based on [Soa87]. The reader is referred to [Coo90] for an introduction and extensive bibliography on enumeration reducibility. We will be mostly working with Σ^0_2 sets. We recall that a Σ^0_2 *approximation* to a Σ^0_2 set A is computable sequence of computable sets $\{A^s : s \in A^s\}$ such that $A = \{x : (\exists t)(\forall s \geq t)[x \in A^s]\}$. See [LS92] for an introduction to Σ^0_2 approximations, and for a proof that every Σ^0_2 set has a *good* Σ^0_2 approximation $\{A^s : s \in A^s\}$, i.e. a computable sequence of computable (in fact, finite) sets such that $\{s : A^s \subseteq A\}$ is infinite.

Let X be any set of natural numbers; if x is a number, then $X^{[x]} = \{z \in X : (\exists y)[z = \langle x, y\rangle]\}$, and $X \upharpoonright x = \{y \in X : y < x\}$. If σ is a string and

$x < |\sigma|$ (where $|\sigma|$ denotes the length of σ), then $\sigma \upharpoonright x$ denotes the initial segment of σ having length x; likewise, if f is a function, then $f \upharpoonright x$ denotes the initial segment of f having length x.

Let $\{\varphi_i\}_{i\in\omega}$ be the standard enumeration of all partial computable functions with corresponding enumerations $\{W_i\}_{i\in\omega}$ and $\{\Phi_i\}_{i\in\omega}$ of the computably enumerable sets and the enumeration operators, respectively. Let us fix, as in [Soa87, p. 16], computable approximations $\{\varphi_{i,s}\}_{i,s\in\omega}$ to the partial computable functions. Without loss of generality, we may assume that if $\varphi_{i,s}(x)\downarrow$ then $\varphi_{i,s}(x) < s$. Correspondingly, we get computable finite approximations $\{W_{i,s}\}_{i,s\in\omega}$ and $\{\Phi_{i,s}\}_{i,s\in\omega}$ to the computably enumerable sets and the enumeration operators, respectively.

Let

$$K^A = \{x : x \in \Phi_x^A\}.$$

Lemma 1.2 *[McE85] Let A, B be sets; then*

$$A \leq_e B \Leftrightarrow A \leq_1 K^B \Leftrightarrow K^A \leq_1 K^B.$$

Define the *jump* of a set A ([McE85]) to be the set $J_e(A) = \chi_{K^A}$. (Note that we identify functions with their graphs.) Clearly $J_e(A) \equiv_e K^A \oplus \overline{K^A}$. If $\mathbf{a}$ is an e-degree, then we can define $\mathbf{a}'$ as $\deg_e(J_e(A))$ for any $A \in \mathbf{a}$ since, by the previous lemma,

$$A \equiv_e B \Rightarrow K^A \oplus \overline{K^A} \equiv_e K^B \oplus \overline{K^B}$$

this gives a well defined unary operation on the e-degrees. Moreover, $\mathbf{a} < \mathbf{a}'$ for every e-degree $\mathbf{a}$.

The following lemma records two important properties of the jump operation.

Lemma 1.3 *[McE85] For every set A,*

1. *$\iota((\deg_T(A))') = (\deg_e(A))'$;*
2. *if A is* total *(i.e. the graph of some total function), then $J_e(A) \equiv_e \overline{K^A}$.*

Definition 1.4 A set A is called *e-high* if $A \in \Sigma_2^0$ and $J_e^{(2)}(\emptyset) \leq_e J_e(A)$. An e-degree $\mathbf{a}$ is called *high*, if $\mathbf{a}$ contains an e-high set (hence $\mathbf{a}' = \mathbf{0}_e''$).

By Lemma 1.3, the embedding ι preserves highness, i.e. it maps high T-degrees to high e-degrees.

The following is a useful characterization of the e-high sets.

Lemma 1.5 *For every set A,*

$$A \textit{ is e-high } \Leftrightarrow Tot \leq_e J_e(A) \Leftrightarrow Tot \leq_T K^A.$$

Proof. First notice that, by Lemma 1.3, A is e-high if and only if $\overline{K^{\overline{K}}} \leq_e J_e(A)$. Moreover, A is e-high if and only if, by Lemma 1.3, $\chi_{\overline{K^{\overline{K}}}} \leq_e \chi_{K^A}$, if and only if, by Lemma 1.1, $\overline{K^{\overline{K}}} \leq_T K^A$. On the other hand, $\overline{K^{\overline{K}}} \equiv_1 Tot$. Indeed, $\overline{K^{\overline{K}}} \leq_1 Tot$ follows from the fact that Tot is Π^0_2-complete. To show that $Tot \leq_1 \overline{K^{\overline{K}}}$ simply observe that $\overline{Tot} \in \Sigma^0_2$, hence $\overline{Tot} \leq_e \overline{K}$, and thus, by Lemma 1.2, $\overline{Tot} \leq_1 K^{\overline{K}}$.

It follows that A is e-high if and only if $Tot \leq_e J_e(A)$ if and only if $Tot \leq_T K^A$. $\square$

Finally notice the following:

Lemma 1.6 *For every total function f, $J_e(f) \equiv_T f'$.*

Proof. Since K^f is computably enumerable in f, we have $K^f \leq_1 f'$, and so $\overline{K^f} \leq_T f'$. On the other hand, f' is computably enumerable in f, hence, by the totality of f, $f' \leq_e f$, and thus $f' \leq_1 K^f$, by Lemma 1.2, which shows that $f' \leq_1 J_e(f)$.

Hence we conclude that $J_e(f) \equiv_T f'$. $\square$

McEvoy ([McE85]) defines the notion of a Σ^0_2-high e-degree:

Definition 1.7 A Σ^0_2-*high* approximation $\{A^s\}_{s\in\omega}$ to a set A is a Σ^0_2 approximation such that the function

$$c(x) = \mu s(s > x \ \&\ A^s \upharpoonright x \subseteq A)$$

(called the *computation function for A* relative to the given approximation) is total and dominates every computable function. A set A is called Σ^0_2-*high*, if it has a Σ^0_2-high approximation. Finally an e-degree is said to be Σ^0_2-*high*, if it contains a Σ^0_2-high set.

Using Lemma 1.3 (1), it is shown in [McE85] that if $\mathbf{a} \leq \mathbf{0}'_e$ is total (hence a degree of the form $\iota(\mathbf{b})$, for some Turing degree $\mathbf{b} \leq_T \mathbf{0}'_T$), and $\mathbf{a}$ is high, then $\mathbf{a}$ is Σ^0_2-high. On the other hand, the class of Σ^0_2-high e-degrees properly extends the class of all high total e-degrees (in fact, there exist quasi-minimal Σ^0_2-high e-degrees, [McE85]).

In the next section we show that the high e-degrees and the Σ^0_2-high e-degrees coincide. This answers Question 7.3 of [Coo90].

2 The Σ^0_2-high e-degrees coincide with the high e-degrees

Theorem 2.1 *An e-degree* $\mathbf{a}$ *is Σ^0_2-high if and only if* $\mathbf{a}$ *is high.*

Proof. ($\Rightarrow$) Let A be Σ^0_2-high; let $\{A^s\}_{s\in\omega}$ be a Σ^0_2-high approximation to A, and let c be the computation function for A relative to this approximation.

By Lemma 1.5 it is enough to show that $Tot \leq_e J_e(A)$. We claim that, for every i,

$$\begin{aligned} i \in Tot &\Leftrightarrow (\forall y)[\varphi_i(y)\downarrow] \\ &\Leftrightarrow (\exists x)(\exists s)[(\forall y < x)\varphi_{i,s}(y)\downarrow \;\& \\ &\qquad (\forall y \geq x)(\forall t > y)[A^t \upharpoonright y \subseteq A \Rightarrow \varphi_{i,t}(y)\downarrow]]. \end{aligned}$$

Indeed, if φ_i is total, then the function

$$\hat{\varphi}_i(x) = \mu s(\,\varphi_{i,s}(x)\downarrow)$$

is a total computable function, and thus dominated by c. Let x be such that $c(y) > \hat{\varphi}_i(y)$ for every $y \geq x$; then

$$(\forall y \geq x)(\forall t > y)[A^t \upharpoonright y \subseteq A \Rightarrow \varphi_{i,t}(y)\downarrow].$$

This establishes the left-to-right implication in the claimed equivalence. The right-to-left implication is trivial.

Now let

$$B = \{\langle i, x\rangle : (\exists y \geq x)(\exists t > y)[A^t \upharpoonright y \subseteq A \;\&\; \varphi_{i,t}(y)\uparrow].$$

Clearly $B \leq_e A$. Hence, by Lemma 1.2, $B \leq_1 K^A$, via, say, the computable function h.

Then

$$\begin{aligned} i \in Tot &\Leftrightarrow (\exists x)(\exists s)[(\forall y < x)\varphi_{i,s}(y)\downarrow \;\&\; \langle i,x\rangle \notin B] \\ &\Leftrightarrow (\exists x)(\exists s)[(\forall y < x)\varphi_{i,s}(y)\downarrow \;\&\; h(\langle i,x\rangle) \in \overline{K^A}]. \end{aligned}$$

It follows that $Tot \leq_e \overline{K^A}$, hence $Tot \leq_e J_e(A)$, as desired.

($\Leftarrow$) Assume that A is e-high. Then, by Lemma 1.5, we have that $Tot \leq_T K^A$. Let $Z = K^A$ and let $\{Z^s\}_{s\in\omega}$ be a good Σ^0_2-approximation to K^A. Let ψ be some Turing functional such that $Tot = \psi^Z$.

We now define an enumeration operator Θ by stages, and show that Θ^Z is Σ^0_2-high. Since the Σ^0_2-high e-degrees are closed upwards in Σ^0_2-e-degrees (see [BCS97]), it follows that $\deg_e(A)$ is Σ^0_2-high as well.

Construction:

Stage 0: Let $\Theta_0 = \emptyset$.

Stage $s+1$: For every $i \leq s$, we distinguish the following two cases:

(a) if $\psi_s^{Z^s}(i) = 0$, then for every $x \leq s$, we enumerate the axiom

$$\langle \langle i, x \rangle, Z^s \rangle \in \Theta_{s+1};$$

(b) otherwise, do nothing.

Let Θ^{s+1} consist of Θ^s plus all the axioms enumerated at stage $s+1$ and let $\Theta = \bigcup_{s \in \omega} \Theta_s$. We now prove that Θ is the desired enumeration operator by verifying a series of claims.

Verifications:
Claim 1 For every number i,

$i \in Tot \Rightarrow (\Theta^Z)^{[i]}$ finite;

$i \notin Tot \Rightarrow (\Theta^Z)^{[i]} = \omega^{[i]}$.

Proof. If $i \in Tot$ then at all sufficiently large good stages of the approximation $\{Z^s\}_{s \in \omega}$ we do nothing on behalf of i (i.e. case (b) of the definition of Θ applies to i). To see this, assume that $i \in Tot$, and let $\sigma \subset \chi_Z$ be such that $\psi^\sigma(i) = 1$. Let t_0 be such that

$$(\forall x < |\sigma|)[\sigma = 1 \Rightarrow (\forall s \geq t_0)[x \in Z^s]].$$

Then

$$(\forall s \geq t_0)[s \text{ is good } \Rightarrow \psi_s^{Z^s}(i) = 1].$$

It follows that at stages $s \geq t_0$, if (a) holds then s is not good, hence $\Theta_s^{Z^s} \nsubseteq \Theta^Z$. Therefore $(\Theta^Z)^{[i]}$ is finite.

If $i \notin Tot$, then at all sufficiently large good stages, case (a) of the definition of Θ applies to i. Indeed, if $i \notin Tot$, then $\psi^Z(i) = 0$. One thus argues as in the preceding case, but starting with a string $\sigma \subset \chi_Z$ such that $\psi^\sigma(i) = 0$.

Since $\Theta_s^{Z_s} \subseteq \Theta^Z$, for all good stages s, it follows in this case that $(\Theta^Z)^{[i]} = \omega^{[i]}$. $\square$

Now let $Y = \Theta^Z$. We want to show that Y has a Σ_2^0-high approximation $\{\hat{Y}^s\}_{s \in \omega}$. Let $\{Y^s\}_{s \in \omega}$ be any good Σ_2^0-approximation to Y. Given a partial function φ and a number u, define $\varphi \restriction u \downarrow$, if $\varphi(v) \downarrow$ for all $v < u$.

Define

$$\langle i, x \rangle \in \hat{Y}^s \Leftrightarrow [\langle i, x \rangle \in Y^s \vee \varphi_{i,s} \restriction \langle i, x+1 \rangle \uparrow].$$

Claim 2 $\{\hat{Y}^s\}_{s \in \omega}$ is a Σ_2^0-approximation to Y.
Proof. Let $\hat{Y} = \{y : (\exists t)(\forall s \geq t)[y \in \hat{Y}^s]\}$. If $i \notin Tot$ then $Y^{[i]} = \omega^{[i]} = \hat{Y}^{[i]}$. On the other hand, assume that $i \in Tot$. If $\langle i, x \rangle \in Y$, then clearly $\langle i, x \rangle \in \hat{Y}$. If $\langle i, x \rangle \notin Y$, then at all sufficiently large stages $\varphi_{i,s} \restriction \langle i, x+1 \rangle \downarrow$ and so when $\langle i, x \rangle \notin Y^s$, we have that $\langle i, x \rangle \notin \hat{Y}^s$. $\square$

Next, let c be the computation function for Y relative to the Σ^0_2 approximation $\{\hat{Y}^s\}_{s\in\omega}$. The following claim completes the proof of the Theorem.

Claim 3 The function c is total and dominates all total computable functions.
Proof. Let us first show that c is total. To this end, let $z \in \omega$ be given. Let $t > z$ be a stage such that

$$(\forall \langle i,x\rangle < z)[\varphi_i \upharpoonright \langle i,x+1\rangle \downarrow \Leftrightarrow \varphi_{i,t} \upharpoonright \langle i,x+1\rangle \downarrow].$$

Then if $s \geq t$ is a good stage of the enumeration $\{Y^s\}_{s\in\omega}$, we have that $\hat{Y}^s \upharpoonright z \subseteq Y$. Therefore $c(z)$ is defined.

Now consider any total φ_i. Let x be such that $\langle i,y\rangle \notin Y$, for every $y \geq x$. Let $z \geq \langle i,x\rangle$, and let y be the least number such that $\langle i,y\rangle \leq z < \langle i,y+1\rangle$. Let s be the least stage such that $\varphi_{i,s}(z)\downarrow$, hence $\varphi_{i,t} \upharpoonright \langle i,y+1\rangle \uparrow$ for every $t < s$. Then $\langle i,y\rangle \in \hat{Y}^t$, for every $t < s$. Therefore $\varphi_i(z) < s \leq c(z)$. □

3 Jumps of properly Σ^0_2 e-degrees

A Σ^0_2 e-degree $\mathbf{a}$ is called *properly* Σ^0_2 ([CC88]) if $\mathbf{a}$ contains no Δ^0_2 set. Copestake and Cooper, [CC88, Theorem 1], show that there exist e-degrees that are properly Σ^0_2 and Σ^0_2-high. Since every high computably enumerable Turing degree corresponds, under the embedding ι, to a high e-degree, it follows that not every Σ^0_2-high e-degree is properly Σ^0_2-high. (A trivial counterexample is $\mathbf{0}'_e = \deg_e(\overline{K})$). It is shown in [MC85] that $\deg_e(A)$ is low if and only if $B \in \Delta^0_2$, for every $B \leq_e A$. This characterization of the low e-degrees seems to suggest the possibility that the properly Σ^0_2 e-degrees are all high. We show in this section that this is not the case.

Theorem 3.1 *Let C be such that C is computably enumerable in $\emptyset'$, $\emptyset' \leq_T C <_T \emptyset''$ and $C' \equiv_T \emptyset'''$. Then there exists a set A of properly Σ^0_2 e-degree, such that $J_e(A) \leq_e \chi_C$.*

Corollary 3.2 *There exist properly Σ^0_2 e-degrees that are not high.*

Proof. Let C and A be as in the previous theorem. If A were e-high, then $J^{(2)}_e(\emptyset) \leq_e \chi_C$, from which, by totality, $J^{(2)}_e(\emptyset) \leq_T \chi_C$; but $J^{(2)}_e(\emptyset) \equiv_T \emptyset''$, by Lemma 1.6. Hence $\emptyset'' \leq_T C$, contradiction. □

3.1 Proof of Theorem 3.1

Let C satisfy the hypotheses of the theorem; let $C = W^K$, for some computably enumerable set W. For every t, let $\kappa_t = \chi_{K^t} \upharpoonright k(t)$, where k is some

$1-1$ computable function such that $K = range(k)$ and $K^t = \{k(s) | s \leq t\}$. Define a Σ^0_2 approximation $\{C^t\}_{t\in\omega}$ to C by letting

$$C^t = W_t^{\kappa_t},$$

As $C' \equiv_T K''$, there is an $f \leq_T C$ that dominates all Δ^0_2 total functions (see e.g. [Ler83, p. 85]). Let $f = \Psi^C$, for some Turing functional Ψ, be such a function.

We need the following lemma:

Lemma 3.3 *There exists a computable sequence $\{B_i^s\}_{i,s\in\omega}$ of finite sets such that, if*

$$B_i = \{x : (\exists t)(\forall s \geq t)[x \in B_i^s]\}$$

then

1. *for every $B \in \Delta^0_2$, there is an i such that $B =^* B_i$ and, for almost all x, $\lim_s B_i^s(x)$ exists;*
2. *the relation $x \in B_i$ (as one of x and i) is computable in C.*

Proof. Given u and X, with $X = K$, or $X = K^v$ for some $v \geq u$, we say that u is X-*true* if $\kappa_u \subseteq \chi_X$. We will use the fact that for every $B \in \Delta^0_2$ there exists some i such that $\chi_B = \varphi_i^K$. Roughly speaking, we will have $x \in B_i^s$ if there exists some K^s-true stage $t < w$, with $\varphi_{i,t}^{\kappa_t}(x) = 1$, where w is the least K^s-true stage such that $\Psi_w^\sigma(x) \downarrow$, for some $\sigma \subset \chi_C$. Then we use the fact that Ψ^C dominates all Δ^0_2 functions to verify that, for all but finitely many x, there exists a K-true stage t such that $\varphi_{i,t}^{\kappa_t}(x) = 1$ and $t < \Psi^C(x) < w$. The main difficulty here is that one can not find, in a computable way, the right w at s. For every i, x, s, we will therefore define the values of a finite set $B_i^s \subseteq \omega$, a finite set $L(x,s) \subseteq \omega \times 2^{<\omega}$ and a linear ordering $<_{x,s}$ on $L(x,s)$. We "assign preconditions" to elements of $\omega \times 2^{<\omega}$ subject to the following rules: $L(x,s)$ may contain only pairs $\langle r, \rho\rangle$ with preconditions which have been satisfied at some stage $u \leq s$. At stage s, we will choose the $<_{x,s}$-first element $\langle r, \rho\rangle$ of $L(x,s)$. We will argue that infinitely many times we choose the correct $\langle w, \sigma\rangle$ and we eventually choose only pairs $\langle r, \rho\rangle$ with $r \geq w$.

Let i, x be given. The formal definitions are given by induction on s.

Stage 0: Define $B_i^0 = \emptyset$ and $L(x,0) = <_{x,0} = \emptyset$. No $\langle r, \rho\rangle$ has a precondition at 0.

Stage $s+1$: If $x \geq s+1$ then $x \notin B_i^{s+1}$; otherwise, we distinguish two cases:

- if $L(x,s) = \emptyset$, then
$$x \in B_i^{s+1} \Leftrightarrow x \in B_i^s;$$

- otherwise, let $\langle w, \sigma \rangle$ be the $<_{x,s}$-least element of $L(x, s)$. Then,

  (a) if there is no $t < w$ such that t is K^{s+1}-true, then $x \notin B_i^{s+1}$;

  (b) otherwise, for the least such t, $x \in B_i^{s+1}$ if and only if $\varphi_{i,t}^{K_t}(x) = 1$.

In the latter case, i.e. when $L(x, s) \neq \emptyset$, we extract $\langle w, \sigma \rangle$ from $L(x, s+1)$ and cancel the related precondition. Hence $\langle w, \sigma \rangle$ has no precondition at any stage $v \geq s + 1$ prior to the smallest stage $v' > s + 1$ (if any) at which we again assign a precondition to $\langle w, \sigma \rangle$.

We *assign a precondition* to each pair $\langle r, \rho \rangle$ such that

1. r is K^{s+1}-true;
2. $\Psi_r^{\rho}(x) \downarrow$;
3. $\rho \subseteq \chi_{C^r}$;
4. ρ of minimal length, satisfying 2. and 3. (i.e. if $\Psi_r^{\rho'}(x) \downarrow$ and $\rho' \subseteq \chi_{C^r}$ then $\rho \subseteq \rho'$; notice that $|\rho'| < r$, for each such ρ', by the definition of the use function as in [Soa87, p. 49]);
5. $\langle r, \rho \rangle$ does not have a precondition at $s + 1$.

At any $v > s + 1$, we say that this precondition becomes *satisfied at* v if

$$(\forall i < |\rho|)[\rho(i) = 0 \Rightarrow (\exists t)[s + 1 \leq t \leq v \,\&\, i \notin C^t]].$$

Let

$$\begin{aligned} L(x, s+1) = {} & (L(x, s) - \{\langle w, \sigma \rangle\}) \cup \\ & \{\langle r, \rho \rangle : \langle r, \rho \rangle \text{ has a precondition that becomes satisfied at } s + 1\}. \end{aligned}$$

Finally, we order $L(x, s+1)$ as follows: if $\langle r, \rho \rangle, \langle r', \rho' \rangle \in L(x, s+1)$, then let $\langle r, \rho \rangle <_{x,s+1} \langle r', \rho' \rangle$ if either

1. $\langle r, \rho \rangle, \langle r', \rho' \rangle \in L(x, s)$ and $\langle r, \rho \rangle <_{x,s} \langle r', \rho' \rangle$, or
2. $\langle r, \rho \rangle \in L(x, s)$ and $\langle r', \rho' \rangle \notin L(x, s)$, or
3. $\langle r, \rho \rangle, \langle r', \rho' \rangle \notin L(x, s)$ and $r < r'$.

We now check that the sequence B_i^s has the desired properties.

Claim Let x be given, let σ be the least string such that $\sigma \subset \chi_C$ and $\Psi^{\sigma}(x) \downarrow$. Let w be the least K-true stage such that $\Psi_w^{\sigma}(x) \downarrow$. Then

1. at infinitely many stages s we extract $\langle w, \sigma \rangle$ from $L(x, s)$;
2. there exists a stage t_0 such that we do not extract any pair $\langle r, \rho \rangle$ with $r < w$ from $L(x, s)$ at any stage $s \geq t_0$.

Proof. Since $\sigma \subset \chi_C$, it is clear that there are infinitely many stages at which the requirements (1-4) for assigning a precondition to $\langle w, \sigma \rangle$ are fulfilled. Moreover, once assigned at a stage s_0, there exists a stage $s_1 > s_0$ such that the precondition becomes satisfied at s_1 and so is then in $L(x, s)$ until extracted. As there are only finitely many elements of $L(x, s_1)$ before $\langle w, \sigma \rangle$ in the ordering and no new ones can later be inserted before it $\langle w, \sigma \rangle$ is eventually extracted. Hence, there exist infinitely many stages s such that $\langle w, \sigma \rangle \in L(x, s)$ and we extract $\langle w, \sigma \rangle$ from $L(x, s)$ at infinitely many stages.

Let $t < w$, and assume for a contradiction that at infinitely many stages s, we extract $\langle t, \rho_s \rangle$, for some string ρ_s. Thus $|\rho_s| < t$ by the definition of the use function, since $\Psi_t^{\rho_s}(x) \downarrow$. Then there exist a ρ, with $|\rho| < t$, and infinitely many stages u_s at which we assign a precondition to $\langle t, \rho \rangle$ which becomes satisfied at some stage $v_s \leq s$ and $\langle t, \rho \rangle \in L(x, v)$ for every v such that $v_s \leq v \leq s$. Then t is K-true. Let t_0 be a stage such that

$$(\forall s \geq t_0)(\forall i < t)[i \in C \Rightarrow i \in C^s].$$

By the minimality of σ and w, and since $C^t \subseteq C$ and t is K-true, it follows that there exists some $i < |\rho| < t$ such that $i \in C$ and $\rho(i) = 0$. But no pair $\langle r, \rho \rangle$ with $\rho(i) = 0$, for some $i < |\rho|$ such that $\chi_C(i) = 1$, can have a precondition assigned to $\langle r, \rho \rangle$ at some stage $u \geq t_0$ which becomes later satisfied. $\square$

We now conclude the proof of the lemma. Let $B \in \Delta_2^0$, and let i be such that $\chi_B = \varphi_i^K$. Let

$$t(x) = \min\{t : t \text{ is } K\text{-true and } \varphi_{i,t}^{K_t}(x) \downarrow\}.$$

Then t is total and so a Δ_2^0 function. It follows that there exists some number x_0 such that $f(x) > t(x)$, for all $x \geq x_0$.

Given $x \geq x_0$, let w and σ be as in the previous claim (for x). Then $t(x) < f(x) < w$ (since $f(x) = \Psi_w^\sigma(x)$). Moreover, if t_0 is as in the proof of the previous claim, then, for every pair $\langle r, \rho \rangle$ such that $\langle r, \rho \rangle$ is extracted from $L(x, s)$ at any stage $s \geq t_0$, we have $t(x) \leq r$. Hence for all $x \geq x_0$, $\chi_{B_i}(x) = \varphi_i^K(x)$.

Since $f(x), \psi(x)$, and w can be computed by C, we easily conclude that the relation $x \in B_i$ is computable in C. $\square$

Remark 3.4 Note that if $t(x) \geq w$, then $\lim_s B_i^s(x)$ need not exist, but, in any case, $x \notin B_i$, since at every large enough stage at which we extract $\langle w, \sigma \rangle$ from $L(x, s)$ we have $x \notin B_i^s$.

We now go back to the proof of the theorem. We will build a Σ_2^0 set A such that, for every Δ_2^0 set B, $A \not\equiv_e B$, and $K^A \leq_T C$. This implies that $\deg_e(A)$ is properly Σ_2^0 and, by Lemma 1.1, $J_e(A) \leq_e \chi_C$.

3.2 The strategies

The properly Σ_2^0-strategy. Let $\{\Phi_e, \Psi_e\}_{e\in\omega}$ be some effective listing of all pairs of e-operators. To make A of properly Σ_2^0 e-degree, it is enough to satisfy the following requirements, for every $e, i \in \omega$:

$$\mathcal{P}_{e,i}: \qquad A = \Phi_e^{B_i} \mathbin{\&} B_i = \Psi_e^A \Rightarrow (\exists^\infty x)[\lim_s B_i^s(x) \uparrow]$$

where $\{B_i\}_{i\in\omega}$ and $\{B_i^s\}_{i,s\in\omega}$ are as given in Lemma 3.3.

Indeed, if we satisfy these requirements for every e, i, then $\deg_e(A)$ is properly Σ_2^0. Suppose, for the sake of a contradiction, that $A \equiv_e B$ and $B \in \Delta_2^0$. Then, by the previous lemma, $A = \Phi_e^{B_i}$ and $B_i = \Psi_e^A$ for some e, i, with $B =^* B_i$ and so $\lim_s B_i^s(x)$ does not exist for infinitely many x for the desired contradiction, since $\lim_s B_i^s(x)$ exists for almost all x.

The strategy to meet $\mathcal{P}_{e,i}$ is a slight modification of the canonical properly Σ_2^0 strategy as given in [CC88], and described as follows:

(a) appoint a witness x and let $x \in A$;

(w_1) wait for finite sets D, E such that $x \in \Phi_e^D$ and $D \subseteq \Psi_e^E$;

(b) fix $E - \{x\} \subseteq A$;

(w_2) wait for $D \subseteq B_i$;

(w_3) let $x \notin A$, wait for $D \not\subseteq B_i$;

(ℓ) let $x \in A$; go back to (w_2).

A triple x, D, E as above is called a *follower* of $\mathcal{P}_{e,i}$.

As described in [CC88, Theorem 1], for a given follower x, D, E this strategy may have the following outcomes: (w_1) yields $x \in A - \Phi_e^{B_i}$ or $y \in B_i - \Psi_e^A$ for some y; (w_2) corresponds to the case $D \subseteq \Psi^A$, $D \not\subseteq B_i$; (w_3) corresponds to the case $x \in \Phi^{B_i} - A$; finally, the infinitary outcome ℓ entails that $\lim_s B_i^s(y)$ does not exist for some $y \in D$.

The subrequirements $\mathcal{P}_{e,i,j}$. It follows by the analysis of the outcomes of the previous strategy that if $B_i^s(x)$ does have limit on every $x \in D$, then $A \neq \Phi_e^{B_i}$ or $B_i \neq \Psi_e^A$. The only complication here (see Remark 3.4) is that there might exist finitely many numbers x such that $\lim_s B_i^s(x)$ does not exist, thus, for some $y \in D$, $\lim_s B_i^s(y)$ need not exist. We cope with this difficulty by attacking $\mathcal{P}_{e,i}$ through infinitely many subrequirements $\mathcal{P}_{e,i,j}$, with $j \in \omega$. The strategy for $\mathcal{P}_{e,i,j}$ consists in looking for a follower x, D, E such that $D \upharpoonright j = B_i \upharpoonright j$: thus, for almost all j, if we appoint a follower x, D, E as before, we are bound to conclude that $B_i^s(y)$ exists on every $y \in D$. Thus $\mathcal{P}_{e,i}$ is satisfied through some subrequirement $\mathcal{P}_{e,i,j}$ (in fact cofinitely many such subrequirements). Before acting, the subrequirement $\mathcal{P}_{e,i,j}$ must therefore be provided with some knowledge of what numbers $x < j$ are in fact in B_i. This information is coded in the first component, $h(\sigma, s)$, of the outcome of the node corresponding to $\mathcal{P}_{e,i,j}$ in the tree of outcomes.

The strategy for $K^A \leq_T C$. For every i, we will look for a finite set D such that $i \in \Phi_i^D$. If such a D exists then we let $D \subseteq A$. Notice that we can determine computably in $\emptyset'$ and, thus, in C, whether or not such a finite set exists.

3.3 The tree of outcomes

For notation and terminology for strings and trees, the reader is referred to [Soa87]. The tree of outcomes is the smallest set T of strings σ such that

1. if $|\sigma|$ is even then $\sigma\widehat{\ }(h, r) \in T$, for every $h \in \omega$ and $r \in \{0, 1\}$;
2. if $|\sigma|$ is odd then $\sigma\widehat{\ }r \in T$, for every $r \in \{0, 1\}$.

The strings of even length are assigned to the (sub)requirements $\mathcal{P}_{e,i,j}$, according to some fixed priority listing. The first component, $h(\sigma, s)$, of the outcome of σ at stage s will be an assessment as to which numbers $x < j$ are in fact in B_i: at stage $s+1$, $h(\sigma, s)$ will be chosen to be the first element of a list $\mathcal{L}(\sigma, s)$ of numbers. Each element h of the list is the canonical index of a finite subset of $\{x : x < j\}$. Its position in the list measures how well the set $\{x : x < j\} - B_i$ is approximated by the finite set D_h. Having decided on the first component, h, of the outcome at σ, the strategy for $\mathcal{P}_{e,i,j}$ is ready to act at $\sigma^+ = \sigma\widehat{\ }h$. The outcome 1 at σ^+ corresponds to (w_1) or (w_2); the outcome 0 corresponds to (w_3) or (ℓ).

The strings of odd length are devoted to guaranteeing that $K^A \leq_T C$: if $|\sigma| = 2i + 1$ then we have outcome 0 if there exists (modulo higher priority constraints) some finite set D such that $i \in \Phi_i^D$; otherwise we have outcome 1.

Let $\hat{T} = T \cup \{\sigma^\frown h : |\sigma| \text{ even } \& h \in \omega\}$. For $\sigma \in \hat{T}$, the parameter $\alpha(\sigma, s)$ is intended to record some finite set which we want to keep in A for the sake of our actions at σ; the parameter $\epsilon(\sigma, s)$ is meant to record some finite set of elements which we want to keep out of A.

The ordering $\preceq$ of T is determined in the usual way by the ordering of the outcomes given that we define $(h, r) < (h', r')$ if

$$h > h' \text{ or } [h = h' \,\&\, r < r'].$$

We extend $\preceq$ to $\hat{T}$ in the obvious way.

Finally, let $\{\xi_\sigma\}_{\sigma \in \hat{T}}$ be a computable partition of ω into infinite computable sets.

3.4 The construction

The construction proceeds by stages. At stage s we define a finite set A^s, a string δ_s, and the values of several parameters. Unless otherwise specified, at each stage each parameter retains the same value as at the preceding stage.

Stage 0: Define $\delta_0 = \emptyset$. For every $\sigma \in \hat{T}$, let

$$\alpha(\sigma, 0) = \epsilon(\sigma, 0) = \mathcal{L}(\sigma, 0) = \emptyset.$$

Let $x(\sigma, 0)$ and $p(\sigma, h, 0)$ be undefined for every $x, h \in \omega$. Finally, let $A^0 = \emptyset$.

Stage $s + 1$: Suppose that we have defined $\delta_{s+1} \restriction n$, where $n < s + 1$: let $\sigma = \delta_{s+1} \restriction n$. Our aim is to define a string σ^{++} which we will be $\delta_{s+1} \restriction n + 1$.

$|\sigma|$ **even.** Let $\mathcal{P}_{e,i,j}$ be the requirement assigned to σ. For simplicity, drop subscripts, and let $\Phi_e = \Phi$, $\Psi_e = \Psi$ and $B_i = B$.

Our first task is to define the first component, $h(\sigma, s+1)$, of the outcome. We define $h(\sigma, s+1)$ to be the least element of $\mathcal{L}(\sigma, s)$ if $\mathcal{L}(\sigma, s) \neq \emptyset$, otherwise $h(\sigma, s + 1) = 0$. Then we cancel the precondition for $h(\sigma, s + 1)$ by letting $p(\sigma, h(\sigma, s + 1), s + 1) \uparrow$.

To every h such that $\max D_h < j$ and h does not have a precondition, we assign the precondition $p(\sigma, h, s + 1)$ which becomes satisfied at some later stage $v > s + 1$ if, for every $x < j$ and $x \in D_h$, there exists u such that $s + 1 \leq u \leq v$ and $B^u(x) = 0$.

Define

$$\mathcal{L}(\sigma, s + 1) = (\mathcal{L}(\sigma, s) - \{h(\sigma, s + 1)\}) \cup \{h : h \text{ has a precondition that is satisfied at } s + 1\}$$

and order $\mathcal{L}(\sigma, s + 1)$ in the usual way: for every $h, h' \in \mathcal{L}(\sigma, s + 1)$, define $h <_{\sigma,s+1} h'$ if either

1. $h, h' \in \mathcal{L}(\sigma, s)$ and $h <_{\sigma,s} h'$, or
2. $h \in \mathcal{L}(\sigma, s)$ and $h' \notin \mathcal{L}(\sigma, s)$, or
3. $h, h' \notin \mathcal{L}(\sigma, s)$ and $h < h'$.

Let $\sigma^+ = \sigma\hat{\ }h(\sigma, s+1)$.

Now we are ready to activate the strategy for $\mathcal{P}$.

Let $x = x(\sigma^+, s+1)$ be the least number in ξ_{σ^+} such that $x \notin \alpha(\rho, s+1)$, for every $\rho \prec \sigma^+$.

Case 1).

$$(\exists D)(\exists E)[x \in \Phi_s^D \,\&\, D \cap D_{h(\sigma,s+1)} = \emptyset \,\&\, D \subseteq \Psi_s^E \\ \&\, E \cap \bigcup\{\epsilon(\rho, s+1) : \rho \preceq \sigma\} = \emptyset].$$

Choose the least such pair D, E.

In this case, let $\alpha(\sigma^+, s+1) = E - \{x\}$:

1. if $D \subseteq B^s$, then let $\sigma^{++} = \sigma^+\hat{\ }0$ and $\epsilon(\sigma^{++}, s+1) = \{x\}$;
2. otherwise, let $\sigma^{++} = \sigma^+\hat{\ }1$ and $\alpha(\sigma^{++}, s+1) = \{x\}$.

Case 2). Otherwise, let $\sigma^{++} = \sigma^+\hat{\ }1$ and $\alpha(\sigma^{++}, s+1) = \{x\}$.

$|\sigma|$ **odd.** Let $|\sigma| = 2i+1$. We distinguish two cases.

Case 1). $(\exists D)[i \in \Phi_i^D \,\&\, D \cap \bigcup\{\epsilon(\rho, s+1) : \rho \preceq \sigma\} = \emptyset]$.

In this case, let $\sigma^{++} = \sigma\hat{\ }0$, and let $\alpha(\sigma, s+1) = D$ for the least such D.

Case 2). Otherwise, let $\sigma^{++} = \sigma\hat{\ }1$.

Definition of A^{s+1}. At the end of stage $s+1$, let

$$A^{s+1} = (A^s \cup \bigcup\{\alpha(\rho, s+1) : \rho \preceq \delta_{s+1}\}) - \bigcup\{\epsilon(\rho, s+1) : \rho \preceq \delta_{s+1}\}.$$

3.5 Verification

The verification is based upon the following lemmas.

Lemma 3.5 *For every n, $\sigma_n = \liminf_s \delta_s \restriction n$ exists.*

Proof. Assume by induction that the claim is true of n. The only nontrivial case is when $|\sigma_n|$ is even, where, say, the requirement $\mathcal{P}_{e,i,j}$ is assigned to σ_n.

Let h be the canonical index of $\overline{B_i} \restriction j$. It is clear that, whenever we assign a precondition to h, then this precondition becomes satisfied at some later stage. Hence, at infinitely many stages s, $h \in \mathcal{L}(\sigma_n, s)$, and at infinitely many stages t, $h = h(\sigma_n, t)$. On the other hand, it is also clear that for almost all stages s, if $h' \in \mathcal{L}(\sigma_n, s)$, then $D_{h'} \subseteq D_h$, hence $h' \leq h$ by the usual coding of canonical sets. Therefore it follows that $\sigma_{n+1} = \sigma_n{}^\frown(h, r)$, for some $r \in \{0, 1\}$. $\square$

Let $f = \bigcup_{n\in\omega} \sigma_n$.

Lemma 3.6 *For every $\tau \in \hat{T}$, if $\tau \subset f$, then $\alpha(\tau) = \lim_s \alpha(\tau, s)$, $\epsilon(\tau) = \lim_s \epsilon(\tau, s)$ and $x(\tau) = \lim_s x(\tau, s)$ exist. Moreover, if $\tau = \sigma_n$ for some n, then the requirement assigned to σ_n is satisfied.*

Proof. By induction on n, we show that if $\tau = \sigma_n$ or $\tau = \sigma_n^+$, where $\sigma_{n+1} = \sigma_n^{+\frown} r$ for some $r \in \{0, 1\}$ (of course $\sigma_n^+ = \sigma_n$ if n is odd), then $\lim_s \alpha(\tau, s)$, $\lim_s \epsilon(\tau, s)$ and $\lim_s x(\tau, s)$ exist, and the requirement assigned to σ_n is satisfied. The case $n = 0$ is trivial as are the existence of the required limits for all nodes to the left of the true path.

Assume that the claim is true of n. For every $\tau \in \hat{T}$ such that $\tau \preceq \sigma_n$, let $\alpha(\tau) = \lim_s \alpha(\tau, s)$, $\epsilon(\tau) = \lim_s \epsilon(\tau, s)$ and $x(\tau) = \lim_s x(\tau, s)$; and let t be a stage such that, for every $s \geq t$ and $\tau \preceq \sigma_n$, $\alpha(\tau) = \alpha(\tau, s)$, $\epsilon(\tau) = \epsilon(\tau, s)$ and $x(\tau) = x(\tau, s)$.

Suppose first that $|\sigma_n|$ is even, and let $\mathcal{P}_{e,i,j}$ be the requirement assigned to σ_n. Let $\sigma_{n+1} = \sigma_n{}^\frown(h, i)$, and let $\sigma_n^+ = \sigma_n{}^\frown h$. Then

$$x(\sigma_n^+) = \min x \in (\xi_{\sigma_n^+} - \bigcup_{\tau \preceq \sigma_n} \alpha(\tau)).$$

- If there are no finite sets D, E such that $D \cap D_h = \emptyset$, $x(\sigma_n^+) \in \Phi_e^D$, $E \cap \bigcup_{\tau \preceq \sigma_n} \epsilon(\tau) = \emptyset$ and $D \subseteq \Psi_e^E$, then $\sigma_{n+1} = \sigma_n^{+\frown} 1$,

  $$\lim_s \epsilon(\sigma_n^+, s) = \lim_s \epsilon(\sigma_{n+1}, s) = \emptyset,$$

  $\lim_s \alpha(\sigma_n^+, s) = \emptyset$, $\lim_s \alpha(\sigma_{n+1}, s) = \{x(\sigma_n^+)\}$ and $x(\sigma_n^+) \in A$. Moreover, either $x(\sigma_n^+) \in A - \Phi_e^{B_i}$, or $x(\sigma_n^+) \in \Phi_e^D$, for some $D \subseteq B_i$, but $D \not\subseteq \Psi_e^A$.

- If D, E exist, then we eventually choose the least such pair D, E, hence $\alpha(\sigma_n^+) = E - \{x(\sigma_n^+)\}$, $\epsilon(\sigma_n^+) = \emptyset$, and either (a) or (b) holds:

  (a) $\sigma_{n+1} = \sigma_n^{+\frown}0$ and $\alpha(\sigma_{n+1}) = \emptyset$, $\epsilon(\sigma_{n+1}) = \{x(\sigma_n^+)\}$;

  (b) $\sigma_{n+1} = \sigma_n^{+\frown}1$ and $\alpha(\sigma_{n+1}) = \{x(\sigma_n^+)\}$, $\epsilon(\sigma_{n+1}) = \emptyset$.

  In case (a) either

  (a_1) there exist infinitely many stages s such that $\sigma_n^{+\frown}1 \subseteq \delta_s$, in which case, there exists some $y \in D$ such that $\lim_s B_i^s(y)$ does not exist; or

  (a_2) $D \subseteq B_i$ but $x(\sigma_n^+) \notin A$, giving $x(\sigma_n^+) \in \Phi_e^{B_i} - A$.

  In (b) we have $D \not\subseteq B_i$, but $E \subseteq A$, hence $D \subseteq \Psi_e^A$.

Remark 3.7 Notice that if j is such that $\lim_s B_i^s(y)$ exists for every $y \geq j$, then (a_1) does not occur, by Lemma 3.3.

If $|\sigma_n| = 2i+1$ is odd and $i \in \Phi_i^D$, for some finite set D such that $D \cap \bigcup_{\tau \preceq \sigma_n} \epsilon(\tau) = \emptyset$, then $\sigma_{n+1} = \sigma_n{}^\frown 0$ and $\alpha(\sigma_{n+1}) = D$, for some such D; otherwise $\sigma_{n+1} = \sigma_n{}^\frown 1$ and $\alpha(\sigma_{n+1}) = \emptyset$. In either case $\epsilon(\sigma_{n+1}) = \emptyset$.

The proof of the lemma is now complete. □

Lemma 3.8 $K^A \leq_T C$.

Proof. We will show that, for every n, one can compute σ_n recursively in C.

Now, $\sigma_0 = \emptyset$. Assume by induction that we can compute σ_n and a stage s_n such that $\tau \not\subseteq \delta_s$, for every $s \geq s_n$ and $\tau \prec_L \sigma_n$ and each parameter at any $\tau \preceq \sigma_n$ has reached its limit by stage s_n. Assume first that $|\sigma_n|$ is even, and let $\mathcal{P}_{e,i,j}$ be the requirement assigned to σ_n. Since C can compute $B_i \upharpoonright j$, it follows that C can compute the first component, $h = \lim_s h(\sigma_n, s)$, of the outcome of σ_n. Moreover, since $\emptyset' \leq_T C$, C can compute the least stage $s_n^+ \geq s_n$ such that $\tau \not\subseteq \delta_s$, for every $\tau \prec_L \sigma_n{}^\frown h$ (since for every $x \in B_i \upharpoonright j$ and every t, one can compute in $\emptyset'$ whether there exists some $s \geq t$ such that $x \notin B_i^s$). Again, using $\emptyset'$ as an oracle, one can compute whether Case 1 or Case 2 of the construction holds, thus computing σ_{n+1} and the corresponding s_{n+1}.

A similar argument applies in the case $|\sigma_n| = 2i+1$, for some i, since the oracle $\emptyset'$ can compute whether or not there exists some stage $s \geq s_n$ and some finite D such that $i \in \Phi_i^D$, and $D \cap \bigcup_{\tau \preceq \sigma_n} \epsilon(\tau, s_n) = \emptyset$.

It follows that $i \in K^A$ if and only if $\sigma_{2i+2} = \sigma_{2i+1}{}^\frown 0$, thus $K^A \leq_T C$. □

Remark 3.9 We expect that, by combining the above construction of A with a variant of the coding procedure and the associated guessing at outcomes used in the tree proof of the Sacks' jump inversion theorem, one can actually guarantee that $J_e(A) \equiv_e \chi_C$.

References

[BCS97] S. Bereznyuk, R. Coles, and A. Sorbi. The distribution of properly Σ^0_2 enumeration degrees. preprint, 1997.

[CC88] S. B. Cooper and C. S. Copestake. Properly Σ_2 enumeration degrees. *Z. Math. Logik Grundlag. Math.*, 34:491–522, 1988.

[Coo90] S. B. Cooper. Enumeration reducibility, nondeterministic computations and relative computability of partial functions. In K. Ambos-Spies, G. Müller, and G. E. Sacks, editors, *Recursion Theory Week, Oberwolfach 1989*, volume 1432 of *Lecture Notes in Mathematics*, pages 57–110, Heidelberg, 1990. Springer–Verlag.

[Ler83] M. Lerman. *Degrees of Unsolvability.* Perspectives in Mathematical Logic. Springer–Verlag, Heidelberg, 1983.

[LS92] A. H. Lachlan and R. A. Shore. The n-rea enumeration degrees are dense. *Arch. Math. Logic*, 31:277–285, 1992.

[MC85] K. McEvoy and S. B. Cooper. On minimal pairs of enumeration degrees. *J. Symbolic Logic*, 50:839–848, 1985.

[McE85] K. McEvoy. Jumps of quasi–minimal enumeration degrees. *J. Symbolic Logic*, 50:839–848, 1985.

[Med55] Y. T. Medevdev. Degrees of difficulty of the mass problems. *Dokl. Nauk. SSSR*, 104:501–504, 1955.

[Rog67] H. Rogers, Jr. *Theory of Recursive Functions and Effective Computability.* McGraw-Hill, New York, 1967.

[Soa87] R. I. Soare. *Recursively Enumerable Sets and Degrees.* Perspectives in Mathematical Logic, Omega Series. Springer–Verlag, Heidelberg, 1987.