The Journal of Symbolic Logic
Volume 91, Number 2, June 2026

INTROENUMERABILITY, AUTOREDUCIBILITY, AND RANDOMNESS

ANG LI

Abstract. We define Ψ-autoreducible sets given an autoreduction procedure Ψ. Then, we show that for any Ψ, a measurable class of Ψ-autoreducible sets has measure zero. Using this, we show that classes of cototal, uniformly introenumerable, introenumerable, and hyper-cototal enumeration degrees all have measure zero.

By analyzing the arithmetical complexity of the classes of cototal sets and cototal enumeration degrees, we show that weakly 2-random sets cannot be cototal and weakly 3-random sets cannot be of cototal enumeration degree. Then, we see that this result is optimal by showing that there exists a 1-random cototal set and a 2-random set of cototal enumeration degree. For uniformly introenumerable degrees and introenumerable degrees, we utilize Ψ-autoreducibility again to show the optimal result that no weakly 3-random sets can have introenumerable enumeration degree. We also show that no 1-random set can be introenumerable.

§1. Introduction. In 1959, Friedberg and Rogers [4] introduced enumeration reducibility. A set $A \subseteq \omega$ is *enumeration reducible* to another set $B \subseteq \omega$ if there is a c.e. set W such that $A = \{x : (\exists y)\langle x, y\rangle \in W \text{ and } D_y \subseteq B\}$, where $\{D_y\}_{y\in\omega}$ gives a computable listing of all finite sets. We call the c.e. set W that witnesses this reduction an enumeration operator and write $A = W(B)$. The degree structure induced by enumeration reduction $\leq_e$ consists of the enumeration degrees. We can identify subsets of ω with infinite strings in the Cantor space 2^ω. Therefore, we can consider the measure of different classes of enumeration degrees (often abbreviated by e-degrees), including cototal e-degrees, uniformly introenumerable e-degrees, introenumerable e-degrees, and hyper-cototal e-degrees.

Given a set A of natural numbers and any number n, we may ask whether the membership of n in A can be determined using the oracle A without asking "is n in A". If so, A has a kind of self-reducibility. The notion of autoreducibility introduced by Trakhtenbrot [12] in 1970 is a formalization of this idea. A set A is said to be *autoreducible* if there is a Turing functional Φ such that for any n, $A(n) = \Phi^{A-\{n\}}(n)$. We will generalize the autoreduction notion by defining Ψ-autoreducibility for any autoreduction procedure Ψ, which is a function from $\omega \times 2^\omega$ to $\{0, 1\}$. The classes of enumeration degrees mentioned above all have natural autoreducibility by replacing

Received September 1, 2023.
2020 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 03D30, 03D32.
Key words and Phrases. logic, computability theory, enumeration degree, algorithmic randomness, cototal, measure, autoreducible, introenumerable.

© The Author(s), 2023. Published by Cambridge University Press on behalf of The Association for Symbolic Logic. This is an Open Access article, distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution licence (https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/), which permits unrestricted re-use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

0022-4812/26/9102-0006
DOI:10.1017/jsl.2023.95

https://doi.org/10.1017/jsl.2023.95 Published online by Cambridge University Press

the Turing functional with different autoreduction procedures. Next, we will show that any measurable class of Ψ-autoreducible sets has measure zero for any Ψ. Then, we use this property of classes of Ψ-autoreducible sets to show that the classes of above e-degrees all have measure zero.

Intuitively, given a set $A \subseteq \omega$, or equivalently an infinite string in 2^ω, it is random if it is hard to compress or one cannot predict the next bit or it has no rare properties. In 1966, Martin-Löf introduced a randomness notion using the latter idea that a random set is in no effective measure zero set in [8]. An infinite string $A \in 2^\omega$ is *Martin-Löf random* (*n-random*), if A is not in $\bigcap_m G_m$, where $\{G_m\}_{m\in\omega}$ is any uniformly Σ^0_1 (Σ^0_n, respectively) sequence of open sets such that the measure of each G_m is smaller than 2^{-m}. A set A is *weakly n-random* if A avoids all Π^0_n classes. Generally, a set is random if it avoids a particular kind of null classes. Such null classes can be arithmetical as above or even go beyond arithmetical.

Since our classes of e-degrees have measure zero, sufficiently random sets must avoid such measure zero classes. Therefore, we can ask questions about what level of randomness the above sets or e-degrees can reach, and what level of randomness the above sets or e-degrees must avoid. We answer such questions for cototal sets, cototal e-degrees, uniformly introenumerable sets, uniformly introenumerable e-degrees, introenumerable sets, and introenumerable e-degrees. For references for randomness notions, see [2] or [10].

We start by giving the definitions of the sets and e-degrees we mentioned. First, a set A is *total* if $\overline{A} \leq_e A$. It is named total because the degree of a total set is the degree of the graph of a total function. In [1], the notion of cototality is given by reversing the relationship between A and $\overline{A}$.

Definition 1.1. A set A is *cototal* when $A \leq_e \overline{A}$.

Definition 1.2. An infinite set X is *uniformly introenumerable* if there is an enumeration operator Γ such that for every infinite subset Y of X, $\Gamma(Y) = X$.

In [7], Jockush introduced the notion of uniform introenumerability. The definition of uniform introenumerability we give here is slightly different by using an enumeration operator instead of a c.e. operator, though the two definitions were shown to be equivalent in [6] by Greenberg et al. Recently, Goh et al. [5] also showed that Jockush's notion of (non-uniform) introenumerability is equivalent to the following notion:

Definition 1.3. An infinite set X is *introenumerable* if, for every infinite subset Y of X, there is an enumeration operator Γ such that $\Gamma(Y) = X$.

In [11], Sanchis introduced a reduction that is related to hyperarithmetical reduction and only uses positive information about membership in the set:

Definition 1.4. Let A and B be sets such that, for some c.e. set W, the following relation holds: $x \in B$ if and only if

$$(\forall f \in \omega^{<\omega})(\exists n, y)[\langle f \upharpoonright n, x, y\rangle \in W \wedge D_y \subseteq A].$$

Then we say that B is *hyper-enumeration* reducible to A and write this relation: $B \leq_{he} A$.

Definition 1.5. A is called *hyper-cototal* if $A \leq_{he} \overline{A}$.

https://doi.org/10.1017/jsl.2023.95 Published online by Cambridge University Press

THEOREM 1.6. *The relationship of enumeration degrees of the above notions is the following*:

$$\begin{array}{c} \textit{Cototal} \to \textit{Uniformly Introenumerable} \\ \dashrightarrow \textit{Introenumerable} \to \textit{Hyper-cototal}. \end{array}$$

REMARK 1.7. The solid arrows are strict. For proof of the first arrow, see [9]. The third arrow and the strictness of the first arrow are proved in [5] by Goh et al. It is still unknown whether there is a set of introenumerable e-degree that does not have uniformly introenumerable e-degree.

§2. Measure of classes with autoreduction. In this section, we define Ψ-autoreducible sets given an autoreduction procedure Ψ and show that any measurable class of Ψ-autoreduction sets has measure zero. Next, we apply the autoreducibility of hyper-cototal e-degrees to show that the measure of the class of such e-degrees is zero.

DEFINITION 2.1. Given a function $\Psi : \omega \times 2^\omega \to \{0,1\}$, A set A is Ψ-*autoreducible* if and only if

$$(\forall n)[A(n) = \Psi(n, A - \{n\})].$$

Here, we say that the function Ψ is an autoreduction procedure.

Next, to show that the measure of a class of Ψ-autoreducible sets is zero, we use the Lebesgue density theorem.

THEOREM 2.2. *Fix an autoreduction procedure* Ψ, *a measurable class* S *of* Ψ-*autoreducible sets has measure zero.*

PROOF. Suppose a class S of Ψ-autoreducible sets has positive measure. By the Lebesgue density theorem, for any $\varepsilon > 0$, there is a string $\sigma \in 2^{<\omega}$ such that $\frac{\mu(S \cap [\sigma])}{\mu(S)} \geq 1 - \varepsilon$. Fix $\varepsilon = \frac{1}{4}$ along with the corresponding string σ. Consider an $n \in \omega$ larger than $|\sigma|$. Define subsets $P_i (i = 0, 1)$ of S as follows:

$$P_i = \{X \in S : \Psi(n, X - \{n\}) = i\}.$$

Since P_0 and P_1 partition S, one of them must have the following relative measure: $\frac{\mu(P_i \cap [\sigma])}{\mu(S)} \geq \frac{1-\varepsilon}{2} = \frac{3}{8}$. Without loss of generality, assume that such subset is P_0. Now, consider the set

$$P_2 = \{\hat{X} : X \in P_0, \hat{X}(n) = 1, (\forall i \neq n)[X(i) = \hat{X}(i)]\}.$$

Notice that if $x \in P_0$, $X(n) = 0$. So, P_2 also has relative measure $\frac{\mu(P_2 \cap [\sigma])}{\mu(S)} \geq \frac{3}{8} > \frac{1}{4}$. Therefore, $\frac{\mu(P_2 \cap S \cap [\sigma])}{\mu(S)} > 0$. So, $P_2 \cap S$ is not empty. For any $Y \in P_2 \cap S$, $\Psi(n, Y - \{n\}) = 0 \neq 1 = Y(n)$. This is a contradiction. Therefore, S has measure zero. ⊣

REMARK 2.3. In this theorem, the assumption that the class S is measurable is necessary. Consider the finite difference equivalence classes: two sets A and B are in the same equivalence class if and only $(A - B) \cup (B - A)$ is finite. Now, we can define a class S_0 that contains exactly one element from each of the equivalence

https://doi.org/10.1017/jsl.2023.95 Published online by Cambridge University Press

classes. It is not difficult to see that S_0 is not measurable. We can define a function Ψ_0 such that if $A \in S_0$ and $n \in \omega$, then $\Psi_0(n, A - \{n\}) = A(n)$. It is well-defined because, for any $B \in S_0$ and $B - \{n\} = A - \{n\}$, $\Psi_0(n, B - \{n\})$ has to equal $A(n)$ by the definition of S_0. Therefore, S_0 is a class consisting of Ψ_0-autoreducible sets that does not have measure zero since it is not measurable.

Now we use the above theorem to show that the measure of the class of hyper-cototal e-degrees is zero. First, we discuss the autoreducibility of hyper-cototal sets.

LEMMA 2.4. *For every hyper-cototal set A, there is a Ψ such that A is Ψ-autoreducible.*

PROOF. Suppose A is hyper-cototal and there is some hyper-enumeration operator Δ such that $A = \Delta(\overline{A})$. When $n \in A$, $\overline{A} \subseteq \overline{A - \{n\}}$. Therefore, $n \in \Delta^{\overline{A}} \subseteq \Delta^{\overline{A-\{n\}}}$. When $n \notin A$, $n \notin \Delta^{\overline{A}} = \Delta^{\overline{A-\{n\}}}$. So, $A(n) = \Delta^{\overline{A-\{n\}}}(n)$. Then, we can define $\Psi(n, X) := \Delta^{\overline{X}}(n)$. ⊣

In fact, each set of hyper-cototal degree is Ψ-autoreducible for some autoreduction procedure Ψ as well.

LEMMA 2.5. *Any set in the class of hyper-cototal e-degrees is a hyper-cototal set.*

PROOF. In [11], Sanchis proved that If $A \leq_e B$, then $A \leq_{he} B$ and $\overline{A} \leq_{he} \overline{B}$. Suppose A has hyper-cototal e-degree and $A \equiv_e B$, where B is a hyper-cototal set. Then, $A \equiv_{he} B \leq_{he} \overline{B} \equiv_{he} \overline{A}$. ⊣

Next, in order to apply Theorem 2.2 to show that the measure of the classes of hyper-cototal e-degrees is 0, we first need to show that the class of hyper-cototal e-degrees is measurable by analyzing the arithmetical complexity of

$$\{A : A \leq_{he} \overline{A}\} = \bigcup_{\Gamma} \{A : (\forall n)[n \in A \to n \in \Gamma^{\overline{A}} \wedge n \notin A \to n \notin \Gamma^{\overline{A}}]\}.$$

Notice that $n \in \Gamma^{\overline{A}}$ and $n \notin \Gamma^{\overline{A}}$ are Π^1_1 and Σ^1_1, respectively, for a hyper-enumeration operator Γ by Definition 1.4. So, the class of hyper-cototal e-degrees is the difference of two Π^1_1 classes. Recall that Π^1_1 sets are measurable. Therefore, the class of hyper-cototal e-degrees is measurable. Now, we use the results from above to see that the class of hyper-cototal e-degrees has measure zero.

LEMMA 2.6. *The classes of hyper-cototal, introenumerable, uniformly introenumerable, and cototal e-degrees all have measure zero.*

PROOF. Suppose the class of hyper-cototal e-degrees has positive measure. Because there are only countably many hyper-enumeration operators, there exists a Γ such that the class of hyper-cototal e-degrees witnessed by this operator has positive measure. However, any set in this class would be Γ-autoreducible by Lemma 2.4. Now, applying Theorem 2.2 gives us a contradiction. By the relationship between the e-degrees mentioned above in Theorem 1.6, we see that the measure of these classes are all zero. ⊣

§3. Bounds of randomness. Notice that, for any class of measure zero, sufficiently random sets avoid it. So, we now discuss what level of randomness these e-degrees could and could not have. In this section, all necessary background knowledge of

https://doi.org/10.1017/jsl.2023.95 Published online by Cambridge University Press

randomness is from Nies' book [10]. We first discuss the class of cototal sets and the class of cototal e-degrees.

THEOREM 3.1. *Weakly 2-random sets are not cototal.*

PROOF. The class of cototal sets $\{A : A \leq_e \overline{A}\}$ is defined by

$$\bigcup_e \{A : A = \Gamma_e^{\overline{A}}\} = \bigcup_e \{A : \forall n[n \in A \to (\exists D_y \subseteq \overline{A})[\langle n, y\rangle \in \Gamma_e\rangle] \\ \wedge n \notin A \to (\forall y)[\langle n, y\rangle \in \Gamma_e \to D_y \cap A \neq \emptyset]]\},$$

where Γ_e's are enumeration operators. Therefore, the class of cototal sets is a union of Π^0_2 classes. By Lemma 2.6, all such classes have measure zero. Because any weakly 2-random set avoids all null Π^0_2 classes, weakly 2-random sets are not cototal. ⊣

To see that weak 2-randomness is optimal, we show that the 1-random Chaitin's Ω is a cototal set.

THEOREM 3.2. *There exists a 1-random cototal set.*

PROOF. Because Ω is left-c.e., there is a non-descending computable sequence $\{q_n\}$ of rationals such that $\Omega = \lim_{n\to\infty} q_n$. For any enumeration of $\overline{\Omega}$, we can enumerate Ω using this computable sequence. First, to determine whether 0 is in Ω or not, either for some n, we see the dyadic expansion of q_n starts with 1 or we see 1 enter $\overline{\Omega}$. Only for the first case, we enumerate 0 in Ω. Then, we can iteratively do this process for each nature number in order. Eventually, we obtain an enumeration of Ω. Therefore, $\Omega \leq_e \overline{\Omega}$. ⊣

For the class of cototal e-degrees, we first discuss what level of randomness is enough to avoid them.

THEOREM 3.3. *Weakly 3-random sets do not have cototal e-degree.*

PROOF. Notice that the class of cototal e-degrees defined by an enumeration operator Γ_e is

$$\{A : A = \Gamma_e^{\overline{K_A}}\} = \{A : (\forall n)[n \in A \to (\exists y)[\langle n, y\rangle \in \Gamma_e \to D_y \cap K_A = \emptyset] \\ \wedge n \notin A \to (\forall y)[\langle n, y\rangle \in \Gamma_e \to D_y \cap K_A \neq \emptyset]]\}.$$

Since $D \cap K_A = \emptyset$ and $D \cap K_A \neq \emptyset$ are Π^0_1 and Σ^0_1 respectively, the class of cototal e-degrees defined by Γ_e is Π^0_3. Since each of these classes is null, weakly 3-random sets avoid them all. So, we conclude that weakly 3-random sets do not have cototal e-degree. ⊣

Next, we see that weak 3-randomness is optimal by showing that there is a 2-random set of cototal e-degree even though any cototal set cannot be weakly 2-random.

THEOREM 3.4. *There exists a 2-random set of cototal e-degree.*

PROOF. Consider Chaitin's Ω relativized to $\emptyset'$, i.e., $\Omega^{\emptyset'}$, which is 2-random. Let L be $\{q \in \mathbb{Q}_2 : q < \Omega^{\emptyset'}\}$. Then, $L \leq_e \Omega^{\emptyset'} \leq_e L \oplus \overline{L}$. Notice that L is Σ^0_2. In [1], it was shown that every Σ^0_2 set has cototal e-degree. So, there exists M

https://doi.org/10.1017/jsl.2023.95 Published online by Cambridge University Press

such that $M \equiv_e L$ and $\overline{M} \geq_e M$. Then, $\overline{\Omega^{\emptyset'} \oplus L \oplus M} \geq_e \overline{L} \oplus \overline{M} \geq_e \overline{L} \oplus M \equiv_e \overline{L} \oplus L \geq_e \Omega^{\emptyset'} \equiv_e \Omega^{\emptyset'} \oplus L \oplus L \equiv_e \Omega^{\emptyset'} \oplus L \oplus M$. Hence, we have a cototal set that is enumeration equivalent to $\Omega^{\emptyset'}$. ⊣

In the proofs above, we did not use autoreducibility since it is enough to analyze the arithmetical complexities of the class of cototal sets and the class of cototal e-degrees to show the optimal level of randomness the sets in these classes must avoid. However, a similar analysis would not work for the classes of (uniform) introenumerable sets or e-degrees. We can verify the complexity of the collection of uniformly introenumerable e-degrees:

$$\bigcup_e \{A : \exists i, m \forall B[\forall a[a \in A \leftrightarrow \exists b[\langle a, b\rangle \in \Gamma_m \wedge D_b \subseteq \Gamma_i(A)]] \wedge [B \subseteq \Gamma_i(A) \wedge [\forall p \in B \exists q > p] \rightarrow \forall t[t \in \Gamma_i(A) \leftrightarrow \exists s[\langle t, s\rangle \in \Gamma_e \wedge D_s \subseteq B]]]]\}.$$

This is Π^1_1. We suspect that the class of uniformly introenumerable e-degrees is Π^1_1-complete. This was shown to be true for the class of uniformly introreducible sets in [6]. Assuming that there is no simpler definition, the analysis we used for cototal e-degrees would not work. Instead, for each set A of uniform introenumerable e-degree, we show Ψ-autoreducibility for some autoreduction procedure Ψ so that we can apply Theorem 2.2 again.

THEOREM 3.5. *Weakly* 3*-random sets do not have uniformly introenumerable e-degree.*

PROOF. We will show that uniformly introenumerable e-degrees are contained in a countable union of measure zero Π^0_3 classes. To do this, we show that each set A of uniformly introenumerable e-degree is Ψ-autoreducible for some Ψ. Since A has uniformly introenumerable e-degree, there is a set B, enumeration operators Φ, Γ, and Δ such that $A = \Delta(B)$, $B = \Phi(A)$, and for any infinite subset C of B, $\Gamma(C) = B$. Let

$$\Psi(n, Z) = \begin{cases} 1, & n \in \Delta(\Gamma(\Phi(Z))) \\ & \text{or } \Phi(Z) \text{ is finite,} \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Note that n has to be in A when $\Phi(A - \{n\})$ is finite. So, A is Ψ-autoreducible. Now we consider the class of Ψ-autoreducible sets:

$$\{D : \forall n[[n \in D \rightarrow n \in \Delta(\Gamma(\Phi(D - \{n\})))) \vee (\exists p \forall t > p)[t \notin \Phi(D - \{n\})]] \wedge [n \notin D \rightarrow (\forall q \exists s > q)[s \in \Phi(D - \{n\})] \wedge n \notin \Delta(\Gamma(\Phi(D - \{n\})))]]\}.$$

This is a Π^0_3 class. By Theorem 2.2, this is a null class. Because weakly 3-random sets cannot be in any Π^0_3 null class, weakly 3-random sets do not have uniformly introenumerable e-degree. ⊣

https://doi.org/10.1017/jsl.2023.95 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Meanwhile, there also exists 2-random uniformly introenumerable e-degrees because of Theorem 3.4 and the fact that every set of cototal e-degree has uniform introenumerable e-degree.

With more work, the previous result can be improved to show that weakly 3-random sets do not have introenumerable e-degree either.

THEOREM 3.6. *No weakly* 3*-random set has introenumerable e-degree.*

PROOF. Suppose a weakly 3-random set A has introenumerable e-degree. Let B be an introenumerable set such that there are enumeration operators Φ and Δ with $A = \Delta(B)$ and $B = \Phi(A)$. For a contradiction, we define $C = \bigcup_i c_i$ as an infinite subset of B such that $\Gamma_i(C) \neq B$ for any enumeration operator Γ_i (here we identified strings c_i with corresponding sets). When we are constructing C, we also define a set D_i at each stage i. Let $c_0 = \emptyset$ and $D_0 = \emptyset$. Suppose c_i and D_i have been defined. By inductive assumption, $\Phi(A - D_i)$ is infinite. First, we consider whether there is an extension e of c_i such that $e \preccurlyeq c_i\Phi(A - D_i) \upharpoonright [|c_i|, \infty)$, and $\Gamma_i(e) - B \neq \emptyset$. If so, we define c_{i+1} to be the least such e that contains at least one more element than c_i and $D_{i+1} = D_i$. If not, we consider whether there is an extension e of c_i such that for some n, $\Phi(A - D_i \cup \{n\})$ is infinite, $e \preccurlyeq c_i\Phi(A - D_i) \upharpoonright [|c_i|, \infty)$, and $\Gamma_i(e\Phi(A - D_i \cup \{n\}) \upharpoonright [|e|, \infty)) \subsetneq B$. If so, we define c_{i+1} to be the least such e that contains at least one more element than c_i, and $D_{i+1} = D_i \cup \{n\}$. If not, we can define

$$\Psi(n, Z) = \begin{cases} 1, & n \in \Delta(\Gamma_i(c_i\Phi(Z - D_i) \upharpoonright [|c_i|, \infty))) \\ & \text{or } \Phi(Z - D_i) \text{ is finite,} \\ 0, & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

similar to the proof in Theorem 3.5. Notice that A is Ψ-autoreducible and the class of Ψ-autoreducible sets is Π^0_3. This is impossible because A is weakly 3-random. This is a contradiction. Therefore, at least one of the two cases we considered has to be true. In this way, we obtain an infinite $C = \bigcup_i c_i \subseteq B$. Now we show that $\Gamma_i(C) \neq B$ for any i. For any i, if the first case we considered is true, then $\Gamma_i(C)$ contains an element not in B. If the second case is true, $\Gamma_i(C) \subseteq \Gamma_i(c_{i+1}\Phi(A - D_{i+1}) \upharpoonright [|c_{i+1}|, \infty)) \subsetneq B$. ⊣

Again, by Theorems 1.6 and 3.4, we conclude that there exists 2-random introenumerable e-degree while there is no weakly 3-random introenumerable e-degree. Next, we consider the class of uniformly introenumerable sets. We use the proof ideas of Proposition 8 given by Figueira, Miller, and Nies in [3] that showed no random is autoreducible.

THEOREM 3.7. *No* 1*-random set is uniformly introenumerable.*

PROOF. We will apply Schnorr's theorem. To do so, we will show that the initial segment of any uniformly introenumerable set A can be compressed beyond any fixed constant.

Let Γ be the enumeration operator such that $\Gamma(B) = A$ for any infinite subset B of A. For each m, there is a least n_m such that $n_m > n_p$ for any $p < m$ and $\Gamma_{n_m}(0^m A \upharpoonright [m, n_m)) \upharpoonright m = A \upharpoonright m$ since $A - \{0, 1, \ldots, m-1\}$ is an infinite subset of A. Let c_m be the number of 1's in the string $A \upharpoonright m$.

Now we define a prefix-free machine M that outputs $A \upharpoonright n_m$ with input $\gamma = 0^{|\sigma|}1\sigma 0^{|\tau|}1\tau A \upharpoonright [m, n_m)$, where σ, τ are binary strings corresponding to m, c_m.

https://doi.org/10.1017/jsl.2023.95 Published online by Cambridge University Press

M first obtains the length of σ by reading until the first 1 and then obtains the number m by reading $|\sigma|$ many bits after the first 1. Next, M can find out c_m in the same way by reading the input until τ. Now, M's read head keeps on moving forward to read $A \upharpoonright [m, n_m)$ bit by bit to do the enumeration of $\Gamma(0^m A \upharpoonright [m, n_m)) \upharpoonright m$ step by step to enumerate $A(x)$ for x between 0 and $m-1$ until c_m many of such $A(x)$ is determined to be 1, which means the other bits on $A \upharpoonright m$ are zeros. M can output $A \upharpoonright n_m$ by concatenation. Therefore, $K(A \upharpoonright n_m) \leq^+ n_m - m + 4\log(m)$. By Schnorr's theorem, A is not 1-random. ⊣

For introenumerable sets, we combine the methods used in Theorems 3.6 and 3.7.

THEOREM 3.8. *No* 1*-random set is introenumerable.*

PROOF. Suppose there is a 1-random introenumerable set A. We prove the theorem by constructing an infinite subset $B = \bigcup_i b_i$ of A such that $\Gamma_i(B) \neq A$ for any enumeration operator Γ_i (here we identified the strings b_i with its corresponding set).

Let $b_0 = \emptyset$. Suppose we have already defined b_i. There are two possible cases. One of the two cases must hold for it to be 1-random.

First, We consider whether there is an n such that $\Gamma_i(b_i A \upharpoonright [|b_i|, n))$ contains an element that is not in A. If so, we let $b_{i+1} = b_i A \upharpoonright [|b_i|, n)$. In this case, we have a finite extension b_{i+1} of b_i such that b_{i+1} is a subset of A, and for any infinite extension B of b_{i+1}, $\Gamma_i(B)$ has an element not in A.

Second, if there is no such n in the first case, we consider whether there is an m such that $\Gamma_i(b_i 0^m A \upharpoonright [|b_i| + m, \infty)) \subsetneq A$. If so, we let $b_{i+1} = b_i 0^m$. In this case, we have a finite extension b_{i+1} of b_i such that applying Γ_i to A's subset $b_{i+1} A \upharpoonright [|b_{i+1}|, \infty)$ does not output A.

If one of the cases holds for every i, we can show that for any i, $\Gamma_i(B) \neq A$, contradicting introenumerability. If the first case holds for i, then for any extension B_0 of b_{i+1}, $\Gamma_i(B_0) \neq A$. If the first case does not hold, notice that B is a subset of $B_1 = b_i 0^m A \upharpoonright [|b_i| + m, \infty)$. Then, $\Gamma_i(B) \subseteq \Gamma_i(B_1) \subsetneq A$.

If neither cases hold for some i, we show that A is not 1-random using a method similar to the one used in the proof of the above theorem. For each m, there is a least n_m such that $n_m > n_p$ for any $p < m$ and

$$\Gamma_{i,n_m}(b_i 0^m A \upharpoonright [|b_i| + m, n_m)) \upharpoonright |b_i| + m = A \upharpoonright |b_i| + m$$

because the failure of the second case guarantees that eventually numbers in $A \upharpoonright |b_i| + m$ will be enumerated and no other numbers would be enumerated by the failure of the first case. Let c_m be the number of 1s in the string $A \upharpoonright [|b_i|, |b_i| + m)$. Now we define a prefix-free machine M that outputs $A \upharpoonright n_m$ with input $\gamma = 0^{|\sigma|} 1 \sigma 0^{|\tau|} 1 \tau A \upharpoonright [|b_i| + m, n_m)$, where σ, τ are binary strings corresponding to m, c_m. M obtains m, c_m in the same way as the proof above by reading until τ. Then, M obtains the first $|b_i|$ bits of A using Γ_i. Next, its read head keeps on moving forward to read $A \upharpoonright [|b_i| + m, n_m)$ bit by bit to do the enumeration of $\Gamma_i(b_i 0^m A \upharpoonright [|b_i| + m, n_m))$ step by step to enumerate $A(x)$ for x between $|b_i|$ and $|b_i| + m - 1$ until c_m many of such $A(x)$ is determined to be 1 and output $A \upharpoonright n_m$ by concatenation. Therefore, $K(A \upharpoonright n_m) \leq^+ n_m - m + 4\log(m)$. By Schnorr's theorem, A is not 1-random. ⊣

https://doi.org/10.1017/jsl.2023.95 Published online by Cambridge University Press

REFERENCES

[1] U. Andrews, H. Ganchev, R. Kuyper, S. Lempp, J. Miller, A. Soskova, and M. Soskova, *On cototality and the skip operator in the enumeration degrees*. ***Transactions of the American Mathematical Society***, vol. 372 (2019), no. 3, pp. 1631–1670.

[2] R. G. Downey and D. R. Hirschfeldt, ***Algorithmic Randomness and Complexity***, Springer, New York, 2010.

[3] S. Figueira, J. Miller, and A. Nies, *Indifferent sets*. ***Journal of Logic and Computation***, vol. 19 (2009), no. 2, pp. 425–443.

[4] R. M. Friedberg and H. Rogers, *Reducibility and completeness for sets of integers*. ***Mathematical Logic Quarterly***, vol. 5 (1959), pp. 117–125.

[5] J. Le Goh, J. Jacobsen-Grocott, J. Miller, and M. Soskova, *Enumeration pointed trees*. In preparation.

[6] N. Greenberg, M. Harrison-Trainor, L. Patey, and D. Turetsky, *Computing sets from all infinite subsets*. ***Transactions of the American Mathematical Society***, vol. 374 (2021), no. 11, pp. 8131–8160.

[7] C. G. Jockusch, *Uniformly introreducible sets*, this Journal, vol. 33 (1969), no. 4, pp. 521–536.

[8] P. Martin-Löf, *The definition of random sequences*. ***Information and Control***, vol. 9 (1966), no. 6, pp. 602–619.

[9] E. McCarthy, *Cototal enumeration degrees and their applications to effective mathematics*. ***Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society***, vol. 146 (2018), no. 8, pp. 3541–3552.

[10] A. Nies, ***Computability and Randomness***, ***vol. 51***, OUP, Oxford, 2012.

[11] L. E. Sanchis, *Hyperenumeration reducibility*. ***Notre Dame Journal of Formal Logic***, vol. 19 (1978), no. 3, pp. 405–415.

[12] B. A. Trakhtenbrot, *Autoreducibility*. ***Doklady Akademii Nauk SSSR***, vol. 192 (1970), no. 6, pp. 1224–1227.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS
UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN–MADISON
480 LINCOLN DRIVE
MADISON, WI 53706, USA
E-mail: ali233@wisc.edu

https://doi.org/10.1017/jsl.2023.95 Published online by Cambridge University Press