

## A NOTE ON INFINITE SERIES OF ISOLS

JUDITH GERSTING

1. **Introduction.** Let  $E$  denote the collection of all nonnegative integers (numbers),  $\Lambda$  the collection of all isols, and  $\Lambda_R$  the collection of all regressive isols. In [3], J. C. E. Dekker introduced the definition of an infinite series of isols,  $\sum_T a_n$ , where  $T$  denotes a regressive isol and  $a_n$  denotes a function from  $E$  into  $E$ . We recall the definition: When  $T$  is a finite regressive isol,

$$\sum_T a_n = a_0 + \cdots + a_{T-1} \quad (0 \text{ if } T = 0).$$

When  $T$  is an infinite regressive isol,

$$\sum_T a_n = \text{Req} \sum_0^\infty j(t_n, \nu(a_n)),$$

where  $j(x, y)$  is a recursive function mapping  $E^2$  one-to-one onto  $E$ ,  $t_n$  is any regressive function ranging over a set in  $T$ , and for any number  $n$ ,  $\nu(n) = \{x \mid x < n\}$ . Some properties of infinite series of isols were studied in [1] and [3]. By results in [3],  $\sum_T a_n$  is an isol and is independent of the choice of the regressive function whose range is in  $T$ . In the particular case that  $a_n$  is a recursive function, then  $\sum_T a_n$  is a regressive isol [1, Theorem 1]. In [2], J. Barback studied some properties of regressive isols that can be represented as infinite series  $\sum_T a_n$  where the function  $a_n$  is not necessarily recursive. These regressive isols were of the form  $\sum_T a_n$  where  $T \leq^* a_{n-1}$ . The definition of the relation  $T \leq^* a_{n-1}$  is as follows: If  $T$  is finite, then  $T \leq^* a_{n-1}$ ; if  $T$  is infinite,  $T \leq^* a_{n-1}$  means that there is a regressive function  $t_n$  ranging over a set in  $T$  such that  $t_n \leq^* a_{n-1}$ , that is, the mapping  $t_n \rightarrow a_{n-1}$  has a partial recursive extension. The following properties are known about the  $\leq^*$  relation:

- (1) If  $T \leq^* a_n$ , then  $t_n \leq^* a_n$  for every regressive function  $t_n$  ranging over a set in  $T$ ;
- (2) if  $T \leq^* a_n$ , then  $T \leq^* a_{n-1}$ ;
- (3) if  $T \leq^* a_{n-1}$ , then  $\sum_T a_n$  is a regressive isol [2, Proposition 5]; and
- (4)  $T \leq^* a_n$  for every recursive function  $a_n$ .

Our first two theorems below deal with the following question: Let

---

Received by the editors February 20, 1970 and, in revised form, April 19, 1971.  
AMS 1970 subject classifications. Primary 02F40.

Copyright © 1972 Rocky Mountain Mathematics Consortium

$T$  be an infinite regressive isol and  $a_n$  a function from  $E$  into  $E$  such that  $T \leq^* a_n$ . By combining (2) and (3) above, we know that  $\sum_T a_n$  is a regressive isol. Let  $S$  be an isol such that  $S \leq \sum_T a_n$ . We know from [4] that  $S$  will be a regressive isol. Can  $S$  also be represented as an infinite sum over  $T$ ? Theorem 1 shows that this is the case; Theorem 2, however, indicates that even if  $a_n$  is a recursive function,  $S$  need not have a representation as  $\sum_T b_n$  for any recursive function  $b_n$  with  $b_n \leq a_n$ . Theorem 3 shows that the converse of (3) above is false, i.e.,  $T \leq^* a_{n-1}$  is not a necessary condition for  $\sum_T a_n$  to be a regressive isol.

## 2. Three theorems.

**THEOREM 1.** *Let  $T$  be an infinite regressive isol and  $a_n$  a function from  $E$  into  $E$  such that  $T \leq^* a_n$ . Let  $S$  be a (regressive) isol such that  $S \leq \sum_T a_n$ . Then there exists a function  $b_n$  from  $E$  into  $E$  such that*

- (a) 
$$T \leq^* b_n,$$
- (b) 
$$b_n \leq a_n \quad \text{for all } n \in E,$$
- (c) 
$$S = \sum_T b_n.$$

**PROOF.** Let  $t_n$  be any regressive function ranging over a set in  $T$ . Because  $T \leq^* a_n$ , it follows from results in [2] that  $\sum_T a_n$  is a regressive isol and that

$$(1) \quad j(t_0, 0), \dots, j(t_0, a_0 - 1), j(t_1, 0), \dots, j(t_1, a_1 - 1), \dots$$

represents a regressive enumeration of a set  $\tau \in \sum_T a_n$ . By the inequality  $S \leq \sum_T a_n$ , there exists a set  $\sigma \in S$  such that  $\sigma$  is a separated subset of  $\tau$ . Let  $s_n$  denote the function ranging over  $\sigma$  which preserves the ordering established in (1). It follows that  $s_n$  is a regressive function. We now wish to define a function  $b_n$  in such a manner that  $t_n \leq^* b_n$ . Let the number  $t_n$  be given for any  $n \in E$ . Because of the relation  $t_n \leq^* a_n$ , the set

$$(j(t_n, 0), \dots, j(t_n, a_n - 1)) \subset \tau$$

can be effectively generated. (Note that this set is empty in the event that  $a_n = 0$ .) Since  $\sigma$  is a separated subset of  $\tau$ , the number of elements of  $\sigma$  which appear in this set, say  $k$ , can be effectively determined. We define  $b_n = k$ .

Now  $b_n$  is defined for all  $n$ , and clearly  $t_n \leq^* b_n$ . Thus we have  $T \leq^* b_n$ , and (a) is satisfied. Also it is clear that  $b_n = k \leq a_n$ , so that

(b) also holds. Again by the results in [2],  $\sum_T b_n$  is regressive and

$$j(t_0, 0), \dots, j(t_0, b_0 - 1), j(t_1, 0), \dots, j(t_1, b_1 - 1), \dots$$

represents a regressive enumeration of a set  $\gamma \in \sum_T b_n$ . Let  $r_n$  be the regressive function determined by this enumeration of  $\gamma$ . We now have  $S = \text{Req } \sigma$  and  $\sum_T b_n = \text{Req } \gamma$ , with  $\sigma = \rho s_n$  and  $\gamma = \rho r_n$ . To complete the proof, it is necessary to show that  $\gamma \simeq \sigma$ . We will construct a one-to-one partial recursive function  $g(x)$  such that  $\gamma \subset \delta g$  and  $g(\gamma) = \sigma$ .

Making use of the assumption  $T \equiv^* a_n$ , let  $f(x)$  denote the partial recursive function such that  $\rho t_n \subset \delta f$  and  $f(t_n) = a_n$ . Also, since  $\sigma$  is a separated subset of  $\tau$ , let  $\sigma^*$  and  $\tau^*$  denote the disjoint recursively enumerable sets containing  $\sigma$  and  $\tau - \sigma$ , respectively. Let  $k(x)$  and  $l(x)$  denote the recursive functions such that  $j(k(x), l(x)) = x$ . Define the functions  $v$  and  $w$  by

$$\begin{aligned} v(x, i) &= j(k(x), i), \\ w(x) &= 1 \quad \text{for } x \in \sigma^*, \\ &= 0 \quad \text{for } x \in \tau^*. \end{aligned}$$

Clearly  $v$  and  $w$  are partial recursive functions. Finally, let

$$g(x) = v \left( x, (\mu y \leq f k(x) - 1) \left[ \sum_{i=0}^y wv(x, i) = l(x) + 1 \right] \right).$$

Then  $g(x)$  is a partial recursive function. Also, if  $g(x) = g(z)$  for some  $x$  and  $z$  belonging to  $\delta g$ , then

$$\begin{aligned} g(x) = g(z) &\Rightarrow j(k(x), y_1) = j(k(z), y_2) \\ &\Rightarrow k(x) = k(z) \quad \text{and} \quad y_1 = y_2 \\ &\Rightarrow (\forall i)(v(x, i) = v(z, i)) \quad \text{and} \quad y_1 = y_2 \\ &\Rightarrow \sum_{i=0}^{y_1} wv(x, i) = \sum_{i=0}^{y_2} wv(z, i) \\ &\Rightarrow l(x) + 1 = l(z) + 1 \\ &\Rightarrow l(x) = l(z). \end{aligned}$$

Since  $k(x) = k(z)$  and  $l(x) = l(z)$ , it follows that  $x = z$  and  $g$  is one-to-one.

For  $x \in \gamma$ , say  $x = r_n = j(t_p, q)$  with  $0 \leq q < b_p$ , then  $f k(x) - 1 = a_p - 1$  and  $\{v(x, i) \mid 0 \leq i \leq a_p - 1\}$  is

$$\{j(t_p, 0), \dots, j(t_p, a_p - 1)\} \subset \tau.$$

There are  $b_p$  elements of  $\sigma$  in this set and  $q + 1 = l(x) + 1 \leq b_p$ . Hence  $g(x)$  is defined, namely  $g(x)$  is the  $(q + 1)$ st member from left to right in this set, as ordered above, which belongs to  $\sigma$ , and this is exactly  $s_n$ . Hence  $g(r_n) = s_n$ , that is,  $\gamma \subset \delta g$  and  $g(\gamma) = \sigma$ . This completes the proof.

REMARK. The next theorem shows that if  $T \leq^* a_n$  is replaced in the hypothesis of Theorem 1 by the stronger condition that  $a_n$  is a recursive function, this recursive property need not carry through to the  $b_n$  function. Some preliminary ideas are needed. Let  $f$  be a one-to-one function from  $E$  into  $E$  and let  $T$  be an infinite regressive isol. Let  $t_n$  be any regressive function ranging over a set in  $T$ . We then let  $\phi_f(T)$  be defined as the recursive equivalence type of the range of the function  $t_{f(n)}$ . M. Hassett proved in [6] that there exist infinite regressive isols  $S$  and  $T$  such that  $S \leq T$  while  $S \neq \phi_f(T)$  for any strictly increasing recursive function  $f$ .

THEOREM 2. *There is an infinite regressive isol  $T$ , a recursive function  $a_n$ , and a regressive isol  $S$  such that  $S \leq \sum_T a_n$  and for no recursive function  $b_n$ , with  $b_n \leq a_n$  for all  $n$ , is it the case that  $S = \sum_T b_n$ .*

PROOF. Let  $S$  and  $T$  be infinite regressive isols such that  $S \leq T$  and  $S \neq \phi_f(T)$  for any strictly increasing recursive function  $f$ . Let  $a_n$  denote the recursive function identically equal to 1. Then  $T = \sum_T a_n$ , and hence  $S \leq \sum_T a_n$ . Let us assume that there is a recursive function  $b_n$  having the properties

$$(1) \quad b_n \leq a_n \quad \text{for all } n \in E,$$

and

$$(2) \quad S = \sum_T b_n.$$

It follows from (1) and the definition of  $a_n$  that  $b_n \leq 1$  for all  $n \in E$ . However since  $S$  is infinite, (2) implies that  $\{n \mid b_n = 1\}$  is an infinite set. Let  $f(x)$  be the strictly increasing recursive function ranging over this set. Then

$$S = \sum_T b_n = \text{Req}(j(t_{f(0)}, 0), j(t_{f(1)}, 0), \dots) = \phi_f(T).$$

Therefore  $S = \phi_f(T)$  for a strictly increasing recursive function  $f$ , and this is a contradiction. This completes the proof.

REMARK. The next result illustrates that for  $T$  an infinite regressive

isol, the converse of the theorem

$$T \leq^* a_{n-1} \Rightarrow \sum_T a_n \in \Lambda_R$$

does not hold.

**THEOREM 3.** *There exist an infinite regressive isol  $T$  and a function  $a_n$  from  $E$  into  $E$  such that  $\sum_T a_n \in \Lambda_R$  but  $T \not\leq^* a_{n-1}$ .*

**PROOF.** Let  $\tilde{t}_n$  be any regressive function ranging over an isolated set which does not include zero. We define a function  $t_n$  from  $E$  into  $E$  by the enumeration

$$3\tilde{t}_0, 3\tilde{t}_0 + 1, 3\tilde{t}_0 + 2, 3\tilde{t}_1, 3\tilde{t}_1 + 1, 3\tilde{t}_1 + 2, \dots$$

It is clear that  $t_n$  is a regressive function. Also,  $\text{Req } \rho t_n = 3 \text{ Req } \rho \tilde{t}_n$ , so that  $t_n$  ranges over an isolated set. Letting  $T = \text{Req } \rho t_n$ ,  $T$  is thus an infinite regressive isol. In addition, if  $p(x)$  denotes the partial recursive function  $p(x) = x + 1$ , we see that  $p(t_n) = t_{n+1}$  for  $n = 3k$  or  $n = 3k + 1$ ,  $k \in E$ .

We now define a function  $a_n$  from  $E$  into  $E$  by

$$\begin{aligned} a_n &= t_n && \text{if } n = 3k \text{ for some } k \in E, \\ &= t_{n+2} && \text{if } n = 3k + 1 \text{ for some } k \in E, \\ &= t_n && \text{if } n = 3k + 2 \text{ for some } k \in E. \end{aligned}$$

We know that  $\sum_T a_n \in \Lambda$ . We wish to show that  $\sum_T a_n \in \Lambda_R$ . Let the set  $\sigma$  be defined as  $\sigma = \sum_0^\infty j(t_n, \nu(a_n))$ ; then  $\sigma \in \sum_T a_n$ . Consider the following enumeration of  $\sigma$ , where the ordering proceeds from left to right on the first line, then from left to right on the second line, etc.:

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma &= j(t_0, 0), \dots, j(t_0, t_0 - 1), j(t_2, 0), \dots, j(t_2, t_2 - 1), j(t_1, 0), \dots, \\ &\quad j(t_1, t_3 - 1), j(t_3, 0), \dots, j(t_3, t_3 - 1), j(t_5, 0), \dots, j(t_5, t_5 - 1), \\ &\quad j(t_4, 0), \dots, j(t_4, t_6 - 1), j(t_6, 0), \dots \end{aligned}$$

Let  $b_n$  be the function determined by this enumeration. Then  $\sigma$  will be a regressive set if we can establish that  $b_n$  is a regressive function. To see that  $b_n$  is in fact regressive, let  $b_{n+1} = j(t_i, y)$  be given. If  $y \neq 0$ , then  $b_n = j(t_i, y - 1)$ . If  $y = 0$ , we consider the index  $i$  and determine whether  $i = 3k$ ,  $i = 3k + 1$ , or  $i = 3k + 2$  for some  $k \in E$ . If  $i = 3k$ , then  $b_n = j(t_{i-2}, t_i - 1)$ . If  $i = 3k + 2$ , then  $b_n = j(t_{i-2}, t_{i-2} - 1)$ . If  $i = 3k + 1$ , then  $b_n = j(p(t_i), p(t_i) - 1)$ . In any case,  $b_n$  can be effectively determined from  $b_{n+1}$ . Thus  $b_n$  is a regressive function and  $\sigma$  is a regressive set. Therefore  $\sum_T a_n \in \Lambda_R$ .

Suppose now that  $T \leq^* a_{n-1}$ . Let  $q(x)$  denote the partial recursive function such that  $\rho t_n \subset \delta q$  and  $q(t_n) = a_{n-1}$ . We note that if  $n = 3k + 2$  for some  $k \in E$ , then  $q(t_n) = a_{n-1} = t_{n+1}$ . Define a function  $s(x)$  on  $\rho t_n$  by

$$\begin{aligned} s(t_n) &= p(t_n) && \text{if } n = 3k \text{ for some } k \in E, \\ &= p(t_n) && \text{if } n = 3k + 1 \text{ for some } k \in E, \\ &= q(t_n) && \text{if } n = 3k + 2 \text{ for some } k \in E. \end{aligned}$$

Then the function  $s(x)$  has a partial recursive extension mapping  $t_n$  into  $t_{n+1}$ . Hence  $t_n \leq^* t_{n+1}$ , which is a contradiction. Thus  $T \not\leq^* a_{n-1}$ . This completes the proof.

#### REFERENCES

1. J. Barback, *Recursive functions and regressive isols*, Math. Scand. 15 (1964), 29-42. MR 31 #1189.
2. ———, *Regressive upper bounds*, Rend. Sem. Mat. Univ. Padova 39 (1967), 248-272. MR 37 #63.
3. J. C. E. Dekker, *Infinite series of isols*, Proc. Sympos. Pure Math., vol. 5, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, R. I., 1962, pp. 77-96.
4. ———, *The minimum of two regressive isols*, Math. Z. 83 (1964), 345-366. MR 28 #3927.
5. J. C. E. Dekker and J. Myhill, *Recursive equivalence types*, Univ. California Publ. Math. 3 (1960), 67-213. MR 22 #7938.
6. M. J. Hassett, *A note on regressive isols*, Math. Z. 97 (1967), 425-426. MR 35 #2735.
7. F. J. Sansone, *Combinatorial functions and regressive isols*, Pacific J. Math. 13 (1963), 703-707. MR 32 #5509.

ARIZONA STATE UNIVERSITY, TEMPE, ARIZONA 85281

PURDUE UNIVERSITY AT INDIANAPOLIS, INDIANAPOLIS, INDIANA 46205