Spectra of computable models of strongly minimal disintegrated theories

Steffen Lempp, University of Wisconsin-Madison

http://www.math.wisc.edu/∼lempp

(Joint work with Uri Andrews)

June 22, 2019

Spectra of computable models of strongly minimal disintegrated theories

Steffen Lempp, University of Wisconsin-Madison

http://www.math.wisc.edu/∼lempp

(Joint work with Uri Andrews)

June 22, 2019 (9:20 p.m. Nur-Sultan time)

Throughout this talk, we work in a countable (computable) relational first-order language $\mathcal{L}$.

Throughout this talk, we work in a countable (computable) relational first-order language $\mathcal{L}$.

Recall that an $\mathcal{L}$-theory is *strongly minimal* if all subsets definable (with parameters) in any of its models are finite or cofinite, and that any strongly minimal theory is $\aleph_1$-categorical.

Throughout this talk, we work in a countable (computable) relational first-order language $\mathcal{L}$.

Recall that an $\mathcal{L}$-theory is *strongly minimal* if all subsets definable (with parameters) in any of its models are finite or cofinite, and that any strongly minimal theory is $\aleph_1$-categorical.

A strongly minimal theory T is *disintegrated* if for all $\mathcal{M} \models T$ and all $A \subseteq M$,

$$\mathrm{acl}(A) = \bigcup_{a \in A} \mathrm{acl}(\{a\})$$

Throughout this talk, we work in a countable (computable) relational first-order language $\mathcal{L}$.

Recall that an $\mathcal{L}$-theory is *strongly minimal* if all subsets definable (with parameters) in any of its models are finite or cofinite, and that any strongly minimal theory is $\aleph_1$-categorical.

A strongly minimal theory T is *disintegrated* if for all $\mathcal{M} \models T$ and all $A \subseteq M$,

$$\mathrm{acl}(A) = \bigcup_{a \in A} \mathrm{acl}(\{a\})$$

Zil'ber's Conjecture (1970's) stated that any strong minimal theory is either disintegrated, essentially that of a vector space, or bi-interpretable with an algebraically closed field.
(We call such theories *trichotomous*.)

Throughout this talk, we work in a countable (computable) relational first-order language $\mathcal{L}$.

Recall that an $\mathcal{L}$-theory is *strongly minimal* if all subsets definable (with parameters) in any of its models are finite or cofinite, and that any strongly minimal theory is $\aleph_1$-categorical.

A strongly minimal theory T is *disintegrated* if for all $\mathcal{M} \models T$ and all $A \subseteq M$,

$$\mathrm{acl}(A) = \bigcup_{a \in A} \mathrm{acl}(\{a\})$$

Zil'ber's Conjecture (1970's) stated that any strong minimal theory is either disintegrated, essentially that of a vector space, or bi-interpretable with an algebraically closed field.
(We call such theories *trichotomous*.)

Hrushovski disproved Zil'ber's Conjecture using so-called *Hrushovski constructions* (1991) and *Hrushovski fusions* (1992).

The following theorem will allow us to define spectra:

Theorem (Baldwin/Lachlan 1971)

The countable models of any $\aleph_1$-categorical but not totally categorical theory T in any countable language form an elementary chain

$$\mathcal{M}_0 \prec \mathcal{M}_1 \prec \ldots \prec \mathcal{M}_\omega$$

where $\mathcal{M}_0$ is the prime model and $\mathcal{M}_\omega$ is the countable saturated model of T.

The following theorem will allow us to define spectra:

Theorem (Baldwin/Lachlan 1971)

The countable models of any $\aleph_1$-categorical but not totally categorical theory T in any countable language form an elementary chain

$$\mathcal{M}_0 \prec \mathcal{M}_1 \prec \ldots \prec \mathcal{M}_\omega$$

where $\mathcal{M}_0$ is the prime model and $\mathcal{M}_\omega$ is the countable saturated model of T.

Definition

The *spectrum of computable models* of an $\aleph_1$-categorical but not totally categorical theory T in any computable language is

$$\mathrm{SCM}(T) = \{\alpha \leq \omega \mid \mathcal{M}_\alpha \text{ is computable}\}.$$

The following theorem will allow us to define spectra:

Theorem (Baldwin/Lachlan 1971)

The countable models of any $\aleph_1$-categorical but not totally categorical theory T in any countable language form an elementary chain

$$\mathcal{M}_0 \prec \mathcal{M}_1 \prec \ldots \prec \mathcal{M}_\omega$$

where $\mathcal{M}_0$ is the prime model and $\mathcal{M}_\omega$ is the countable saturated model of T.

Definition

The *spectrum of computable models* of an $\aleph_1$-categorical but not totally categorical theory T in any computable language is

$$\mathrm{SCM}(T) = \{\alpha \leq \omega \mid \mathcal{M}_\alpha \text{ is computable}\}.$$

Warning: $\mathcal{M}_\alpha$ may have dimension $k + \alpha$ for fixed $k > 0$.

We first present all previously known results about upper bounds for spectra:

We first present all previously known results about upper bounds for spectra:

Theorem (Nies 1999)

Any spectrum of computable models of a strongly minimal (or indeed any $\aleph_1$-categorical) theory is a $\Sigma^0_3(\emptyset^{(\omega)})$-subset of $[0, \omega]$.

We first present all previously known results about upper bounds for spectra:

Theorem (Nies 1999)

Any spectrum of computable models of a strongly minimal (or indeed any $\aleph_1$-categorical) theory is a $\Sigma^0_3(\emptyset^{(\omega)})$-subset of $[0, \omega]$. If T is also model complete, its spectrum is a Σ^0_4-set.

We first present all previously known results about upper bounds for spectra:

Theorem (Nies 1999)

Any spectrum of computable models of a strongly minimal (or indeed any $\aleph_1$-categorical) theory is a $\Sigma^0_3(\emptyset^{(\omega)})$-subset of $[0, \omega]$. If T is also model complete, its spectrum is a Σ^0_4-set.

Theorem (Goncharov/Harizanov/Laskowski/Lempp/McCoy 2003)

A strongly minimal disintegrated theory T is model complete in the language $\mathcal{L}_M$ (expanded by constants for a model $\mathcal{M}$ of T).

We first present all previously known results about upper bounds for spectra:

Theorem (Nies 1999)

Any spectrum of computable models of a strongly minimal (or indeed any $\aleph_1$-categorical) theory is a $\Sigma^0_3(\emptyset^{(\omega)})$-subset of $[0,\omega]$. If T is also model complete, its spectrum is a Σ^0_4-set.

Theorem (Goncharov/Harizanov/Laskowski/Lempp/McCoy 2003)

A strongly minimal disintegrated theory T is model complete in the language $\mathcal{L}_M$ (expanded by constants for a model $\mathcal{M}$ of T).

Corollary

For any strongly minimal disintegrated theory T, the spectrum of T is a Σ^0_5-set.

Theorem

The following are all previously known spectra of computable models of strongly minimal (indeed, all $\aleph_1$-categorical) theories:

- $\emptyset$ and $[0, \omega]$ (trivial)
- $\{0\}$ (Goncharov 1978) and $[0, n]$ ($n \in \omega$, Kudaibergenov 1980)

Theorem

The following are all previously known spectra of computable models of strongly minimal (indeed, all $\aleph_1$-categorical) theories:

- $\emptyset$ and $[0, \omega]$ (trivial)
- $\{0\}$ (Goncharov 1978) and $[0, n]$ ($n \in \omega$, Kudaibergenov 1980)
- ω and $[1, \omega]$ (Khoussainov/Nies/Shore 1997)
- $\{1\}$ (Nies 1999) and $[1, \alpha)$ ($\alpha \leq \omega$, Hirschfeldt/Nies 1999)

Theorem

The following are all previously known spectra of computable models of strongly minimal (indeed, all $\aleph_1$-categorical) theories:

- $\emptyset$ and $[0, \omega]$ (trivial)
- $\{0\}$ (Goncharov 1978) and $[0, n]$ ($n \in \omega$, Kudaibergenov 1980)
- ω and $[1, \omega]$ (Khoussainov/Nies/Shore 1997)
- $\{1\}$ (Nies 1999) and $[1, \alpha)$ ($\alpha \leq \omega$, Hirschfeldt/Nies 1999)
- $\{\omega\}$ (Hirschfeldt/Khoussainov/Semukhin 2006)

Theorem

The following are all previously known spectra of computable models of strongly minimal (indeed, all $\aleph_1$-categorical) theories:

- $\emptyset$ and $[0, \omega]$ (trivial)
- $\{0\}$ (Goncharov 1978) and $[0, n]$ ($n \in \omega$, Kudaibergenov 1980)
- ω and $[1, \omega]$ (Khoussainov/Nies/Shore 1997)
- $\{1\}$ (Nies 1999) and $[1, \alpha)$ ($\alpha \leq \omega$, Hirschfeldt/Nies 1999)
- $\{\omega\}$ (Hirschfeldt/Khoussainov/Semukhin 2006)
- $\{0, \omega\}$ (Andrews 2011, the first known non-interval!)

Theorem

The following are all previously known spectra of computable models of strongly minimal (indeed, all $\aleph_1$-categorical) theories:

- $\emptyset$ and $[0, \omega]$ (trivial)
- $\{0\}$ (Goncharov 1978) and $[0, n]$ ($n \in \omega$, Kudaibergenov 1980)
- ω and $[1, \omega]$ (Khoussainov/Nies/Shore 1997)
- $\{1\}$ (Nies 1999) and $[1, \alpha)$ ($\alpha \leq \omega$, Hirschfeldt/Nies 1999)
- $\{\omega\}$ (Hirschfeldt/Khoussainov/Semukhin 2006)
- $\{0, \omega\}$ (Andrews 2011, the first known non-interval!)

All spectra except for the last are for a strongly minimal disintegrated theory; the last is by a Hrushovski construction.

Theorem

The following are all known spectra of computable models of strongly minimal (indeed, all $\aleph_1$-categorical) theories in finite languages:

- $\emptyset$ and $[0, \omega]$ (trivial)
- $\{0\}$ (Herwig/Lempp/Ziegler 1999)

Theorem

The following are all known spectra of computable models of strongly minimal (indeed, all $\aleph_1$-categorical) theories in finite languages:

- $\emptyset$ and $[0, \omega]$ (trivial)
- $\{0\}$ (Herwig/Lempp/Ziegler 1999)
- $[0, \alpha)$ ($\alpha \leq \omega$) and $\{\omega\}$ (Andrews 2011)

Theorem

The following are all known spectra of computable models of strongly minimal (indeed, all $\aleph_1$-categorical) theories in finite languages:

- $\emptyset$ and $[0, \omega]$ (trivial)
- $\{0\}$ (Herwig/Lempp/Ziegler 1999)
- $[0, \alpha)$ ($\alpha \leq \omega$) and $\{\omega\}$ (Andrews 2011)

All spectra except for the last bullet are for a strongly minimal disintegrated theory; the last bullet is by Hrushovski constructions.

For strongly minimal disintegrated theories T, adding restrictions on the language yields much better results:

For strongly minimal disintegrated theories T, adding restrictions on the language yields much better results:

Theorem (Andrews/Medvedev 2014)

If T is a strongly minimal disintegrated theory in a *finite* language $\mathcal{L}$, then the possible spectra of computable models are exactly $\emptyset$, $[0, \omega]$, and $\{0\}$.

For strongly minimal disintegrated theories T, adding restrictions on the language yields much better results:

Theorem (Andrews/Medvedev 2014)

If T is a strongly minimal disintegrated theory in a *finite* language $\mathcal{L}$, then the possible spectra of computable models are exactly $\emptyset$, $[0, \omega]$, and $\{0\}$.

This shows that the Herwig/Lempp/Ziegler model was essentially the only way to construct a nontrivial spectrum for a strongly minimal disintegrated theory in a finite language.

For strongly minimal disintegrated theories T, adding restrictions on the language yields much better results:

Theorem (Andrews/Medvedev 2014)

If T is a strongly minimal disintegrated theory in a *finite* language $\mathcal{L}$, then the possible spectra of computable models are exactly $\emptyset$, $[0, \omega]$, and $\{0\}$.

This shows that the Herwig/Lempp/Ziegler model was essentially the only way to construct a nontrivial spectrum for a strongly minimal disintegrated theory in a finite language.

In addition to disintegrated theories, the result of Andrews/ Medvedev also extends to locally modular expansions of a group and, by Poizat (1988), to field-like theories, i.e., to "most" trichotomous theories.

For infinite languages, the situation is more difficult.

Theorem (Andrews/Lempp)

If T is a strongly minimal disintegrated theory in a (possibly infinite) *binary relational* language $\mathcal{L}$, then the possible spectra of computable models are exactly the following seven sets: $\emptyset$, $[0, \omega]$, $\{0\}$, $\{1\}$, $\{0, 1\}$, $\{\omega\}$, and $[1, \omega]$.

For infinite languages, the situation is more difficult.

Theorem (Andrews/Lempp)

If T is a strongly minimal disintegrated theory in a (possibly infinite) *binary relational* language $\mathcal{L}$, then the possible spectra of computable models are exactly the following seven sets: $\emptyset$, $[0,\omega]$, $\{0\}$, $\{1\}$, $\{0,1\}$, $\{\omega\}$, and $[1,\omega]$.

Our recent work has been motivated by the following sweeping

Conjecture

If T is a strongly minimal disintegrated theory in a (possibly infinite) relational language $\mathcal{L}$ of arity at most n, then there are only finitely many possible spectra of computable models.

For infinite languages, the situation is more difficult.

Theorem (Andrews/Lempp)

If T is a strongly minimal disintegrated theory in a (possibly infinite) *binary relational* language $\mathcal{L}$, then the possible spectra of computable models are exactly the following seven sets: $\emptyset$, $[0,\omega]$, $\{0\}$, $\{1\}$, $\{0,1\}$, $\{\omega\}$, and $[1,\omega]$.

Our recent work has been motivated by the following sweeping

Conjecture

If T is a strongly minimal disintegrated theory in a (possibly infinite) relational language $\mathcal{L}$ of arity at most n, then there are only finitely many possible spectra of computable models.

The following constitutes progress toward, and is related to, this conjecture.

In a strongly minimal model $\mathcal{M}$, a relation $R \subseteq M^n$

- *has (Morley) rank* 0 if R is finite (and nonempty);
- *has (Morley) rank at most* 1 if for any $\bar{a} \in M^n$ with $\mathcal{M} \models R(\bar{a})$, $\dim(\mathrm{acl}(\bar{a}))$ is at most 1, i.e., $\bar{a}$ does not contain two mutually generic elements.

In a strongly minimal model $\mathcal{M}$, a relation $R \subseteq M^n$

- *has (Morley) rank* 0 if R is finite (and nonempty);
- *has (Morley) rank at most* 1 if for any $\bar{a} \in M^n$ with $\mathcal{M} \models R(\bar{a})$, $\dim(\mathrm{acl}(\bar{a}))$ is at most 1, i.e., $\bar{a}$ does not contain two mutually generic elements.

Theorem (Andrews/Lempp)

If T is a strongly minimal disintegrated theory in a relational language $\mathcal{L}$ *of bounded arity* such that in each model $\mathcal{M}$ of T, any relation $R^{\mathcal{M}}$ has rank at most 1, then the possible spectra of computable models are exactly the following nine or ten sets: $\emptyset$, $[0, \omega]$, $\{0\}$, $\{1\}$, $\{0, 1\}$, $\{\omega\}$, $[1, \omega]$, $\{0, \omega\}$, and $\{0, 1, \omega\}$, and possibly $\{1, \omega\}$.

In a strongly minimal model $\mathcal{M}$, a relation $R \subseteq M^n$

- *has (Morley) rank* 0 if R is finite (and nonempty);
- *has (Morley) rank at most* 1 if for any $\overline{a} \in M^n$ with $\mathcal{M} \models R(\overline{a})$, $\dim(\mathrm{acl}(\overline{a}))$ is at most 1, i.e., $\overline{a}$ does not contain two mutually generic elements.

Theorem (Andrews/Lempp)

If T is a strongly minimal disintegrated theory in a relational language $\mathcal{L}$ *of bounded arity* such that in each model $\mathcal{M}$ of T, any relation $R^{\mathcal{M}}$ has rank at most 1, then the possible spectra of computable models are exactly the following nine or ten sets: $\emptyset$, $[0,\omega]$, $\{0\}$, $\{1\}$, $\{0,1\}$, $\{\omega\}$, $[1,\omega]$, $\{0,\omega\}$, and $\{0,1,\omega\}$, and possibly $\{1,\omega\}$.

Among the two additional spectra, $\{0,\omega\}$ was not known before to be the spectrum of a disintegrated theory; and $\{0,1,\omega\}$ was not even known to be a spectrum at all.

The assumption of bounded arity in the previous theorem was crucial since we also have:

Theorem (Andrews/Lempp)

If T is a strongly minimal disintegrated theory in a relational language $\mathcal{L}$ (of any arity) such that in each model $\mathcal{M}$ of T, any relation $R^{\mathcal{M}}$ has rank at most 1, then the possible spectra of computable models are exactly the nine or ten spectra from the previous theorem as well as the sets $[0, \alpha)$ and $[0, \alpha) \cup \{\omega\}$ for all $\alpha \leq \omega$.

With a trick, we can "almost" reduce the ternary case to the rank-1 case and obtain the following

Theorem (Andrews/Lempp)

If T is a strongly minimal disintegrated theory in a ternary relational language $\mathcal{L}$, then there are at least nine and at most eighteen possible spectra of computable models:
For any spectrum S, $[3, \omega) \cap S \neq \emptyset$ implies $[1, \omega] \subseteq S$.

Step 1: Reduce to rank 1:

Binary $\mathcal{L}$: If $\mathcal{M}_\alpha$ for some $\alpha \geq 2$ is computable, then fix two mutually generic $a, b \in M_\alpha$.

Step 1: Reduce to rank 1:

Binary $\mathcal{L}$: If $\mathcal{M}_\alpha$ for some $\alpha \geq 2$ is computable, then fix two mutually generic $a, b \in M_\alpha$.
Now $R^{\mathcal{M}_\alpha}$ has rank 2 iff $\mathcal{M}_\alpha \models R(a, b)$, so in that case we (effectively in R) replace R by $\neg R$ (which is at most rank 1).

Step 1: Reduce to rank 1:

Binary $\mathcal{L}$: If $\mathcal{M}_\alpha$ for some $\alpha \geq 2$ is computable, then fix two mutually generic $a, b \in M_\alpha$.
Now $R^{\mathcal{M}_\alpha}$ has rank 2 iff $\mathcal{M}_\alpha \models R(a, b)$, so in that case we (effectively in R) replace R by $\neg R$ (which is at most rank 1).

Ternary $\mathcal{L}$: If $\mathcal{M}_\alpha$ for some $\alpha \geq 3$ is computable, then fix three mutually generic $a, b, c \in M_\alpha$.
First reduce to rank at most 2 as in the binary case.

Step 1: Reduce to rank 1:

Binary $\mathcal{L}$: If $\mathcal{M}_\alpha$ for some $\alpha \geq 2$ is computable, then fix two mutually generic $a, b \in M_\alpha$.
Now $R^{\mathcal{M}_\alpha}$ has rank 2 iff $\mathcal{M}_\alpha \models R(a, b)$, so in that case we (effectively in R) replace R by $\neg R$ (which is at most rank 1).

Ternary $\mathcal{L}$: If $\mathcal{M}_\alpha$ for some $\alpha \geq 3$ is computable, then fix three mutually generic $a, b, c \in M_\alpha$.
First reduce to rank at most 2 as in the binary case. Then $\mathcal{M}_\alpha \models \exists^\infty w\, R(w, y, z)$ iff at least two of $\mathcal{M}_\alpha \models R(a, y, z)$, $\mathcal{M}_\alpha \models R(b, y, z)$, and $\mathcal{M}_\alpha \models R(c, y, z)$ hold,

Step 1: Reduce to rank 1:

Binary $\mathcal{L}$: If $\mathcal{M}_\alpha$ for some $\alpha \geq 2$ is computable, then fix two mutually generic $a, b \in M_\alpha$.
Now $R^{\mathcal{M}_\alpha}$ has rank 2 iff $\mathcal{M}_\alpha \models R(a, b)$, so in that case we (effectively in R) replace R by $\neg R$ (which is at most rank 1).

Ternary $\mathcal{L}$: If $\mathcal{M}_\alpha$ for some $\alpha \geq 3$ is computable, then fix three mutually generic $a, b, c \in M_\alpha$.
First reduce to rank at most 2 as in the binary case. Then $\mathcal{M}_\alpha \models \exists^\infty w\, R(w, y, z)$ iff at least two of $\mathcal{M}_\alpha \models R(a, y, z)$, $\mathcal{M}_\alpha \models R(b, y, z)$, and $\mathcal{M}_\alpha \models R(c, y, z)$ hold, so this is computable (as are $\exists^\infty w\, R(x, w, z)$, $\exists^\infty w\, R(x, y, w)$).

Step 1: Reduce to rank 1:

Binary $\mathcal{L}$: If $\mathcal{M}_\alpha$ for some $\alpha \geq 2$ is computable, then fix two mutually generic $a, b \in M_\alpha$.
Now $R^{\mathcal{M}_\alpha}$ has rank 2 iff $\mathcal{M}_\alpha \models R(a, b)$, so in that case we (effectively in R) replace R by $\neg R$ (which is at most rank 1).

Ternary $\mathcal{L}$: If $\mathcal{M}_\alpha$ for some $\alpha \geq 3$ is computable, then fix three mutually generic $a, b, c \in M_\alpha$.
First reduce to rank at most 2 as in the binary case. Then $\mathcal{M}_\alpha \models \exists^\infty w\, R(w, y, z)$ iff at least two of $\mathcal{M}_\alpha \models R(a, y, z)$, $\mathcal{M}_\alpha \models R(b, y, z)$, and $\mathcal{M}_\alpha \models R(c, y, z)$ hold, so this is computable (as are $\exists^\infty w\, R(x, w, z)$, $\exists^\infty w\, R(x, y, w)$).
Now all of $\exists^\infty w\, R(w, y, z)$, $\exists^\infty w\, R(x, w, z)$, $\exists^\infty w\, R(x, y, w)$, $R(x, y, z) \setminus [\exists^\infty w\, R(w, y, z) \vee \exists^\infty w\, R(x, w, z) \vee \exists^\infty w\, R(x, y, w)]$, $[\exists^\infty w\, R(w, y, z) \vee \exists^\infty w\, R(x, w, z) \vee \exists^\infty w\, R(x, y, w)] \setminus R(x, y, z)$ have rank at most 1 and are effectively interdefinable with $R(x, y, z)$.

Step 2: Going "down", easy case:

Step 2: Going "down", easy case:
For a basis B of a strongly minimal disintegrated model $\mathcal{M}_\alpha$, we have

$$M_\alpha = \mathrm{acl}(\emptyset) \sqcup \bigsqcup_{b \in B} \mathrm{iacl}(b)$$

where all iacl(b) are pairwise isomorphic.

Step 2: Going "down", easy case:
For a basis B of a strongly minimal disintegrated model $\mathcal{M}_\alpha$, we have

$$M_\alpha = \mathrm{acl}(\emptyset) \sqcup \bigsqcup_{b \in B} \mathrm{iacl}(b)$$

where all $\mathrm{iacl}(b)$ are pairwise isomorphic.
Suppose

- $\mathcal{M}_\beta \subset \mathcal{M}_\alpha$ for $\beta < \alpha \leq \omega$,
- $\mathcal{M}_\alpha$ is a computable model,
- M_β is a Δ^0_2-subset of M_α, and
- M_β contains an infinite Σ^0_1-subset S.

Then $\mathcal{M}_\beta$ has a computable copy:

Step 2: Going "down", easy case:
For a basis B of a strongly minimal disintegrated model $\mathcal{M}_\alpha$, we have

$$M_\alpha = \mathrm{acl}(\emptyset) \sqcup \bigsqcup_{b \in B} \mathrm{iacl}(b)$$

where all iacl(b) are pairwise isomorphic.
Suppose

- $\mathcal{M}_\beta \subset \mathcal{M}_\alpha$ for $\beta < \alpha \leq \omega$,
- $\mathcal{M}_\alpha$ is a computable model,
- M_β is a Δ^0_2-subset of M_α, and
- M_β contains an infinite Σ^0_1-subset S.

Then $\mathcal{M}_\beta$ has a computable copy:
Let $\dim(\mathcal{M}_\beta) = k + \beta$, fix $k + \beta$ many mutually generics $\bar{a}$ in M_α and construct $\mathrm{acl}(\bar{a})$, "discarding mistakes" into S.

Step 3: Complexity of acl(∅) and iacl(a):

Step 3: Complexity of acl(∅) and iacl(a):

If all relations in $\mathcal{M}_\alpha$ are at most rank 1, then both acl(∅) and iacl(a) (for every generic $a \in M_\alpha$) are Σ^0_2-subsets of M_α (*non*uniformly in a); so they are Δ^0_2-subsets if $\alpha < \omega$.

Step 3: Complexity of acl($\emptyset$) and iacl(a):

If all relations in $\mathcal{M}_\alpha$ are at most rank 1, then both acl($\emptyset$) and iacl(a) (for every generic $a \in M_\alpha$) are Σ^0_2-subsets of M_α (*non*uniformly in a); so they are Δ^0_2-subsets if $\alpha < \omega$.

Proof:

Define the n-neighborhood $\mathrm{Nbh}_n(a)$ of $a \in M_\alpha$ by recursion:

$$\mathrm{Nbh}_0(a) = \{a\}$$
$$\mathrm{Nbh}_{n+1}(a) = \{b \in M_\alpha \mid \exists c \in \mathrm{Nbh}_n(a)\,[c, b \text{ "directly connected"}]\}$$

where c and b are "directly connected" if the binary projection of an m-ary relation $R \in \mathcal{L}$ holds (or fails) between c and b but not between c and cofinitely many elements of M_α, nor between b and cofinitely many elements of M_α.

Step 3: Complexity of acl($\emptyset$) and iacl(a):

If all relations in $\mathcal{M}_\alpha$ are at most rank 1, then both acl($\emptyset$) and iacl(a) (for every generic $a \in M_\alpha$) are Σ^0_2-subsets of M_α (*non*uniformly in a); so they are Δ^0_2-subsets if $\alpha < \omega$.

Proof:
Define the n-neighborhood $\mathrm{Nbh}_n(a)$ of $a \in M_\alpha$ by recursion:

$$\mathrm{Nbh}_0(a) = \{a\}$$
$$\mathrm{Nbh}_{n+1}(a) = \{b \in M_\alpha \mid \exists c \in \mathrm{Nbh}_n(a)\,[c, b \text{ "directly connected"}]\}$$

where c and b are "directly connected" if the binary projection of an m-ary relation $R \in \mathcal{L}$ holds (or fails) between c and b but not between c and cofinitely many elements of M_α, nor between b and cofinitely many elements of M_α.

Then $\mathbf{0}'$ can compute canonical indices for $\mathrm{Nbh}_n(a)$ (uniformly in n but *non*uniformly in a).

Step 4: "Down": If all relations in $\mathcal{M}_\alpha \models T$ are at most rank 1 and $k \in \mathrm{SCM}(T) \cap [2, \omega)$, then $k - 1 \in \mathrm{SCM}(T)$:

Step 4: "Down": If all relations in $\mathcal{M}_\alpha \models T$ are at most rank 1 and $k \in \mathrm{SCM}(T) \cap [2, \omega)$, then $k - 1 \in \mathrm{SCM}(T)$:

Assume $\mathcal{L}$ is "closed under permutation of variables".
Define the set of "bad elements"

$$B = \{b \in M_k \mid \exists i \, \exists^\infty y \, \exists \overline{z} \, R_i(b, y, \overline{z})\}$$

Step 4: "Down": If all relations in $\mathcal{M}_\alpha \models T$ are at most rank 1 and $k \in \mathrm{SCM}(T) \cap [2, \omega)$, then $k - 1 \in \mathrm{SCM}(T)$:

Assume $\mathcal{L}$ is "closed under permutation of variables".
Define the set of "bad elements"

$$B = \{b \in M_k \mid \exists i\, \exists^\infty y\, \exists \overline{z}\, R_i(b, y, \overline{z})\}$$

Case I: B is finite: Then for any generic $a \in M_k$, $\mathrm{iacl}(a)$ is a Σ^0_1-subset of M_k (finite or infinite).

Step 4: "Down": If all relations in $\mathcal{M}_\alpha \models T$ are at most rank 1 and $k \in \mathrm{SCM}(T) \cap [2, \omega)$, then $k-1 \in \mathrm{SCM}(T)$:

Assume $\mathcal{L}$ is "closed under permutation of variables".
Define the set of "bad elements"

$$B = \{b \in M_k \mid \exists i \, \exists^\infty y \, \exists \overline{z} \, R_i(b, y, \overline{z})\}$$

Case I: B is finite: Then for any generic $a \in M_k$, $\mathrm{iacl}(a)$ is a Σ^0_1-subset of M_k (finite or infinite).

Case II: B is infinite: Then $\mathrm{acl}(\emptyset)$ contains an infinite Σ^0_1-subset B in $\mathcal{M}_k$.

Step 4: "Down": If all relations in $\mathcal{M}_\alpha \models T$ are at most rank 1 and $k \in \mathrm{SCM}(T) \cap [2, \omega)$, then $k - 1 \in \mathrm{SCM}(T)$:

Assume $\mathcal{L}$ is "closed under permutation of variables".
Define the set of "bad elements"

$$B = \{b \in M_k \mid \exists i\, \exists^\infty y\, \exists \bar{z}\, R_i(b, y, \bar{z})\}$$

Case I: B is finite: Then for any generic $a \in M_k$, $\mathrm{iacl}(a)$ is a Σ^0_1-subset of M_k (finite or infinite).

Case II: B is infinite: Then $\mathrm{acl}(\emptyset)$ contains an infinite Σ^0_1-subset B in $\mathcal{M}_k$.

In either case, we can apply the previous steps to see that $\mathcal{M}_{k-1}$ is computable.

Step 5: "Up": If all relations in $\mathcal{M}_\alpha \models T$ are at most rank 1 and of bounded arity, and if $k \in \mathrm{SCM}(T) \cap [2, \omega)$, then $k + 1 \in \mathrm{SCM}(T)$ (uniformly in k; so $\omega \in \mathrm{SCM}(T)$ as well):

Step 5: "Up": If all relations in $\mathcal{M}_\alpha \models T$ are at most rank 1 and of bounded arity, and if $k \in \mathrm{SCM}(T) \cap [2, \omega)$, then $k + 1 \in \mathrm{SCM}(T)$ (uniformly in k; so $\omega \in \mathrm{SCM}(T)$ as well):

Again, assume $\mathcal{L}$ is "closed under permutation of variables".

Case I: For generic $a \in M_k$, there are infinitely many disjoint tuples $\overline{b}$ in M_k such that

$$\mathcal{M}_k \models \exists i \left(R_i(a, \overline{b}) \wedge \exists^{<\infty} x \, R_i(x, \overline{b}) \right)$$

Step 5: "Up": If all relations in $\mathcal{M}_\alpha \models T$ are at most rank 1 and of bounded arity, and if $k \in \mathrm{SCM}(T) \cap [2, \omega)$, then $k+1 \in \mathrm{SCM}(T)$ (uniformly in k; so $\omega \in \mathrm{SCM}(T)$ as well):

Again, assume $\mathcal{L}$ is "closed under permutation of variables".

Case I: For generic $a \in M_k$, there are infinitely many disjoint tuples $\overline{b}$ in M_k such that

$$\mathcal{M}_k \models \exists i \left(R_i(a, \overline{b}) \wedge \exists^{<\infty} x \, R_i(x, \overline{b}) \right)$$

Then we can generate a Σ^0_1-set of such disjoint tuples and then construct $\mathcal{M}_{k+1}$ as $\mathcal{M}_k \sqcup \mathrm{iacl}(g)$ for a new generic element g.

Step 5: "Up": If all relations in $\mathcal{M}_\alpha \models T$ are at most rank 1 and of bounded arity, and if $k \in \mathrm{SCM}(T) \cap [2, \omega)$, then $k+1 \in \mathrm{SCM}(T)$ (uniformly in k; so $\omega \in \mathrm{SCM}(T)$ as well):

Again, assume $\mathcal{L}$ is "closed under permutation of variables".

Case I: For generic $a \in M_k$, there are infinitely many disjoint tuples $\overline{b}$ in M_k such that

$$\mathcal{M}_k \models \exists i \left(R_i(a, \overline{b}) \wedge \exists^{<\infty} x \, R_i(x, \overline{b}) \right)$$

Then we can generate a Σ^0_1-set of such disjoint tuples and then construct $\mathcal{M}_{k+1}$ as $\mathcal{M}_k \sqcup \mathrm{iacl}(g)$ for a new generic element g.

Case II: Otherwise there is a finite set $\{h_0, \dots, h_n\}$ of elements involved in all R_i:

Step 5: "Up": If all relations in $\mathcal{M}_\alpha \models T$ are at most rank 1 and of bounded arity, and if $k \in \mathrm{SCM}(T) \cap [2, \omega)$, then $k+1 \in \mathrm{SCM}(T)$ (uniformly in k; so $\omega \in \mathrm{SCM}(T)$ as well):

Again, assume $\mathcal{L}$ is "closed under permutation of variables".

Case I: For generic $a \in M_k$, there are infinitely many disjoint tuples $\overline{b}$ in M_k such that

$$\mathcal{M}_k \models \exists i \left(R_i(a, \overline{b}) \wedge \exists^{<\infty} x \, R_i(x, \overline{b}) \right)$$

Then we can generate a Σ^0_1-set of such disjoint tuples and then construct $\mathcal{M}_{k+1}$ as $\mathcal{M}_k \sqcup \mathrm{iacl}(g)$ for a new generic element g.

Case II: Otherwise there is a finite set $\{h_0, \dots, h_n\}$ of elements involved in all R_i: We can then generate a new language $\mathcal{L}'$ of *lower* arity consisting of all R_i with fixed h_j, and iterate Case I vs. Case II for $\mathcal{L}'$, etc., until we reach Case I or a binary language.

Binary $\mathcal{L}$: We also need to show

$$\{0,1\} \cap \mathrm{SCM}(T) \neq \emptyset \text{ and } \omega \in \mathrm{SCM}(T) \implies 2 \in \mathrm{SCM}(T)$$

Binary $\mathcal{L}$: We also need to show

$$\{0,1\} \cap \mathrm{SCM}(T) \neq \emptyset \text{ and } \omega \in \mathrm{SCM}(T) \implies 2 \in \mathrm{SCM}(T)$$

Ternary $\mathcal{L}$: Can only prove

$$[3,\omega) \cap SCM(T) \neq \emptyset \implies [1,\omega] \subseteq \mathrm{SCM}(T)$$

Binary $\mathcal{L}$: We also need to show

$$\{0,1\} \cap \mathrm{SCM}(T) \neq \emptyset \text{ and } \omega \in \mathrm{SCM}(T) \implies 2 \in \mathrm{SCM}(T)$$

Ternary $\mathcal{L}$: Can only prove

$$[3,\omega) \cap SCM(T) \neq \emptyset \implies [1,\omega] \subseteq \mathrm{SCM}(T)$$

Finally: Several priority arguments to establish new spectra.

Thanks!

Thanks!

Raqmet!

Thanks!

Raqmet!

Happy Birthday, Chris!