

Extra credit problem:

Theorem
There exists a pair $\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{D} \neq P_{\mathcal{L}}, P_{\mathcal{D}}$
are r.e.-inseparable but not effectively
r.e.-inseparable.

Proof

Let A be an immune set whose
complement is not r.e. By [Rogers Thm 8-11]
there is such a set.

$$\text{Let } \mathcal{L} = \{ \lambda y [n] \mid n \in \bar{A} \}$$

$$\text{Let } \mathcal{D} = \{ \lambda y [n] \mid n \in A \}$$

1) $P_{\mathcal{L}}$ is r.e.-inseparable from $P_{\mathcal{D}}$.

By s-m-n and padding there is a strictly
increasing recursive function $f \nrightarrow (\forall x) [\psi_{f(x)} = \lambda y [x]]$.

Since by oc $P_{\mathcal{L}}$ is r.e.-separable from $P_{\mathcal{D}}$. Then
 $\exists z [P_{\mathcal{L}} \subseteq W_z \text{ and } P_{\mathcal{D}} \subseteq \bar{W}_z]$. But then

$B = \{ x \mid (\exists y) [y \in W_z \text{ and } f(x) = y] \}$ is r.e.

Moreover $x \in \bar{A} \Rightarrow f(x) \in P_{\mathcal{L}} \subseteq W_z \Rightarrow x \in B$, $x \in A \Rightarrow f(x) \in P_{\mathcal{D}}$
 $\Rightarrow f(x) \notin W_z \Rightarrow x \notin B$. Hence $\bar{A} = B$ and $\bar{A}$ r.e. $\Rightarrow$

2) P_C is not effectively inseparable from P_D .

§ b w o c o w. Then $\exists$ rec $h \nexists$

$$(\forall x) [h(x) \in (P_C - W_x) \text{ or } h(x) \in W_x \cap P_D].$$

By the parametric recursion theorem $\exists$ recursive e such that

$$\psi_{e(z)}(y) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } [y = h(e(z)) \text{ and } \psi_{h(e(z))}^{(0)} \notin D_2] \\ \uparrow & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

Since $(\forall x) [h(x) \in P_C \text{ xor } h(x) \in P_D]; (\forall z) [\psi_{h(e(z))}^{(0)} \downarrow$
and $[\psi_{h(e(z))} \in \mathbb{C} \text{ xor } \psi_{h(e(z))} \in \mathbb{D}]]$.

(1)

$D_2 \subseteq A \Rightarrow h(e(z)) \in W_{e(z)}$. For, $D_2 \subseteq A \wedge$
 $h(e(z)) \notin W_{e(z)} \Rightarrow \psi_{h(e(z))}^{(0)} \in D_2 \Rightarrow \exists u \in \mathbb{D} \nexists \psi_{h(e(z))} = u$
 $\Rightarrow h(e(z)) \in P_D$. But $h(e(z)) \notin W_{e(z)} \Rightarrow h(e(z)) \in P_C \Rightarrow \Leftarrow$.
 $\therefore D_2 \subseteq A \Rightarrow h(e(z)) \in W_{e(z)} \wedge h(e(z)) \in P_D$. But $\psi_{h(e(z))}^{(0)} \notin D_2$.
 $\therefore D_2 \subseteq A \Rightarrow \psi_{h(e(z))}^{(0)} \in (A - D_2)$. $\rightarrow$

For all finite sets A , let CA denote the canonical index of A .

Define g as follows:

$$g(0) = \psi_{h(e(c\emptyset))}^{(0)}$$

$$g(x+1) = \psi_{h(e(c\{g(0), g(1), \dots, g(x)\}))}^{(0)}$$

g is clearly recursive since $(\forall z) [\psi_{h(e(\cdot))}^{(0)} \downarrow]$.

Since $\emptyset \subseteq A$, $g(0) \in (A - \emptyset) = A$. $g(1) \in (A - \{g(0)\})$.
 $g(2) \in (A - \{g(0), g(1)\})$. By induction,
 $(\forall x) [(\forall y) [y \leq x \Rightarrow g(y) \in A] \text{ and } g(x+1) \in (A - \{g(0), g(1), \dots, g(x)\})]$.

Hence $g(0), g(1), \dots$ is a non-repeating enumeration of an infinite subset of A .

Hence A has an infinite r.e. subset but A is immune. Contradiction. $\square$

Good

believe!

Theorem: Suppose that $\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{D}$ are disjoint classes of partial recursive functions, where $\mathcal{C}$ is a singleton $\{\psi\}$. Then $P_{\mathcal{C}}$ is effectively r.e. inseparable from $P_{\mathcal{D}}$ if and only if:

$$(\exists \text{ recursive } f)(\forall z)[D_z \subseteq \delta\psi \Rightarrow \psi|_{D_z} \in \mathcal{D}],$$

where the notation $\delta\psi$ means the domain of ψ , and $\psi|_{D_z}$ means ψ with its domain restricted to D_z , i.e., $\lambda y [\text{if } y \in D_z \text{ then } \psi(y) \text{ else } \uparrow]$.

Proof:

$\Leftarrow$: Suppose there is a recursive function f such that $(\forall z)[D_z \subseteq \delta\psi \Rightarrow \psi|_{D_z} \in \mathcal{D}]$. By the parametric recursion theorem, there exists a recursive function e such that for all x, y :

$\psi_{e(x)}(y)$ is computed by simultaneously enumerating $\delta\psi$ and W_x (alternately executing one step from each enumeration), to yield:

$\psi(y)$, if y appears in $\delta\psi$ before $e(x)$ appears in W_x ;

$\psi_{f(z)}(y)$, if $e(x)$ appears in W_x , and y does not appear in $\delta\psi$ before $e(x)$ appears in W_x , and D_z is the set of integers that appear in $\delta\psi$ before $e(x)$ appears in W_x ;

$\uparrow$, if neither y appears in $\delta\psi$, nor $e(x)$ appears in W_x .

Let x be any integer. Then there are two cases to consider:

case (i): $e(x) \in W_x$. In this case, let z be an integer such that D_z is the set of integers that appear in $\delta\psi$ before $e(x)$ appears in W_x . Then for all y , $\varphi_{e(z)}(y)$ is $\psi(y)$ if $y \in D_z$, and $\varphi_{f(z)}(y)$ if $y \notin D_z$. But $D_z \subseteq \delta\psi$ and therefore $\psi \upharpoonright_{D_z} \subseteq \varphi_{f(z)} \in \underline{D}$ by the hypothesis. Therefore, for all y , $\varphi_{e(z)}(y) = \varphi_{f(z)}(y)$ and $\varphi_{e(x)} \in \underline{D}$.

case (ii): $e(x) \notin W_x$. In this case, for all y , $\varphi_{e(x)}(y) = \psi(y)$. Therefore, $\varphi_{e(x)} \in \underline{C}$.

Thus, for any x , either $e(x) \in W_x \cap P_{\underline{D}}$ or $e(x) \in P_{\underline{C}} - W_x$. Thus, $P_{\underline{C}}$ is effectively r.e. inseparable from $P_{\underline{D}}$ as witnessed by the recursive function e . Q.E.D. $\Leftarrow$.

$\Rightarrow$: Suppose $P_{\tilde{C}}$ and $P_{\tilde{D}}$ are effectively r.e. inseparable, where $\tilde{C}$ is the singleton $\{\psi\}$.

Then there must be a recursive function h such that $(\forall x) [h(x) \in W_x \cap P_{\tilde{D}} \text{ or } h(x) \in P_{\tilde{C}} - W_x]$.

By the parametric recursion theorem, there exists a recursive function e such that for all z, y :

$$\varphi_{e(z)}(y) = \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if } y = h(e(z)) \text{ and } (\forall u \in D_z) [\psi(u) \downarrow] \\ & \text{and } (\forall u \in D_z) [\varphi_{h(e(z))}(u) \downarrow = \psi(u)]; \\ \uparrow, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Let z be any integer such that $(\forall u \in D_z) [\psi(u) \downarrow]$, i.e. $D_z \subseteq \delta\psi$.

$h(e(z)) \in W_{e(z)}$. For if $h(e(z)) \notin W_{e(z)}$, i.e.,

$\varphi_{e(z)}(h(e(z))) \uparrow$, then $\text{not } (\forall u \in D_z) [\varphi_{h(e(z))}(u) \downarrow = \psi(u)]$,

i.e., $\varphi_{h(e(z))} \neq \psi$. But $h(e(z)) \notin W_{e(z)} \Rightarrow$

$h(e(z)) \in P_{\tilde{C}} \Rightarrow \varphi_{h(e(z))} = \psi. \Rightarrow \Leftarrow$.

Since $h(e(z)) \in W_{e(z)} \Rightarrow \varphi_{e(z)}(h(e(z))) \downarrow$. Therefore,
 $(\forall u \in D_2) [\varphi_{h(e(z))}(u) \downarrow = \varphi(u)]$, i.e., $\varphi \upharpoonright_{D_2} \subseteq \varphi_{h(e(z))}$.

Moreover, $h(e(z)) \in W_{e(z)} \Rightarrow h(e(z)) \in P_{D_2}$; so

$$\varphi_{h(e(z))} \in \tilde{D}.$$

Therefore, $(\forall z) [D_2 \subseteq \delta \varphi \Rightarrow \varphi \upharpoonright_{D_2} \subseteq \varphi_{h(e(z))} \in \tilde{D}]$,

and $\lambda z [h(e(z))]$ is the required recursive function. Q.E.D. $\Rightarrow$.

Q.E.D. proof.