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Abstract

Harvey Friedman introduced natural independence results for the Peano axioms via certain schemes of combinatorial well-foundedness. We consider here parameterized versions of this scheme and classify exactly the threshold for the transition from provability to unprovability in PA. For this purpose we fix a natural bijection between the ordinals below $\varepsilon_0$ and the positive integers and obtain an induced natural well ordering $\prec$ on the positive integers. We classify the asymptotic of the associated global count functions. Using these asymptotics we classify precisely the phase transition for the parameterized hierarchy of elementary descent recursive functions and hence for the combinatorial well-foundedness scheme. Let $CWF(g)$ be the assertion

$$(\forall K)(\exists M)(\forall m_0, \ldots, m_M)[\forall i \leq M(m_i \leq K + g(i)) \rightarrow \exists i < M(m_i \leq m_{i+1})].$$

Let $f_\alpha(i) := i^{H_\alpha^{-1}(i)}$ where $H_\alpha^{-1}$ denotes the functional inverse of the $\alpha$-th function from the Hardy hierarchy. Then

\[PA \vdash CWF(f_\alpha) \iff \alpha < \varepsilon_0.\]
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1 Introduction

The Peano Axioms have been designed in a way such that every true statement in the language for natural numbers is a consequence of these axioms. It has therefore been a great surprise when Gödel showed in 1931 that there are true statements about the natural numbers which do not follow from the Peano Axioms (PA). The example Gödel came with, was somewhat artificial and thus not completely satisfying. (It looked like the sentence ‘this sentence is true but unprovable’).

Since then logicians have therefore been searching for mathematically relevant examples for independent statements. A breakthrough has been obtained
in 1977 by Paris and Harrington [6] who showed that a slight modification of the finite Ramsey theorem is unprovable in PA.

Around 1980 H. Friedman established further striking natural examples for independent statements. He showed that the miniaturization of Kruskal’s theorem is not provable in predicative analysis. Moreover he introduced principles of combinatorial well-orderedness and combinatorial well-quasi-orderedness as paradigms for independent assertions [10].

In 1995 he studied jointly with Sheard [4] combinatorial well-orderedness principles with respect to abstract elementary recursive ordinal notation systems. In this article we fix a concrete example for an elementary recursive ordinal notation system for \( \varepsilon_0 \) which goes back to Schütte 1977. For this specific natural well-ordering we are able to classify exactly the phase transition from provability to unprovability for the underlying principle of combinatorial well-orderedness. This is part of a general research program on phase transitions in logic and combinatorics initiated by the second author (See, for example, [9, 11, 12]). Our results in this paper reflect specific properties of the natural well-ordering of \( \varepsilon_0 \), in particular number-theoretic aspects of the coding. The approach is related to Arai’s investigation on the slowly well-orderedness of \( \varepsilon_0 \) [1] but instead of a norm based approach we work directly with natural number codes for ordinals. We therefore had to employ methods from multiplicative number theory (Dirichlet series, Rankin’s method) instead of additive methods to obtain the asymptotic of the count functions. Nevertheless in the unprovability part we make essential use of Arai’s result. Moreover we adapt parts of Arai’s treatment to the current situation. It is still quite mysterious why this is possible and it seems that this problem is closely related to Burris central problem 12.21 [3] on finding general principles to explain why local additive results lift to global multiplicative results. In our situation we have a lift from an additive independence result to a multiplicative one.

1.1 Notation and definitions

With \( \mathcal{N} \) we denote the natural numbers, starting at 0. Let \( (p_i)_{i \geq 1} \) enumerate the prime numbers in increasing order. Let \( \mathcal{P} \) be the set of all primes. Define the following transitive relation on \( \mathcal{N} \):

\[
m \prec n \iff (m \neq n \& (n = 0 \vee m = 1 \vee \frac{m}{\gcd(m,n)} = p_{m_1} \cdot \ldots \cdot p_{m_k} \& \frac{n}{\gcd(m,n)} = p_{n_1} \cdot \ldots \cdot n_l \& \forall i \leq k \exists j \leq l (m_i \prec n_j))
\]

Then \( (\mathcal{N}^+, \prec) \simeq (\mathcal{E} \leq \varepsilon_0, <) \).

A multiplicative number system \( \langle A, P, \cdot, 1, M \rangle \) is a countable free commutative monoid \( \langle A, \cdot, 1 \rangle \) with \( P \) the set of indecomposable elements (‘primes’), and \( M \) a multiplicative norm on \( A \) (i.e. \( M : A \rightarrow \mathcal{N}, M(a) = 1 \iff a = 1, M(a \cdot b) = M(a) \cdot M(b) \) for all \( a, b \in A \)), such that for every \( n \geq 2 \), \( \{ a \in A : M(a) = n \} \) is finite.

Let \( q_1 := p_2 \) and \( q_{k+1} := p_{q_k} \) for \( k \geq 1 \); and \( q_0(d) := d \) and \( q_{k+1}(d) := p_{q_k(d)} \) for \( k \geq 1 \).

For \( K \geq 1 \), let \( Q_K := \{ m \in \mathcal{N} : m < q_K \} \) and \( Q_K(d) := \{ m \in \mathcal{N} : m < q_K(d) \} \)

Define a norm \( M(n) := n \)
We call an unbounded function \( h : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R} \) with \( \lim_{y \to \infty} |h(y)| = \infty \) a function. In \([2]\) the following lower- and upperbounds are proven.

**Lemma 1.1**

1. \( C_{Q,K}(n) \geq \exp \left( \frac{2^{-K} \left( \frac{\ln(n)}{\ln K} \right)}{\ln K} \right) \) for \( K \geq 3, n \geq T(K) := \max\{e^2, e^K\} \)
2. \( \exists \forall n \ C_{Q,K}(n) \leq \exp\left(V_{\frac{\ln(n)}{\ln K}}\right) \) for all \( K \geq 3 \)

An additive number system \( \langle A, P, \cdot, 1, N \rangle \) is a countable free commutative monoid \( (A, \cdot) \) with \( P \) the set of indecomposable elements, and with \( N \) an additive norm on \( A \) (i.e. \( N : A \to \mathbb{N} \), \( N(a) = 0 \iff a = 1 \), \( N(a \cdot b) = N(a) + N(b) \) for all \( a, b \in A \)), such that for every \( n \geq 1 \), \( \{a \in A : N(a) = n\} \) is finite

Let \( N(1) := 0 \) and \( N(\Pi_{i \in I} m_i) := \sum_{i \in I} m_i \cdot (N(i) + 1) \) be an additive norm. Let \( c_{Q,K}(n) := \#\{a \in Q_K : N(a) = n\} \) be the local count function.

Bounds for the local count function have already been obtained in the literature on additive number theory, and even the asymptotic behaviour. For example a famous theorem of Hardy and Ramanujan says

\[
c_{Q_2}(n) \sim \frac{\exp\left(\pi \sqrt{\frac{2}{3}} n\right)}{4 \sqrt{3n}}
\]

Related results for the set \( Q_K \) for \( K \geq 3 \) have been obtained by \([13]\).

We write \( a_1 := a, a_{k+1} := a^{a_k}, a_0(d) := d, a_{k+1}(d) := a^{a_k(d)} \) for \( a, d \in \mathbb{R}, k \in \mathbb{N} \). For \( n \geq 1 \) let \( \ln_1(n) := \max\{1, \ln(n)\} \) and \( \ln_{k+1}(n) := \max\{1, \ln_1(\ln_k(n))\} \)

With \([x]\) we denote the binary length of \( x \). Thus \([0] := 1\) and \([x] := \lfloor \log_2(x + 1) \rfloor \) for \( x > 0 \). We call a function \( h : \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{N} \) unbounded if \( h \) is weakly increasing and \( \lim_{x \to \infty} h(n) = \infty \). If \( h \) is unbounded, we let \( h^{-1}(x) := \min\{n \in \mathbb{N} : x < h(n)\} \).

We call an unbounded function \( h \) log-like if \((\forall x > 0)[h(x-1) < h(x) \Rightarrow (3y)[x = 2^y]]\). We call an unbounded function \( h \) exp-like if \((\forall x)[F(x) \in \{0\} \cup \{2^y : y \in \mathbb{N}\}]\).

For any limit ordinal \( \lambda \leq \epsilon_0 \), let \( (\lambda[n])_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \) be the fundamental sequence of \( \lambda \).

Thus if \( \lambda = \omega^{\alpha_1} + \ldots + \omega^{\alpha_k} > \alpha_1 \geq \ldots \geq \alpha_k = \beta + 1 \), then \( \lambda[n] = \omega^{\alpha_1} + \ldots + \omega^{\alpha_k-1} + \omega^{\beta+1} \). and if \( \lambda = \omega^{\alpha_1} + \ldots + \omega^{\alpha_k} > \alpha_1 \geq \ldots \geq \alpha_k \in \text{Lim} \), then \( \lambda[n] = \omega^{\alpha_1} + \ldots + \omega^{\alpha_k-1} + \omega^{\alpha_k[n]} \).

For all ordinals \( \alpha \leq \epsilon_0 \) we define the explike function \( F_\alpha : \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{N} \) as follows \( F_0(x) := 2^x, F_{\alpha+1}(x) := F_{\alpha+1}^{\alpha+1}(x) \), where the upper index denotes the number of iterations, and \( F_\alpha(x) := F_{\alpha[2]}(x) \) if \( \alpha \) is a limit.

A basic result is that \( PA \) proves the totality of \( F_\alpha \) iff \( \alpha < \epsilon_0 \). Thus \( PA \) does not prove the assertion \((\forall x)(\exists y)[F_\alpha(x) = y]\). See \([4]\) for a proof.

For all \( \alpha \leq \epsilon_0 \) we put \( f_\alpha(K, i) := \lambda[i]^{\epsilon_0+1}(i) \)

**1.2 Summary of the result**

In this section we establish the following result.

1. \( PA \not\vdash (\forall K)(\exists M)((\forall m_0, \ldots, m_{M-1})[0 > m_0 \land \forall i < M : m_i \leq f_{\epsilon_0}(K, i)]) \Rightarrow \exists i < M - 1 : m_i \geq m_{i+1} \)
2. If \( \alpha < \epsilon_0 \) then \( \text{PA} \vdash (\forall K)(\exists M)((\forall m_0, \ldots, m_{M-1})[0 > m_0 \& \forall i < M : m_i \leq f_\alpha(K, i)]) \Rightarrow \exists i < M - 1 : m_i \leq m_{i+1} \)

So if we define the function: 
\[ D(K, h) := \max\{M : (\exists m_0 \supset \cdots \supset m_{M-1})[0 > m_0 \& \forall i < M : m_i \leq K + i^h(i)]\} \]
then our theorem is equivalent to
\[ \text{PA} \vdash (\forall K)(\exists M)M > D(K, F_\alpha^{-1}) \iff \alpha < \epsilon_0 \]
This theorem is the multiplicative analogue of the following result of [1] and [9]:
1. \( \text{PA} \not\vdash (\forall K)(\exists M)((\forall m_0, \ldots, m_{M-1})[0 > m_0 \& \forall i < M : N(m_i) \leq K + |i| \cdot |i|_F^{-1}(i)]) \Rightarrow \exists i < M - 1 : m_i \leq m_{i+1} \)
2. If \( \alpha < \epsilon_0 \) then \( \text{PA} \vdash (\forall K)(\exists M)((\forall m_0, \ldots, m_{M-1})[0 > m_0 \& \forall i < M : N(m_i) \leq K + |i| \cdot |i|_F^{-1}(i)]) \Rightarrow \exists i < M - 1 : m_i \leq m_{i+1} \)

Or, with \( L(K, h) := \max\{M : (\exists m_0 \supset \cdots \supset m_{M-1})[0 > m_0 \& \forall i < M : N(m_i) \leq K + |i| \cdot |i|_{h(i)}]\} \)

\[ \text{PA} \vdash (\forall K)(\exists M)M > L(K, F_\alpha^{-1}) \iff \alpha \epsilon_0 \]

So by replacing the additive norm \( N \) with the multiplicative norm \( M \), and replacing the function \( K + |i| \cdot |i|_F^{-1}(i) \) with \( K + i^h(i) \cdot i^h(i) \), we get again an independence result. The first is obtained by using bounds on the local count function \( c_{Q_e} \), the latter by using bounds on the global count function \( C_{Q_e} \). This suggests the existence of a relation between local additive and global multiplicative. In fact, this parallelism is stated as an open problem (12.21) in the book of Burris [3]

In [1] it is shown that, with \( l(i) = |i|^2 \), \( F_\alpha \) is bounded by \( K \mapsto L(2K + 16, l) \). Therefore the latter function is not provably total in PA. In section 3.3 of this paper we show that \( F_\alpha \) is also bounded by a function which involves \( D \). This yields the unprovability assertion. For the provability result, section 3.2, we show that for \( \alpha < \epsilon_0 \), \( D \) is bounded from above by a function which is primitive recursive in \( F_\alpha \). This implies that \( D \) is provable recursive in PA.

Of course, we also need to show that the assertion about which the independence result is retrieved, is true indeed. This is a simple consequence of Kőnigs lemma (every finitely-branching infinite tree has a path), and the fact that an descending chain of ordinals cannot be infinite. Remember that \( (N^+, \cdot) \simeq (\mathcal{E} \leq \epsilon_0, <) \)

**Lemma 1.2** Let \( || \cdot || \) and \( f \) be any function \( \mathcal{N} \rightarrow \mathcal{N} \)
\[ (\forall K)(\exists M)\forall \alpha_0, \ldots, \alpha_M \exists 0(\forall i \leq M : ||\alpha_i|| \leq K + f(i) \Rightarrow \exists i : \alpha_i \leq \alpha_{i+1}) \]

**Proof**

Let \( b := \{< \alpha_0, \ldots, \alpha_M \supset 0 | \forall i \leq M : ||\alpha_i|| \leq K + f(i) \supset 0 > \alpha_0 > \cdots > \alpha_M \} \)

Suppose the lemma is false
Then \( (\exists K)(\forall M)\exists < \alpha_0, \ldots, \alpha_M \in b \)
Then $b$ is an infinite tree. $b$ is also finitely branched, since: suppose $< \alpha_0, \ldots, \alpha_M > \notin b$. If $< \alpha_0, \ldots, \alpha_{M+1} > \notin b$ then $|\alpha_{M+1}| \leq K + f(m + 1)$, so there are only finite possible successors.

By König’s lemma, there is a path $f : \mathcal{N} \to \mathcal{N}$, $(\forall i) < f(0), f(1), \ldots, f(i) > \notin b$. But then $f(0), f(1), \ldots$ are isomorph with an infinite descending chain of ordinals, which is impossible

# 2 The provability assertion

**Lemma 2.1**
1. $x \geq 4 \Rightarrow x^2 \leq 2^x$
2. $x \geq 3 \Rightarrow 3^x \leq 2^x$
3. $|2_K(y)| \geq y$
4. $2_{K-1}(|N + 1|_K) \leq N + 1$ for all $K \geq 4, N + 1 \geq 2_{K-1}(K - 2)$
5. $K \geq 4$ & $1 \leq m_0 \leq K + 1 \Rightarrow m_0 \leq q_{K-1}$.
6. $K$ loglike $\Rightarrow h^{-1}$ explike
7. $F$ explike $\Rightarrow F^{-1}$ loglike

**Proof**
1. and 2. See Proposition 16 in [1]
2. Induction on $K$. If $K=1$ then $|2_1(y)| = |\log_2(2^y + 1)| \geq |\log_2(2^y)| = y$
   And $|2_{K+1}(y)|_{K+1} = |2_{K+1}(2_K(y))|_K \geq 2_{K+1}(y)_K \geq y$
4. First we show it is true for $N + 1 = 2_{K-1}(K - 2)$ using induction on $K \geq 4$
   $K = 4 : 2_{4-1}(4 - 2)_4 = 2_4 = N + 1$
   $K > 4 : 2_K(|N + 1|_{K+1}) = 2_1(2_{K-1}(|N + 1|_K) \leq 2_1(|N + 1|_K) = 2_1(|2_{K-1}(K - 2)|_{K+1}) \leq 2_1(|2_{K-1}(K - 2)|_K = 2_1(2_{K-2}(K - 2)) = 2_{K-1}(K - 2)$
   Thus $2_{K-1}(|N + 1|_K)$ grows slower in $N$ than 1, the assertion follows for all $N + 1 \geq 2_{K-1}(K - 2)$
5. For $K = 4$ it is checked by hand.
   For $K \geq 5$ we prove the assertion by induction on $m_0$
   Suppose that $m_0 \succ q_{K-1}$
   Then $q_{K-1}$ is not a divisor of $m_0$. Since $q_{K-1}$ is prime, this implies that $\gcd(m_0, q_{K-1}) = 1$. Then by definition of $\prec$: there is a prime $p_1|m_0$ s.t. $q_{K-1} \prec p_1$, i.e. $p_{K-2} \prec p_1$, i.e. $q_{K-2} \prec q_{K-1}$.
   (Here we use the fact that $\forall a, b \neq 0, 1$ $a \prec b \Rightarrow p_a < p_b$, which follows easy from the definition of $\prec$)
   But $j < m_0 \leq K + 1$, and thus $j \leq K, K - 1 \geq 4 \Rightarrow j \leq q_{K-1}$ by induction hypothesis. Contradiction.
6. Let $b$ be loglike. $h^{-1}(x) = \min\{n \in N : h(n) > x\}$. Suppose $h^{-1}(x) = m \neq 0$. Then $h(m) > x$ and $h(m - 1) \leq x$, hence $h(m) > h(m - 1) \Rightarrow (3y) m = 2^y$
   Thus $\forall x h^{-1}(x) \in \{0\} \cup \{2^y : y \in N\}$, hence, $h^{-1}$ is explike.
7. Let $F$ be explike. $F^{-1}(x) = \min\{n \in N : F(n) > x\}$. Let $x > 0$ be arbitrary.
   Suppose $m = F^{-1}(x) > F^{-1}(x - 1) = m'$. If $F(m') > x$ then $m = F^{-1}(x) \leq m' = F^{-1}(x - 1)$ but we assumed $m > m'$
   Neither is possible $F(m') < x$ because then $x - 1 < F(m') < x$ which is not
possible.
Hence, $F(m') = x$, hence, $x = 2^y \implies y$

**Theorem 1** Let $h$ be the loglike function $h = F_{\alpha}^{-1}(i)$ for some $\alpha < \epsilon_0$. Let $K \geq 4$ and let $V$ be as in lemma 1.1.1. Then $D(K, h) \leq \max\{2F_{\alpha}(K), 2K(K - 2), 2K + 1(5V)\}$

**Proof**
Fix $K \geq 4$ and let $N_1 := \max\{2F_{\alpha}(K), 2K(K - 2), 2K + 1(5V)\}$.

Choose an arbitrary sequence $m_0, \ldots, m_{n-1}$ s.t. $0 > m_0 > \cdots > m_{n-1}$ and $m_i \leq K + i(|\epsilon_i|)$ for all $i = 0, \ldots, n - 1$. We need to show $n \leq N_1$.

We proof this by contradiction. Assume $n > N_1$.

$h$ is loglike, so $F_{\alpha} = h^{-1}$ is explike. From this fact together with $K \geq 4$, it follows that $\exists N \geq 4$ s.t. $N_1 = 2^{N+1}$.

We have $K \geq 4$ and $m_0 \leq K + 0^{||\epsilon_0||} \leq K + 1$, so by lemma 2.1.5 $m_0 \leq q_{K-1}$.

By transitivity of $\leq$, $m_i \leq q_{K-1}$ for all $i = 0, \ldots, n - 1$.

Since $n > N_1 = 2^{N+1}$ we thus have $m_{2N}, \cdots, m_{2N+1} \in Q_{K-1}$.

$h$ is loglike so $h(i) = h(2^N)$ for all $i \in [2^N, 2^{N+1} - 1]$.

Let $k := K + (2^{N+1} - 1)|2^{N+1} - 1|_{h(2^N)}$. Then we have

$\forall i \in [2^N, 2^{N+1} - 1]: m_i \leq K + (i)|\epsilon_i| \leq k$.

And hence $C_{Q_{K-1}}(k) \geq \text{card}([2^N, 2^{N+1} - 1]) = 2^N$

By lemma 1.1.1 we also have $C_{Q_{K-1}}(k) \leq \exp(V_{\frac{\ln 1(k)}{\ln K - 2}})$.

To reach a contradiction we’ll show that $\exp(V_{\frac{\ln 1(k)}{\ln K - 2}}) < 2^N$, which is equivalent to

$$V_{\frac{\ln 1(k)}{N}} < \ln_{K-2}(k) \ln(2)$$

(1)

**Step one** $\ln_{1(k)} \frac{1}{N} \leq \ln(2) \cdot (1 + 2|N + 1|_K)$

Proof step one:

By definition $N_1 \geq 2F(K)$, therefore $2^N \geq F(K) = h^{-1}(K)$.

$h^{-1}(K) = \min\{n : K < h(n)\}$, so $K < h(h^{-1}(K))$.

$2^N \geq h^{-1}(K) \Rightarrow h(2^N) \geq h(h^{-1}(K)) > K$ (h is weakly increasing) and hence $K \leq h(2^N) - 1$.

Thus

$$|N + 1|_{h(2^N) - 1} \leq |N + 1|_K$$

(2)

An easy induction on K shows $2K(K - 2) \geq 2^{K+1}$, hence $2^{N+1} = N_1 \geq 2K(K - 2) \geq 2^{K+1}$, and thus $N \geq K$.

For $k$ we have using (2)

$$k = K + (2^{N+1} - 1)_{h(2^N)} \leq K + (2^{N+1})_{h(2^N)}$$

$$= K + 2^{(N+1)|N + 1|_{h(2^N) - 1}} < N + 2^{(N+1)|N + 1|_K}$$

6
\[ \leq 2^{N+1} \cdot 2^{(N+1)|N+1|K} \]

(since \( \forall y \geq 1 : N + y \leq y \cdot 2^{N+1} \))

Hence

\[ \ln_1(k) \leq \ln(2^{N+1} \cdot 2^{(N+1)|N+1|K}) = (N + 1)(|N + 1|K + 1) \ln(2) \]

And thus

\[ \frac{\ln_1(k)}{N} \leq \frac{(N + 1)}{N}(|N + 1|K + 1) \ln(2) \leq \left(\frac{5}{4} |N + 1|K + \frac{5}{4}\right) \ln(2) \]

(since \( N \geq 4 \))

\[ \leq \left(\frac{5}{4} |N + 1|K + 1 + \frac{1}{4} \cdot |N + 1|K\right) \ln(2) \]

(since \( |N + 1|K \geq 1 \))

\[ \leq (2|N + 1|K + 1) \ln(2) \]

**Step two** \( V \cdot (1 + 2|N + 1|K) \leq \ln_{K-2}(k) \)

(This together with step one proves (1) and hence the contradiction)

Proof step two:

Let \( x := V(1 + 2|N + 1|K) \). We’ll show \( e_{K-2}(x) \leq k \)

\[ N_1 \geq 2_{K+1}(5V) \Rightarrow N + 1 \geq 2_{K}(5V) \]
\[ \Rightarrow |N + 1|K \geq 2_{K}(5V)|K| \geq 5V \text{ (Lemma 2.1.3) } \geq 5 > 4 \]

This gives \( 2x = 2V(1 + 2|N + 1|K) < 4V + 4V|N + 1|K \)
\[ < |N + 1|K + 5V|N + 1|K = 5V|N + 1|K < (|N + 1|K)^2. \]

Hence we get

\[ e_{K-2}(x) \leq 3_{K-2}(x) \leq 2_{K-2}(2x) \]

(Lemma 2.1.2)

\[ \leq 2_{K-2}(2(|N + 1|K)^2) \leq 2_{K-1}(|N + 1|K) \]

by applying Lemma 2.1.1: \( |N + 1|K \geq 4 \Rightarrow (|N + 1|K)^2 \leq 2^{(N+1)K} \Rightarrow 2_{K-2}((|N + 1|K)^2) \leq 2_{K-2}(2^{(N+1)K}) = 2_{K-1}(|N + 1|K) \)

Using lemma 2.1.4:

\[ e_{K-2}(x) \leq 2_{K-1}(|N + 1|K) \leq N + 1 < k \]

and we have reached a contradiction

(The last estimation \( N + 1 < k \) is true because \( k = K + (N_1 - 1)|N_1 - 1|_{h(2N)} \)
\[ \Rightarrow (N_1 - 1)|N_1 - 1|_{h(2N)} \geq (N_1 - 1)^1 = 2^{N+1} - 1 > N + 1 \]

**Corollary** If \( \alpha < \epsilon_0 \) then \( PA \vdash (\forall K)(\exists M)M > D(K, h) \)

**Proof**

\( D(K, h) \) is bounded by a function which is primitive recursive in \( F_{\alpha} \), hence provably total in PA.
3 The unprovability assertion

Define the functions $g_1, g, r$ as follows:

\[ r(n) := 2n + 16 \]
\[ g_1(n) := \max\{2n+2(n+1), 2_1(2_1(21) - 1), 2T(n+3)\} \] where $T$ is the function from lemma 1.1.2
\[ g(n) := 6^{2_1(3n+20)} - 1 \cdot 2^{2_1(3n+20)} \cdot 2g_1(n) \]
\[ l(i) := |i|^2 \]

**Lemma 3.1**

1. $2^{(|i|-1)} \leq i \leq 2^{|i|} - 1$
2. $i > g_1(n) \Rightarrow l(|i|) \geq n + 3 + r(n)$
3. $i > g_1(n) \Rightarrow (|i| - 1) \geq 8l(|i|)^2$
4. $q_{m+r(n)} \cdot 2g_1(n) \leq g(n)$

**Proof**

1. $|i| = \alpha \Rightarrow 2^\alpha \leq i \leq 2^{\alpha+1} - 1 \Rightarrow 2^{|i|-1} \leq i \leq 2^{|i|} - 1$
2. $i > g_1(n) \geq 2n+2(n+1) \Rightarrow l(|i|) = ||i||^2 \geq ||2n+2(n+1)||^2 = ||2_{n+1}(n+1)+1||^2 \geq ||2_{n+1}(n+1)+1||^2 = (2_{n+1}(n+1)+1)^2$

For $n = 1 : (2_1(1+1)+1)^2 = 25 > 22 = 3n+19$
For $n > 1$ observe that $(2_n(n+1)+1)^2$ grow faster in $n$ then $3n+19$.
3. If $\gamma \geq 21$ then $2^7 > 8(\gamma + 1)^4$.
   Hence,
   \[ \beta \geq 8 \cdot 22^4 \Rightarrow \left(\frac{1}{8\beta}\right)^\frac{1}{4} - 1 \geq 21 \]
   \[ \Rightarrow 2\left(\frac{1}{8\beta}\right)^\frac{1}{4} - 1 \geq 8(\frac{1}{8\beta}) - 1 + 1 \]
   
   Applying assertion 1 to $|i|$ gives $2^{(|i|-1)} \leq |i| \leq 2^{|i|} - 1$, and applying assertion 1 again to these bounds gives $2^{2^{|i|-1} - 1} \leq i \leq 2^{|i|} - 1$

Now
\[ i \geq 2_1(2_1(21) - 1) \Rightarrow ||i|| \geq 22 \Rightarrow 8l(|i|)^2 = 8||i||^4 \geq 8 \cdot 22^4 \]
\[ \Rightarrow 2\left(\frac{1}{8\beta}\right)^\frac{1}{4} - 1 \geq 8||i||^4 \]
\[ \Rightarrow 2^{|i|} - 1 \geq 8||i||^2 \Rightarrow |i| - 1 \geq 2^{|i|} - 1 \geq 8||i||^4 \]

4. Put $m := n + 3$ and $z(n) := 6n\ln_1(n)$. Note that $z$ is increasing in $n$ and that $p_0 \leq z(n)$. This last property follows from $n \geq 20 \Rightarrow p_0 \leq n(\ln_1(n) + \ln_1(\ln_1(n) - \frac{1}{2}))$, which is proven by [7].

By repeated application we get $q_k \leq z^{(k)}(2)$.
And thus $q_{m+r(n)} \cdot 2^{g_1(n)} \leq z^{(m+r(n))}(2) \cdot 2^{g_1(n)} \leq z^{(3n+20)}(2) \cdot 2^{g_1(n)}$

We claim $z^{(k)}(n) \leq 6^{2_1(k)-1} \cdot n^{2_1(k)}$. This follows with induction: $z^{(1)}(n) \leq 6n^2$
and
\[ z^{(k+1)}(n) = z(z^{(k)}(n)) \leq z(6^{2_1(k)-1} \cdot n^{2_1(k)}) \leq 6(6^{2_1(k)-1} \cdot n^{2_1(k)})^2 = 6^{2_1(k+1)-1} \cdot n^{2_1(k+1)} \]
And thus

\[ q_{m+r(n)} \cdot 2^{g_1(n)} \leq z^{(3n+20)}(2) \cdot 2^{g_1(n)} \leq 6^{2z(3n+20)-1}, \quad 2^{2z(3n+20)} \cdot 2^{g_1(n)} \leq g(n) \]

**Theorem 2** Let \( h \) be the log-like function \( h(i) = F_{r^{-1}}^i(i) \), with inverse \( h^{-1} = F_n \). Then \( D(g(n), h) \geq F_n(n) \) for all \( n \).

**Proof**

Let \( m := n + 3 \). Recall \( l(i) := |i|^2 \) and

\[ L(r(n), l) = \max\{M : (\exists 0 > m_0 > \ldots > m_{M-1})(\forall i) N(m_i) \leq r(n) + |i| \cdot |i|_{l(i)} \} \]

Choose a sequence \( 0 > l_0 > \ldots > l_{M_0} \) with \( \forall i \quad N(l_i) \leq r(n) + |i| \cdot |i|_{l(i)} \) and \( M_0 \) maximal (i.e. \( M_0 = L(r(n), l - 1) \)).

Since \( |i|^2 \geq 1 \Rightarrow |i|_{l(i)}^2 \leq |i| \Rightarrow |i|_{l(i)} = |i| \cdot |i|_{l(i)} \leq |i| \cdot |i| = l(i) \)

And thus \( \forall i \quad N(l_i) \leq r(n) + l(i) \).

From this sequence, we'll construct a sequence \( 0 > m_0 > \ldots > m_{h^{-1}(n)} \) with \( \forall i \quad m_i \leq g(n) + |i|^{|h(i)} \). This proves the assertion.

First we observe that \( l_0 = q_r(n) \).

Since suppose not. Then either \( l_0 > q_r(n) \) or \( l_0 > q_r(n) \). In the first case we have \( 0 > q_r(n) > q_r(n) > \ldots > l_{M_0} \). Since \( \forall x \quad N(q_x) = x + 1 \):

\[ N(q_{r(n)}) = r(n) + 1 = r(n) + |0| \cdot |0|_{l(0)} \]

\[ N(l_i) \leq r(n) + |i| \cdot |i|_{l(i)} \leq r(n) + 1 + |i| \cdot |i|_{l(i)} \]

And hence \( M_0 \) is not maximal. Contradiction.

In the case that \( l_0 > q_r(n) \), we either have that \( \exists \alpha > 1 \quad l_0 = q_r(n) \cdot \alpha \) and then

\[ N(l_0) = N(q_r(n)) + N(\alpha) > N(q_r(n)) = r(n) + 1 = r(n) + |0| \cdot |0|_{l(0)} \]

Contradiction.

Or we have that \( \exists \beta > r(n) \& \exists \gamma > l_0 = q_{\beta} \cdot \gamma \) and then

\[ N(l_0) > N(q_\beta) = \beta + 1 > r(n) + 1 = r(n) + |0| \cdot |0|_{l(0)} \]

Contradiction.

For \( 0 \leq i \leq g_1(n) \) we put \( m_i := q_{m+r(n)} \cdot 2^{g_1(n) - i} \). Then obviously \( 0 > m_0 > \ldots > m_{g_1(n)} \). And \( m_i \leq g(n) \) by lemma 3.1.4.

For \( g_1(n) < i \leq h^{-1}(n) \) we define \( k(i) := 2^{(|i| - 1)(|i|_{h(n)} - 1)} \)

\[ Q_m(\leq k(i)) := \{ l < q_m : l \leq k(i) \} \]

And \( enum_{Q_m(\leq k(i))} \) is the enumeration function of \( enum_{Q_m(\leq k(i))} \) with respect to \( \leq \).

(So \( enum_{Q_m(\leq k(i))}(2^{(|i| - 1)}) \) is the \( 2^{(|i| - 1)} \)-th element of the set \( \{ l < q_m : l \leq k(i) \} \)

ordered by \( \leq \). Below we show that such an element indeed exists)

We put \( m_{q_m(l_{i})} := q_m(l_{i}) \cdot enum_{Q_m(\leq k(i))}(2^{(|i| - 1)}) \). Observe that \( l_{i} \) is welldefined since \( |i| \leq i \leq h^{-1}(n) \leq L(r(n), l) \) where the last inequality is proven in [1].

For all \( i > g_1(n) \)

\[ m_{g_1(n)} = q_{m+r(n)} \cdot q_m(q_r(n)) = q_m(l_0) > q_m(l_{i}) \]
Hence the lefthandside is greater than the righthandside lefthandside grows faster in $i > g$

$\text{enum}Q_{m(\leq k(i))}(2^{[i]} - i) > \text{enum}Q_{m(\leq k(i+1))}(2^{[i+1]} - (i + 1))$

And thus $m_i > m_{i+1}$

If $|i| < |i + 1| \text{ then } l_{[i]} > l_{[i+1]} \Rightarrow q_m(l_{[i]}) > q_m(l_{[i+1]})$

Also $\text{enum}Q_{m(\leq k(i))}(2^{[i]} - i) < q_m(l_{[i]})$ and $\text{enum}Q_{m(\leq k(i+1))}(2^{[i+1]} - (i + 1)) < q_m(l_{[i]})$

And thus $m_i > m_{i+1}$

So we have shown $m_{g_1(n)} > m_{g_1(n)+1} > \cdots > m_{h^{-1}(n)}$

Now we have to show that for those $i$, $m_i \leq g(n) + i[l_{h(i)}]$

In [2] it is proven that $m \leq 2^{2^N(m)^2}$ for all $m \geq 1$. Using this we obtain

$$m_i \leq q_m(l_{[i]}) \cdot k(i) \leq 2^{(2^Nq_m(l_{[i]}))^2} \cdot k(i)$$

$$= 2^{(2^{m+N(l_{[i]}))}^2} \cdot k(i) \leq 2^{2^{(m+\tau(n)+l([i]))^2}} \cdot k(i)$$

Using Lemma 3.1.1, 3.1.2, 3.1.3 we get

$$m_i \leq 2^{(2^N(l_{[i]}))^2} \cdot k(i) = 2^{8(l_{[i]^2} + (l_{[i]})^2 + l_{[h(i)]})}$$

$$\leq 2^{(l_{[i]} + l_{[h(i)]})^2} = 2^{2^{l_{[i]}^2 + l_{[h(i)]}} \leq 2^{l_{[h(i)]}} \leq 2^{l_{[h(i)]} + g(n)}}$$

We still had to show that the $(2^{[i]} - i)$-th element of $Q_{m}(\leq k(i))$ exists. We'll show that $\#Q_{m}(\leq k(i)) \geq 2^{l_{[i]} - 1}$.

Note $h^{-1}(n) \geq i \Rightarrow h(i) \leq n$. And from $i > g_1(n) \geq 2^{T(m)}$ follows $k(i) = 2_1((|i| - 1)(|i|_{h(i)} - 1)) \geq 2_1((|i| - 1)(|i| - 1)) \geq 2_1(|i| - 1) \geq T(m)$

So by lemma 1.1.2, $C_{Q_m}(k(i)) \geq (2^{2^{m-l_{[h(i)]}}} - m_{n+2}(k(i)))$

$i > g_1(n) \geq 2_{n+2}(n+1)$ implies $2^{2^{m-l_{[h(i)]}}} \geq m_{n+1}(2_1(|i| - 1)^2)$, since the lefthandside grows faster in $i$ than the righthandside, and for $i = 2_{n+2}(n + 1)$ the lefthandside is greater than the righthandside

Hence

$$2^{2^m(|i| - 1)} \geq m_{n+1}(2_1(|i| - 1)^2) \Rightarrow$$

$$2^{2^m(|i|_{h(i)} - 1)} \geq 2^{2^m(|i| - 1)} \geq m_{n+1}(2_1(|i| - 1)(|i|_{h(i)} - 1)) = m_{n+1}(k(i))$$

$$\Rightarrow 2^{2^m} \ln(k(i)) = 2^{2^m(|i|_{h(i)} - 1)(|i| - 1) \ln(2)}$$

$$\geq (|i| - 1) \ln(2) m_{n+1}(k(i)) = (2^{2^{[i]+1}}) m_{n+1}(k(i))$$

$$\Rightarrow 2^{2^m} \ln(k(i)) \geq \ln(2^{2^{[i]+1}})$$
\[ C_{Q_m}(k(i)) \geq \exp(2^{2^{-m}} \frac{\ln(k(i))}{\ln_{m-1}(k(i))}) \geq 2^{|i|-1} \]

**Corollary** PA \( \not\vdash (\forall K)(\exists M ) M > D(K, F_{\epsilon_0}^{-1}) \)

**Proof**

\( F_{\epsilon_0} \) is not provably total in PA, hence \( D(g(n), F_{\epsilon_0}^{-1}) \) is not provably total in PA, and the assertion follows.
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